

So it is very interesting that the people who on the civilian side of the budget say cut, cut, cut, on the defense side say spend, spend, spend. Even if they did not ask for it, spend, spend, spend. It is very hard to listen to those people talk about being serious about the budget. Both sides should be treated the same, and I hope they will.

CONCERNS ABOUT 1997 BUDGET

(Mr. STUPAK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, we've now had a look at the Republican's 1997 budget, and I have several major concerns.

It appears that many of the cuts proposed last year have reappeared in the new budget. These include cuts in Medicare and Medicaid, cuts in the earned income tax credit, and in education.

I am greatly concerned about the impact of these cuts on seniors, on rural health programs, on student loan programs.

I also worry about extremist positions on these budget areas which will lead once again to Government shutdowns, disruption of service to Americans, and a tremendous waste of time and money.

Mr. Speaker, we have the means to reach agreement on a plan to balance the budget in 7 years.

In discussions earlier this year, Republicans and the President agreed on certain cuts, enough to realize \$711 billion in savings.

At the time of the discussion, only \$635 billion in cuts was needed to balance the budget by the year 2002. More recent figures show similar areas of agreement.

Let's build on areas where we agree. Let's balance the budget while protecting essential programs for Americans—education, the environment, Medicaid, and Medicare.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, DC, May 10, 1996.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that Jim Dyer, currently the staff director of the Appropriations Committee and formerly a staff assistant for Congressman Joseph McDade of Pennsylvania, has been served with a subpoena issued by the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania in the case of United States versus McDade.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compli-

ance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

BOB LIVINGSTON,
Chairman.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV. Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules, but not before 5 p.m. today.

HEALTHY MEALS FOR CHILDREN ACT

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2066) to amend the National School Lunch Act to provide greater flexibility to schools to meet the Dietary Guidelines for Americans under the school lunch and school breakfast programs, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2066

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 "Healthy Meals for Children Act".

SEC. 2. INCREASED FLEXIBILITY FOR SCHOOLS TO MEET THE DIETARY GUIDELINES FOR AMERICANS UNDER THE NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT.

Section 9(f)(2) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1758(f)(2)) is amended by striking subparagraph (D) and inserting the following:

"(D) USE OF ANY REASONABLE APPROACH.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—A school food service authority may use any reasonable approach, within guidelines established by the Secretary in a timely manner, to meet the requirements of this paragraph, including—

"(I) using the school nutrition meal pattern in effect for the 1994–1995 school year; and

"(II) using any of the approaches described in subparagraph (C).

"(ii) NUTRIENT ANALYSIS.—The Secretary may not require a school to conduct or use a nutrient analysis to meet the requirements of this paragraph."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] will each be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

□ 1415

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in support of H.R. 2066 which amends the School Lunch Program to provide schools flexibility in demonstrating how they have met the dietary guidelines for Americans.

This bill not only has bipartisan support in Congress, it has the support of the American School Food Service Association, the American Association of School Administrators, the National School Boards Association, and the Association of School Business Officials.

During the 103d Congress, the National School Lunch Program was modified to require schools to meet the dietary guidelines for Americans under the school lunch and breakfast programs. I supported this change.

The law permitted schools to use nutrient-based menu planning, assisted nutrient-based menu planning or a food-based menu system, which was the only method of menu planning used under prior law, as long as they met the dietary guidelines. On Tuesday, June 13, 1995, the Department of Agriculture published their final regulations on the school meal initiatives for healthy Americans. Unfortunately, these regulations did not meet congressional intent with respect to providing schools with flexibility in how they demonstrated they were in compliance with the dietary guidelines.

Schools throughout the Nation expressed concern about the implementation of these final regulations. Of special concern were changes to the food-based menu system which had the potential of adding from 5 to 10 cents to the cost of school meals. The reason for the increased cost was a requirement that schools add additional servings of grains, bread, and fruits and vegetables to school meals. Even schools currently meeting the dietary guidelines under the previous food-based menu plan would have to enact such changes. The alternative would be to use the nutrient standard menu plan, which would require schools to make a significant investment in computer hardware and require extensive training and technical assistance to implement the new software and procedures associated with this plan.

