

This year, H.R. 3297 is named for one of our fallen heroes, Father Mychal Judge, who, in response to the vicious September 11th terrorist attacks, died while serving his city and his nation in his capacity of a fire chaplain in the New York Fire Department. However, Father Mychal is not the first police or fire chaplain killed in the line-of-duty. We should not forget the two others who fell before him: First, William Paris, with the Detroit Police Department back in the early 1970s, who was killed when a criminal in a barricade situation demanded to speak to a chaplain. He was gunned down by the perpetrator; second, the Reverend Bruce Bryan, a police chaplain from Carson, California who was killed while on duty. Reverend Bryan was shot four times execution-style by a person that he and a deputy sheriff were driving home.

Mr. Speaker, the tragic events of September 11th have changed the hearts and minds of the vast majority of people in this great country. No longer are we asking our brave emergency services personnel to react to random, but dangerous problems. We have asked them to step up and take on those actions caused by terrorist attackers. We should not—we cannot—let another Congress go by without addressing this very important issue.

Mr. Speaker, with that I also want to wholeheartedly thank Chairman SENSENBRENNER and Representative NADLER, who, along with the diligent work of their staffers, have helped make this near decade-long goal a reality.

I urge all Members to support this legislation.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3297.

The Public Safety Officers' Benefit program was created in 1976 to assist in the recruitment and retention of law enforcement officers, firefighters and emergency medical technicians. But it is much more than a tool for attracting and keeping qualified public safety officers. It is a way of doing what is right by the men and women who selflessly risk their lives every day to protect each and every one of us.

The death benefit provides a one-time, lump sum payment of \$259,038 payable to the surviving spouse, children or parents of a public safety officer killed in the line of duty.

H.R. 3297 makes a common sense, and compassionate, change, allowing for an individual named on a life insurance policy to receive the benefit if a deceased officer leaves no surviving child or spouse.

Policy officers, firefighters and EMT's put themselves in harm's way every day without stopping to consider the race, religion or family life of the people they are attempting to save. We owe it to them to do the same as we provide much-needed financial assistance to the loved ones they leave behind.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, on September 11, 2002, Reverend Mychal Judge responded to the attack on the World Trade Center as a New York City Fire Department chaplain. He braved the fire, falling debris, and chaos on the scene to administer last rites to victims in the lobby. Father Judge paid the ultimate price for his heroic actions; he too lost his life on that tragic day.

Under the existing Public Safety Officer Benefit program, chaplains of fire and police departments are not eligible for public safety

officer benefits. While no amount of money can replace their fallen brother, Father Judge's two surviving sisters currently cannot receive benefits from this program. This bill, H.R. 3297, will extend Federal death benefits to officially designated chaplains of volunteer and professional police and fire departments that were killed in the line of duty. This will broaden the number of eligible beneficiaries.

The bill also addresses the issue of deceased public safety officers without immediate families. Nine public safety officers died on September 11 without spouses, children, or surviving parents. H.R. 3297 will expand the Public Safety Officer program to extend death benefits to the beneficiary named on the deceased officer's life insurance policy. All expanded benefits will be effective as of September 11, 2001. Benefits are intended to pay for burial of the fallen officer and grief counseling services for the family.

Mr. Speaker, I fully support H.R. 3297 to extend the current Federal death benefits to the families of chaplains killed while responding to police and fire emergencies. I cannot think of a finer way to honor the brave officers that lost their lives on September 11, and in other emergency situations. Therefore, I ask my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 3297 to remember the public safety officers that have lost their lives in service to our great Nation by voting in favor of the bill.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3297, amending the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to ensure that chaplains killed in the line of duty receive public safety officer death benefits.

On September 11th, our Nation witnessed the best and the worst of humanity. The despicable and cowardly terrorist acts were valiantly countered with the incredible heroism and courage of our firefighters, law enforcement officers, emergency personnel, and our fellow citizens. On that day, as in emergencies before and since, men of the cloth such as Father Mychal F. Judge were also present to give comfort to victims and rescuers alike.

