If you are concerned about the ability of the Navy and our sailors to be militarily ready, then you will support the continuation of the President's's deal in conference because it represents the quickest way for us to resume a full spread of training activities which can include live fire exercises.

The bottom line is that we have already negotiated a deal that is supported by all sides in this debate. But without the Skelton Amendment we would have had no deal. And so whether you are coming at this debate from a military or Puerto Rican perspective you can be sure that supporting the President's deal is the right thing to do.

REMEMBERING LANCE CORPORAL KEOKI P. SANTOS AND LANCE CORPORAL SETH JONES

HON. DARLENE HOOLEY

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2000

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, on April 8, 2000 nineteen U.S. Marines were killed in the Arizona desert when their MV–22 Osprey crashed during a training exercise.

Two of those Marines, Lance Corporal Keoki Santos and Lance Corporal Seth Jones, were citizens of Oregon.

Lance Corporal Santos—who was only 24 years old—was a native of Grande Ronde, a Native American confederation which I have the good fortune of representing here in Congress.

He was an outstanding Marine. Keoki was also deeply loved by his mother, Mrs. Christina Mercier.

Lance Corporal Jones, who was only 19 years old, was an equally outstanding Marine.

He too left behind grieving relatives—his mother, Ms. Michele Tytlar, lives in Portland, Oregon and his father, Mr. Daniel Jones, lives in Bend, Oregon.

Mr. Speaker, this Monday is Memorial Day. Most, if not every Member of Congress, will return home to participate in official remembrance ceremonies.

Yesterday, three flags were flown over the Capitol of the United States commemorating the bravery of Lance Corporal Santos and Lance Corporal Jones.

This Memorial Day, I will present these flags to the families of these two Marines at Willamette National Cemetery.

I will also read aloud and present each family a letter from the Commandant of the Marine Corps, General James L. Jones.

This letter shares the Commandant's thoughts on the service and loss of not just these men, but all nineteen of the Marines killed in this tragic accident.

We owe an enormous debt to every American soldier, sailor, flyer, and Marine.

As we all return home this weekend to observe Memorial Day, we must remember those who served our Nation in uniform and now lie in eternal rest.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR INCREASED APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE INS OMAHA DISTRICT OFFICE

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2000

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member would commend to his colleagues the following editorial from the May 12, 2000, edition of the Omaha World-Herald.

As the editorial correctly notes, the Omaha District Office of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), which serves Nebraska and Iowa, has experienced a dramatic increase in demand for the services it provides. Despite the on-going efforts of the Nebraska and Iowa Congressional Delegations, on behalf of their constituents, to bring attention to this untenable situation and also to the lack of resources committed to the enforcement of immigration laws in this country's interior states, INS officials at the Federal and regional levels remain unresponsive. This Member and several of his colleagues from Nebraska and Iowa feel that the problems must now be addressed through the appropriations process.

This Member hopes that his colleagues in the House of Representatives will favorably review the requests outlined in the editorial and that they will increase assistance to INS operations not only in Nebraska and Iowa but in this country's interior region as a whole.

[From the Omaha World-Herald, May 12, 2000]

SHOW THEM THE MONEY

The figures are as solid as they are daunting: The Omaha office of the Immigration and Naturalization Service has a backlog of more than 5,000 cases. Over the last five years, it has seen a 400 percent increase in the number of documents processed. Workloads like that can't be handled with smoke and mirrors. Warm bodies must be in place, and that place needs to be safe and efficient. Some members of Congress clearly understand the problem, and they are commendably committed to solving it.

Last week the entire Nebraska congressional delegation, joined by Rep. Jim Leach of Iowa, wrote to colleagues whose committees oversee spending for the INS. The request was for them to earmark enough money (about $119,000 yearly) to add two immigration information officers and two clerical positions to the local office.

This request for a direct appropriation wouldn't have been necessary if Mark Reed, director of the INS Central Region, had responded to these officials' 1999 request to flesh out the office's ability to respond to public needs. It's hard to fathom why he didn't.

Now, Nebraska's three House members have approached the chair of the appropriate subcommittee about getting a one-time injection of $2 million to relocate the Omaha INS branch to new quarters, possibly near Eppley Airfield.

If the lawmakers are successful in these efforts, that will address the local agency's two biggest problems: a personnel shortage and an inadequate physical plant. It's about time something was done. The modern-day trend toward more and more newcomers argues that from an operational standpoint, things are likely to get worse before they get better.

For years, the local INS has operated piecemeal out of four buildings, the main one being at 3736 South 132nd St. Until last fall, clients had to wait outside in all kinds of weather. That was addressed when the local INS officials leased a 2,400-square-foot waiting area, but even that was a stopgap measure. Getting the 65,000-square-foot building envisioned by the local officials and community activists, along with an adequate number of people to staff it, would be the right thing to do.

What the lawmakers are attempting amounts to a fiscal end-run, asking for improvements the INS should already have requested on its own. There's no telling it will work, but let's hope so. Certainly, the intentions are honorable. The INS overload here has gone beyond embarrassing and is edging toward intolerable.

IT'S TIME THAT CONGRESS LOOK INTO THE FEDERALIZATION OF CRIMES

HON. DONALD A. MANZULLO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 2000

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, its high time that Congress takes a serious look at the federalization of crimes in the United States. The State and Federal Courts together comprise an intertwined system for the administration of justice in the United States. The two courts systems have played different but equally significant roles in the Federal system. However, the State courts have served as the primary tribunals for trials of criminal law cases.

The Federal Courts have a more limited jurisdiction than the State Courts with respect to criminal matters because of the fundamental constitutional principle that the Federal government is a government of delegated power in which the residual power remains with the States. In criminal matters, the jurisdiction of the Federal Courts should compliment, not supplant, that of the State Courts.

The 1999 Year-End Report on the Federal Judiciary shows how its caselaod has grown:

One hundred years ago, there were 108 authorized federal judgeships in the federal judiciary, consisting of 71 district judgeships, 28 appellate judgeships, and 9 Supreme Court Justices. Today, there are 852—including 655 district judgeships, 179 appellate judgeships and 9 Supreme Court Justices. In 1900, 13,605 cases were filed in federal district courts, and 1,093 in courts of appeals. This past year, over 320,194 cases were filed in federal district courts, over 546,000 in courts of appeals, and over 1,300,000 filings were made in bankruptcy courts alone.

It is apparent that some growth of the federal court system should occur over time due to increases in population. But what also has grown substantially is the scope of federal jurisdiction. Federalization of the states' criminal codes is something that politicians, especially here at the federal level, cannot seem to help but engage in from time to time. It has been over time, in response to criminal concerns nationwide, that Congress has again and again federalized crimes in the name of fighting crime and protecting the nation's populace. But, is the federalization of crime really an antidote for our nation's crime problems? Is it really proper to federalize crime so politicians can ''prove'' their effectiveness? These are important questions that must be asked. We all