Regrettably, the only remedy remaining is a legislative fix.

Fortnately, the bill has been improved during the legislative process. Nevertheless, I remain concerned about two provisions. First, the bill would waive all procedural requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Second, the bill authorizes the use of otherwise outlawed hunting practices, notably the use of electronic calling devices and un-plugged shotguns.

I realize that we have agreed to move this bill due to the documented habitat loss and the absence of any administrative remedies. However, I continue to question whether it is ever appropriate for the Congress to pass legislation to waive NEPA or to authorize otherwise illegal, or certainly, unsportsmen-like hunting methods.

I am pleased that the Chairman of the Resources Committee, Mr. YOUNG and Mr. SAXTON agreed to include an expiration date of May 15, 2001, or earlier if the Service files its final EIS before that date, to limit the duration of this emergency action. I am also pleased to see that the Senate amended the bill to require the Fish and Wildlife Service to develop and implement a comprehensive management plan for mid-continent light geese and their habitats.

Certainly, in an ideal world it would have been far preferable to first require the Fish and Wildlife Service to complete the plan before authorizing emergency measures. But in light of the circumstances, it is my hope that an effective plan will make the need for future legislation regarding emergency management of these species unnecessary.

We have also come to recognize that the version of H.R. 2454 that was reported to the Senate by the Committee on Environment and Public Works included a second title that would have authorized a program for the conservation and management of neotropical migratory birds. This title closely resembled legislation passed by the House on April 12, H.R. 39, the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act. Surprisingly, this bill has not been scheduled for floor action this session.

It is my understanding that the Senate agreed to remove this second title after the Chairman of the Committee on Resources assured the Senate that he will work with his leadership to ensure that H.R. 39 is brought to the House floor next year for a vote. I sincerely hope that Chairman YOUNG can bring the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act before the House early next year, and I look forward to working with him to pass this important legislation.

Let me close simply by restating my concern—and the concern of many of my colleagues on this side of the aisle—that it is unfortunate that Congress is compelled to authorize these emergency actions to control the light geese population.

But considering the changes that have been made to the bill in committee and by the Senate, I am satisfied that the bill has been sufficiently narrowed to limit excessive light geese mortality while the Fish and Wildlife Service completes its EIS and develops a long-term comprehensive management plan. It is not ideal, but it is reasonable under the circumstances, and I urge my colleagues to pass this legislation.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the legislation being offered today by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON]. I want to commend him and the Chairman of the full Committee [Mr. YOUNG] for their diligence in working with the other body to assure that Congress acts on this vital legislation before the end of the session.

H.R. 2454, the ''Arctic Tundra Habitat Emergency Conservation Act,'' quite simply is trying to head off an unmitigated conservation disaster for white geese, including greater and lesser snow geese and Ross' geese.

During the past three decades, these mid-continent snow geese species populations have literally exploded, from an estimated 800,000 in 1969 to more than five million today.

This dramatic increase has resulted in the devastation of nearly 50,000 acres of snow geese habitat around Canada's Hudson Bay. This tundra habitat, most of which comprises a coastal salt marsh, is vital for nesting. As the snow geese proliferate and consume this habitat, other populations of birds are also placed at risk by this loss of habitat.

A special report issued in January, 1998 by Ducks Unlimited provides a good example of the depth and the breadth of the problem. In studies conducted in Churchill, Manitoba, there were 2,000 nesting pairs in 1968. In 1997, that number grew to more than 40,000 pairs. The result is a cruel fate for the birds, particularly the thousands of orphaned, malnourished and eventually dead goslings who cannot survive on barren tundra.

Together with expected population increases is another vexing problem: recovery of habitat, destroyed by overfeeding at this far-north latitude, is expected to take at least 15 years; it will take even longer if some of the acreage continues to be foraged by geese during the recovery period.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has been working for a few years in partnership with the Canadian Wildlife Service, several state departments of Fish and Game, Ducks Unlimited, the Audubon Society and other non-governmental entities to try to address the problem. In February of this year, the Fish and Wildlife Service issued two final rules to authorize the use of additional hunting methods to reduce the population of snow geese so that a reasonable population can survive on a viable habitat. The goal was to reduce the number of mid-continent light geese in the first year by 975,000 using additional hunting methods carefully studied and approved by the Fish and Wildlife Service.