Sadly, Father Judge was the first confirmed death on that day of infamy. Accordingly, it is incumbent upon our Nation to honor heroes of faith such as Father Judge by bestowing upon them public safety officer status. I believe that it is a fitting tribute to their memory. Accordingly, I urge my fellow colleagues to fully support this important measure.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this vital legislation. I personally want to extend my sympathy and the sympathy of the citizens of the eighteenth congressional district of Texas for the families that lost loved ones. In particular my condolences go to the family of Mychal Judge, the New York Fire Department priest who died in the Twin Towers catastrophe and who the bill is named after. My colleague, the gentleman from New York, Mr. NADLER sponsored this bill in the Judiciary Committee.

His reasons for introducing this legislation were noble. The legislation should clear up confusion about whether chaplains qualify for Federal benefits. This legislation will provide that if there is no surviving spouse or surviving child, any such benefits shall be paid to the person designated by such officer as a beneficiary under that officer's most recently executed life insurance policy, provided that such person survived such officer. Current law restricts such beneficiaries to the spouse, child,

or parent. I implore the members of this august body to pass H.R. 3297.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAN MILLER of Florida). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3297, 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.

GIVING CONSENT OF CONGRESS TO AGREEMENT OR COMPACT BETWEEN UTAH AND NEVADA REGARDING CHANGE IN BOUNDARIES

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2054) to give the consent of Congress to an agreement or compact between Utah and Nevada regarding a change in the boundaries of those States, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2054

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

SECTION 1. CONSENT TO AGREEMENT OR COMPACT.

(a) *CONSENT GIVEN.*—The consent of the Congress of the United States is given to Utah and Nevada to enter into an agreement or compact that meets the following requirements:

(1) *The agreement or compact is consented to by the legislatures of Utah and Nevada and such consent is evidenced through Acts enacted by the legislatures of Utah and Nevada not later than December 31, 2006.*

(2) *The agreement or compact is not in conflict with any Federal law.*

(3) *The agreement or compact does not change the boundary of any other State.*

(4) *The agreement or compact does not result in the transfer to Nevada of more than a total of 10,000 acres of lands that are located within Utah on the date of the enactment of this Act.*

(5) *The agreement or compact is entered into for the primary purpose of changing the boundaries of Utah and Nevada so that the lands located within the municipal boundaries of the city of Wendover, Utah, on the date of the enactment of this Act, including the municipal airport, shall, after the implementation of the agreement or compact, be located within the boundaries of Nevada. This paragraph shall not prohibit the agreement or compact from including provisions that are reasonably related to the following:*

(A) *A change in the boundaries of Utah and Nevada for the purposes described in this paragraph.*

(B) *Including other Utah lands immediately surrounding the municipal boundaries of Wendover, Utah, as described in this paragraph, in a transfer to Nevada if such inclusion would—*

(i) *facilitate the management of lands transferred under the agreement or compact or the*

placement of the boundaries of Utah or Nevada; or

(ii) minimize the likelihood of future residential development on remaining Utah lands.

(C) Any other provision in the agreement or compact regarding a change in ownership of, management of, or other responsibilities or obligations related to—

(i) providing State, county, or municipal services;

(ii) public utilities;

(iii) public schools; or

(iv) the municipal airport referred to in this paragraph.

(6) The agreement or compact is consented to by a majority of the registered qualified electors who cast a vote on the agreement or compact held in each of the cities of West Wendover, Nevada, and Wendover, Utah, on the date of the regularly scheduled general election for Federal office in 2002. The question in the vote held in each of the cities of West Wendover, Nevada, and Wendover, Utah, under this paragraph shall contain the same language to the extent allowed by local law. Such language shall explain, with specificity sufficient to inform voters, all components of the agreement or compact regarding changes in ownership of, management of, or other responsibilities, costs, or obligations related to—

(A) State, county, and municipal social and public services;

(B) public utilities;

(C) land use;

(D) community economics;

(E) public schools; and

(F) the local municipal airport.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE OF AGREEMENT OR COMPACT.**—An agreement or compact entered into in accordance with subsection (a) shall become effective upon the fulfillment of the requirement of subsection (a)(1) without further consent or ratification on the part of the Congress of the United States.

