

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CAPITO. 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. 5012, the bill just considered by the House.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

GREAT LAKES LEGACY ACT OF 2002

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1070) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to make grants for remediation of sediment contamination in areas of concern and to authorize assistance for research and development of innovative technologies for such purpose, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1070

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 "Great Lakes Legacy Act of 2002".

SEC. 2. REMEDIATION OF SEDIMENT CONTAMINATION IN AREAS OF CONCERN IN THE GREAT LAKES.

Section 118(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1268(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(12) REMEDIATION OF SEDIMENT CONTAMINATION IN AREAS OF CONCERN.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—In accordance with this paragraph, the Administrator, acting through the Great Lakes National Program Office and in coordination with the Office of Research and Development, may carry out qualified projects.

"(B) QUALIFIED PROJECT.—In this paragraph, a qualified project is a project to be carried out in an area of concern located wholly or in part in the United States that—

"(i) monitors or evaluates contaminated sediment;

"(ii) subject to subparagraph (D), implements a plan to remediate contaminated sediment; or

"(iii) prevents further or renewed contamination of sediment.

"(C) PRIORITY.—In selecting projects to carry out under this paragraph, the Administrator shall give priority to a project that—

"(i) constitutes remedial action for contaminated sediment;

"(ii) has been identified in a Remedial Action Plan submitted pursuant to paragraph (3) and is ready to be implemented; or

"(iii) will use an innovative approach, technology, or technique that may provide greater

environmental benefits or equivalent environmental benefits at a reduced cost.

"(D) LIMITATION.—The Administrator may not carry out a project under this paragraph for remediation of contaminated sediments located in an area of concern—

"(i) if an evaluation of remedial alternatives for the area of concern has not been conducted, including a review of the short-term and long-term effects of the alternatives on human health and the environment; or

"(ii) if the Administrator determines that the area of concern is likely to suffer significant further or renewed contamination from existing sources of pollutants causing sediment contamination following completion of the project.

"(E) NON-FEDERAL MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—The non-Federal share of the cost of a project carried out under this paragraph shall be not less than 35 percent.

"(ii) IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS.—The non-Federal share of the cost of a project carried out under this paragraph may include the value of in-kind services contributed by a non-Federal sponsor, including any in-kind service performed under an administrative order on consent or judicial consent decree, but not including any in-kind services performed under a unilateral administrative order or court order.

"(iii) OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—The non-Federal share of the cost of the operation and maintenance of a project carried out under this paragraph shall be 100 percent.

"(F) MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT.—The Administrator may not carry out a project under this paragraph unless the non-Federal sponsor enters into such agreements with the Administrator as the Administrator may require to ensure that the non-Federal sponsor will maintain its aggregate expenditures from all other sources for remediation programs in the area of concern in which the project is located at or above the average level of such expenditures in its 2 fiscal years preceding the date on which the project is initiated.

"(G) COORDINATION.—In carrying out projects under this paragraph, the Administrator shall coordinate with the Secretary of the Army, and with the Governors of States in which the projects are located, to ensure that Federal and State assistance for remediation in areas of concern is used as efficiently as possible.

"(H) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—In addition to other amounts authorized under this section, there is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this paragraph \$50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2007.

"(ii) AVAILABILITY.—Funds appropriated under clause (i) shall remain available until expended."

SEC. 3. RELATIONSHIP TO FEDERAL AND STATE AUTHORITIES.

Section 118(g) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1268) is amended—

(1) by striking "construed to affect" and inserting the following: "construed—

"(1) to affect";

(2) by striking the period at the end and inserting "; or";

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) to affect any other Federal or State authority that is being used or may be used to facilitate the cleanup and protection of the Great Lakes."; and

(4) by aligning the remainder of the text of paragraph (1) (as designated by paragraph (1) of this section) with paragraph (2) (as added by paragraph (3) of this section).

SEC. 4. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In coordination with other Federal and local officials, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency is authorized to conduct research on the development and use of innovative approaches, technologies, and techniques for the remediation of sediment

contamination in areas of concern in the Great Lakes.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to amounts authorized under other laws, there is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2007.

(2) AVAILABILITY.—Funds appropriated under paragraph (1) shall remain available until expended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1070, the Great Lakes Legacy Act of 2002. H.R. 1070 reflects a consensus approach to addressing sediment contamination in the Great Lakes.

The Great Lakes are, without question, a vital resource for both the United States and Canada. The Great Lakes system provides a waterway to move goods; water supply for drinking, industrial and agricultural purposes; a source of hydroelectric power; and swimming and many other recreational activities.