It is clear that human decision making has contributed mightily to the light geese problem through increased agricultural production, sanctuary designation, and reduction in harvest rates.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us takes an affirmative and humane step to help assure the long-term survival of mid-continent light geese and the conservation of the habitat upon which they and other species depend. I urge my colleagues to support this important bill, and I pledge my support toward making sure the President signs it.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, so I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill, H.R. 2454.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2724) to make technical corrections to the Water Resources Development Act of 1999.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE.

(a) JACKSON COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI.—Section 219 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 110 Stat. 3757) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by striking paragraph (5) and inserting the following:

''(5) JACKSON COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI.—Provision of an alternative water supply and a project for the elimination or control of combined sewer overflows for Jackson County, Mississippi.''; and

(2) in subsection (e)(1), by striking ''$10,000,000'' and inserting ''$20,000,000''.

(b) MANCHESTER, NEW HAMPSHIRE.—Section 219(e)(3) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 110 Stat. 3757) is amended by striking ''$10,000,000'' and inserting ''$20,000,000''.

(c) ATLANTA, GEORGIA.—Section 219(f)(1) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335) is amended by striking ''$25,000,000 for''.

(d) PATERSON, PASSAIC COUNTY, AND PASSAIC VALLEY, NEW JERSEY.—Section 219(f)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335) is amended by striking ''$20,000,000 for''.

(e) ELIZABETH AND NORTH HUDSON, NEW JERSEY.—Section 219(f) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4835; 113 Stat. 335) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (33), by striking ''$20,000,000'' and inserting ''$10,000,000''; and

(2) in paragraph (34)—

(A) by striking ''$10,000,000'' and inserting ''$20,000,000''; and

(B) by striking ''in the city of North Hudson'' and inserting ''for the North Hudson Sewerage Authority''.

SEC. 2. UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM.

Section 1103(e)(5) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 652(e)(5)) (as amended by section 509(c)(3) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 340)) is amended by striking ''paragraph (1)(A)(i)'' and inserting ''paragraph (1)(B)''.

SEC. 3. DELAWARE RIVER, PENNSYLVANIA AND DELAWARE.

Section 346 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 309) is amended by striking ''economically acceptable'' and inserting ''environmentally acceptable''.

SEC. 4. PROJECT REAUTHORIZATIONS.

Section 364 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 313) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Each'' and all that follows through the colon and inserting the following: ''Each of the following projects is authorized to

be carried out by the Secretary, and no construction on any such project may be initiated until the Secretary determines that the project is technically sound, environmentally acceptable, and economically justified:'';

(2) by striking paragraph (1); and

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (6) as paragraphs (1) through (5), respectively.

SEC. 5. SHORE PROTECTION.

Section 103(d)(2)(A) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2213(d)(2)(A)) (as amended by section 215(a)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 292)) is amended by striking ''or for which a feasibility study is completed after that date,'' and inserting ''except for a project for which a District Engineer's Report is completed by that date,''.

SEC. 6. COMITE RIVER, LOUISIANA.

Section 371 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 321) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(a) IN GENERAL.—'' before ''The''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) CREDITING OF REDUCTION IN NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The project cooperation agreement for the Comite River Diversion Project shall include a provision that specifies that any reduction in the non-Federal share that results from the modification under subsection (a) shall be credited toward the share of project costs to be paid by the Amite River Basin Drainage and Water Conservation District.''.

SEC. 7. CHESAPEAKE CITY, MARYLAND.

Section 535(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 (113 Stat. 349) is amended by striking ''the city of Chesapeake'' each place it appears and inserting ''Chesapeake City''.

SEC. 8. CONTINUATION OF SUBMISSION OF CERTAIN REPORTS BY THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY.

(a) RECOMMENDATIONS OF INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD.—Section 302(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2251(b)) is amended in the last sentence by striking ''The'' and inserting ''Notwithstanding section 3003 of Public Law 104–66 (31 U.S.C. 1113 note; 109 Stat. 734), the''.

(b) LIST OF AUTHORIZED BUT UNFUNDED STUDIES.—Section 710(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2264(a)) is amended in the first sentence by striking ''Not'' and inserting ''Notwithstanding section 3003 of Public Law 104–66 (31 U.S.C. 1113 note; 109 Stat. 734), not''.

(c) REPORTS ON PARTICIPATION OF MINORITY GROUPS AND MINORITY-OWNED FIRMS IN MISSISSIPPI RIVER-GULF OUTLET FEATURE.—Section 844(b) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 4177) is amended in the second sentence by striking ''The'' and inserting ''Notwithstanding section 3003 of Public Law 104–66 (31 U.S.C. 1113 note; 109 Stat. 734), the''.

