

| | | |
|-----------------|---------------|---------------|
| Guthrie | Manzullo | Rohrabacher |
| Hall (TX) | Marchant | Rooney |
| Harper | McCarthy (CA) | Ros-Lehtinen |
| Hastings (WA) | McCaul | Roskam |
| Heller | McClintock | Royce |
| Hensarling | McCotter | Ryan (WI) |
| Herger | McHenry | Scalise |
| Hill | McHugh | Schmidt |
| Hoekstra | McKeon | Schock |
| Hunter | McMorris | Sensenbrenner |
| Inglis | Rodgers | Sessions |
| Issa | Mica | Shadegg |
| Jenkins | Miller (FL) | Shimkus |
| Johnson (IL) | Miller (MI) | Shuster |
| Johnson, Sam | Moran (KS) | Simpson |
| Jones | Murphy, Tim | Smith (NE) |
| Jordan (OH) | Myrick | Smith (NJ) |
| King (IA) | Neugebauer | Smith (TX) |
| King (NY) | Nunes | Stearns |
| Kingston | Olson | Sullivan |
| Kirk | Paul | Terry |
| Kline (MN) | Paulsen | Thompson (PA) |
| Lamborn | Pence | Thornberry |
| Lance | Petri | Tiahrt |
| Latham | Pitts | Tiberi |
| LaTourette | Platts | Turner |
| Latta | Poe (TX) | Upton |
| Lee (NY) | Posey | Walden |
| Lewis (CA) | Price (GA) | Wamp |
| Linder | Putnam | Whitfield |
| LoBiondo | Radanovich | Wilson (SC) |
| Lucas | Rehberg | Wittman |
| Luetkemeyer | Reichert | Roe (TN) |
| Lummis | Roe (TN) | Wolf |
| Lungren, Daniel | Rogers (AL) | Young (AK) |
| E. | Rogers (KY) | Young (FL) |
| Mack | Rogers (MI) | |

NOT VOTING—8

| | | |
|-----------|--------------|--------------|
| Cantor | Israel | Souder |
| Deal (GA) | Miller, Gary | Westmoreland |
| Engel | Olver | |

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes remain on the vote.

□ 1529

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1404.

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

There was no objection.

FEDERAL LAND ASSISTANCE, MANAGEMENT AND ENHANCEMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 281 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1404.

□ 1531

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1404) to authorize a supplemental funding source for catastrophic emergency wildland fire suppression activities on

Department of the Interior and National Forest System lands, to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to develop a cohesive wildland fire management strategy, and for other purposes, with Mr. LUJÁN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am pleased to bring before this body proactive legislation which would establish a new arsenal to provide the necessary resources to combat catastrophic wildfires.

We are all aware of the raging fires which annually sweep across parts of America. Over the last decade, wildfires have become increasingly dangerous and destructive, burning more acreage and more property more often. Yet, financially, the Federal Government continues to be ill-prepared to respond to these fires.

Every year the Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and the other Federal agencies are forced to dramatically shift spending priorities, rapidly increasing funding for fire fighting at the expense of other vital programs.

This “Rob Peter to Pay Paul” approach requires these agencies to borrow funds from other accounts, causing everything from basic maintenance to visitor services to suffer. In fact, as it stands, nearly half of the Forest Service’s annual budget is spent putting out fires, causing some to point out that the agency is no longer the U.S. Forest Service, but rather, the U.S. Fire Service.

The legislation before us, the Federal Land Assistance Management Enhancement Act, or FLAME Act, is a bipartisan effort to correct course by getting out in front of these tragic fire seasons. The legislation would address the funding problem by establishing a dedicated fund for catastrophic, emergency wildland fire suppression activities, separate from appropriated, fire-fighting funding. This pot of money would be available when appropriated funds run out, saving the agencies from having to cut into nonfire programs.

The Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior would be authorized to use money from the FLAME fund only after making a specific declaration that a fire was large enough and dangerous enough to warrant such action.

The bill would also require the Forest Service and the Department of the Interior to present to Congress a long-overdue, comprehensive strategy for combating wildland fire, a strategy that would address the troubling shortcomings in the agencies’ response to fires identified by the Government Ac-

countability Office and the Agriculture Department’s Inspector General.

I would note that this legislation complements proposals in President Obama’s proposed budget to establish a dedicated fund for catastrophic wildfires.

This legislation also enjoys the support of the five former chiefs of the Forest Service, the National Association of State Foresters, the National Association of Counties, the National Federation of Federal Employees, the Western Governors’ Association, and nearly 40 other organizations.

