COMMONWEALTH OF NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

SPEECH OF

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 24, 1997

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, while the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] and I seldom agree on issues, we are apparently in agreement that more resources and effort must be committed to law enforcement in The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. It is my strong recommendation that additional funds be transferred to the appropriate category for use in adding an additional Assistant U.S. Attorney to be stationed in the NMI. It is the obligation of the Federal Government to ensure that Federal laws are enforced in the Commonwealth. The addition of an Assistant U.S. Attorney will provide needed support to enforce Federal criminal law. I hope the Chairman [Mr. ROGERS] will include language in the managers statement to this affect.

In a report prepared under Mr. MILLER's supervision and published in April of this year by the minority staff of the House Resources Committee, it is alleged that in the past 5 years there are 27 documented examples of failure to prosecute violations in the CNMI. Of these, 21 were either in the exclusive or concurrent jurisdiction of the U.S. Department of Labor, the National Labor Relations Board, the U.S. Attorney's Office or other U.S. Departments. Only six were within the exclusive jurisdiction of the CNMI. Mr. MILLER's report was a scathing denunciation of the CNMI but contained no similar rebuke of the Federal agencies who had jurisdiction over the majority of abuses he cites. I am pleased to see his recognition of the need for Federal attention to Federal problems in the CNMI.

While this may be a proper forum to take this first small step, it is not the forum to address the larger questions of Federal responsibility in the CNMI. The committee of jurisdiction is the Resources Committee. It is my understanding that my good friend from Alaska, Mr. YOUNG, chairman of the Resources Committee, will lead a delegation to that area in January. I strongly suggest that the gentleman from California, who is the ranking member of that Committee join the chairman on that trip. Hopefully, he will be persuaded—as I was after my visit there—that while there are some problems in that area—which voluntarily became a part of America 21 years ago—those problems are not insurmountable. I believe this cooperation will yield much more readily to reasoned solutions than the impassioned rhetoric heard on the House floor.

THE ATP PROGRAM

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 26, 1997

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the ATP Program is important to our economy because it facilitates a partnership between research and commercialization. ATP's mission is that technology should benefit the U.S. economy. As a result, ATP's sole aim is to develop high-risk, potentially high-payoff enabling technologies that otherwise would not be pursued because of obstacles and risks that discourage private investments.

This partnership is crucial to the private sector because it gives them the opportunity to succeed without crippling risks that may preempt them from marketing necessary technological patents. ATP is industry driven—research priorities are set by the industry, not the Government. This enables organizations to share costs, risks, and technology expertise in competitive research and development projects.

Partnership programs like the ATP Program help bridge the gap between the lab bench and the marketplace, and help spawn new innovations and industries. This freedom allows researchers and industry to work together toward a common goal. ATP works through rigorous, open competition and is accessible to all businesses. This has proven to be an effective mechanism for motivating companies to look farther out onto the technology horizon. In addition, ATP is a competitive, peer-reviewed, cost-shared program.

In closing, ATP-sponsored research fuels economic growth by introducing future products and industrial processes. I fully support the ATP Program because disabling this program would discourage research and development which is key to strengthening our economy and international commerce.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JAMES E. ROGAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 26, 1997

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, September 25, 1997 due to illness, I was granted a leave of absence and therefore unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner:

Rollcall No. 438 ''no,'' Rollcall No. 439 ''yes,'' Rollcall No. 440 ''no,'' Rollcall No. 441 ''yes,'' Rollcall No. 442 ''yes,'' Rollcall No. 443 ''yes,'' Rollcall No. 444 ''no,'' Rollcall No. 445 ''no,'' Rollcall No. 446 ''yes,'' Rollcall No. 447 ''no''.

Rollcall No. 448 ''no,'' Rollcall No. 449 ''no,'' Rollcall No. 450 ''no,'' Rollcall No. 451 ''yes,'' Rollcall No. 452 ''yes,'' Rollcall No. 453 ''no,'' Rollcall No. 454 ''no,'' Rollcall No. 455 ''yes,'' Rollcall No. 456 ''yes''.

END LOGGING ROAD SUBSIDIES NOW

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 26, 1997

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, as conferees representing the House and Senate go to conference to resolve differences between each Chamber's version of the Interior appropriations bill, I urge my colleagues on the conference committee to put an end to the use of taxpayer subsidies for the construction of logging roads in our national forests.

