

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I don't need even that much time to say that I strongly support this bill.

I appreciate the fact that the authorizing committee has brought it to the floor. We will get it passed. The only substantive argument I really hear is a jurisdictional one. The chair of the Judiciary Committee hasn't raised any objection to this. It ought to be passed, and this Congress should be proud that it did.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out, because I have expressed my opposition to this because of the process which has been acknowledged by several Members on my side of the aisle, the last time legislation like this was taken up was in the 101st Congress. The bill was introduced, I think, on the first day. There were hearings held in the House on that legislation, and then it went through committee markup. It was amended in committee, sent to the House floor, and it was passed on suspension, but that was after the committee had done its work.

It went to the Senate where there were hearings in the Senate. The bill was further amended in the Senate committee. It went to the Senate floor where it was amended again and then came back to the House. The House concurred and amended it one more time. It went back to the Senate, they concurred, and the bill was finally passed.

I point out that that process involved in that case both Houses. Both Houses had ideas on how to improve this legislation. But apparently this year, while a similar bill was introduced in the House, there was only a hearing in the Judiciary Committee. We had no hearing on the incidence of crime in our committee, which I think would have probably provided some insight. I only bring this up, Mr. Speaker, to say that the process in passing legislation should involve both Houses and not just one House.

But I find it rather curious in this instance where those on the other side are saying the Senate did all the work in its wonderful process. I wonder if everybody on the other side of the aisle feels that way with the other issues that are pending here where we seem to have a problem getting concurrence on major issues like the supplemental budget, for example, and a few other issues that are floating around. Maybe we should just yield all of the wisdom in this House to the Senate, as we have on this bill.

Now, I say that somewhat facetiously, obviously, Mr. Speaker, but that is the reason why I feel compelled to make a point of opposing this bill on the process. But we shall see if these other issues are taken up in a like manner by this House, and I won't hold my breath.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from West Virginia has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate my good friend, the gentleman from Washington's, comments about the other body. However, every now and then some blaze of wisdom or light strikes over there and they do see their way to doing something that is good. And when they do it, you have to give them credit for it. What else can you say?

H.R. 725, as amended, would mark the most significant stride forward in improving the public safety in Indian Country in a generation. Swift passage is not only critical to addressing the problem of unchecked violence in Indian Country, but also to ensuring that the United States meets its solemn trust obligations to tribes.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I thank Members on both sides of the aisle and our staffs, as well, who have worked cooperatively and in a bipartisan fashion. And I thank the Members of the other body as well for that light that they have seen—on this particular issue anyway.

I urge my colleagues to support passage of the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 725.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3250. An act to provide for the training of Federal building personnel, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 93-415, as amended by Public Law 102-586, the Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, after consultation with the Republican Leader, announces the appointment of the following individuals to the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention:

Richard Vincent of Nevada (2-year term), vice Larry Brendtro.

Deborah Schumacher of Nevada (3-year term), vice William L. Gibbons.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 111-5, the Chair, on behalf of the Democratic Leader, reappoints the following individual to the Health Information Technology Policy Committee:

Dr. Frank Nemeec of Nevada.

□ 1200

TO AMEND THE NATIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT MUSEUM ACT

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1053) to amend the National Law Enforcement Museum Act to extend the termination date.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1053

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. NATIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT MUSEUM ACT.

Section 4(f) of the National Law Enforcement Museum Act (Public Law 106-492) is amended by striking "10 years" and inserting "13 years".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAHALL. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the 106th Congress authorized the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund to establish the National Law Enforcement Museum on a site selected here in the District of Columbia. The authority to begin construction, however, will expire in November of this year, and the project has yet to break ground. S. 1053 will extend the sunset date for 3 years.

Given the enormous sacrifices made by the men and women who work in law enforcement in order to protect our safety and well-being, this is obviously a worthy project, and we support extending its authorization so this museum proposal may continue moving forward. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, S. 1053 has been adequately explained by the ranking member of the committee. We are pleased that, despite the difficult economic environment, the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund is committed to completing this project without Federal appropriation. So I urge