with two Oak Leaf Clusters. He flew with the Eighth Special Operations Squadron as an MC-130 aircraft commander in June of 1979.

As my colleagues know, on November 4, 1979, the Iranians seized the United States Embassy in Tehran, taking 66 Americans hostage. An extremely complex rescue mission was formed and Lyn volunteered for the mission. The rescue attempt began April 24, 1980, and it ended in a disaster in an Iranian desert on April 25. Lyn was among those who died in this very, very tragic accident.

But today, we are here, grateful for Lyn’s service to his country, grateful for his commitment, and we want to say “thank you” to his family: we want to say “thank you” in the way that Americans will always do for eternal gratitude for those who give that last full measure of devotion for our country.

Today, I would like to urge my colleagues to pass H.R. 1432, a bill to name the United States Post Office on the InnenHEY building in Valdosta, Georgia, as the Major Lyn McIntosh Building in memory of a brave American. Lyn was indeed a great American. Greater love hath no man but that he lay down his life for his friends. Lyn was a friend to all Americans. He gave himself for those 66 hostages; and for that, we will forever be grateful.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this resolution as a memorial to Lyn and his family and to all those who knew and all Americans who benefited from his service to our great country.

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), my distinguished colleague.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

I wanted to say that the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP), my good friend, has introduced a very timely resolution. As the gentleman from Georgia said, the office has earned reauthorization by the American people.

I also want to say that the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill. H.R. 1432.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. JO ANN DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill. H.R. 1432.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill. H.R. 1432.

The yeas and nays were ordered. The yeas and nays were ordered. The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Civil Service and Agency Organization, I am pleased to join with the gentleman from Maryland in support of S. 1202, a bill to extend the authorization of appropriations for the Office of Government Ethics through fiscal year 2006.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1202
Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.
This Act may be cited as the “Office of Government Ethics Authorization Act of 2001”.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

GENERAL LEAVE
Mrs. MORELLA. 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 gentlewoman from Maryland?

There was no objection.
the public’s trust in the integrity of government.

Mr. Speaker, there is no component of government more important than that of assuring the public’s trust. OGE helps to build and maintain that kind of trust that is essential for an orderly, ethical, and respectable conduct of the Nation’s business. For those reasons, I urge swift passage of this bill.

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

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

I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for his words and tell him that I do value working with him on the Subcommittee on Civil Service and Agency Organization. I also want to thank Senator LEIBERMAN who chairs the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs for his sponsorship of this bill. Indeed, accolades to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUTTINGER), the chairman of the committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member, for their support of this legislation. Also, thanks should go to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENIBRENNER), the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, for his cooperation in expediting consideration of this measure.

Mr. Speaker, promoting high ethical standards in the Federal Government is critically important if the citizens of this country are to have confidence in its operation. For this reason, I urge all Members to support S. 1202 and the reauthorization of the Office of Government Ethics.

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 Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1202. The Motion was taken. The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.
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Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2657) to amend title 11, District of Co-

lumbia Code, to redesignate the Family Division of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia as the Family Court of the Superior Court, to recruit and retain trained and experienced judges to serve in the Family Court, to promote consistency and efficiency in the administration of justice to the Family Court and in the consideration of actions and proceedings in the Family Court, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “District of Columbia Family Court Act of 2001”.

SEC. 2. REDESIGNATION OF FAMILY DIVISION AS FAMILY COURT OF THE SUPERIOR COURT.

(a) In general.—Section 11–902, District of Columbia Code, is amended to read as follows:

§ 11–902. Organization of the court

(1) In general.—The Superior Court shall consist of the following:

(A) The Court of Appeals.

(B) The Criminal Division.

(C) The Family Court.

(D) The Probate Division.

(2) Branches.—The divisions of the Superior Court may be divided into such branches as the Superior Court may by rule prescribe.

SEC. 3. APPOINTMENT AND ASSIGNMENT OF JUDGES; NUMBER AND QUALIFICATIONS.

(a) Number of Judges;—

(1) In general.—The number of judges serving on the Family Court of the Superior Court shall not be more than 15.

(2) Emergency Reassignment.—If the chief judge determines that, in order to carry out the purposes of the District of Columbia Family Court Act of 2001, an emergency exists such that the number of judges needed on the Family Court of the Superior Court at any given time is more than 15

(A) the chief judge may temporarily realign judges from other divisions of the Superior Court to serve on the Family Court who meet the requirements of paragraphs (1) and (3) of subsection (b) or senior judges who meet the requirements of those paragraphs, except such reassigned judges shall not be subject to the term requirements set forth in subsection (c); and

(B) the chief judge shall, within 30 days of emergency temporary realignment pursuant to paragraph (A), submit a report to the President and Congress describing—

(i) the nature of the emergency;

(ii) how the emergency was addressed, including which judges were reassigned; and

(iii) whether and why an increase in the number of Family Court judges authorized in subsection (a)(1) may be necessary to serve the needs of families and children in the District of Columbia.

(2) Composition.—The total number of judges on the Superior Court may exceed the authorized number of judges in chapter 11 of title 11 by the number of emergency reassignments described in paragraphs (1) and (3) of subsection (b). The chief judge may increase the number of judges on the Superior Court to the extent necessary to maintain the requirements described in subsection (b).

(3) Appointment and assignment of judges;—

(A) The chief judge of the Superior Court;

(B) The Chief Judge of the Superior Court—

(i) is unable to secure a volunteer judge who is sitting on the Superior Court outside of the Family Court for reassignment to the Family Court;

(ii) obtains approval of the Joint Committee on Judicial Administration; and

(iii) reports to Congress regarding the circumstances that gave rise to the necessity to exceed the cap.

(4) Qualifications.—The chief judge may not assign an individual to serve on the Family Court of the Superior Court or handle a Family Court case unless—

(1) the individual has training or expertise in family law;

(2) the individual certifies to the chief judge that the individual intends to serve the full term of service, except that this paragraph shall not apply with respect to individuals serving as senior judges under section 11–1504, individuals serving as temporary judges under section 11–903, and any other judge serving in another division of the Superior Court;

(3) the Family Division of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia shall be deemed to refer to the Family Court of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.”

SEC. 4. CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subchapter I of chapter 23 of title 16, District of Columbia, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 16–2301 the following new section:

“§16–2301.1. References deemed to refer to Family Court of the Superior Court.”

SEC. 5. APPROVAL.—The District of Columbia Family Court Act of 2001 shall be known as the “District of Columbia Family Court Act of 2001”.

SEC. 6. EFFECTIVE DATE.—This act shall take effect upon enactment.

Section 3 of title 16, District of Columbia Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§16–101. Legislative findings;—

(A) The District of Columbia Family Court Act of 2001 is hereby enacted to—

(1) promote consistency and efficiency in the administration of justice to the Family Court and in the consideration of actions and proceedings in the Family Court, and for other purposes.

(2) expedite judicial hearing of cases brought before hearing commissioners.

(3) make the Family Court of the Superior Court; and

(4) redesignate the Family Division as the Family Court of the Superior Court.”