

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1937, authored by the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. LARSEN) will authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct feasibility studies for three Native American tribes in the State of Washington. The purpose of the studies is to investigate the feasibility of providing potable water and wastewater distribution systems to meet the future domestic and commercial needs of the tribes.

This is a noncontroversial bill, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in strong support as well of H.R. 1937, the Pacific Northwest Feasibility Studies Act. I congratulate my colleague, the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. LARSEN), for his hard work in bringing this bill to the House floor today.

H.R. 1937 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to engage in water supply feasibility studies to benefit several Native American communities in the State of Washington. The studies will help the communities to identify the best ways to meet their water supply and distribution needs for domestic, rural, and commercial water users.

The bill also requires the Secretary to make the results of these studies available to the public and to publish a notice of the availability of study results. The report and accompanying environmental and economic analyses will provide the Congress with recommendations on how best to proceed with cost-effective and environmentally sound solutions to the water problems facing these communities.

This legislation enjoys broad support, and I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 1937.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN), the sponsor of H.R. 1937.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I just want to take a few minutes to speak on behalf of H.R. 1937, the Pacific Northwest Feasibility Studies Act of 2001.

I first want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) on the Republican side, and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), the gentleman from Wash-

ington (Mr. SMITH), and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) on the Democratic side for their support in shepherding this legislation to the floor today.

I just want to point out this bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to conduct water feasibility studies for three Native American tribes in Washington State. I want to speak briefly about one in particular, which is in my district, the Tulalip Indian Tribe. The Tulalip reservation is located outside of Marysville and covers approximately 35 square miles. The permanent population of the reservation is under 7,000 and continues to grow significantly, but during the summer and holidays the reservation population increases by up to 40 percent.

Like many American Indian reservations, the Tulalip reservation faces groundwater access barriers due to the presence of glacial sediments, a shallow aquifer system, bordering salt water and limited drainage. Likewise, most of the current drinking water on the reservation is supplied from a patchwork of public and private wells. Continued degradation of the water resources on the reservation will limit the development of the reservation and surrounding areas.

The study that this bill authorizes is vital to ensure the long-term safety and accessibility of groundwater on the reservation. So I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, H.R. 1937.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, in closing, to thank the ranking member, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN), for her support in helping to bring these four bills to the floor today. Especially the first one, I failed to thank her on the floor for that, so I will do it now.

I want to thank her and all the Members for their support in bringing these four bills forward.

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

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to thank my colleague for those kind words. It has been a pleasure sharing this afternoon with him and getting these bills to the floor and passed, as well as working with him on the committee these several years.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and 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. PETERSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1937, 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. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 695, H.R. 434, H.R. 1628, and H.R. 1937, the four bills just considered.

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

There was no objection.

BROWN V. BOARD OF EDUCATION 50TH ANNIVERSARY COMMISSION

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 2133) to establish a commission for the purpose of encouraging and providing for the commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the Supreme Court decision in *Brown v. Board of Education*.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendments:

Page 3, line 8, strike out "Chair" and insert "one of two Co-chairpersons".

Page 3, after line 8, insert:

(2) Two representatives of the Department of Justice appointed by the Attorney General, one of whom shall serve as one of two Co-chairpersons of the Commission.

Page 3, line 9, strike out "(2)" and insert "(3)".

Page 3, strike out lines 11 to 22.

Page 3, after line 22, insert:

(A)(i) The Members of the Senate from each State described in clause (iii) shall each submit the name of 1 individual from the State to the majority leader and minority leader of the Senate.

(ii) After review of the submissions made under clause (i), the majority leader of the Senate, in consultation with the minority leader of the Senate, shall recommend to the President 5 individuals, 1 from each of the States described in clause (iii).

(iii) The States described in this clause are the States in which the lawsuits decided by the *Brown* decision were originally filed (Delaware, Kansas, South Carolina, and Virginia), and the State of the first legal challenge involved (Massachusetts).

(B)(i) The Members of the House of Representatives from each State described in subparagraph (A)(iii) shall each submit the name of 1 individual from the State to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(ii) After review of the submissions made under clause (i), the Speaker of the House of Representatives, in consultation with the minority leader of the House of Representatives, shall recommend to the President 5 individuals, 1 from each of the States described in subparagraph (A)(iii).

Page 4, line 3, strike out "(3)" and insert "(4)".

Page 4, line 6, strike out "(4)" and insert "(5)".

Page 4, line 8, strike out "(5)" and insert "(6)".

Page 4, line 10, strike out "(6)" and insert "(7)".

Page 5, line 4, strike out "the Chair" and insert "a Co-chairperson".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2133, the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is my pleasure to rise in support of H.R. 2133 introduced by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN), which would establish a commission to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Brown versus Board of Education decision. This bill passed the House on June 27, 2001, under suspension of the rules by a vote of 414 to 2 and passed the Senate on August 3 with some amendments. These amendments change how the commission would be formed and who would make the recommendations for commission members.