The industrialization and development of the Great Lakes Basin over the past 200 years has had an adverse impact on the Great Lakes. As a result, many of the Great Lakes are under fish advisories warning people not to eat fish that may be in the water there.

By treaty, the United States and Canada are developing cleanup plans for the Great Lakes and for specific areas of concern. Unfortunately, only one area of concern, located in Canada, has been cleaned up. Most of the activity at U.S. areas of concern has occurred as a result of Superfund enforcement action or threat of such action.

However, Superfund's suitability for cleaning up the Great Lakes is limited. The Great Lakes sediments became contaminated as a result of pollution from many sources over several generations. Applying Superfund could make virtually every citizen of the Great Lakes Basin a liable party.

There are better ways to address this problem. One solution is to encourage cooperative efforts through public-private partnerships. That is the solution recommended by the bill H.R. 1070, the Great Lakes Legacy Act of 2002.

H.R. 1070 would authorize \$50 million a year for 5 years to clean up contaminated sediment in areas of concern in the Great Lakes. This Federal funding must be matched with at least a 35 percent non-Federal share, encouraging local and private sector investment. This bill also makes sure that these funds are well spent.

At some sites, removing sediments will be the best way to address short- and long-term risks. At other sites, the last thing we want to do is go in and

stir up contaminated sediments by dredging, causing even more harm to the environment.

This consensus bill does not try to presume any particular cleanup option. It simply encourages stakeholders to take action and to make sure that the action they take will make a real improvement to human health and the environment.

I want to commend the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) and his colleagues for working with stakeholders from the Great Lakes to advance this legislation. I believe this is a great example of bipartisan legislation that everyone in this Chamber can support. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

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

I thank the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) for his splendid statement and full discussion of the subject at hand and for his leadership and, as always, bipartisan cooperation in bringing this legislation to the floor today.

I also want to acknowledge the support and cooperation of our chairman of the full committee the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and seeing to it that we move this bill expeditiously through subcommittee, full committee and to the floor today.

There is no question this bill is a long time in coming, and it should, when enacted and implemented, bring to fruition the long-planned and sort of haltingly carried out efforts to clean up decades-long contamination of this repository of one-fifth of all the fresh water on the face of the Earth, the Great Lakes.

It has been my home all my life, living not on the shore but close enough to the shore of Lake Superior, my hometown of Chisholm just about 90 miles away. I spent a great deal of my time as a young lad near the shores of Lake Superior and my service in the Congress, my District extends from Duluth all the way up to Canada, along that splendid rocky outcrop of the 3 billion year old deposits of basalt that look broodingly out onto Lake Superior, which represents 10 percent of the fresh water on the face of the Earth.

My predecessor Congressman John Blatnik was the original author of the first Clean Water Act, Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1956 that began the Nation's efforts to clean up the waters of the United States and was the one who inspired the research laboratories that now are located throughout the Great Lakes to serve as a beacon for the protection, beacon out on those fresh waters to serve as the protection for the future generations of the Great Lakes, on the purity and quality of those waters.

In years past, when I chaired the Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight, I held extensive hearings on the United States-Canada Clean Water

Agreement to push administrations in the past to action on cleanup of the toxic hot spots, or areas of concern as they are called. It is just an unspeakable tragedy that nearly 100 percent of the near shore waters of the Great Lakes and connecting tributaries are under fish consumption advisories because those fish have taken up toxics from bottom feeding organisms, from plants, carried them in their bodies and then are consumed by humans. It was presented in documented testimony in the hearings that I held in the Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight and corroborated since then in subsequent hearings. The chairman has conducted a few.

If a person lives within 20 miles of the Great Lakes and they eat fish once a week, they have on average 440 parts per billion PCBs in their body. If they live anywhere else in America and eat fish once a week, they probably have only 5 parts per billion per PCBs in their body. I need not go into the adverse health consequences of PCBs. They are well-documented in the medical and scientific literature.

We had a researcher, Dr. Waylon Swain, from the University of Michigan testify at the Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight hearing who had done tests on his 16-year-old daughter of the fatty tissue in her body and the content of PCBs and then did a computer projection to determine how long it would take for future generations, for PCBs to leave her offspring if none of them were exposed in the future to PCBs. Six generations. This is a persistent toxic chemical that we need to extract from the bottoms of those areas of concern.

Of the 43 areas of concern of the Great Lakes, 31 are wholly or partly within U.S. waters, and they are mostly harbors. More than 1.3 million in cubic yards of contaminated sediments have been remediated over the past 3 years. We have just touched the top of the challenge, and remediation is nowhere near completed in any one of the areas of concern.

