

Diego, San Francisco, San Jose, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, and elsewhere in the state.

Without this route, Los Angeles will be the largest U.S. city without non-stop air service to Washington's Reagan-National. In fact, California, the most populous state in the Union, will have no direct connection to DCA.

Earlier this year, 57 Members of Congress—including House Majority Leader DICK ARMEY and Democratic Leader RICHARD GEPHARDT and most Members of the California congressional delegation—wrote the DOT in support of American Airline's efforts to preserve this critical service.

The legislation introduced today allows American Airlines to use two existing slot exemptions for service between Washington's Reagan-National and Los Angeles. As such, it does not increase the total number of flights at Washington's Reagan National and permits Alaska Airlines to fly direct to Seattle.

Mr. Speaker, Californians rely upon nonstop air service between Los Angeles International Airport and Washington's Reagan-National Airport. Without congressional action, this convenient nonstop air service will end in September.

I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation.

HONORING THE 125 YEAR HISTORY  
OF LA VETA, COLORADO

**HON. SCOTT McINNIS**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 28, 2001*

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay special tribute to La Veta, Colorado on its 125th Birthday. For over a century, the people of La Veta have contributed a rich heritage and cultural diversity to the state of Colorado. I would like Congress to wish the citizens of La Veta a very happy 125th birthday.

In 1862, Col. John M. Francisco, a former settler with the US Army at Fort Garland, and Judge Henry Daigle built Fort Francisco on land purchased from the Vigil-St. Vrain Land Grant, significantly south west of most of the San Luis Valley bound traffic. When Col. John Francisco looked down on the future site of La Veta in the mid 1850's he said, "This is paradise enough for me." The town of La Veta was incorporated on October 9, 1876.

As more settlers moved into this beautiful and fertile valley, the Fort increased in importance as shelter from Indians and as the commercial center for the area. The first Post Office, named Spanish Peaks, opened in the Plaza in 1871. By 1875 the Indian threat was almost completely gone. In 1876 the narrow gauge railroad came through La Veta several blocks north of the Fort on its way westward through the newly surveyed La Veta Pass. In 1877 the permanent rail depot was built beside the rails and the business community slowly moved north toward it. For many years, this stretch of the line between La Veta and Wagon Creek was the highest in the world. The old depot building at the summit is listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

The mountains of the Sangre de Cristo Range were long known by the Indians of the Southwest. Relics of the Basket Weaver Cul-

ture have also been found within the county. The Spanish Peaks are a historic landmark to travelers—from the early Indians to the vacationer. Besides being the railhead, La Veta has also been the center of local agriculture and coal mining.

Mr. Speaker, the citizens of Colorado are proud of La Veta's 125-year heritage. It is an area rich in culture, history and heritage. For that Mr. Speaker, I would like to wish La Veta happy birthday and wish its citizens good luck and prosperity for the next 125 years.

HONORING YAKOV SMIRNOFF ON  
THE 15TH ANNIVERSARY OF HIS  
CITIZENSHIP

**HON. CHRISTOPHER COX**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 28, 2001*

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Yakov Smirnov, who will celebrate his 15th anniversary as a United States citizen on July 4, 2001.

When Yakov left the Soviet Union in 1977, he arrived in the U.S. with less than \$100 in his pocket. But like so many new immigrants, Yakov quickly found a way to put his talents to use in his new country—and in only a few years he became one of America's most recognized comedians.

Yakov's brand of comedy appealed to so many Americans because it carried real insight. He poked fun at the daily consequences of Soviet tyranny, while displaying a remarkably American irreverence for our own foibles ("In the Soviet Union, I'd line up for three hours just to get a tasteless piece of meat and some stale bread; but in America, you can walk into any fast-food restaurant and get the same thing right away"). But he also reminded us of how fortunate we are to live in a free and democratic nation ("What a country!" became his signature line). In fact, Yakov has said that his comedy has helped him "share his attempts at becoming a real American with the audience."

Yakov's dream of becoming an American citizen was finally fulfilled on July 4, 1986, in a ceremony held at the Statue of Liberty. Describing his joy at the occasion, Yakov says: "I suddenly had a new revelation. You can go to Italy but never become Italian. You can go to France but never become French. But you can come to America and become an American."

When freedom came to the formerly captive peoples of the Soviet Empire, Yakov joked that "the end of the KGB eliminated 100 percent of the torture in Russia, 50 percent of the spying—and 30 percent of my punch lines." But in fact Yakov enjoys continued success in his comedic routines. In 1992, he moved to Branson, Missouri, where he owns his own comedy theater and performs to perennially sold-out shows.