(c) **UNITED STATES OWNERSHIP AND JURISDICTION RETAINED.**—Nothing in this Act or in the agreement or compact consented to under this Act shall be construed to impair or in any manner affect the ownership or jurisdiction of the United States in and over any lands within the boundaries of Utah or Nevada.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2054, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2054 gives congressional consent for the States of Utah and Nevada to enact a compact modifying the boundary between the two States.

Last November, along with the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) and the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS), I had the opportunity to visit the towns of Wendover and West

Wendover. Though a line drawn down the main street separates the two towns and States, they continue to share a common culture. Economically, however, they stand in stark contrast to one another.

Wendover, Utah, was established in 1907 and grew from a sleepy railroad supply station to a bustling community during the 1940s, when it acted as an Air Force training base for B-29 bomber crews, including the crew of the Enola Gay. Once having a population of nearly 20,000, today Wendover's population has declined to only 1,500 residents, most of them living in adverse economic conditions and dilapidated housing.

On the other side of the State line, literally a stone's throw away, conditions are vastly different. West Wendover, Nevada's beginning stems from a local Wendover resident realizing by opening a gas station on the town's western edge, he could legally operate gaming devices on his property. Many years later his recipe for success has been copied by many, resulting in a prosperous town which has a vibrant community life as well as a profitable gaming industry.

For the same reasons West Wendover has thrived, namely the ability to have legalized gaming and a more attractive Tax Code for its residents, Wendover has stalled. Further growth and development of the Utah portion will be forever hindered by those finding the economic climate of Nevada to be more advantageous for living and conducting business. Passing H.R. 2054 is the first step to fixing the Wendover problem.

Allowing these two communities to unite will pave the way for an economic jumpstart for Wendover and will result in additional mutual benefits to both towns. For example, administrative services that are currently performed on both sides of the border on a separate basis could be consolidated, resulting in more efficient government and distribution of services, ultimately resulting in savings to both Wendovers.

By simply allowing the border of a State to be slightly shifted, the people of these communities can work toward unification, politically and economically. During the field briefing we conducted, residents of both Wendover and West Wendover were unified behind one message which was heard time and time again. That message was: "Let us be heard."

Through an amendment adopted by the Committee on the Judiciary, we have done that and made any congressional approval of this measure contingent upon the passage of a local referendum on the issue of merging the two towns. H.R. 2054 will truly allow the residents of the communities to be heard by allowing them to determine the outcome of their potential union.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2054, to provide the consent of Congress to a proposed change in the Utah-Nevada State boundary.

H.R. 2054 was introduced by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) on behalf of himself and the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS). The bill provides for congressional consent for the States of Utah and Nevada to enter into a compact to change the existing boundaries of those States such that the city of West Wendover, Utah, be within the State of Nevada.

The Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law and the full Committee on the Judiciary have resolved some issues related to this bill in a way that makes the bill non-controversial. The bill allows communities within the States of Utah and Nevada to resolve a long-standing issue of local interest and importance collectively by referendum and through their elected representatives.

I suspect if this were a law school issue in a law school class, we could drag this out for a week or two talking about issues of Federalism and various and sundry matters. But in the final analysis, all politics is local, and all of the interested parties will have the opportunity to resolve whatever concerns they have by referendum, debate them. And while this is a pretty substantial change, when you talk about changing State boundaries, it is one that we think is justified and certainly economically in the interests of the local people, and we support the bill.

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from an expanding district in Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS).

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking the Committee on the Judiciary and especially the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSENBRENNER) for taking a good hard look at this legislation that was proposed by my good friend, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), and myself.