The people of the Great Lakes community, 36 million of them, have lived with this problem that threatens their physical health, the health of their children, and impacts the entire region, both economically and in degradation of the Great Lakes environment.

I was heartened when former President Clinton in fiscal 2000 included within the administration's budget a request for \$50 million for remediation of contaminated sediments, and I had at the time introduced H.R. 3670 to authorize a program for cleanup of the Great Lakes areas of concern, but neither the bill nor the \$50 million came to fruition. But the initiatives then stimulated further attention.

I am very delighted to acknowledge the work of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), who is a colleague of ours on the Committee of Transportation and Infrastructure, whose sci-

entific mind and appreciation of the challenges has brought considerable expertise and passion for cleaning up these waters to this issue, and I compliment the gentleman for introducing the bill today before us which will authorize \$50 million annually for the Environmental Protection Agency to carry out projects to address sediment contamination in the Great Lakes areas of concern.

□ 1500

These are going to be prioritized projects. Priority will be given to those that actively address the contaminated sediments that have been identified in the remedial action plans for the areas of concern, projects that promise to implement innovative approaches, new technologies and new techniques to deal with contaminated sediment so as not to, as Chairman DUNCAN expressed concern, reintroduce contaminants into the water column and thereby reestablish the pollution or distribute it further.

One of these innovative approaches is one that has been undertaken by the U.S. environmental research laboratory of EPA in Duluth, the University of Minnesota's Natural Resources Research Institute and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in the harbor of Duluth, using mining technologies which we in the iron ore mining country of my district use to beneficiate low-grade, nonmagnetic ores using a process that has a cost in the range of \$2 to \$3 a cubic yard versus \$400 to \$600 a cubic yard for other technologies, have successfully remediated large volumes of toxic-substance-containing sediment so that this cleansed sediment now can be used in parks and reclaiming areas along the waterfront in Duluth for other environmentally friendly activities.

These are the kinds of innovative approaches this legislation will support and stimulate in the future. The legislation before us also has clarifying language to ensure that the new program will have no effect on existing Federal and State authorities to address contaminated sites. The IJC report recently found that all sediment remediation completed to date has been funded as a result of enforcement action, or the threat of enforcement action, against polluters. While that still would remain, we would hope ideally that there would be a cooperative approach to cleanup. The aptly named "orphan sites" will be one of the targets of this legislation. I expect EPA and the States to continue to pursue and to hold accountable polluters responsible for contamination of all the areas of concern.

Mr. Speaker, again I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) for his persistence in pursuing this issue, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) for his diligence in bringing the legislation forward, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) for his participation, and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DeFAZIO) for

his active support on our side as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment.

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), the original author of the bill.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Great Lakes Legacy Act of 2002. First, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), the chairman of the subcommittee; and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the ranking member of the full committee, for their kind comments and for the help that they have given me in getting this bill to this point, particularly not just in terms of process but also in substance, in the advice I have received.

America is often called the land of plenty, especially when it comes to our natural resources. Few places on Earth are more blessed than we are, and the Great Lakes stand out among our many blessings. I am pleased to be the author of this legislation because it will protect this precious resource, our Great Lakes.

Let me describe just how important the Great Lakes are, both to citizens within the Great Lakes basin and to the country as a whole. The Great Lakes constitute almost 20 percent of the Earth's surface fresh water and 95 percent of the surface fresh water in the United States. Let me repeat that: 95 percent of the surface fresh water in the United States. That means if you take all the waters of the United States, starting first with the rivers, the Hudson River and working west, the Ohio, the magnificent Mississippi, the Missouri, Arkansas, Colorado, Snake and Columbia, and you could name many more, add them all together and then put in all the other lakes in the United States and collect all that surface fresh water together in one spot, then you would still have to multiply that by almost 20 to equal the amount of water in the Great Lakes system. That is an incredible resource. It is an incredibly wonderful thing to have.

These lakes provide us with fresh drinking water, habitat for wildlife, food from fisheries, recreation in and on the waterways, water for agriculture, and shipping lanes for economic growth. Millions of people live on the Great Lakes and millions more journey to the Great Lakes to vacation and enjoy all the splendors the lakes provide.

However, longstanding pollution from contaminated river sediments continues to harm water quality in the Great Lakes and restricts our use of this valuable resource. As we heard from the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the fish have become contaminated with the toxic material, particularly the PCBs. The waterfowl that eat the fish have in turn become more contaminated. And then, of

course, the humans who eat the fish and occasionally the waterfowl collect it all and become even more contaminated.