The Federal Government spends millions of dollars each year subsidizing the construction of logging roads in our national forests. These roads' only purpose is to allow loggers to cut more trees. It is time to end this fiscally wasteful and environmentally destructive subsidy of the timber industry.

Our national forests represent a major portion of some of the last remaining untouched forest in this country. Regrettably, the U.S. Forest Service continues to spend $90 million each year to build logging roads deep into these forests so that timber companies can chop down these precious resources. These needless corporate subsidies also carry with them very detrimental environmental consequences. I know of absolutely no reason why we should continue the construction of these roads.

Logging roads cut through precious habitats of fish and wildlife, including many threatened and endangered species. The construction of these roads has had a devastating impact upon habitat, water quality, and wildlife population. Road construction has also increased the risk of landslides, erosion, and siltation of streams.

In July, the House voted on the Porter-Kennedy amendment to the Interior Appropriations Act of 1998, which would prevent further destruction of our Nation's Federal forests, including old growth forests which remain on public land. The vote to abolish this subsidy came within only two votes of passing the House. A secondary amendment, however, cut the subsidy in half.

Mr. Speaker, it is not often that we have a chance to enhance environmental protection while at the same time reducing the Federal budget deficit and finally putting an end to an unnecessary corporate subsidy. Soon, the House-Senate conference committee will make a decision about the inclusion of the logging road subsidy. I urge the conferees to eliminate purchaser credits and eliminate the appropriation for timber roads. We do not need any new taxpayer subsidized logging roads in our national forests.

AMERICA RECYCLES DAY

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 26, 1997

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that would express the sense of the House that the country ought to give itself a pat on the back for its progress in recycling. I am joined in this effort by Mr. PORTER, Mr. GEJDENSON and Mr. GILCHREST, and I am proud to have them as partners in this worthy effort.

This resolution would suggest that the House believes it appropriate that a national celebration of ''America Recycles Day'' be observed by States and localities. This would be a day to celebrate the progress the country has made in establishing and integrating recycling programs in each State, in hundreds of cities, in thousands of communities.

Whether it be the simple act of depositing an old Coke can in an aluminum recycling bin, or meticulously separating brown glass from green glass from clear glass and hauling them all down to the city recycling center, it is clear that Americans have learned that recycling is a valuable means of conserving resources,

saving money, and keeping our environment clean.

When you look at the trash that we generate in a year's time—208 million tons worth—it is clear that it is incumbent on us to use less, recycle more, and find new ways of managing our finite resources. The numerous recycling programs throughout the country are dedicated to this cause and each person who recycles ought to be commended for their dedication to a cleaner, safer environment.

The resolution I introduce today with my colleagues will hopefully be a catalyst for more Americans to recycle and continue this positive and simple means to a better future.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed following my remarks.

H. RES.—

Whereas the people of the United States generate approximately 208,000,000 tons of municipal solid waste each year, or 4.3 pounds per person per day;

Whereas the average office worker in the United States generates between 120 and 150 pounds of recoverable white office paper a year;

Whereas the Environmental Protection Agency recently estimated that the recycling rate in the United States has reached 27 percent of the solid waste stream;

Whereas making products from recycled materials allows the people of the United States to get the most use of every tree, every gallon of oil, every pound of mineral, every drop of water, and every kilowatt of energy that goes into the products they buy;

Whereas manufacturing from recycled materials creates less waste and fewer emissions;

Whereas recycling saves energy, reducing the need to deplete nonrenewable energy resources;

Whereas it is estimated that 9 jobs are created for every 15,000 tons of solid waste recycled into new products;

Whereas recycling is completed only when recovered materials are returned to retailers as new products and are purchased by consumers;

Whereas buying recycled products conserves resources and energy, reduces waste and pollution, and creates jobs;

Whereas more than 4,500 recycled products are now available to consumers;

Whereas the United States has a two-way, use and reuse system of recycling and buying recyclables;

Whereas Americans support recycling, but need a regular reminder of the importance of buying recycled content products, the availability of recycled content products, and how to recycle;

Whereas states and localities throughout the country will be establishing November 17, 1997, and November 15, 1998, as ''America Recycles Day'' in their communities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) the House of Representatives supports the goals of America Recycles Day; and

(2) the House of Representatives requests that the President issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to support the goals of each America Recycles Day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN F. TIERNEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 26, 1997

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today slightly bemused at the specter we are witnessing where the Republican Majority is effectively denying its own member, the gentlewoman from Washington, the opportunity to address a matter of significance to her and other members.