I am honored to be joined by our subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA); our Interior Appropriations chairman NORM DICKS; Interior Appropriations ranking member SIMPSON; and Congressman GREG WALDEN as original cosponsors of H.R. 1404. Agriculture chairman COLLIN PETERSON is also a cosponsor of the bill.

Each of these Members understands that fire, and the cost of fighting it, is among the most serious issues facing our Federal land management agencies. If not addressed, this issue will continue to cost homes, businesses, communities, public lands, and lives.

The FLAME Act will allow the Forest Service and the Department of the Interior to respond to these dangerous fires while also accomplishing other important aspects of their missions, including those that will prevent fires from devastating our communities in the future.

I ask my colleagues to support passage of the FLAME Act.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the distinguished chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, Mr. RAHALL, for sponsoring this legislation, and I urge my Republican colleagues to support it.

This bill makes budgeting and accounting for fighting fires easier for Federal agencies and for Congress, but Mr. Chairman, as written, it does nothing to prevent forest fires. This is an accounting bill but not a wildfire prevention bill.

It is regrettable that, since taking control of the House, Democrats have not moved a single piece of legislation that gives our land managers new authority or tools to manage the disastrous situation on our Nation’s forests. Funding is important, but it will not solve the problem if our land management agencies are handcuffed to wrong-headed policies backed up by special interest lawsuits.

Jobs are also at stake with the management of our Federal lands. Since 2006, Mr. Chairman, the logging, wood, paper, and cabinetry industries have lost 242,000 jobs. Two weeks ago, a Sierra Pacific timber mill in Quincy, California, closed, which means that close to 10 percent of the town’s economy will be closed down. This is an

area that has had double-digit unemployment since the early 1990s. One of the main reasons the company cited for the mill closing is the lawsuits by environmental groups on every single timber sale.

On the issue of climate change and the President's proposal of a new cap-and-trade energy tax, we know that forests provide large and beneficial inventory of stored carbon and that forest fires contribute huge amounts of carbon dioxide emissions.

We lose millions of acres of our national forests to wildfire every year, and these fires and their aftermath produce billions of tons of pollutants. A medium-sized fire can release 200,000 tons of CO₂, but if the burned trees are left to decompose, several times that amount will be emitted.

At a time when the Democrat majority in Congress are working to make carbon emissions the number one issue on their legislative agenda, it is troubling that action is not being taken to prevent wildfires that emit so much carbon into the atmosphere.

Instead, Congress is working overtime on imposing a cap-and-trade tax scheme that the Obama administration says may cost our economy over \$2 trillion. A new report from Moody's Investor Service predicts that cap-and-trade would cause electricity prices to jump between 15 and 30 percent. This could cost American families up to \$3,100 a year.

These are prices that are too high for Americans to pay, especially when the impact of wildfires is not even being considered. A better way of budgeting for fire fighting is needed, and the bill that we will be considering does precisely that, and I support that. But there is far more to this problem than bookkeeping.

The simple fact is that our national forests now have four to five times the amount of trees per acre compared to when Lewis and Clark ventured West. Today, these lands are a tinderbox waiting for a match strike.

I hope this bill is improved through the limited number of amendments that were made in order by the Rules Committee, but it is clear that after enactment of this bill there is still far, far more that needs to be done to prevent wildfires across this country.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I'm very happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from California (Mrs. CAPPS), a very valued member of our Committee on Natural Resources that was so instrumental in bringing this legislation, as well as many other pieces of legislation out of our committee, to the floor.

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank Chairman RAHALL for giving me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong support of this FLAME Act. This much-needed legislation comes at an important time. Our Nation will be facing longer and more intense fire sea-

sons due to global warming and drought. The cost of fighting fires has grown enormously in recent years, and projections indicate that this trend will only increase, especially in populated wildland-urban interface areas.

The Forest Service has spent over \$1 billion per year in 5 of the last 7 years to extinguish fires. And as the chairman just said, wildland fire management activities are estimated to consume close to half of the Forest Service's budget this year.

These escalating costs are having a significant impact on the Forest Service. For example, the Forest Service is forced to pull funds from other programs, leaving fewer funds available for campground maintenance and forest restoration.

The emergency fund created by the FLAME Act will reduce the need to deplete important Forest Service programs and will provide more reliable funding than uncertain year-to-year supplementals.

Even more important, the FLAME Act will ensure the Forest Service has regular funding available for day-to-day fire management. This includes important prevention steps, like FIREWISE Communities, hazardous fuels treatment, and restoration work.

It's absolutely essential that our efforts to fight today's fires don't hurt our efforts to prevent tomorrow's fires. This bill will ensure this is the case.

