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