Last week, the same Majority brought forward for a vote H.R. 2378, Treasury, Postal, General Government Appropriations for FY 1998. The rules established by the leadership did not allow for broad amendments, Representative SMITH tells us she wanted an opportunity to raise under that bill the issue of Cost of living Adjustments for federal employees, including judges and Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I have no way of knowing if the gentlewoman was persuaded or tricked by her leadership into not raising the issue, at that time. I do know that the membership, in the absence of amendments, addressed the merits of appropriations set forth in H.R. 2378, and voted only on that. In the aftermath, the vote on the appropriations bill was construed as being either ''for'' or ''against'' maintenance of the Cost of living Adjustment—for all Federal employees, judges and Congressmen and women. This, of course, later got further distilled as a vote ''for'' or ''against'' a congressional pay raise.

All of that occurred without adequate deliberation on the issue of COLAs, and even without specific discussion as to whether a distinction could be made for COLAs for federal employees, judges or Members of Congress. Thus, the American public was deprived of a clear and full enunciation of respective positions as well as a recorded vote on this particular issue. Members were ill-served by the portrayal of the vote on the broad Treasury, Postal, General Government Appropriations bill as a vote on a pay raise, particularly when the bill did not specifically address Ms. SMITH's issue.

The Majority now appears ready to compound the travesty today by once again closing debate without providing Ms. SMITH and those who might agree with her position an opportunity to amend or even debate the issue.

Mr. Speaker, operation of the House in such a manner could rightly be seen by the public as akin to the conduct of a certain Senate Committee Chairman in the other legislative body who recently invoked procedure to stifle a hearing and vote on an ambassadorial appointment for Mexico.

I suggest Mr. Speaker, that people will and should be more troubled by the way this business has been conducted than by whether or not a 2.3% COLA, in place since 1989, actually is authorized.

Personally I find that points made by experienced Members—including those who were here in 1989—seem to be reasonable in support of the 2.3% COLA, for Members of Congress, as well as for judges and other federal employees. I am told that the COLA was first established at a time when Members' ability to earn outside income was curtailed. In addition, Members are afforded no living allowances for the costs of maintaining a second residence and other expenses associated with the need to be both in the home district and in Washington D.C. Many Members believe firmly that the 2.3% COLA is fair, especially since it has not taken effect for several years, and that the salary set for Members helps attract quality candidates and Members. They also cite their seven day (and most evening) schedules and dedication to their work—which includes a responsibility to legislate on significant issues, including a multi-trillion dollar budget.

Yet these arguments have not been fully articulated because of the Majority's procedural maneuver to shut down debate. Other than a sense that the public may resent Congress' COLA, there has been little discussion as to why other federal employees and judges ought to be denied COLAs.

Mr. Speaker, I've yet to hear a sufficient rebuttal to the points made in favor of the COLA, but unfortunately it seems I shall not get that chance as the Majority appears set against it.

Had I the opportunity to weigh in, I'd like it known that I would support COLAs for federal employees and judges. Since many would seize the opportunity to politicize any action on Congressional COLA's, I would prefer that they be allowed to take effect in the session of Congress following the one in which a vote is taken. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that that would be the better course this year and at any future time when the compensation of those voting on the issue is in question.

So, I object to abuse of the process, and the refusal of the Majority leadership to put the question squarely to the membership for deliberation, debate and vote. I am also sure many Members will find objectionable the interpretations and misinterpretations of Members' positions.

Mr. Speaker, the insistence of the Republican leadership to be clever on the issue instead of forthright is a disservice to the public and to Members.

TRIBUTE TO ST. JAMES PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

HON. BRAD SHERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 26, 1997

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the groundbreaking ceremony for St. James Presbyterian Church's new sanctuary. It is an honor to join the congregation in celebrating this momentous occasion.

On January 17, 1994, the St. James sanctuary was destroyed by the Northridge earthquake. Since that time the congregation has worshiped in their fellowship hall which does not accommodate their entire congregation. Finally, 3½ years later, they are able to rebuild their sanctuary. We gather here to celebrate this new beginning.

St. James Presbyterian has a long and detailed history which stretches back to the end of the Second World War. During that time the San Fernando Valley had an unexpected population boom and Dr. John Tufft was selected by the Presbyterian Church's Presbytery of