Mr. Chairman, the Zaca fire that burned 240,000 acres in my congressional district 2 years ago burned for 3 months, from July through September, and it cost the Forest Service \$120 million. One fire. With close to 3,000 fires in California last year alone, and the fire season expected to start earlier than usual, it's very clear that we have a real need to create—

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. RAHALL. I yield the gentlelady another 30 seconds.

Mrs. CAPPS. It's very clear that we need to create an emergency Federal fund dedicated solely to fighting devastating wildland fires, a rainy day fund for forest fires. This idea is long overdue.

This legislation deserves to be approved by the House, and I urge all of my colleagues to address the long-term wildfire suppression fund situation by supporting this FLAME Act.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), a member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly support H.R. 1404. It is going to add some flexibility in managing firefighting costs on our Federal lands, but my friend, the gentleman from Washington, is absolutely correct. Our firefighting costs would be much lower and our revenues would be much higher if we'd restore the sound forest management practices

that this Congress long ago abandoned. Instead, we've embraced a radical and retrograde ideology that we should abandon our public lands to overpopulation, overgrowth, and benign neglect. Bills like this one are made necessary precisely because of this public falling.

A generation ago we recognized the importance of proper wildlands management. We recognized that nothing is more devastating to the ecology of a forest than a forest fire, and we recognized that in any living community, including forests, dense overpopulation is unhealthy.

And so we carefully groomed our public lands. We removed excessive vegetation, and we gave timber the room it needs to go. Surplus timber and overgrowth were sold for the benefit of our communities. Our forests prospered, our economy prospered, and forest fires were far less numerous and far less severe than we suffer today.

Today, we're seeing the damage done to our forests and to our economy by this Luddite ideology that human beings shouldn't touch our natural resources.

My region in northeastern California has been tormented by devastating fires in the last few years, and the reason is quite simple. As one forester explained it at a hearing we conducted in Sacramento, the excess timber is going to come out of the forests one way or the other. It's either going to be carried out or it's going to be burned out.

□ 1545

A generation ago, we carried it out, and it fueled prosperity throughout our region and produced a cornucopia of revenues to the Federal Government. But today, it's being burned out, fueling devastating fires that are destroying vast tracts of land and destroying the abundance and prosperity that we once enjoyed.

The first victim of this wrongheaded policy is the environment itself. Our recent forest fires have made a mockery of all our clean air regulations. As the gentleman from Washington pointed out, those concerned about carbon dioxide might be interested in a report by scientists from the National Center for Atmospheric Research and the University of Colorado at Boulder. They estimated that a single forest fire in California in 2007 produced about 25 percent of the average monthly emissions from all fossil fuel burning throughout all of California. Anyone who's seen a forest after one of these fires knows that the environmental devastation could not possibly be more complete.

But the cost of these policies doesn't end there. Timber is a renewable resource. If properly managed, it's literally an inexhaustible source of prosperity. And yet my region, blessed with one of the most bountiful renewable resources in the Nation, has been rendered economically prostrate. A region that once prospered from its surplus

timber is now ravaged by fires that are fueled by that surplus timber.

The gentleman from Washington mentioned the little town of Quincy, California, that happens to be in my district—population 2,000. About 500 families. As of May 4, 150 of those families are going to be out of work because the sawmill had to shut down. Environmental litigation has tied up about two-thirds of their timber harvest.

The company that owns that sawmill, Sierra Pacific, also just announced today that it's shutting down its sawmills in Sonora and Camino for the same reason. That's another 310 families out of work.

This is not environmentalism. A true environmentalist recognizes the damage done by overgrowth and overpopulation and they recognize the role of sound forest management practices in maintaining healthy forests.

So, Mr. Chairman, while I support this legislation, we wouldn't need to be spending so much putting out fires and we'd have a lot more revenue to do it with if we would spend a little more effort on restoring sound forest management practices to our national forests.

Mr. RAHALL. I yield myself such time as I may consume, Mr. Chairman.

The Congress, under the previous majority, in 2003 enacted the Healthy Forests Restoration Act under the guise that it was the solution to preventing wildland fires on Federal lands. Today, nearly 6 years later, fires are still raging across the country and the Federal land managers are breaking the bank trying to pay for them. Clearly, it's time to try something new—and that's what we are attempting to do in this legislation.

I would certainly note that in passing the Healthy Forests Restoration Act, Congress authorized \$760 million annually for hazardous fuels treatments on Federal lands. Sadly, the Bush administration continuously underfunded hazardous fuels treatments at only 65 percent of the level authorized by Congress.