Mr. Speaker, May 17, 2004, will mark the 50th anniversary of this landmark U.S. Supreme Court decision. This legislation would establish a Federal commission to provide for and encourage the commemoration of that anniversary. The Brown decision, as studied in law schools across the United States, is remembered for its definite interpretation of the 14th amendment to the United States Constitution. The Court stated that the discriminatory nature of racial segregation violates the 14th amendment to the U.S. Constitution, which guarantees all citizens equal protection of the laws.

On a human level, the Brown decision has had a dramatic impact on families, communities, and governments by outlawing racial segregation, meaning an end to legal discrimination on any basis. Today, we take it as a given that, as the Court opined at that time, separate educational facilities are inherently unequal.

Cheryl Brown Henderson, of the Brown Foundation, had the idea to establish a commission to prepare for the commemoration of the 50th anniversary of this decision. Seeing the educational value this commission would bring, my colleague, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN), followed through with legislation to establish it. The commission would work in conjunction with the Department of Education to plan and coordinate public education activities and initiatives

through its 10 regional offices. Activities such as public lectures, writing contests, and public awareness campaigns will be included.

The commission is to be comprised of 22 members, including representatives from the Department of Education, the Department of Justice, the NAACP, the Judicial Branch, the Brown Foundation, and the Brown v. Board National Historic Site. In addition, Members of the Senate and House of Representatives from the States in which the lawsuits were originally filed, Delaware, Kansas, South Carolina, and Virginia, and from the State of the first legal challenge, Massachusetts, and the District of Columbia would recommend individuals to the Speaker of the House and minority leader and the majority and minority leader in the Senate for the commission.

Ultimately, we hope that this commission will educate Americans about the far-reaching historical impact of this decision and what it has done for this country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN), the sponsor of this bill, to speak on behalf of it.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank those in the House and the other body for their hard work in bringing this important bill to the floor today. I especially want to thank one of my constituents, Cheryl Brown Henderson, for being the catalyst in this effort to educate America on the Brown versus Board of Education Supreme Court decision.

H.R. 2133 will establish a commission to help educate Americans on the history and ramifications of this landmark case in preparation for the 50th anniversary of the Brown decision. On May 17, 1954, the U.S. Supreme Court issued a definitive interpretation of the 14th amendment that would unequivocally change the landscape of American public education. This decision effectively ended the long-held "separate but equal" doctrine in U.S. education.

The commission will work in conjunction with a number of different Departments, as my colleague just mentioned, the Department of Education, Judicial Branch, NAACP Legal Defense and Education Foundation, and the Brown Foundation. It will also have individuals chosen from the various States where this originated, such as in Delaware, Kansas, South Carolina, and Massachusetts will also serve on the commission. So it will be very far-reaching, but it is a great opportunity to bring all this before the American public.

Establishing a commission will help educate the American public on this decision and will serve as a resounding reminder to all of us of the real struggle and sacrifice required to make equality a reality for all America.

□ 1445

We must not forget these sacrifices that were made in order for equality for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring this historic and far-reaching Supreme Court decision by supporting H.R. 2133.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2133, the legislation to establish the Brown v. Board of Education 50th Anniversary Commission.

I want to commend my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Chicago, Illinois (Mr. Davis) for his leadership in bringing this bill to the floor as the ranking member and co-sponsor of this bill.

This commission, in conjunction with the Department of Education and the Department of Justice, is charged with planning and coordinating public educational activities, initiatives, writing contests, and public awareness campaigns regarding this anniversary of Brown v. the Board of Education.

Under the bill, the commission will in cooperation with the Brown Foundation for Educational Equity, Excellence and Research, submit recommendations to the Congress to encourage, plan and develop the observances of the anniversary of Brown decision. The 50th anniversary of the Brown decision will take place on May 17, 2004. Brown v. the Board of Education is to be commemorated for what it did to address the disparities in the American educational system 47 years ago and to help remind us that there is much yet to be done to address the disparities that we struggle with even today.

Education has always been the way up and the way out for America's youth. Equal educational opportunity is America's best hope for racial, social, and economic justice. It was because of this fact that in 1951 Oliver Brown and the parents of 12 other black children filed a lawsuit against the Topeka Board of Education protesting the City's segregation of black and white students. This is why also today parents all across America, particularly parents of children of color, are demanding that elected officials improve the quality and equality of America's schools.

In 1997, we know that 93 percent of whites age 25 to 29 had attained a high school diploma or equivalency degree. In that same year, only 87 percent of African-Americans had attained their high school diploma and just 63 percent of Hispanics. Among those who achieved a high school diploma, 37 percent of whites had completed a bachelor's degree at a college or university compared with only 16 percent of African-Americans and 18 percent of Hispanics. Clearly the statistics revealed to us that we have not yet achieved the goals of Brown v. Board of Education.

Given the increasing importance of skills in our labor market, these gaps in educational attainment translate into significant differences by race and ethnicity in eventual labor market outcomes, such as wages and employment.

