

a right to expect that vessels they board will be safe, that is laws of the United States under which vessels operate will protect them.

Mr. Speaker, the primary purpose of these vessels is to serve the cause of tourism, and I am a very strong supporter of tourism. I chaired the Congressional Travel and Tourism Caucus for several years and advocated tourism. I want to see developments of this kind take place. This is a very ambitious, a very attractive waterfront development in the City of Richmond, which indeed started under the aegis of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) when he was mayor there.

So I met with the gentleman from Virginia, and I expressed to him my concerns about the rather overly broad sweep of the language and was satisfied that the consequences of that language were not intended by any means by the gentleman from Virginia, nor the other gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) who was the principle co-author of this legislation, and after rather extensive discussion, we came to a very clear meeting of the minds, that adjustments should be made. The gentleman went back to his City of Richmond, talked with the mayor and city council and came back with a narrowing of the scope of the bill so that the designation as nonnavigable applies to a very much smaller and narrower set of Coast Guard laws.

Second, the language provides for the Coast Guard to revoke the designation and make the vessels operating on the canal subject to safety regulations if the vessels are not built, maintained and operated in a manner consistent with public safety, the City of Richmond will be primarily responsible for ensuring that the vessels are operated safely, and third, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) also worked out with the City of Richmond an agreement to consult with the Coast Guard before allowing any material change in the operation of the vessels on the canal. So the city is the primary line of defense and responsibility for public safety and common wiefld.

The Mayor of Richmond, in fourth place, has agreed to introduce a city ordinance restricting the carrying capacity of these vessels to 40 people, the maximum allowed under Coast Guard guidelines and recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, I think these four changes make this a very acceptable bill. I know it took a good deal of effort on the part of both the principle author and the co-author of the legislation to make these adjustments, but they are in the best public interest, and I appreciate their cooperation. I think the public will appreciate their concern and action on behalf of safety, and certainly we should all rest assured that the traveling public will have a very safe medium in which to enjoy the pleasures and the extraordinary his-

tory of this beautiful City of Richmond.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. 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 Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1034, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1034, as amended, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE CONGRESS WITH RESPECT TO THE TRAGIC SHOOTING AT COLUMBINE HIGH SCHOOL IN LITTLETON, COLORADO

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H.Con.Res. 92) expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the tragic shooting at Columbine High School in Littleton, Colorado.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 92

Whereas on April 20, 1999, two armed gunmen opened fire at Columbine High School in Littleton, Colorado, killing 12 students and 1 teacher and wounding more than 20 others; and

Whereas local, State, and Federal law enforcement personnel performed their duties admirably and risked their lives for the safety of the students, faculty, and staff at Columbine High School: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) condemns, in the strongest possible terms, the heinous atrocities which occurred at Columbine High School in Littleton, Colorado;

(2) offers its condolences to the families, friends, and loved ones of those who were killed at Columbine High School and ex-

presses its hope for the rapid and complete recovery of those wounded in the shooting;

(3) applauds the hard work and dedication exhibited by the hundreds of local, State, and Federal law enforcement officials and the others who offered their support and assistance; and

(4) encourages the American people to engage in a national dialogue on preventing school violence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

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

Mr. Speaker, the veneer that separates civilization from barbarism, that separates good from evil, is very thin, and it appears everywhere to be wearing thinner. Last week it wore through in my hometown, and the evil seeped out and stole the lives of 12 innocent children and one valiant teacher at Columbine High School. Mr. Speaker, yesterday my son Ray gave me something he had written in response to this tragedy. I believe it is not just fatherly pride that compels me to read parts of it here today. I believe he eloquently captures the nature of the cultural abrasives that ever so relentlessly eat away at our national soul, and I would like to cite just a part of it:

“Do you believe in God?” “Yes, I believe in God.”

“Seventeen year old Cassie Bernal’s life ended with that answer. Our answers to the Columbine High School murders begin with the same question, and our answer must be the same as Cassie Bernal or the nihilistic fury unleashed by those two young murderers will surely prevail.”

People search for meaning in these brutal senseless acts. People question the norms of a society in which monstrous violence can be countenanced. People question the righteousness, even the existence of a God who can allow such pain and violence into the world. These are valid, but unanswerable questions.

We can speculate and hypothesize, we can blame and vent, but in the end we know we cannot fathom the meaning of this event or presume to comprehend this evil. Nevertheless, our choice is stark: Do we believe in God or not? An answer to that question is the whole of what we take away from the Columbine massacre, for the answer means everything.

We either coast in the cultural currents of a facile nihilism, or we embrace God on our knees and pray for His grace and forgiveness. Nihilism or God, that is the choice. The comfortable in-between is now gone.

In reporting on Adolph Eichmann’s 1960 trial in Jerusalem, philosopher Hannah Arendt noted the banality of