Yakov says he will continue to relish having a job that allows him to encourage Americans to cherish the freedom we have to laugh at ourselves—and yes, at our government. "I've learned that the secret to being happy is discovering your gift and having the opportunity to share it with the world," he once said. "As I found out for myself, it can be quite a ride before your gift defines itself and allows you to realize what it is."

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join with me in paying tribute to Yakov Smirnov on the 15th anniversary of his citizenship. He truly embodies what it means to be an American. As we prepare to celebrate the 4th of July, the United States Congress can all join with Yakov and say, "What a country!"

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT  
APPROPRIATIONS ACT,  
2002

SPEECH OF

**HON. DALE E. KILDEE**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 27, 2001*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2311) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes:

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Bonior-Stupak-Kapture amendment to prohibit expansion of drilling in or along the Great Lakes.

The Great Lakes rank among the most precious environmental treasures in the world. The five lakes hold almost 20 percent of the fresh water in the world, and they hold almost 90 percent of the United States' fresh water supply. The United States' share of Great Lakes shoreline is longer than the coastlines of either the East Coast or West Coast of our nation. Furthermore, the lakes' ecological diversity impacts ecosystems in eight states as well as much of Canada.

All five of the Great Lakes rank among the top eighteen largest lakes in the world. In fact, Lake Superior has the largest surface water of any fresh water lake in the world, and it holds more volume than all of the other Great Lakes combined. We should not put these treasures at risk for a small amount of fossil fuel.

Some colleagues want to compare drilling in the Great Lakes to drilling in ocean waters, but this line of thought compares apples to oranges.

First, the water exchange rate in the lakes is very slow, because they are essentially self-contained. A spill under these circumstances would devastate the ecology for many years, and it simply should not be risked.

Second, drilling in the lakes threatens fresh waters not salt waters, and a spill would compromise drinking water for millions.

Third, drilling in and along the lakes would yield only miniscule increases in energy supply for our nation.

When the risks are so high and rewards so low, it makes no sense to move forward with plans to implement drilling of any kind.

Finally, I wish to highlight an often overlooked fact about Michigan's relationship with the Great Lakes. They are the foundation of our state's robust tourism industry. In fact, tourism is the second largest industry in our state.

Americans from throughout the Midwest and beyond come to our lakeshores for recreation and relaxation. Just as Florida fears significant negative economic consequences when fuel

spills threaten her coastline, so does Michigan.

The Great Lakes supply fresh water to many. They offer recreational resources to millions. They contribute to the ecology of a significant portion of the United States. We would be foolish to endanger.

Vote yes on this amendment.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

SPEECH OF

**HON. BETTY McCOLLUM**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 27, 2001*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2311) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes:

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose drilling of any kind beneath the Great Lakes and urge my colleagues to support the Bonior amendment.

Visit Minnesota's North Shore and you will immediately know why.

Lake Superior is a constant source of wonder. It helps shape our landscape and climate, it supports our economy and it enhances our quality of life.

Mr. Chairman, water is a precious resource in my state. We have over 10,000 lakes. Lake Superior, of course, is the most identifiable of Minnesota's lakes, its familiar wolf head shape visible from outer space.

Did you know the greatest of the Great Lakes (Lake Superior) is over 31,000 square miles, the same size as the entire state of Maine? Lake Superior also holds more fresh drinking water than all the other Great Lakes combined—Lake Ontario, Lake Michigan, Lake Huron, and four Lake Erie's.

Each year, millions of people from all over the world visit the lake in Minnesota for sightseeing, fishing, scuba diving and boating.

Lake Superior is also important to the economies of Minnesota and the entire Upper Midwest. Duluth, Minnesota and Superior, Wisconsin make up the busiest international inland port in America.

Our lakes, especially Lake Superior, are not isolated.

We are a part of a great chain of lakes. What happens in one lake does have an impact in all of the Lakes.

Mr. Chairman, the Great Lakes provide over 35 million people with their fresh drinking water. These lakes constitute twenty percent of the Earth's fresh water, 95% in the United States.

Why would anyone put our nation's largest source of fresh drinking water at risk?

Data from the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality shows that only 28.5% of one day's consumption of natural gas and 2.2% of one day's consumption of oil in the United States has been produced. Not enough for even one day has been produced in over 20 years.