(d) LIST OF AUTHORIZED BUT UNFUNDED PROJECTS.—Section 1001(b)(2) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 579a(b)(2)) is amended in the first sentence by striking ''Every'' and inserting ''Notwithstanding section 3003 of Public Law 104–66 (31 U.S.C. 1113 note; 109 Stat. 734), every''.

SEC. 9. AUTHORIZATIONS FOR PROGRAM PREVIOUSLY AND CURRENTLY FUNDED.

(a) PROGRAM AUTHORIZATION.—The program described in subsection (c) is hereby authorized.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Transportation for the program authorized in subsection (a) in amounts as follows:

(1) FISCAL YEAR 2000.—For fiscal year 2000, $10,000,000.

(2) FISCAL YEAR 2001.—For fiscal year 2001, $10,000,000.

(3) FISCAL YEAR 2002.—For fiscal year 2002, $7,000,000.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—The program referred to in subsection (a) is the program for which funds appropriated in title I of Public Law 106–69 under the heading ''FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION'' are available for obligation upon the enactment of legislation authorizing the program.

□ 1745

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT).

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

Mr. Speaker, the bill's clarifications and revisions were developed in close coordination with the Senate and the administration.

Mr. Speaker, Senator Chafee worked very closely with the House conferees on the Water Resources Development Act. If I am not mistaken, it was the last major legislative achievement before his untimely death. He also worked very closely with us to fine-tune this legislation and then expedite its passage. It is a tribute to him that we were able to enact the Water Resources Development Act and then expeditiously move this bill.

H.R. 2724 perfects the legislation and addresses new, time-sensitive issues. It deserves the support of all of our colleagues.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with the distinguished gentleman from New York (Chairman BOEHLERT) in support of this bill, H.R. 2724. As the gentleman from New York (Chairman BOEHLERT) has just suggested, this is a technical corrections bill to the water resources bill. It is bipartisan, noncontroversial. I urge its support.

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. 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 New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 2724.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOEHLERT. 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. 2724.

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

There was no objection.

COMMENDING THE SERVICE OF WOMEN IN WORLD WAR II

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 41) honoring the women who served the United States in military capacities during World War II and recognizing that these women contributed vitally to the victory of the United States and the Allies in the war, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 41

Whereas during World War II women in the United States were recruited into the Armed Forces to perform military assignments so that men could be freed for combat duties;

Whereas, despite social stigmas and public opinion averse to women in uniform, women applied for military service in such numbers that enrollment ceilings were reached within the first several years;

Whereas during World War II women served in the Army in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps (WAAC) and the Women's Army Corps (WAC);

Whereas these women served the Army by performing a variety of duties traditionally performed by men;

Whereas in 1943 the Army removed the auxiliary status of the WAAC units, in unspoken recognition of the value of their services;

Whereas almost one-half of World War II WACs served in the Army Air Forces as officers and enlisted personnel, with duties including such flying jobs as radio operator, photographer, and flight clerk;

Whereas 7,315 of these Army Air Forces WACs were serving overseas in all theaters of war in January 1945;

Whereas General Eisenhower stated, ''During the time I have had WACs under my command they have met every test and task assigned to them; their contributions in efficiency, skill, spirit, and determination are immeasurable'';

Whereas at the end of the war 657 women were honored for their service in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps and the Women's Army Corps, receiving medals and citations including the Distinguished Service Medal, the Legion of Merit, the Air Medal, the Soldiers' Medal for heroic action, the Purple Heart, and the Bronze Star;

Whereas in 1946 the Army requested that Congress establish the Women's Army Corp as a permanent part of the Army, perhaps the single greatest indication of the value of women in the Army to the war effort;

Whereas during World War II women served with the Army Air Forces in the Women's Auxiliary Ferrying Squadron (WAFS), the Women's Flying Training Detachment (WFTD), and the Women Air Force Service Pilots (WASPs);

Whereas women serving with the Army Air Forces ferried planes from factories to airfields, performed test flights of repaired aircraft, towed targets used in live gunnery practice by male pilots, and performed a variety of other duties traditionally performed by men;

Whereas women pilots flew more than 70 types of military aircraft, from open-cockpit primary trainers to P–51 Mustangs, B–26 Marauders, and B–29 Superfortresses;

Whereas from September 10, 1942, to December 20, 1944, 1,074 WASPs flew an aggregate 60,000,000 miles in wartime service;

Whereas, although WASPs were promised military classification, they were classified