When we first brought this legislation to the attention of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), I am sure, Mr. Speaker, he had his doubts about what the Representative from Utah and the Representative from Nevada had in mind, or what these two Westerners were even up to. But he took his time to study this issue, learn about the two communities, and the Committee on the Judiciary chairman even paid us a visit to the two communities of West Wendover, Nevada, and Wendover, Utah.

Let me say to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSENBRENNER), we want to thank him for taking a

thoughtful look at this bill and hearing directly from those who will be most affected by any potential annexation, our constituents in both Nevada and Utah.

Mr. Speaker, so that each of my colleagues can get a better understanding of this legislation, let me provide a brief explanation to expand on what I believe will be the comments of the gentleman from Utah (Chairman HANSEN) later on.

First arriving in Washington, D.C., during the 105th Congress, both the communities of Wendover, Nevada, and West Wendover, Utah, have approached me on the idea of forming a single Wendover. As the gentleman from Utah (Chairman HANSEN) will articulate, because of the unique circumstance, these two communities are already virtually a single community, separated by an invisible line through their community, which happens to divide the State of Utah and the State of Nevada. But where they appear to be virtually one, as anybody who has ever driven I-80 west from Salt Lake City could attest to, they are not a single community.

□ 1600

As a matter of fact, these two small communities live with an onerous duplication of services, including fire, police, court systems, as well as separate utility and school systems. There are two Wendovers. Each serve as one of the friendliest places out West, but they represent perhaps the least efficient two communities in the West. Indeed, these two communities have been exploring the idea of becoming one Wendover for several years and, together with the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), we want to give them that opportunity.

To clear up the confusion that often accompanies this legislation, passage of H.R. 2054 will not move the State boundary. What it will do is give the consent of this body that the two communities, through the State governments in Nevada and Utah, can begin negotiation of an annexation agreement process. The two State legislatures would have to ratify one agreement, an agreement which would then, and only then, provide for such annexation and joining of these two communities, as should be agreed to in order to take place.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is not a mandate on the communities. This November, both West Wendover, Nevada and Wendover, Utah will vote on the referendum to determine how they wish to proceed on this issue, and this is exactly how the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) and I envision the process of carrying this out. Let the local communities decide their fate and give Congress the ability to provide our consent by supporting H.R. 2054.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and the Committee on the Judiciary, and I urge support for this bill.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, let me say that I do support the legislation and I want to commend my colleagues for addressing this issue today. I was out in Nevada just a week ago, and I was actually on I-80. I am not sure I know why a town in Utah would necessarily want to join Nevada; instead, maybe it should be Nevada joining Utah or vice versa. In any case, I understand the importance of the legislation, and both are beautiful States.

However, Mr. Speaker, the reason I am taking to the floor right now is to draw attention to the fact that we have a number of suspension bills today, including this one, which I support. However, many of us on the Democratic side of the aisle are very concerned over the fact that we are not bringing up what we consider the most important issue to face this Congress, and that is the need for a Medicare prescription drug benefit. I have taken to the floor many nights during Special Orders, and today during morning hour, and it disturbs me a great deal to know that the Republican leadership seems to have come to some sort of paralysis, if you will, on the issue of prescription drugs.

We all know that our seniors and our constituents are crying out for Congress to address this issue, and yet the Republican leadership, for over 2 months now, has been talking about how they are going to bring up a prescription drug bill. They said they were going to bring it up before the Memorial Day recess, and they did not. They said they were going to bring it up the week following the Memorial Day recess, and they have not. Today I read Congress Daily, and it says GOP Drug Plan to Remain Under Wraps Another Week. There was talk about unveiling a bill this week, and now it looks like it will not be until the following week. But they promise us that they still plan to pass a bill before the July 4 recess.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe it anymore. I have heard it so many times that we are going to address the issue of prescription drugs, and the Republican leadership simply has not brought up the bill. They have not brought it up in committee and they have not brought it up on the floor.

