

support of this bill and in support of the new chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COBLE]. I do not believe there is anybody better prepared in the Congress to head the mission of this Congress in deliberating these matters, save for maybe the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS], his vast knowledge of working with the committee over the years.

However, I have one concern with the bill. I am going to vote for this bill regardless if the amendment I propose passes or not, but the Coast Guard, Congress, has been known for safety. There is a provision in this bill that allows for the closing of 23 small boat stations.

The bill gives an opportunity for the Coast Guard to work out all kinds of safety parameters here, to ensure that there will be adequate safety, et cetera, et cetera, but the truth of the matter is, "Scarlett, quite frankly, I don't buy it."

We have had testimony offered to us that the last time some of these small boat stations were closed, there was an accompanying loss of life. The Coast Guard has one mission. That is safety.

What the Traficant amendment is dealing with financially, Congress, is \$3 million; \$3 million could be taken out of transportation, taken out of some expense account. Under the Traficant amendment, it says they could transfer everything out of these small boat stations but they must leave one pair of eyes of a Coast Guard full-time official, one pair of hands, one pair of eyes.

Let me caution Congress: With all of these beautiful ideas of these weekend warriors, be careful, Congress. There are an awful lot of other good amendments, after the Traficant amendment is considered, that will put some extenuating circumstances and criteria that speak to safety.

The truth of the matter is there is only one amendment today that will stop these closings. Every one of those other amendments will get a quick-over, fancy report and they will close those small boat stations.

The Traficant amendment says those small boat stations will not be closed. They could transfer everything they want out of there, but they must leave one full-time personnel to coordinate those local efforts.

Congress, that is good sense. We are here to set policy. We have given the executive branch so much authority in so many areas, we are now not even getting votes on major issues, including bailouts of Mexico.

I am recommending to the Congress that the policy of the Congress be the Coast Guard is an excellent, excellent American service. Its No. 1 mission is safety. We will retain it and keep its mission as safety. When you get a chance, consider that in any regard.

I will support this bill under any circumstances. It is a good bill. I commend the chairman, the gentleman

from North Carolina [Mr. COBLE] for his outstanding effort.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I also wanted to commend the Committee on Rules, as well as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation, for supporting an open rule on this Coast Guard authorization bill.

I did want to say, though, that I totally, 100 percent agree with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT], the ranking member, that his amendment, the Traficant amendment, if you will, is the only amendment that will assure that the 23 small boat unit stations are not closed.

I remember because when I was first elected to Congress back in 1988, they had recently, the Coast Guard had recently proposed closing a number of stations, Coast Guard stations around the country, including the one that I represent at the Shark River Inlet. The effects of those closures at the time were widespread.

I think many Members know that over the years, the Coast Guard committee and this Congress have added more and more responsibilities to the Coast Guard, whether it be to enforce against drug trafficking, to enforce our environmental laws, to enforce our fishing laws. More and more work every year goes to the Coast Guard, and at the same time we have been providing some additional funds for the Coast Guard.

□ 1500

But to suggest, as this small boat unit closure plan does, that all of a sudden now there are this minute 23 stations around the country that are no longer needed at a time when the amount of incidents, search and rescue incidents as well as all of the other jurisdiction the Coast Guard now has, and that traffic increases every year, to suggest this is the time to make these kinds of closures I think makes no sense.

In addition, although I understand there are amendments out there and the rule provides for an open rule where all of these amendments can be heard, all of the other amendments, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] said, will basically allow the Coast Guard to close these 23 stations and others and look for some sort of alternative, either the State or locality or auxiliary, to step in and perform those functions also, let me assure my colleagues in the State of New Jersey it is not possible through our State of New Jersey through our marine police or Coast Guard auxiliary or local fire departments or whatever to step in and take over the responsibilities that the Coast Guard has at these various stations. That is why it is very important we pass the Traficant amendment today.

I appreciate the fact we have an open rule, and I also appreciate the fact that

the chairman, Mr. COBLE, has tried very hard to do what he can to cooperate with those of us who are concerned about these closures. But I sincerely believe the only way we can make sure that the closures do not occur is by passing the Traficant amendment.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I have no other Members in the Chamber requesting time at this point, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, we have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 961, CLEAN WATER AMENDMENTS OF 1995

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-114) on the resolution (H. Res. 140) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 961) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

AUTHORIZING 1995 SPECIAL OLYMPICS TORCH RELAY TO BE RUN THROUGH CAPITAL GROUNDS

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution (H.Con. Res. 64) authorizing the 1995 Special Olympics Torch Relay to be run through the Capitol Grounds.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

Mr. WISE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do not plan to object, and I yield to the gentleman from Maryland for an explanation of his request.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the concurrent resolution before us would authorize the 1995 Special Olympics Torch Relay to be run through the Capitol Grounds on May 19, 1995, as part of the journey of the special olympics torch to the Special Olympics Summer Games at Gallaudet University here in the District.

Under the resolution, the Capitol Police Board will oversee the run and the Architect of the Capitol is responsible for establishing the conditions and making preparations necessary for the event.

This is an annual event and one which Congress has approved several times before. This year approximately 60 local and Federal law enforcement agencies throughout the region will participate in this 26-mile relay run