

gentleman is one of only a few veterans of the World War I era who are still with us today. Men and women who served in World War II are rapidly passing away as well. This park will help honor their deeds and their fight for freedom which brought an end to tyranny and injustice, not once but twice in this century.

I am proud to join the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) in support of this proposal to honor our veterans. As the largest metropolitan area in the United States with one of the largest concentrations of veterans, I can think of no better place to honor the memories of these men and women who fought for freedom and to remind future generations of the valor and heroism of our American soldiers.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA).

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY). I know he was a great help at the committee in steering it through. We have 56,000 veterans in the 13th Congressional District. Again I can only hope and pray that we can do all we can to recognize their efforts. This bill would go a long way. I encourage its strong support.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCNULTY).

Mr. MCNULTY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I want to commend both the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) and all of those who are supporting this legislation. It is appropriate that we take this up at this particular time as we approach another celebration of our Independence Day and remember to keep our priorities straight. Had it not been for the men and women who have worn the uniform of the United States military through the years, we would not have the privilege of going around bragging about how we live in the freest and most open democracy on the face of the earth. Freedom is not free. We paid a tremendous price for it. Not a day goes by that I do not remember all of those who, like my brother Bill, made the supreme sacrifice and all of the many veterans who served our country and then came back home and rendered such outstanding service in our communities and raised wonderful families to carry on their great traditions.

I enthusiastically support this legislation. I thank the sponsors. I urge my colleagues to approve it unanimously.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill is considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and is considered read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 592

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF PORTION OF GATEWAY NATIONAL RECREATION AREA AS WORLD WAR VETERANS PARK AT MILLER FIELD.

Section 3(b) of Public Law 92-592 (16 U.S.C. 460cc-2(b)) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" after "(b)"; and
(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(2) The portion of the Staten Island Unit of the recreation area known as Miller Field is hereby designated as 'World War Veterans Park at Miller Field'. Any reference to such Miller Field in any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States shall be considered to be a reference to 'World War Veterans Park at Miller Field'."

The CHAIRMAN. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

Are there any amendments to the bill?

If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS) having assumed the chair, Mr. BONILLA, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 592) to redesignate Great Kills Park in the Gateway National Recreation Area as "World War II Veterans Park at Great Kills", pursuant to House Resolution 231, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to designate a portion of Gateway National Recreation Area as 'World War Veterans Park at Miller Field'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 592, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

RURAL NEVADA AGAIN UNDER SIEGE BY U.S. FOREST SERVICE

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, once again, the absolute greed of the Federal bureaucracy is pushing aside the common sense of local people on an issue in my district.

I would like to share with my colleagues what can only be termed as an insensitive approach to a very personal and private situation of the Federal Agency Forest Service in my home State of Nevada.

In its seemingly endless battle over public lands in rural Nevada, once again we are under siege by the Forest Service. But it is not commercial real estate or high market value land interests that we are after, it is about a mere two-acre cemetery.

The Forest Service wants to sell the small town of Jarbidge, Nevada, two acres to buy its own cemetery where the parents and grandparents of this small rural town have been laid to rest since the beginning of this century.

The Federal Government already owns nearly 90,000 square miles of Nevada's lands. Nevadans are not asking for much, a mere two acres to be exact, a two-acre cemetery already occupied for nearly a century by parents and grandparents of many Nevadans.

On behalf of the families of Jarbidge, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1231 to convey these two acres out of the millions they own.

WHERE I STAND—MIKE O'CALLAGHAN: USFS PICKS NEW FIGHT

(Mike O'Callaghan is the Las Vegas Sun executive editor)

About the time it appears there is some justice and common sense ruling north-eastern Nevada, along comes another goofy act.

A couple of weeks ago this column praised the Nevada Supreme Court for settling a dispute started three years ago by a few Elko County residents who saw a conspiracy under every rock in that huge area. After using and abusing the power of a local grand jury the district judge was slapped and four state employees were given back their lives by the Supreme Court.

That whole mess was started by a businessman who believed the state and federal conservation agencies were conspiring to destroy the county when acting to protect the environment. He wrote a letter to the county commissioners calling for a grand jury because the conservation agencies, especially the Nevada Division of Wildlife and the U.S. Forest Service, and environmental groups were ruining almost everything held dear by the people of that area. Those suffering economically, according to the writer, were the ranching, mining, and business communities and all of the taxpayers.