It is important to remember that the historic *Brown v. Board of Education* decision, which was announced in May of 1954 by Chief Justice Earl Warren, represented a significant change in our policy in our public schools that has meant much progress for those who were for many years segregated into substandard and unequal classrooms.

Justice Warren, in that opinion, stated that public education was a right which must be made available to all on equal terms. I trust that this commission will remember those words when planning for the observances of the 50th anniversary of the *Brown* decision. I hope those words will remind all of us that we have yet to achieve the goals that were set forth in that historic opinion.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join with me in supporting this very important piece of legislation.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today in support of H.R. 2133 which would establish a commission for the purpose of encouraging and providing for the commemoration of the 50th Anniversary on May 17, 2004 of the Supreme Court's unanimous and landmark 1954 decision in *Brown v. the Board of Education*.

While the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments to the Constitution outlawed slavery, guaranteed rights of citizenship to naturalized citizens and due process, equal protection and voting rights, nearly a century would pass before the last vestiges of "legalized" discrimination and inequality would be effectively revoked. The right of equal protection under the law for African-Americans was dealt a heavy blow with the Supreme Court's 1875 decision to uphold a lower court in *Plessy v. Ferguson*. The *Plessy* decision created the infamous "separate but equal" doctrine that made segregation "constitutional" for almost 80 years.

It was not until the 1950's, when the NAACP defense team led by the Honorable Thurgood Marshall as general counsel, launched a national campaign to challenge segregation at the elementary school level that effective and lasting change was achieved. In five individually unique cases filed in four states and the District of Columbia, the NAACP defense team not only claimed that segregated schools told Black children they were inferior to White children, but that the "separate but equal" ruling in *Plessy* violated equal protection. Although all five lost in the lower courts, the U.S. Supreme Court accepted each case in turn, hearing them collectively in what became *Brown v. Board of Education*.

The *Brown* decision brought a decisive end to segregation and discrimination in our public school systems, and gradually our national, cultural and social consciousness as well.

The first, however, did not end there. We may have overcome segregation and racism,

but now the fight is economic, one in which some of our schools are inferior to others because of inadequate funding, overcrowded classrooms, dilapidated school buildings and a nationwide lack of teachers. We only have to look at the high levels of crime, drug use, juvenile delinquency, teen pregnancy and unemployment to know the value of a good education. If *Brown* taught us anything, it is that without the proper educational tools, young people lose hope for the future.

No one challenges the concept of investing in human capital, but it is a well-known fact that we spend ten times as much to incarcerate then we do to educate. If we can find the resources to fund a tax cut and for a U.S. prison system with nearly 2 million inmates, we can give our public schools the repairs and facilities they desperately need, we can reduce class sizes and provide adequate pay to attract the best and brightest into the teaching profession.

I urge my colleagues here in the House to join me in remembering the lessons of *Brown v. Board of Education* when we consider our national priorities, by committing ourselves to addressing the unfulfilled promises of equality and opportunity contained in the *Brown* decision.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill, H.R. 2133.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF ARMY RESERVE CENTER IN KEWAUNEE, WISCONSIN TO CITY OF KEWAUNEE

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 788) to provide for the conveyance of the excess Army Reserve Center in Kewaunee, Wisconsin, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 788

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

SECTION 1. LAND CONVEYANCE, ARMY RESERVE CENTER, KEWAUNEE, WISCONSIN.

(a) CONVEYANCE REQUIRED.—The Administrator of General Services shall convey, without consideration, to the City of Kewaunee, Wisconsin (in this section referred to as the "City"), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of Federal real property, including improvements thereon, that is located at 401 5th Street in Kewaunee, Wisconsin, and con-

tains an excess Army Reserve Center. After such conveyance, the property may be used and occupied only by the City, or by another local or State government entity approved by the City.

(b) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the real property to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Administrator. The cost of the survey shall be borne by the City.

(c) REVERSIONARY INTEREST.—During the 20-year period beginning on the date the Administrator makes the conveyance under subsection (a), if the Administrator determines that the conveyed property is not being used and occupied in accordance with such subsection, all right, title, and interest in and to the property, including any improvements thereon, shall revert to the United States. Upon reversion, the United States shall immediately proceed to a public sale of the property.

(d) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—(1) The property shall not be used for commercial purposes.

(2) The Administrator may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under subsection (a) as the Administrator considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(e) TREATMENT OF AMOUNTS RECEIVED.—Any net proceeds received by the United States as payment under subsection (c) shall be deposited into the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 788 would require the General Services Administration to convey to the City of Kewaunee, Wisconsin at no cost a parcel of property containing an Army Reserve Center located in northwest Kewaunee. The property consists of two buildings with approximately 17,000 square feet of space constructed on 4.4 acres of land.

The property is excess to the needs of the Army and surplus to the needs of the Federal Government. It has been vacant since 1996.

Currently, the City of Kewaunee's municipal services are located at different sites around the city. Kewaunee city hall, police department, ambulance service and community center/senior center have outgrown their present facilities. They require room to expand. The City of Kewaunee intends