On July 1995, I introduced H.R. 2066 with my colleague on the committee, GEORGE MILLER. H.R. 2066 will not change, in any way, the requirement that school meals meet the dietary guidelines for Americans. It will, however, permit schools to use any reasonable approach to meet the dietary guidelines, including those contained in the regulations issued by the Department. Adding additional fruits, vegetables, and grains is certainly one way to ensure the dietary guidelines are met. However, schools could choose to bake instead of fry certain food items or use low-fat alternatives to some food items. There are not just one or two ways to meet the dietary guidelines.

Nothing in this act affects the ability of States to determine if schools have met the dietary guidelines. Compliance reviews will continue to take place. There will still be State and Federal audits and corrective action will still be required for schools not meeting the dietary guidelines.

According to the American School Food Service Association, "We support giving schools the maximum flexibility in planning their menus so that they can best meet local taste preferences and maintain maximum control over program costs while improving the nutritional quality of their meals."

We need to allow schools the flexibility to serve meals students will eat. Only 50 percent of low-income students participate in the School Lunch Program and 46 percent of middle and upper income children participate. As long as schools are serving healthy, nutritious meals, it shouldn't matter how individual schools meet the dietary guidelines.

The bottom line is that schools know best what children will eat. We need to free their hands to do the job that they know how to do best.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2066.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in support of H.R. 2066 and want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania for moving this important bill through committee and to the floor.

This bill is good for the School Lunch Program and for the children it serves.

H.R. 2066 confirms that reason will be applied in the implementation of the requirement we enacted in the School Lunch Act last Congress that school breakfasts and lunches meet the dietary guidelines for Americans. We must enable schools to meet this requirement both with efficiency and in as cost effective manner as possible and this legislation will see that this happens. I firmly believe that such flexibility also will result in more children actually eating the nutritious meals that schools provide.

This legislation in no way retreats from our commitment to ensuring that school meals meet the dietary guidelines for Americans, nor does it compromise the timelines established for schools to provide balanced nutritious meals beginning this fall under these guidelines.

I am grateful to the American School Food Service Association for its assistance and support on this measure. I think the comfort level of the school food service community is important, since they are the ones throughout this Nation who are committed to seeing that the guidelines are reached in school menus. But I also think it is important to recognize the other major education groups that are behind this effort—the National School Board Association, the American Association of School Administrators, and the Association of School Business Officials—all sharing the common goal of having well-fed children ready to learn.

I am most pleased that the administration supports the enactment of this bill, and worked with us in crafting substitute language to ensure that a

reasonable accountability mechanism is in place for schools.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if he would mind engaging in a colloquy at this point.

The amendment to the committee-reported bill is a welcome addition to this legislation. It would have the Secretary of Agriculture establish general guidelines for school food authorities to turn to for help when crafting the approach they will use to meet the dietary guidelines.

I would ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania, am I correct that it is the intent of this amendment that the Secretary exercise this authority sparingly, so that schools will have maximum control over how they meet the dietary guidelines and not be limited only to federally prescribed approaches.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GOODLING. Yes, the gentleman is correct. School food authorities must have maximum flexibility to plan menus that adhere to the dietary guidelines, meet children's preferences, and take account of food, planning, and preparation costs. While the amended language recognizes some Federal oversight is advisable, the guidelines to be issued by the Secretary must ensure that school food authorities may choose among the widest possible range of reasonable approaches consistent with their responsibility to serve meals that comply with the dietary guidelines. The Secretary's guidelines are to help schools in designing their meal programs, not micromanage them. They should set outer bounds and clearly impermissible practices, not prescribe a list of approved approaches or simply add some options to the three choices already in regulations. The committee continues to believe that the primary method of assuring accountability is, as already incorporated in regulations, periodic review of schools' meals to see whether they live up to the dietary guidelines and follow-up corrective actions if necessary. The Secretary's guidelines should not be used to unnecessarily prejudice schools' menu planning approaches, especially when many schools are already meeting the dietary guidelines using their food-based menu systems.

Mr. MILLER of California. If I might ask the gentleman one other question, and that is, would the Secretary's guidelines limit schools that already use or want to use a food-based menu system to the options in current regulations and the 1994-95 school year meal pattern as added by the bill?

Mr. GOODLING. No, they would not. It should be clearly understood that the Secretary's guidelines are to recognize school food authorities' right to develop their own approach to complying with the dietary guidelines using

their best judgment. This could mean using their current meal patterns, already designed alternatives, the options in current regulations, the 1994-95 meal pattern, or any other reasonable approach within the general bounds set by the Secretary. They could, for example, make adjustments to the food-based system in current regulations to better recognize children's preferences or control costs, or take suggestions from the Department's options to revise their own system. The bottom line is that the basic responsibility for developing reasonable approaches to meeting the dietary guidelines is with the school food authorities, with Federal guidance and oversight but not a panoply prescriptive rules or preset options.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for those clarifications.