Most disturbing of all, we hear that the proposal that they are thinking about is really nothing more than throwing some money, like a voucher, if you will, to private insurance companies, rather than providing a comprehensive Medicare drug benefit. We have a very good government program called Medicare where seniors get their hospitalization, seniors get their doctor bills paid for. All we have to do, and this is what the Democrats have been saying, all we have to do is expand Medicare to provide for a prescription drug benefit guaranteed

under Medicare. That is what the Democrats have been asking for.

The Republicans try to give the impression that they are doing that, but when we look at what they are actually promoting, it is nothing more than giving some money to private insurance companies in the hope that somehow they will cover prescription drugs.

The problem is that not only the Republicans are not addressing this issue and not bringing it up, but they are talking about privatizing Medicare. They are talking about perhaps trying to cover a few people maybe that are very low income who do not have prescription drugs now and maybe covering, maybe, at the most, maybe 1 million of the 30 million or so seniors who do not have any kind of prescription drug benefit. It is not fair. It is not fair. The comment was made by President Bush, by the Republican leadership, that we were going to have a comprehensive prescription drug benefit that all seniors were going to be able to take advantage of, and it is simply not what we are getting.

The other thing is that the Republicans refuse to talk about the cost issue. The biggest concerns that we hear from our constituents is that we are not addressing the cost of prescription drugs. The prices keep going up. There is nothing that the Republicans have proposed that would actually bring prices down and ease the burden, if you will, on senior citizens or even anyone else in the country. Democrats have been saying that we need to address that. Democrats are saying we would like to have something very much like part B now that pays for doctor bills, a very low deductible, a low copayment, 80 percent of the cost paid for by the Federal Government and giving the power to the Secretary of Health and Human Services to mandate to him that he has to bring costs down by negotiating prices for all of the seniors, 30 million to 40 million seniors. This is what needs to be done and it needs to be done now.

I do not want to denigrate in any way this legislation.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAN MILLER of Florida). The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's discussion is not germane to the subject of H.R. 2054.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman make a point of order that the comments are not relevant under clause I of rule XVII?

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. That is correct. The debate is not relevant to the bill that is under discussion.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, if I could be heard on the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized on the point of order.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, as I said before, my intention is not to denigrate this bill. I believe that this is a

very important bill. I understand the comments that were made by my colleague from Nevada earlier about why it is important for these two towns to get together and have the opportunity to join together and perhaps both be part of the great State of Nevada.

My only point is that as much as that is an important bill, and I support it, we need to address the issue of prescription drugs as well. I am going to say that it is very upsetting to me and those of us on the Democratic side of the aisle that we continue to see these suspensions come up, which are really not controversial, but the Republican leadership refuses to bring up a prescription drug bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

As stated on p. 706 of the House Rules and Manual, "On a motion to suspend the rules, debate is confined to the object of the motion and may not range to the merits of a bill not scheduled for such consideration."

The point of order is sustained.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from the shrinking district from Utah (Mr. HANSEN).

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary for yielding me this time. I am the other side of Wendover. I am the Bangladesh side and Mr. GIBBONS is the Paris, France side. But I have represented that poor side for almost 21 years now or more, and it is Tooele County, and it has been a privilege for me to represent the good people out there who are very fine citizens and very fine Americans.

The greater Wendover community is divided socially, economically, and politically by the location of the Utah-Nevada State boundary. Although the two communities have grown side by side for decades, knowing where the boundaries lie, it seems that some of the practical challenges faced by every small town is amplified by this particular area because of the unique mix of circumstances. The area is very remote and, on the Utah side, is bordered by the Bonneville Salt Flats and other public lands which severely limit the ability of the Utah community to grow in the future. In just about every category of public services, there is an inefficient duplication: Two separate police departments, two separate fire departments, duplicate utility systems, separate public school systems, separate local court systems, and the list goes on and on.

