postal workers, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. McCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 257, of which I am a cosponsor.

The U.S. Postal Service delivers more than 200 billion pieces of mail a year and handles about 680 million pieces of mail each day. Letter carriers work tirelessly six days a week, providing over 136 billion homes and business with an invaluable service. Unfortunately, as a result of the September 11 terrorist attacks and the national anthrax scare, the U.S. Postal Service has been placed on the front lines of our war against terrorism. Three pieces of mail were recently confirmed as being contaminated with anthrax. On a grand scale, that's a low ratio, but not when human lives are concerned.

The three letters exposed workers from a wide array of postal distribution centers to anthrax and many are being treated medically as a precaution. But despite the risk of anthrax infection, our Postal Service continues to sort the mail. 34 billion pieces of mail were delivered since September 11, equaling about five pieces for each person in the world. I visited my local postal facilities and am reassured by the steps they are taking to protect their workers on Long Island.

This resolution, H. Con. Res. 257, commends the hard-working men and women of the United States Postal Service for their commitment to mail delivery during this time of national emergency. Postal workers are known for delivering mail no matter what the situation and I'm proud of their work in the face of terrorism.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. McHUGH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 257, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

## REAL INTERSTATE DRIVER EQUITY ACT OF 2001

Mr. LATOURETTE. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2546) to amend title 49, United States Code, to prohibit States from requiring a license or fee on account of the fact that a motor vehicle is providing interstate pre-arranged ground transportation service, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2546

*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 ''Real Interstate Driver Equity Act of 2001''.*

***SEC. 2. REGULATION OF INTERSTATE PRE-ARRANGED GROUND TRANSPORTATION SERVICE.***

*Section 14501 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:*

*''(d) PRE-ARRANGED GROUND TRANSPORTATION.—*

*''(1) IN GENERAL.—No State or political subdivision thereof and no interstate agency or other political agency of 2 or more States shall enact or enforce any law, rule, regulation, standard or other provision having the force and effect of law requiring a license or fee on account of the fact that a motor vehicle is providing pre-arranged ground transportation service if the motor carrier providing such service—*

*''(A) meets all applicable registration requirements under chapter 139 for the interstate transportation of passengers;*

*''(B) meets all applicable vehicle and intrastate passenger licensing requirements of the State or States in which the motor carrier is domiciled or registered to do business; and*

*''(C) is providing such service pursuant to a contract for—*

*''(i) travel from one State, including intermediate stops, to a destination in another State; or*

*''(ii) travel from one State, including one or more intermediate stops in another State, to a destination in the original State.*

*''(2) MATTERS NOT COVERED.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed—*

*''(A) as subjecting taxicab service to regulation under chapter 135 or section 31138;*

*''(B) as prohibiting or restricting an airport, train, or bus terminal operator from contracting to provide preferential access or facilities to one or more providers of pre-arranged ground transportation service; and*

*''(C) as restricting the right of any State or political subdivision of a State to require that any individual operating a vehicle providing prearranged ground transportation service originating in the State or political subdivision have submitted to a criminal background investigation of the records of the State in which the operator is domiciled, by the motor carrier providing such service or by the State or political subdivision by which the operator is licensed to provide such service, as a condition of providing such service.''.*

***SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.***

*(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 13102 of title 49, United States Code, is amended—*

*(1) by redesignating paragraphs (17), (18), (19), (20), (21), and (22) as paragraphs (18), (19), (21), (22), (23), and (24), respectively;*

*(2) by inserting after paragraph (16) the following:*

*''(17) PRE-ARRANGED GROUND TRANSPORTATION SERVICE.—The term 'pre-arranged ground transportation service' means transportation for a passenger (or a group of passengers) that is arranged in advance (or is operated on a regular route or between specified points) and is provided in a motor vehicle with a seating capacity not exceeding 15 passengers (including the driver).''; and*

*(3) by inserting after paragraph (19) (as so redesignated) the following:*

*''(20) TAXICAB SERVICE.—The term 'taxicab service' means passenger transportation in a motor vehicle having a capacity of not more than 8 passengers (including the driver), not operated on a regular route or between specified places, and that—*

*''(A) is licensed as a taxicab by a State or a local jurisdiction; or*

*''(B) is offered by a person that—*

*''(i) provides local transportation for a fare determined (except with respect to transportation to or from airports) primarily on the basis of the distance traveled; and*

*''(ii) does not primarily provide transportation to or from airports.''.*

*(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—*

*(1) MOTOR CARRIER TRANSPORTATION.—Section 13506(a)(2) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:*

*''(2) a motor vehicle providing taxicab service;''.*

*(2) MINIMUM FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY.—Section 31138(e)(2) of such title is amended to read as follows:*

*''(2) providing taxicab service (as defined in section 13102);''.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

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

The Real Interstate Driver Equity Act of 2001, H.R. 2546, was introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT). This legislation is needed to solve a problem that arises when a for-hire motor carrier travels across a State line in interstate commerce.