I yield such time as she may consume to the gentleman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support for the Healthy Meals for Children Act and urge its immediate adoption. I applaud my colleagues, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Chairman BILL GOODLING, and the gentleman from California, Congressman GEORGE MILLER, for their commitment to the healthy development of kids in this country, and their ability to work together in a bipartisan fashion to bring this important bill to the floor.

The Healthy Meals for Children Act provides schools with more flexibility in how they meet the dietary guidelines for school meals was required by the National School Lunch Act. This bill in no way, it in no way changes the dietary guidelines or erodes the nutritional content of school breakfasts or lunches. This measure allows school administrators and food service staff to make nutritious affordable meals that our kids will eat.

The school lunch program provides man of our children with the one balanced meal that they eat all day. In my home State of Connecticut this legislation will ensure more nutritious meals or over half a million children. In the largest city in my district, New Haven, CT, over half of the children in public schools qualify for either free meals or reduced priced meals through the school lunch program.

Hungry or malnourished children cannot perform at their highest capability in the classroom or in their lives. By giving schools more flexibility to meet the national dietary guidelines, we are improving the health, the life and the performance of children in and out of our classrooms.

Last year the congressional majority made school lunches for our Nation's kids the first item on the chopping block; and, fortunately, the American people fought back and the school lunch program was saved. I am pleased that the bipartisanship of my colleagues has produced this sensible progressive legislation which I support.

My hope is that we can achieve this kind of bipartisan legislation and sensible legislation in the areas of Medicare and Medicaid and education and our environment.

The Healthy Meals for Children Act is supported by the administration, the American Association of School Administrators, and the National School Board Association, among others. Passing this legislation provides food and service workers with flexibility to design meals that children will eat and that meet the dietary guidelines at the same time.

I thank my colleagues for their hard work on this legislation and urge the immediate adoption of the Healthy Meals for Children Act.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON] who realizes that computers will never give us the nutritional value that milk does.

(Mr. GUNDERSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by saying I am delighted to be on the floor dealing with a school nutrition issue other than milk. The fact is, however, Mr. Chairman, that I rise in strong support of this bill but I think it is important as I do so that we understand part of the problem that we faced over the last couple of years.

This is not the first time we have had to deal with all of this. A couple of years ago this whole attempt to regulate through administrative regulations the nutrient standards, et cetera, created such an uproar that we had to take legislative action at that time to make clear that that did not happen.

Many of my colleagues will recall about a year ago, when we were asking the question about whether or not we ought to literally block grant our school nutrition programs, give the money and give the authority back to the schools and let them design a program based on the proper meal plan, and, obviously, the nutrition standards that we all sought, that there was all kind of concern that if we let that happen there would be all kinds of problems.

Well, I think what we are doing today is we are witnessing the problems on the other side once again. Anybody who believes that a one-size-fits-all Washington mentality is going to be able to deal with this issue, does not understand the real life of school nutrition. We looked at this issue in many of our schools in western Wisconsin the last time it was around and we literally discovered that the cost of computers and training was more than what many of these schools spent on salaries for the school dietitians that provided the meals for the children, and we recognized how absurd that

was; that we were going to lose everything in the process.

And, frankly, schools were seriously asking me the question.

□ 1430

I remember one school administrator, she called me up and she said: We are trying to decide. We are going to build a new school. We are trying to decide whether we should even build a hot lunchroom, because the regulations from Washington are getting so complex and so costly, there is simply no way in our small school system we can meet them.

Well, we were able to put that off once, and now we are back here today to put that off a second time and say let us not jeopardize the nutrition goals for our school children because of our love in Washington for regulations and mandates.

So I support the legislation. I commend the chairman for bringing it forth.

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

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

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2066, the Healthy Meals for Children Act.

Last June, after the publication of the final regulations for the Healthy Meals for Healthy Americans Act, I was contacted by school food service providers from my congressional district. One particular individual, Richard Deburgh, director of food services for the Glendale Unified School District, expressed his concern about the regulations in a letter urging that we "support the dietary guidelines but oppose dietary commandments."

This sentiment was echoed by others who contacted me to express their concern that the regulations would affect their ability to prepare meals which were not only healthy and met the dietary guidelines, but which children would eat.