The grand jury was called and it acted as wild as the charges made in the letter. While all of this was going on, the U.S. Forest Service sat on its hands and took no action to replace a road damaged by a flood in 1995. This resulted in the county going to fix the road running alongside the West Fork of the Jarbidge River. Immediately another federal agency, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, came unglued because it said the roadwork was hurting the bull trout habitat. Eventually this mess was calmed down and on the surface appears straightened out because the state also had a role to play.

So now everything is hunky-dory between the federal conservation agencies and Elko County? Not really. There's the small issue over cemetery land at Jarbidge. Yes, a very small two acres that Rep. Jim Gibbons wants turned over to the county. Here are Gibbon's words before a subcommittee in Washington last week:

"As you may know Jarbidge is a small, rural community in Elko County, Nevada. Known historically for its contribution to Nevada's mining industry, this community is surrounded by national forest lands and the Jarbidge Wilderness Area.

"Within this area is a small cemetery, under administration of the Forest Service, where generations of residents of this historic community have been laid to rest.

"The earliest tombstones are dated in the very early 1900s, and some members of the Jarbidge community claim that this land has been used as a cemetery long before its designation as Forest Service land.

"Since 1915 the Jarbidge Cemetery has been operated under a permit to Elko County by a Special Use authorization which runs periodically for 10 and occasionally 20 years.

"In an effort to remove the uncertainty about the continued existence of this cemetery and to resolve the operational responsibility, the residents of Jarbidge have long expressed an interest in having two acres, containing the cemetery, conveyed to the county so they might have a permanent, private cemetery.

"Madame Chairman, that is why I have introduced HR 1231, a bill that would direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey approximately two acres of National Forest lands to Elko County, Nevada, or continued use as a cemetery."

No problem for this small request coming from a state with thousands of square miles controlled by the federal government. Guess again. USFS Deputy Chief Ron Stewart testified against HR 1231 because his agency expects to be paid fair market price of those two acres. His testimony doesn't describe how you put a price on a cemetery that's just a bit less than 100 years old. What it does reveal is a petty attitude by a large federal agency that continues to result in even its rational decisions being questioned by the people in and around little Jarbidge.

Gibbons could hardly believe Forest Service officials were making the demand but it they were, he added, they "should hang their heads. These people are asking for a cemetery, not for land to build commercial or residential enterprises. . . ."

Because of the actions of Elko's runaway grand jury I began to wonder what was in the water the jurors were drinking. This most recent action by the Forest Service in Washington has convinced me that its decision makers are drinking straight from the polluted Potomac River.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. LIPINSKI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MINK of Hawaii addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MORELLA addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BAIRD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 1530

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE PRESIDENT'S PLAN TO MODERNIZE AND STRENGTHEN MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for

60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to start this afternoon by talking about the President's plan to modernize and strengthen Medicare for the next century which he announced at a press conference that was held at the White House yesterday; and let me say, Mr. Speaker, if I can, that I strongly welcome this proposal. I think it is a very good proposal and specifically with regard to the new prescription drug benefit, the effort to eliminate co-payments and deductibles for preventive care, the fact that it also includes the Medicare buy-in for the near elderly, those who just are below the age of 65, and the fact that by using 15 percent of the projected surplus that Medicare is fully funded for a much longer period of time than would be the case under current conditions. All these things I think are a strong indication that this is a very good proposal which certainly the Democrats support and which I am hopeful that the Republicans and the Republican leadership will support as well so that we can get a bill out of committee to the floor and passed in this Congress.

Let me just talk a little bit about some of the most important aspects of this Medicare proposal in my opinion. I think probably the most important aspect is the new voluntary Medicare Part B prescription drug benefit that is affordable and is available to all beneficiaries.

We all know that when you talk about Medicare the biggest gap, if you will, that exists in the Medicare program now is the lack of a prescription drug benefit. When Medicare was started under President Johnson as a Democratic initiative back in the 1960s, over 30 years ago now, prescription drugs were not that much a part of the average senior citizen's budget. Medicine then was not so much emphasizing preventive care, particularly prescription drugs; and, frankly, a lot of the prescriptions that we have now had not even been invented. So it was not an important issue. It was not included in the Medicare package at the time.

But as time went on over the last 30 years the lack of a prescription drug benefit has been a major gap causing senior citizens to expend a lot of money out of pocket, in some cases several thousand dollars a year. And so the President's response in trying to include a modest prescription drug benefit is commendable, it is fully paid for, and I think it will go far towards helping senior citizens and the disabled under Medicare to deal with this problem.

I just wanted, if I could, to outline some of the high points of this. There is no deductible. And, well, basically the way it applies is that you contribute initially \$24 a month as the premium that you pay for this new Part B; and Medicare, once you participate, pays half of your drug costs from the first prescription filled each year up to