During testimony before the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, sort of an anomaly presented itself where if someone wanted to hire a car in Cleveland, Ohio, for instance, and take it over to Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, to watch the Browns beat up on the Pittsburgh Steelers, as we hope will happen next month, the car for-hire could drop the person at the stadium in Pittsburgh but could not pick them back up and bring them back to Ohio without a dual licensure.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BLUNT) and his co-sponsors, I know the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), have put their finger right on the pulse of what we need to do to solve this problem and hence have introduced H.R. 2546.

On November 7 of this year, the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure ordered by a voice vote that this bill be reported with one amendment.

Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the primary author of the legislation.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and the members of his committee for bringing this bill to the floor today. Certainly, I also want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), and almost 20 others who have joined with us as co-sponsors on this bill.

In my district in southwest Missouri, we frankly do not have lots of limousine transportation; but we do make lots of limousines. In fact, I think we may be the biggest manufacturer of limousines anywhere in the country;

and for those men and women who work to make limousines and for those many businesses, large and mostly small, and our friends in this industry who provide this service at a time when we are more and more concerned about all kinds of transportation and transportation security, this bill really solves a transportation security problem for many people.

It solves just simply a problem created in doing business every day for the small businesses that provide this great service to so many Americans, whether it is to go to that football game Mr. LATOURETTE mentioned or simply to travel from Newark Airport to the City of New York where someone can take a passenger. But as of today they could not wait for that same passenger and take them back to the airport. That passenger is deprived of the security of knowing that the person they contracted with to take them somewhere can be there and be ready to take them back or in Washington, D.C., where limousine operators have to carry three separate license plates, one for the District of Columbia, one for Maryland, one for Virginia, and are forced to change those license plates whenever they cross the boundaries in order to avoid the fines that otherwise come with the inconsistent regulation that now dominates this particular service.

Under this bill, limousine and sedan companies will be able to travel across State lines as long as they meet certain requirements, like registering with the Department of Transportation as an interstate carrier and ensuring that all their travel is prearranged.

It is also important to note that even though drivers may travel over State boundaries, they are not allowed to pick up additional business while they are on their trip. For example, if a limousine takes a person from Los Angeles to Las Vegas, they can take their client back to Los Angeles; but they cannot engage in short-term fares while waiting for the return trip.

Some cities were concerned that they would not be able to ensure out-of-state drivers had the proper security clearance. We added an amendment in committee that ensures that these States and localities will be able to require any individual operating within their jurisdiction have the proper criminal background check.

This legislation was written in cooperation with the taxi association, the limousine association, the paratransit authority, various regional airports and the City of New York. I believe we have worked on all sides to produce a compromise bill that will help small business owners while ensuring that States and localities will be able to protect their citizens.

Again, this has been a bipartisan effort. We are grateful to the committee for bringing this bill to the floor and to all those representing small business and representing the people who manufacture limousines and sedans who have worked to make this bill possible.

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

Madam Speaker, H.R. 2546, as reported by the committee, makes it unlawful for a State or political subdivision of a State, an interstate agency or a political agency of two or more States to impose any license or fee on account of the fact that a motor vehicle is providing prearranged ground transportation service in interstate commerce.

I want to commend the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS). I think they have tried in the past, and here we have it on the floor today.

The company providing the service must be properly registered to provide service in interstate commerce and must meet all the licensing requirements of the State in which it is domiciled or registered to do business.

This legislation is extremely critical, Madam Speaker, for limousine firms in my own State of New Jersey as they attempt to keep their businesses afloat after September 11.

The for-hire vehicle industry is made up of 18,600 companies nationally that provide local for-hire passenger transportation service. These services include taxicabs and black cars and airport shuttles, executive sedans and limousines. There are approximately 254,000 vehicles that transport over 2 billion passengers in 1 year.

Massive layoffs in this predominantly small business industry are estimated to number 80,000 out of a total of 162,000 nationally. This is a workforce that will be cut in half, and I am hopeful that this bill can ease the burden.