As we all know, the same foods do not appeal to all children in all areas of the country. It is important to allow local school food service providers the freedom to provide students with meals they will eat.

Mr. Speaker, those individuals who work with children each day in local schools know best what they will eat. They live in the local community, talk to the children each day as they pass through the cafeteria line, and have a vested interest in the health of these children. We need to provide them with the flexibility to design and serve healthy meals which children will eat.

H.R. 2066 provides schools with this flexibility and at the same time, maintains the requirement that such meals meet the dietary guidelines for Americans.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support H.R. 2066, the Healthy Meals for Children Act. This legislation would offer school food service providers greater flexibility in meeting the national dietary guidelines in school lunch and breakfast programs.

We are moving this bipartisan legislation because the USDA Food and Consumer Service

under the direction of Ellen Haas is out of control. In the name of advancing good nutrition for children, the USDA is burying our schools in bureaucratic paperwork and regulatory micromanagement. The USDA mandates not just that schools meet the national dietary guidelines, but that they demonstrate their compliance in two or three different ways, as required by prescriptive and needless regulation.

Here is what school food service directors are saying about the USDA's June, 1995, regulation on School Meal Initiatives for Healthy Americans, and about our bill:

Richard DeBurgh, Glendale, CA: "I believe that this bill is essential to stop the ever-increasing bureaucracy associated with school lunch."

Helen Kerrian, National City, CA: "The final regulations published by the Department of Agriculture are very prescriptive. They mandate additional costs * * * even in districts which are meeting the dietary guidelines today."

Sharon Briel, Glendora, CA: "I believe this bill is necessary because USDA has been unresponsive to the concerns of the school food service industry."

This kind of big government run amok will 10 to 17 cents of the cost of every school lunch, according to the National School Food Service Association—and for nothing. It's time for government and bureaucrats to take less, and for America's needy children to get more.

I am proud that this Congress has been uncompromising in its support for excellent school lunch and breakfast programs in our schools. As part of this historic Congress, Chairman GOODLING and I have approached this issue from two solid principles that all of us can agree upon. First, hungry children cannot learn. And second, because needless bureaucratic paperwork literally steals from families, from taxpayers, and from the mouths of hungry children, we need to act to cut the red tape.

H.R. 2066 does just that. Schools will still offer nutritious meals that meet the dietary guidelines. They just won't have to tell USDA about it in triplicate, when simpler compliance will do.

I understand that H.R. 2066 has the support of the American School Food Service Association, and from Congressman GEORGE MILLER. I have enclosed letters of support from a number of school food service directors in my State. It was adopted by voice vote in the Opportunities Committee May 1. And I am proud to be a cosponsor of the chairman's excellent bill, and I urge its adoption without amendments. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2066, the Healthy Meals for Children Act to allow schools greater flexibility in meeting dietary guidelines under the school lunch and school breakfast programs. A proper nutritional diet is essential to a child's mental and physical development. Schools need to provide nutritious and wholesome food to nourish growing children at the same time that schools work to nourish the students' minds and spirits with education.

I believe that our local schools should be given the flexibility to offer food that the students will actually like to eat. I support this Healthy Meals for Children Act because it will give schools the discretion to meet the goal of

offering nutritious and wholesome food to our children.

Furthermore, I am concerned about the cost of wasting food in our schools. Food is essential nourishment for everyone, and I support policies that would allow the Houston Independent School District [HISD] to design a nutritional program. In the HISD school system, schools can provide students with nutritious meals while giving students food that they like to eat, and then designing a program to allow the Houston schools to donate the extra food to feed the homeless. I encourage the formation of such a program by HISD and I encourage other districts to adopt this innovative and beneficial program. Hunger in America warrants continued efforts to stomp out hunger.

In closing, I urge all of my colleagues to vote in support of the Healthy Meals for Children Act.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the 53 years since the Federal Government began supporting lunch programs in schools, 25 laws have been passed by Congress making changes in the form and goals of Federal school lunch assistance. The history of school lunches is an interesting one, with its beginnings in World War II and depression-era programs to help the farmer. The war years also saw Federal support for lunch programs justified by the growing numbers of women in the work force.