After many years of dumping harmful, toxic substances into the waterways surrounding the Great Lakes and the lakes themselves, the pristine environment and waters of the Great Lakes have suffered. Cleanup projects have been implemented at only a portion of the so-called areas of concern identified by the EPA as the worst of the contaminated sites. Let me just explain what these areas of concern are. That is kind of a euphemistic phrase in my mind. What it is describing is dirty, toxic, polluted sediments at the bottom of the rivers. This material is slowly leaching into the Great Lakes.

Years ago we cleaned up our rivers on the surface. We cleaned up the obvious pollution, the things you could see floating down the river. Many of us recall the days when the Cuyahoga River in Cleveland caught fire and rats ran across the river, it was so contaminated. When I moved to Grand Rapids, Michigan, the Grand River, which runs right through the city, was polluted enough that you would not think of swimming in there; and you did not want to eat the fish in it. We have made progress in cleaning up the obvious pollution. Today, the Cuyahoga River is a reasonably clean river. The Grand River in Grand Rapids is so clean that people fish constantly and eat the fish without difficulty, and some people even swim in the river now.

However, what we have not addressed is the problem of the sediments, what is at the bottom of the river. We have not addressed this for several reasons. First of all, we did not know how to address it, because if you simply dredge it, you stir up all the sediments and the contamination just flows down into the lake. So we needed to know more about how to do it. But also there was a hope that the toxic material would just stay there in the sediments and not move and we could just leave it there and ignore it. We have now found out that we cannot ignore it. It is steadily leaching into the Great Lakes, and we must stop it and we have to develop methods to do it.

One of the biggest obstacles to completing a remedial action plan, or a cleanup plan, is the funding for it. Community groups, States, the EPA, and the Army Corps of Engineers have all committed to remediation efforts and have cited the lack of Federal funding as an impediment to cleaning up areas of concern in communities that have taken the initiative to improve the quality of their water. It is time that we helped them clean up these sites.

Existing authorities and programs such as Superfund and other enforcement mechanisms have not provided the resources that are necessary to clean up contaminated sediments. We must provide the EPA administrator

with authority and with authorized appropriations to carry out qualified projects in areas of concern that require cleanup and are not likely to suffer further contamination. We must take steps to monitor and clean up contaminated sediment and prevent further or renewed contamination. In addition, we must pursue research and development of innovative approaches and technology to help us learn how to remove contaminated sediment in the most environmentally safe and efficient manner. The Great Lakes Legacy Act helps accomplish these goals.

Finally, this act is not only environmentally responsible; it is also fiscally responsible. The act provides leveraged funding and fosters partnerships between State and local authorities and private interests by requiring a 35 percent non-Federal cost share. In addition, non-Federal sponsors are prevented from using Federal funds to displace previous expenditures for remediation programs. In other words, with a 65-35 split, we will get a greater environmental bang for our Federal buck.

The Great Lakes Legacy Act will greatly improve cleanup efforts in the Great Lakes communities which need it most and will allow unfettered, continued use of this precious natural resource. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their assistance. I appreciate their support of this bill.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers on our side, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Let me just close the debate by saying there is almost nothing that people take for granted as much as they do their water. Yet many people have said and have written that water may well be the oil of the 21st century. The importance of our water supply is going to grow and grow and grow with the passing years. Certainly the Great Lakes, as the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) just said, is a precious national resource. The Great Lakes contain, as the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) has said, almost one-fifth of the world's freshwater supply. The Great Lakes contain 95 percent of the U.S. surface freshwater supply. The Great Lakes is a very, very important asset.

This is a good bill. This is a very pro-environment bill. The lack of controversy should not mask or decrease or cover up the significance of this bill, the importance of it. I think this is one of the most significant clean-water bills that this Congress has ever passed. I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

Let me say one other thing before I yield back my time. I just want to commend the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS). The gentleman from Minnesota is certainly always one of the most active members of our committee and a real leader on all of these issues, and I

thank him for his support of this legislation.

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

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

I thank the gentleman not only for his kind remarks but also for his very thoughtful summation. In his ever-judicious manner, he has summed up the issue before us and stated the case so well. I not only urge unanimous approval of the legislation in this body, but I also urge the other body to move expeditiously on this legislation.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON). The Chair would remind all Members that they should refrain from urging the Senate to take a specific action.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Great Lakes Legacy Act, H.R. 1070.