Finally, there are several recurring problems involving support for the Wendover Airport on the Utah side. For as long as I can remember, it has been a running joke that one way to correct a lot of these problems is just to redraw the State boundary to put Wendover, Utah into Nevada. Last year, Wendover, Utah Mayor Steve Perry and some of the council members approached Congress about exploring this very unique idea.

The approach of this legislation is to empower the local communities with their future destiny. For State boundaries to change under the Constitution, Congress must grant its consent, which is what H.R. 2054 would do. It is a prospective ratification of an interstate agreement between the two affected States which would meet certain criteria as specified in the text of this bill.

Under the bill, both States would have to ratify one agreement, an agreement that both sides would agree is acceptable. At any point, either State could walk away from the process and the boundary would not be moved. The wisdom of this approach is that whatever agreement is reached and would inherently be acceptable to both sides, this approach removes Congress and the Federal Government from getting involved in the financial details of what is essentially a State and local matter.

While some people, perhaps many map publishers, may wince at the idea of creating a little "jog" in this nice straight line that currently divides Utah and Nevada, I would point out that quite often, boundaries are artificial creations of man in trying to deal with political problems and realities. Sometimes in the interest of bettering people's lives, it may be necessary to revisit the initial dividing up of land between political subdivisions. This may indeed be one of those times, and this bill supports the rights of the local people affected to make these important decisions.

I would really like to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, for the hard work on this legislation and for him taking the time to go to Wendover and see firsthand the situation. I would also like to thank my chief cosponsor, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS), who represents the Nevada side of the border, and the ranking member, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) for his cooperation; the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR), and the ranking member, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) for their efforts as well.

Mr. Speaker, I think this will take care of a problem for a little city. It seems that we always worry about the big cities and never about the little ones, and maybe this will give us a chance to show a very small community that we do care about them.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY).

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, today we are here discussing H.R. 2054, a bill that relates to the compact between Utah and Nevada regarding a change in the boundaries. This is a good bill. It is important to the people that live in both States and in the cities of West Wendover and Wendover, but this Congress should also be focusing on the

high cost of prescription drugs and the millions of seniors who need help paying for them.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I will reiterate the same point of order I made with the previous speaker: The debate does not relate to H.R. 2054. The rules are quite plain that in motions to suspend the rules it must.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Nevada is recognized on the point of order.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I think it is equally important to the people in Wendover and West Wendover as we are improving their economy to also be discussing the very serious situation of a prescription medication benefit in Medicare.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

As stated earlier, in the House Rules and manual on page 706, "On a motion to suspend the rules, debate is confined to the object of the motion and may not range to the merits of a bill not scheduled for such consideration."

As such, the point of order is sustained.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY).

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, while it makes no sense that Wendover and West Wendover should be separated, it also makes no sense in this country not to provide a prescription medication benefit within Medicare.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON).

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am here to rise in strong support of this legislation. I understand the inherent interest of West Wendover and Wendover and how important it is for them to be connected. I applaud the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), as he always does in his first rate and capable manner of bringing forward the interests of his constituents here to the floor of Congress.

This is a difficult situation, but not unlike many situations that we face in this Nation. In the case of prescription drug relief, for example, people in our country feel like they are refugees from their own health care system.

□ 1615

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman's debate is not confined to or relating to H.R. 2054, once again.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. May I be heard on the point of order, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAN MILLER of Florida). The gentleman will

confine his remarks to the pending bill before this House.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, my point was as much as, just as people in between the lines, the current lines that exist in Utah and Nevada and between East Wendover and Wendover, find a difficulty with what they are presented with, this is analogous to what people are up against in this country. Many seniors in my district have to travel from Connecticut to Canada to seek prescription drug relief.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I must once again reiterate my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will insist that the gentleman from Connecticut keep his comments on the bill before the House today. As the Chair has ruled previously, the gentleman will confine his comments to the bill that is presently before the House.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I again would just point out that East Wendover is a desolate mining town of only about 1,500 residents and is largely in debt. Several public hearings have been held by the city councils on the east and west to determine whether East Wendover should be annexed to West Wendover.