We are not just talking about owner-operators and drivers. We are talking about coach builders, as the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) spoke of, dealers, the thousands of vendors who do business with this industry.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased that the bill before us addresses the concerns expressed by airport, train and bus terminal operators, as well as the City of New York, regarding prior drafts of the bill. The bill does not restrict an airport, a train or a bus terminal operator from contracting to provide preferential process or access to one or more providers or prearranged ground transportation service, nor does it restrict the rights of any State or political subdivision to require that ground transportation operators submit to criminal background checks as a condition of providing the service.

Finally, this bill reaffirms that taxicab services are exempt from the economic and minimum liability regulations of the Federal Government.

This is an imminently sensible compromise, Madam Speaker. This is a piece of legislation we have supported for years. I urge my colleagues to join us in support of the bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume, and I just want to emphasize a point that our colleague and the author of the bill, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), made during his remarks, and that is, during the full committee markup of this legislation, there was some concern expressed by principally the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) and the concern of some cities that a car would come into town on a 2-day trip, perhaps, and while waiting for their fare to take them back to Los Angeles or wherever, they came in, would engage in transporting others to different places within Las Vegas to the detriment of locally licensed vendors.

The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and his co-sponsors have very carefully crafted the bill to ensure that that fear is not realized, and I commend him for making that change and being sensitive to some of the concerns raised and, as a matter of fact, the only concerns raised in the committee about the bill; and as I say, it passed the committee by voice vote.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), my friend and a long-time leader in this area.

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), my friend and neighbor, for yielding the time to me; and I am proud to rise as a co-sponsor and supporter of the legislation.

Let me begin by thanking the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) without whom this legislation would not have gotten on the floor; his legislative skill and his partnership in this effort are truly appreciated, and I thank the gentleman for his work.

I also want to extend my appreciation to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL). The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) was one of the earliest and most significant co-sponsors of this bill, and I know that the small business people in his district and across the country appreciate his leadership on this.

Let me also express my appreciation to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and the majority and minority staffs of the committee for their excellent cooperation in bringing us to this point.

I also want to thank my friend and constituent Don Kensey, Madam Speaker, who is with us today who first brought this to my attention several years ago in my office in New Jersey.

This legislation is good for the traveling passenger. It is good for the small

business person, and I believe it is good for highway safety. It is good for the traveling passenger because it gives him or her more choices as to how to get to where they want to go, and with transportation being something in a state of confusion today or anxiety, having one more safe and secure choice to go from south Jersey, where I live, to New York City or to go from Los Angeles to Las Vegas and back or from Cleveland to Pittsburgh to watch the Steelers, I will not say defeat the Browns since the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) still has control of the time, take on the Browns, these are choices people ought to be able to make; and because of this legislation, they will be able to.

Second, there are, as the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) said, thousands of small business people around this country who are profoundly affected by this legislation. These are men and women who are living from paycheck to paycheck, who are scraping to get their businesses going; and by giving them the chance to compete on a fair and level playing field, we are enhancing their ability to employ their employees and to move their passengers and customers around the country.

Finally, I think the legislation is very much needed for highway safety purposes because face it, very often, these vehicles are employed by people who are out for that great, good time in celebration of a wedding, celebration of a graduation, a special occasion in the family where people want to relax and enjoy themselves and should not be behind the wheel.

□ 1615

Madam Speaker, when they employ one of these vehicles, it permits them to travel safely, to make the highways safer for each one of us.

Following up on something the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) said, this industry, because of its close relationship to air travel, is in a state of great distress. From the leadership of gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) on the Committee on Small Business, and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and others on the majority side are trying to find ways through the Small Business Administration and other vehicles, other agencies, to try to help this segment of the air travel industry through a grave and difficult crisis.

Madam Speaker, I hope that today is simply the first step in a broad and comprehensive effort to help this integral and important part of our air transportation system stay in business and stay intact.

Madam Speaker, I extend my thanks for the cooperation of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT). I urge my colleagues to carefully consider the legislation, give it their affirmative vote and pass this legislation.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I enter into the RECORD an exchange of letters between the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Commerce and Energy on the bill under consideration, H.R. 2546.

The letters referred to are as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
*Washington, DC, November 13, 2001.*

Hon. DON YOUNG,
*Chairman, Committee on Transportation, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN YOUNG: I am writing with regard to H.R. 2546, the Real Interstate Driver Equity Act of 2001. As you know, Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives grants the Committee on Energy and Committee jurisdiction over interstate commerce. H.R. 2546 deals in significant part within such matters, and is therefore within the jurisdiction of my Committee.