When I first came to the House of Representatives, 23 years ago, public schools provided a basic lunch to students. In the 1970's Congress began to focus on the operational needs of school lunch programs. Congress enacted a series of laws that established guaranteed cash and commodity reimbursements for each school lunch served and inflation adjustments in these reimbursements. This so-called performance funding feature was designed to encourage program expansion by assuring schools an amount of Federal funding they would receive. Later, Congress established uniform meal reimbursements for all lunches served and varied the financial support for different types of lunches according to their nutritional content.

Over time, educators showed us that students learned better, behaved better, and were more attentive when they weren't hungry. Social services providers have shown us that the lunch children received in school was the most nutritious meal of the day for many children. Breakfasts are now offered in many communities before the school day begins.

In fiscal year 1995, a national total of over 4.2 billion lunches were served under the School Lunch Program. Of these, 1.8 billion were served free, and 300 million lunches were served at a reduced price of no more than 40 cents each. In Illinois alone, a total of 156 million lunches were served—62 million free and 9 million at a reduced rate.

Over the years Congress continued to support school lunches by providing commodities to supplement the local education agency's lunch menu. Also over the years, the ideas of dietary requirements have changed. The Healthy Meals for Healthy Americans Act of 1994, Public Law 103-448, addressed concerns raised by the 1993 school nutrition dietary assessment study concerning levels of fat, sodium, and carbohydrates in meals served under the School Lunch Program.

A 1994 law, Public Law 103-448, established a new set of nutritional requirements for

school lunch programs, largely to reduce the amount of fat content in the lunches served to our schoolchildren every schoolday. This bill under consideration today, H.R. 2066, the Healthy Meals for Children Act, will provide increased flexibility for schools to meet the standards required for reimbursement. This bill was designed to clear up confusion about what nutritional standards may be used in order to comply with Federal guidelines, and will make it easier for schools to meet new dietary guidelines for school lunch programs.

American schoolchildren are fortunate to have national standards that are available to be used to assure the families and children that the food they are provided in school will be safe, healthful, and nutritionally beneficial to their growing minds and bodies. I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2066, 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. GOODLING. 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. 2066, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

REREFERRAL OF H.R. 3387, J. PHIL CAMPBELL, SENIOR NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION CENTER

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Resources be discharged from further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3387, to designate the Southern Piedmont Conservation Research Center located at 1420 Experimental Station Road in Watkinsville, GA, as the J. Phil Campbell, Senior Natural Resource Conservation Center, and that the bill be rereferred to the Committee on Agriculture.

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

There was no objection.

SELMA TO MONTGOMERY NATIONAL HISTORIC TRAIL

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1129) to amend the National Trails Systems Act to designate the route from Selma to Montgomery as a national historic trail, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1129

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

Congress assembled, That section 5(a) of the National Trails System Act (16 U.S.C. 1244(a)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"() The Selma to Montgomery National Historic Trail, consisting of 54 miles of city streets and United States Highway 80 from Brown Chapel A.M.E. Church in Selma to the State Capitol Building in Montgomery, Alabama, traveled by voting rights advocates during March 1965 to dramatize the need for voting rights legislation, as generally described in the report of the Secretary of the Interior prepared pursuant to subsection (b) of this section entitled 'Selma to Montgomery' and dated April 1993. Maps depicting the route shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior. The trail shall be administered in accordance with this Act, including section 7(h). The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the National Park Service, which shall be the lead Federal agency, shall cooperate with other Federal, State and local authorities to preserve historic sites along the route, including (but not limited to) the Edmund Pettus Bridge and the Brown Chapel A.M.E. Church."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] will each be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN].

(Mr. HANSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1129 designates the route from Selma to Montgomery, AL, as a national historic trail. This route is the site of one of the most significant protest demonstrations of the modern civil rights movements, which led directly to the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. The National Park Service, pursuant to a previous act of Congress, has studied the trail and found that it merits designation as a national historic trail. It is important to note that the National Park Service felt the events which took place at this site were so significant that it warranted waiving the customary 50-year waiting period for designation of historic sites.

The language including in the bill by the subcommittee makes it clear that by enactment of this legislation, Congress will not be establishing the Selma to Montgomery Trail as a new unit of the National Park System. Only 2 of the approximately 15 congressionally designated trails are currently units of the park system. However, the definition of what constitutes a unit of the park system is so unclear, that the other trails could be easily added at a later date by administrative action. In this case, there are no Federal lands in the area, and it makes good sense of the NPS to work with other co-operators in the administration of this trail. It is important to point out that in making this amendment, it is not my intention that this trail should receive any less financial or administrative support than any other trail where the