Opposition to the annexation has emerged primarily from residents and business interests in West Wendover concerned with the economic impact of acquiring East Wendover's debt.

Supporters argue that the acquisition of East Wendover's airport, which once housed the Enola Gay, would attract more tourists to the city's casinos. Although there has been no vocal opposition to the annexation based on disagreement with Nevada's more liberal laws, most published reports note the large presence of a Mormon population in Utah.

And again these are the problems that the citizens face here. Again, I would like to commend the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) for the outstanding job that he has done representing his constituents. I only hope that other constituents across this country who struggle with similar kinds of issues, though they are not specific to these lines, but when we cross boundary lines for prescription drugs and turn people that otherwise would be able to receive them—

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. It complicates the problem. I thank the Chair for his indulgence and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a controversial bill, and despite the fact that a number of my colleagues feel strongly that the residents of Wendover and

West Wendover should be entitled to prescription drug benefits, a point, by the way, which I agree with, the bill itself is not controversial; and I therefore strongly encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of the bill and support the bill.

I commend the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) for bringing it forward. It is nice to know that the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) believes in gerrymandering. I am just sorry that he did not bring this early enough to get these people out of Utah soon enough that we would not have to have fought with Utah about whether these residents were there for this census, and we would not be all the way up in the United States Supreme Court arguing with Utah about whether they deserve a new congressional district or North Carolina deserves a new congressional district.

But that is kind of far afield, too. They did not get that done in time to resolve that dispute, but it is still a good bill. I encourage my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Just to get back on track, Mr. Speaker, let me say that what H.R. 2054 does is that it says that at the general election in November of this year, the residents of Wendover, Utah, and West Wendover, Nevada, will vote on a plan of merger, a marriage contract, if you will. If the voters in both communities support this procedure, then the next step is to have the Utah and Nevada legislatures consider whether or not the State lines should be adjusted so that Wendover, Utah, would be put into the State of Nevada.

Nevada has got a provision in its State constitution that delineates the boundaries of the State. Should both States approve it, there would have to be an amendment proposed by the two sections of the State legislature and approved by the voters of the State of Nevada in the general election of 2006.

Should that all happen, then the State boundary would be adjusted, because the consent of Congress would be given in advance under these procedures through the enactment of H.R. 2054. And should that happen, this will be the first time since 1863 that a State boundary was changed for a reason other than the fact that the river constituting the boundary between two States has changed course.

In 1863, during the Civil War, as we all know, the Congress admitted West Virginia as a State, carving the loyalist counties of the Commonwealth of Virginia out of that Commonwealth and establishing them as a separate State. So what we are doing here is setting in motion something that might not have happened in our country for 140 years.

So even though this bill is non-controversial, it is somewhat prece-

dent-setting, and it is precedent-setting in that in fact the Congress is giving the say to the people of these two communities on whether or not they want the State line adjusted. If either of the communities says, no way, we do not want to have that, then this whole issue is moot and everybody who wants to talk about this issue will forever hold their peace.

With that, I urge the passage of this bill.

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 Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2054, 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Wando Evans, one of his secretaries.

MYCHAL JUDGE POLICE AND FIRE CHAPLAINS PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS' BENEFIT ACT OF 2002

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 2431) to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to ensure that chaplains killed in the line of duty receive public safety officer death benefits, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 2431

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 "Mychal Judge Police and Fire Chaplains Public Safety Officers' Benefit Act of 2002".

SEC. 2. BENEFITS FOR CHAPLAINS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1204 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796b) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (7) as (3) through (8), respectively;

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) ‘chaplain’ includes any individual serving as an officially recognized or designated member of a legally organized volunteer fire department or legally organized police department, or an officially recognized or designated public employee of a legally organized fire or police department who was responding to a fire, rescue, or police emergency;” and