I recognize your desire to bring this legislation before the House in an expeditious manner. Accordingly, I will not exercise my Committee's right to a referral. By agreeing to waive its consideration of the bill, however, the Energy and Commerce Committee does not waive its jurisdiction over H.R. 2546. In addition, the Energy and Commerce Committee reserves its authority to seek conferees on any provisions of the bill that are within its jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this legislation. I ask for your commitment to support any request by the Commerce Committee for conferees on H.R. 2546 or similar legislation.

I request that you include this letter as a part of the Committee's report on H.R. 2546 and as part of the Record during consideration of the legislation on the House floor.

Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

W.J. ''BILLY'' TAUZIN,
*Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
*Washington, DC, November 13, 2001.*

Hon. W.J. (BILLY) TAUZIN,
*Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN TAUZIN: Thank you for your letter of November 13, 2001, regarding H.R. 2546, the ''Real Interstate Driver Equity Act of 2001'' and for your willingness to waive consideration of provisions in the bill that are under your committee's jurisdiction under House Rules.

I agree that your waiving consideration of relevant provisions of H.R. 2546 does not waive your committee's jurisdiction over the bill. I also acknowledge your right to seek conferees on any provisions that are within the your committee's jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference on H.R. 2546 or similar legislation, and would support your request for conferees on such provisions.

Your letter and this response will be included in the record during floor consideration of the bill.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

DON YOUNG,
*Chairman.*

Mr. SHAYS. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Real Interstate Driver Equity Act.

I was disappointed when I learned from ground transportation operators in my southwestern Connecticut district that a Stamford couple attending a play in Manhattan could hire a Connecticut car service to bring them to the city, but the same service couldn't bring the client back to Stamford without purchasing a costly additional permit from New York! This is absurd.

Car services based in Connecticut that take clients to and from New York City—duly licensed and insured under the guidelines of the Federal Highway Administration—should not have to purchase additional permits from a local government in order to provide round trip service.

This common sense legislation simply says that a licensed livery company cannot be subject to additional permitting requirements to complete a round trip into another state. The Livery Permit issued by the Federal Highway Administration is the only permit that should be necessary to conduct interstate commerce.

Just as I do not need to obtain separate drivers' licenses from D.C., Maryland, Delaware, New Jersey and New York in order to drive home to Connecticut at the end of the week, local governments should not have the authority to hold interstate commerce hostage to discriminatory pricing schemes.

Mr. PETRI. Madam Speaker, the Real Interstate Driver Equity Act of 2001 (H.R. 2546) was introduced by Representative ROY BLUNT of Missouri. This legislation is needed to solve a problem that arises when a for-hire vehicle, usually a limousine or sedan, travels across a state line in interstate commerce.

As the law is written today, state and local jurisdictions can require for-hire vehicles to be licensed in multiple states. In some instances, if they do not pay for additional licenses they can only drop their passenger in another state. They cannot make incidental stops. They cannot return the same passenger to the state of origin.

An example that illustrates the problem with the current framework is that of a traveler who arranges to be picked up at an airport. On the way home to another state, they wish to stop and have dinner within the same state in which they arrived. This seems like a reasonable situation. What could go wrong with this arrangement? Unfortunately, that stopover could result in the car being ticketed, towed and impounded. The customer is stranded to look for a way to get home and the car service is left without a car and with hundreds or even thousands of dollars in fines and fees.

This is not a fair practice and H.R. 2546 corrects the problem. For-hire vehicles providing prearranged ground transportation should be able to engage in interstate commerce. This legislation would not allow a carrier to operate in another jurisdiction with spontaneous new clients as though they were licensed within that jurisdiction. The legislation also protects the right of transportation terminal operators to provide preferential access and States and political subdivisions to require criminal background checks.

The for-hire vehicle industry utilizes nearly 250,000 vehicles to move more than two billion passengers each year. With the economic downturn, they are an industry that has been hard hit and have requested financial support from the Congress.

With the current budgetary climate, I am doubtful that the Congress will be able to provide direct fiscal relief. However, H.R. 2546

will reduce a burden that costs for-hire vehicle operators business and costs consumers efficient travel and convenience. Representative BLUNT's bill is the next best thing to directing financial relief in these trying times.

I am pleased to report that after more than two years of consideration, this legislation has reached the House Floor. The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has been working with the sponsor and other interested parties to resolve the areas of controversy. As amended at Committee, H.R. 2546 has addressed all of the various concerns. I urge our colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this good piece of legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2546, 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.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## JAMES L. WATSON UNITED STATES COURT OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE BUILDING

Mr. LATOURETTE. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2841) to designate the building located at 1 Federal Plaza in New York, New York, as the ''James L. Watson United States Court of International Trade Building.''