The skyrocketing cost of fighting fires forced drastic reductions in other Forest Service accounts under the Bush administration. This included cuts to fire preparedness, State fire assistance, cooperative fire assistance, and hazardous fuels treatments.

The lack of investment in fire prevention under the Bush administration led to a situation where communities around the country have NEPA-approved hazardous fuels projects waiting for Federal funding.

In western States last year, there were over 1 million acres of NEPA-approved hazardous fuels projects that were awaiting funding from the Bush administration.

The FLAME Act will relieve the drain on the Forest Service and the Department of the Interior budgets to ensure that funding is not swept away from vital fire prevention activities. This is why the FLAME Act has received support from those organiza-

tions I mentioned in my opening statement—a rather broad-based list of organizations, well over 40, that are in support of the pending legislation.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the ranking member for yielding to me.

I want to commend him and Chairman RAHALL for addressing this important issue over the last 2 years. The wildfire funding problems for the Forest Service are some of the most challenging issues the agency faces today.

Wildfire funding costs have skyrocketed over the last decade and are consuming the Forest Service's budget, which means that there's much less funding for other Forest Service needs. We will continue to see high costs and more damage to our forests and communities unless we take steps to reduce fire risk in our national forests. We must provide the Forest Service with additional tools to get our Federal forests in a healthy, more fire-resistant condition.

This is a bill of great importance to States and communities across the country. The problems of forest management affect not just western States, but those along the eastern seaboard as well. Virginia is one such example. Last year, Virginia had more acres burn than any year since 1963, which shows how the problem of forest management has progressively worsened.

This version of the FLAME Act is an improvement from the one passed by the House in the last Congress. However, the bill does not do enough to address the problem causing the increasing costs of fighting fires—that is, the unhealthy conditions of our forests.

My amendment to the FLAME Act, which I will offer tomorrow, will provide the Forest Service with an additional tool to address these problems that will ultimately be a cost-saving measure.

My amendment creates a new contracting tool for the Forest Service to partner with States. This will give the Forest Service permanent authority to contract with States to reduce wildfire risks across boundary lines.

This practice is commonly known as "good neighbor authority" and has been tested in States like Colorado and Utah, where it has proven to be effective.

Currently, H.R. 1404 contains no such tool for the Forest Service. The significance of this measure is that it will encourage both Federal and State agencies to work together to address unhealthy conditions in Federal forests.

Fires know no boundaries. They can start on Federal land and easily spread to State and private forest land and vice versa. My amendment provides a more comprehensive approach to preventing dangerous fires and fighting them when they happen.

I'm pleased that my amendment has the support of the Society of American Foresters, the Western Council of State Foresters, the Forest Foundation, and other forestry groups.

I have also spoken with the Forest Service and they have told me they have no objections to this amendment. I might also add that we have cleared this amendment in the Ag Committee, which shares jurisdiction with the Resources Committee for forestry issues, and they also have no objection to this amendment.

This is something that the professionals who fight forest fires around our country—the professional fighters—and the societies that are comprised of American foresters want and need in this legislation. So I hope that there will be bipartisan support. I know in the Rules Committee there was bipartisan support for bringing this amendment forward. I certainly hope that that will continue as we try to maintain the type of bipartisan cooperation that has led to the point that we have reached thus far in bringing this legislation forward in a way to significantly enhance it.

Mr. RAHALL. I yield 2 minutes to someone who knows well the problems this legislation seeks to address, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH).

Mr. HEINRICH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I rise in support of the FLAME Act, an absolutely critical strategy for fighting the catastrophic forest fires that face communities across the western United States, particularly in communities in New Mexico that I have seen impacted directly by these fires in recent years.

In New Mexico's First Congressional District, both the Sandia and Mountainair Ranger Districts of the Cibola National Forest tower over the valley where most of my residents live. Both are afflicted with severe drought conditions that have contributed to a dangerous tinderbox effect in these forests. As a result of climate change, the Mountainair Ranger District has gone into fire restrictions earlier than ever before.

Still, much of the funding to fight these fires has been reappropriated on an ad hoc basis from Federal land agency budgets. For those agencies, that has often meant cutting funding for employees, for scientific research, and education—the very kinds of things that help prevent forest fires in the first place.

The FLAME Act will create a critical Federal fund specifically to fight catastrophic wildfires, keep our communities safe, and ensure the safety of our firefighters who risk their lives to protect us every fire season.

I would urge all my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

As I stated in my opening remarks, this is a good bill and I commend the

chairman for introducing it. This bill passed on the suspension calendar in the last Congress. Nobody even asked for a recorded vote. So it has broad bipartisan support, yet the underlying issue is—and it's something this Congress should take up in the future—and that is to try to go to the core of preventing forest fires, and that is proper maintenance.