I would like to commend my colleague and friend from Michigan, Congressman VERN EHLERS for crafting this important legislation and for his diligence in gathering the appropriate support. As a cosponsor of the Great Lakes Legacy Act, I am extremely pleased that the Great Lakes region is one step closer to cleaning up toxic hot spots that lurk under the world's largest freshwater system.

While globally there are 42 Areas of Concern (AOC), that is, areas that suffer from severe sediment contamination, 26 are located in the United States, and in my state of Michigan there are 14 designated AOCs. Contamination levels in these areas threaten human health, contribute to the loss of fish and wildlife habitat, restrict critical dredging activities, and lead to numerous beach closings. AOCs are among Michigan's most demanding environmental challenge.

Like other environmental clean-up programs, full remediation of Great Lakes AOCs continues to be bogged down by a burdensome web of complex regulations, lack of necessary funding, and insufficient progress of research and development into new technologies. Recognizing these obstacles, the legislation we are considering today aims to solve the problems that plague successful clean-up efforts.

In short, H.R. 1070 addresses the most costly and technical hurdles that face these hazardous hot spots. More specifically, this legislation authorizes funding for States, Indian tribes, regional agencies, and local governments for projects in AOCs to monitor or evaluate contaminated sediment and remediate contaminated sediments. It also targets funding for research and development of new technologies that aim to clean toxic sediments in the Great Lakes basin.

My support for this legislation goes beyond my co-sponsorship of the measure. In March I introduced a resolution, House Resolution 361. H.Res. 361 calls on the House of Representatives to take swift action in helping to restore and protect Michigan's Great Lakes, the state's most precious natural resource. My bill highlights the environmental problems associated with AOCs and includes the goals set forth in the Great Lakes Legacy Act. In my view, the work done by my colleague from

Michigan on this subject is too important for the Congress to let slip. My resolution affirms the importance of passing H.R. 1070 in an expeditious manner equal to its relevance for helping clean the world's largest source of freshwater.

Let me make this point clear, the environmental problems that are caused by AOCs are not just a Michigan issue. Although most Areas of Concern in the United States are concentrated in Michigan, it is a national and international problem. Its risks for human health, aquatic populations, ecological habitats and wildlife are serious and impact states beyond Michigan. Therefore, it would be unwise for the Congress to ignore this issue or delay its consideration any further.

Mr. Speaker, again, I am pleased to lend my full support for the Great Lakes Legacy Act and urge my colleagues to do the same. With that Mr. Speaker, I yield back the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1070, 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.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to carry out projects and conduct research for remediation of sediment contamination in areas of concern in the Great Lakes, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1070.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1515

JOSEPH CURSEEN, JR. AND THOMAS MORRIS, JR. PROCESSING AND DISTRIBUTION CENTER

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3287) to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 900 Brentwood Road, NE, in Washington, D.C., as the "Joseph Curseen, Jr. and Thomas Morris, Jr. Processing and Distribution Center".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3287

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

SECTION 1. JOSEPH CURSEEN, JR. AND THOMAS MORRIS, JR. PROCESSING AND DISTRIBUTION CENTER.

(a) REDESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 900

Brentwood Road, NE, in Washington, D.C., and known as the Brentwood Processing and Distribution Center, shall be known and designated as the "Joseph Curseen, Jr. and Thomas Morris, Jr. Processing and Distribution Center".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the Joseph Curseen, Jr. and Thomas Morris, Jr. Processing and Distribution Center.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON). Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) and the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3287, the bill presently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3287, introduced by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN), our distinguished colleague, designates the Brentwood Processing and Distribution Center in Washington, D.C., as the Joseph Curseen, Jr., and Thomas Morris, Jr., Processing and Distribution Center. I am very proud to have my name as a cosponsor and original sponsor of this bill also.

Mr. Speaker, today we honor two public servants who died in the line of duty. Thomas Morris and Joseph Curseen did not know when they reported to the Brentwood Processing and Distribution Center last October that they were on the front lines of the war against terrorism. But they were struck down by anthrax which infected the facility when an anonymous terrorist sent envelopes containing spores to Washington.

Both had distinguished careers at the Brentwood Road facility. Curseen began his career with the postal service in 1985 as a letter-sorting machine operator. Morris, an Air Force veteran, began work at the facility in 1973. Both men were born and raised in Washington, D.C., and their deaths shocked the Washington area, the postal community, and the entire Nation. It is fitting to name the building where they served their country after these two distinguished public servants. And so, Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of H.R. 3287.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as we approach the 1-year period following the attacks on our country, I rise to support a bill of special significance to honor two native sons of the District of Columbia