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2841

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

**SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.**

The building located at 1 Federal Plaza in New York, New York, shall be known and designated as the ''James L. Watson United States Court of International Trade Building''.

**SEC. 2. REFERENCES.**

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the building referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''James L. Watson United States Court of International Trade Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

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

Madam Speaker, H.R. 2841 designates the building located at 1 Federal Plaza in New York as the ''James L. Watson United States Court of International Trade Building.'' I thank the ranking member and senior member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), for bringing this legislation to the attention of the committee and urging that we move on it in an expeditious fashion.

Judge Watson was born in Harlem, New York. He was the son of parents that had both been born in Jamaica, and his father served as a municipal court judge for 18 years. Judge Watson served with the Buffalo Soldiers in the 371st Infantry Regiment, 92nd Division, in World War II. He was wounded in Italy and returned to the United States decorated with a Purple Heart and the Infantry Combat Badge.

After returning from the war, he graduated from New York University in 1947 and Brooklyn Law School in 1951. Judge Watson was elected to the New York State Senate in 1954. While serving in the State Senate, in 1962 President John Kennedy chose him to accompany Vice President Johnson to the Jamaican Independence celebration. In 1963, Judge Watson was elected to the New York City Civil Court.

He served on the City Civil Court until President Johnson appointed him to what was known as the United States Customs Court and that is now known as the United States Court of International Trade in 1966. The nine members of the United States Customs Court could be assigned to sit in any Federal District Court in the Nation.

Because of his previous experience in the City Civil Court, in his first year on the Federal bench, Judge Watson was assigned to hear cases in California, Oregon, Washington, Atlanta, Tampa, Houston, El Paso, San Antonio and Dallas on civil and criminal matters. He was the first African American to sit on the Federal bench in the deep South.

Judge Watson worked to help modernize his court under the Customs Court Act of 1970. As chairman of the Court's Rules and Practices Committee, he reworked the rules and facilitated the modernization of the court with the introduction of computers. He took senior status in 1991. He passed away in Harlem earlier this year.

Madam Speaker, Judge Watson was a dedicated Federal judge and an exemplary public servant. This action is fitting to designate the Court of International Trade Building in his honor. I support the bill and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I am in strong support of H.R. 2841, sponsored by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL). Madam Speaker, what a great feeling to start out in the judge's chambers as a law clerk, and be able to come to the floor of the House of Representatives to introduce legislation that would be a fitting response, a fitting response to years of service and dedication.

Judge Watson served on the United States Court of International Trade. It was a lifetime appointment by President Lyndon Johnson. He was a former New York State Senator and a civil court judge. His career spanned 36 years, and he set a record of 70 appearances serving as a visiting judge in districts around this great Nation.

On several occasions, he was the first African American judge to hold court in parts of the deep South, the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico. Compassion and evenhandedness are the best mirror when one holds it up to his decisions and written documents which he placed into the record. In World War II, yes, he served as an infantryman with the legendary black 92nd Buffalo Soldiers Division. What a legacy they left this great democracy.

He was seriously wounded in combat in Italy and received the Purple Heart, the Battle Star, the Combat Infantry Badge and a U.S. Army commendation. He attended New York University and Brooklyn Law School. Upon graduation, he established a private practice with retired Judge Bruce Wright; Lisle Carter, former Assistant Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services; and Jacob Smith.

This is a very special dedication today. In March 1966, President Johnson named Judge Watson to the United States Customs Court, which was later renamed the Court of International Trade. During his year on the International Court, Judge Watson helped develop a modern court system, rewrote many of the court's rules, and introduced computers into the court.

He was noted for a judicial style that was very fair and very balanced. His personal ability to settle many civil cases out of court helped avoid costly expenses and the unpredictability of an often-long trial. He was a lifelong resident of Harlem, a sought-after public speaker, and an insightful adviser to all local politicians. His family is well known and very active in civic affairs. His cousins include Bruce Llewellyn, chairman of Coca-Cola; Secretary of State Colin Powell; and Dorothy Llewellyn Cropper, a New York Supreme Court Justice.

His life was full of success, friendship, his devoted family and his loving wife. It is fitting and proper to honor the distinguished Judge Watson with this designation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, this is a great privilege and honor for me, and one that I have never really enjoyed before, to talk about a friend that has passed away and at the same time to talk about trying to leave something that is made out of steel and concrete as a memory for him.

This is difficult because Judge Watson was anything but a monument. He