There is one amendment that addresses that tomorrow. I think that amendment offered by Mr. GOODLATTE will make this bill that much better. I hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support that.

But this is a good bill. It's a start in the right direction. I hear this all the time when we have forest fires in my district—and they happen virtually every year. People want to know: Are there sufficient funds in order to pay for those forest fires?

Now we can say that there's a mechanism put in place that will take care of that, and I commend the chairman for his sponsorship of that.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I certainly understand what the gentleman from Washington is referencing. I said last year during debate on this floor to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that I certainly understand the need to develop comprehensive preventive legislation that is aimed at truly getting at the root causes of these forest fires. I would repeat to the gentleman from Washington, my respected ranking member, that if he introduces such legislation—any member introduces such legislation—we will certainly bring it forth before our committee and give it due consideration and certainly try to work on it as well as we have on this legislation to bring it to the floor of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I'm going to recap very quickly since we are closing general debate at this point. For much of the last decade, the wildlands fire season has been expanding due to factors such as climate change and drought. Unfortunately, future trends appear to indicate that this increase will only continue.

Within the Forest Service, wildlands fire activity now accounts for nearly half of their budget. The Forest Service spent over \$1 billion fighting wildland fires last year. The skyrocketing cost of fighting fires has led to the Forest Service and the Department of the Interior to rob Peter to pay Paul and borrow funds from other agency accounts.

□ 1600

There were cuts to fire preparedness, State fire assistance, cooperative fire assistance, and hazardous fuel treatments in Forest Service budgets.

The FLAME Act will allow the Forest Service and the Department of the Interior to respond to dangerous fires while also accomplishing other impor-

tant parts of their mission. The act will relieve the drain on the Forest Service and the Department of the Interior budgets to ensure that funding is not swept away from vital fire prevention activities. I conclude by urging adoption of the pending measure.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to the rule for H.R. 1404, the Federal Land Assistance, Enhancement, and Management Act of 2009.

While this legislation is important to address the very serious issue of funding shortfalls faced by the Federal wildland firefighting agencies each year, I believe that it does not do enough to address the cause of these soaring wildfire suppression costs.

We need to drastically increase management on our Federal forests to reduce these fuels and the risk of catastrophic wildfire in the first place.

For this reason, I introduced an amendment to make some of these funds available for hazardous fuel reduction projects.

While unfortunately it was not made in order, I am pleased to see that we will be allowed the opportunity to debate Mr. GOODLATTE's amendment to expand the "Good Neighbor" authority to assist in getting some work done on the ground.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and others that bring additional focus to the real root of the problem.

Mr. RAHALL. I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DRIEHAUS) having assumed the chair, Mr. LUJAN, Chair 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. 1404) to authorize a supplemental funding source for catastrophic emergency wildland fire suppression activities on Department of the Interior and National Forest System lands, to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to develop a cohesive wildland fire management strategy, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken tomorrow.

STANLEY J. ROSZKOWSKI UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 520) to designate the United

States courthouse under construction at 327 South Church Street, Rockford, Illinois, as the "Stanley J. Roszkowski United States Courthouse".

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The text of the Senate bill is as follows:

S. 520

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

SECTION 1. STANLEY J. ROSZKOWSKI UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The United States courthouse under construction, as of the date of enactment of this Act, at 327 South Church Street, Rockford, Illinois, shall be known and designated as the "Stanley J. Roszkowski United States Courthouse".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States courthouse referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Stanley J. Roszkowski United States Courthouse".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include therein extraneous materials on S. 520.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 520, legislation introduced by the senior Senator from Illinois, Senator DICK DURBIN, to name the United States district courthouse in Rockford, Illinois, after Stanley J. Roszkowski. Judge Roszkowski has ably served our country in times of war and peace, and I am pleased to be here today to speak on behalf of this bill.

Stanley J. Roszkowski was raised in the village of Royalton, Illinois, which is located in Franklin County in southern Illinois. One of 15 children, he volunteered for the Army Air Corps during World War II, and served as a nose gunner on a B-26 bomber, flying over 35 missions in Italy and Germany.

After the war, he went on to earn his bachelor's degree from the University of Illinois and then his law degree, working as an appliance salesman to pay for his college tuition. He moved to Rockford, Illinois, opened a successful law practice, and became involved in his community.

He gave up his practice of law when President Carter appointed him to the bench in 1977, where he served for the next 20 years as a Federal judge in the Northern District of Illinois. Judge Roszkowski took senior status in 1991,