The House last week wisely stopped the President's proposal to drill off the shores of Florida and in our national monuments. The Great Lakes are no less important.

I oppose drilling of any sort for oil and natural gas beneath the Great Lakes. Not because we do not need to find additional resources. We do. These lakes are just too vital to too many families and it's not worth the risk.

We are making progress in using energy more efficiently and reducing our reliance on oil and natural gas through energy efficiency technology and conservation. We must make bigger investments in current programs. Investments don't have to cost money either. We can and we must reduce our consumption by supporting wind and solar power and renewable fuels like ethanol.

Future generations depend on us not to jeopardize our nation's greatest natural resource. An oil spill or any related disaster on the shores of a Great Lake would impact the fresh drinking water for 35 million people. And for what? Less than a day's worth of oil and natural gas.

The Great Lakes are important to this nation. They are important to my state and to millions of families. They have been crucial in the historical and economic development of our communities and they continue to play a significant role in Minnesota, the nation and the world.

I urge my colleagues today to protect the drinking water of future generations. I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

SPEECH OF

**HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 27, 2001*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2311) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes:

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my strong support for setting aside sufficient funding for Beach Protection projects, and to keep the current language in the bill which states that 65 percent of the initial construction costs of beach replenishment projects are to be financed by the Federal Government, and 35 percent of the costs are to be paid by states and local governments.

The fact of the matter is that our beaches are national assets that deserve national protection. Just like our national parks, our beaches are not enjoyed solely by those who live near or on them. Just the opposite is true: our beaches are visited by tens of millions of people from all over the country. Foreign tourists come from all parts of the globe to visit our coasts and beaches.

My good friend, Representative TOM TANCREDO of Colorado, has offered an amendment today to strike language in the bill that directs the Secretary of the Army to honor existing Federal contracts with States, counties, and cities throughout coastal America. Under the gentleman's amendment, the Federal government would essentially shirk its responsibility, and shuffle it onto the shoulders of state

and local governments, by switching the cost share ratio to 35 percent federal/65 percent local.

I rise in opposition to this amendment, because it is bad national policy, as well as bad for local taxpayers in coastal communities.

Mr. Speaker, the record is clear: states and local governments have consistently shown their commitment to assist in the preservation and replenishment of beaches along the Nation's coastlines. The proposed Federal change in cost sharing would result in the delay or elimination of several important Corps of Engineers projects, which would potentially increase the property damage from hurricanes and severe storm events. Additionally, states and localities would not be able to absorb the increased costs without raising taxes or cutting other vital priorities.

Our nation's beaches contribute to our national economy—four times as many people visit our nation's beaches each year than visit all of our National Parks combined. And yet Congress provides copious funding for national parks—as it should. It is estimated that 75% of Americans will spend some portion of their vacation at the beach this year. Beaches are the most popular destination for foreign visitors to our country as well. The amount of money spent by beach-going tourists creates an extensive economic benefit—a portion of which goes back to the Federal government in the form of income and payroll taxes.

So to suggest, as the amendment from Mr. TANCREDO does, that beach protection confers benefits to only a handful of beach-house owners, is simply false. Just look at my own State of New Jersey. Tourism is the second greatest contributor to the New Jersey economy. In 1999, tourism brought \$27.7 billion to the state. Out of the 167 million trips made to New Jersey in 1999, 101 million were to the Shore area.

I would also like to thank the Committee for setting aside \$413,000 in funds to complete the next stage of the Manasquan Inlet Project, which extends from the Manasquan Inlet to the Barnegat Inlet and includes the beaches of several coastal towns in Ocean County, which are in my district.

Additionally, the Manasquan Inlet is absolutely crucial the fishing industry and the general economic health of the New Jersey metropolitan shore. It is through the Manasquan Inlet that many large deep-sea fishing vessels gain their entry to the ocean and where they can return with their catch. Nearly 22,000 people are employed by the fishing industry in New Jersey, with an economic output of almost \$2.1 billion. Protecting the beaches and preventing erosion benefits more than just the tourism industry.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all members of Congress to protect our nation's beaches, coastal communities and tourism industry by keeping the Federal/Local cost share at 65 percent Federal, 35 percent local.

Vote "no" on the Tancredo amendment.

PCBS IN THE HUDSON RIVER

**HON. MAURICE D. HINCHEY**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 28, 2001*

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend to my colleagues the following article written by Ned Sullivan on the issue of