

Mr. WISE. Madam Speaker, as the Congress adjourns and shortly Sandy and I will get in the car with our two children and begin heading home to the western side of West Virginia, about a 7-hour drive away, we are going to ask ourselves once again: Why is it that we have to drive north to drive so far south? Or why is it that we can take the alternate route and drive so far south and then west and then we get to go north again? Why is there not a direct route, a direct route called Corridor H, a route that has been torn by controversy for many, many years but a highway that should be built.

This is going to begin a series of statements on why Corridor H should be built. Today I am going to entitle this, "Why Corridor H is a National Highway."

It is not, as some say, a narrow West Virginia road or a State interest. It is not just of local concern, nor is it a pork-barrel project. Corridor H is a vital project that has been on the books for 25 years.

Let's take a look at the map, Madam Speaker. Here we are roughly in Washington, DC. I-66 goes out toward the Virginia line and intersects with Interstate 81. The logical thing, if you were going to continue going to the west, would be to go straight, would it not? That is what Corridor H does. But instead our traffic, economic, and tourist and all other traffic, is required to go to the north to 68 or down to the south to 64 and keep going down.

Were Corridor H to be completed, and indeed 40 miles of Corridor H, 4-lane Corridor H is already completed from I-79, 40 miles to Weston, to Buckhannon, to Elkins, West Virginia. But were Corridor H, the 100 and some miles left, to be completed, what you would have is an extension of Interstate 66, a major east-west corridor that goes to I-79 and then permits you to continue going to the west, either down Interstate 79 or up and over on Route 50, another 4-lane road.

What you would have is a straight east-west corridor running all the way from the Washington metropolitan area to Ohio, Kentucky and points west.

This is truly a national highway. Indeed, it would also connect, Madam Speaker, with the inland port at Front Royal, an increasingly commercial development that is showing more success in getting goods to the port at Norfolk. But the problem is that if you are trying to bring anything from the west to the east, you are confronted by extremely mountainous and difficult terrain. Corridor H would end that. It is a major economic development corridor as well as a national highway, a highway truly of national significance.

I think it should also be pointed out that some argue that it is too expensive or environmentally damaging. What they fail to acknowledge is that the four routes that were considered, two running to the south, one running to the north and now the route that

has been adopted this way, that those routes were considered and rejected. Indeed, the least expensive route and the one that causes the least environmental disruption is the one that has been adopted.

The two southern routes threaten great environmental problems and were the most expensive to construct. So out of consideration and to meet the concerns of many who raised these objections, the fourth route, the one that is presently proposed, is the one that was adopted.

Madam Speaker, I would urge this Congress to get on about the business of constructing Corridor H and to look at I-66 as it ends at Interstate 81 and to recognize the important national significance of this road. It does not get any cheaper to build a road. The least expensive route has been selected and indeed to provide a major east-west corridor, Corridor H is the answer.

Yes, Sandy and I are going to spend 6 to 7 hours driving and we could spend far less were Corridor H constructed. It should not be constructed for our driving ease. What it ought to be constructed for is the economic growth of this entire region, not only West Virginia but parts of Virginia, Ohio, and Kentucky as well.

Madam Speaker, I will be revisiting the issue of Corridor H a good deal more in the future.

MORE FREEDOM, INDEPENDENCE, AND BANG FOR THE BUCK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Madam Speaker, I probably will not take the full 5 minutes. As we adjourn today and Members begin to return to their districts to celebrate the Fourth of July, I think we should remember what we are really celebrating is Independence Day.

There were two events, two news items this week coming out of Washington that I think deserve some attention and may seem in some respects disparate but I think they are related. Like the fireworks displays that we are going to see in communities all across America next Tuesday, we should be talking about independence, we should be talking about freedom, but more importantly I think as it relates to government programs, we ought to be looking for ways that we can get the most bang for our buck.

□ 1430

And so I would like to talk about a couple of news items. First of all, we have an expression back in the Midwest, "When pigs fly," which is another way of saying that that is never going to happen. And I think if you would have asked people several years ago, Do you think the Congress will really get serious about balancing the budget? I think a lot of people would have said, "When pigs fly."

This week the House and Senate conferees came together and we now have a budget blueprint which will, in fact, balance the Federal budget.

Second, I want to talk about something and congratulate Marion Barry, who many times we found reasons to disagree with, and the DC school superintendent, Franklin Smith. There is an article in today's Wall Street Journal where they have agreed to support a local voucher plan for the local schools and privatize up to 11 of the most troubled schools.

I think that is terrific news. I think that is terrific news for the students in Washington, DC. I think it is about independence, I think it is about freedom, and I think it is about getting more bang for the buck.

And so when we talk about the budget, some people are saying we should take 10 years instead of 7 years to balance the budget. When I talk to my constituents, they think we ought to balance it in 3 or 4 years, rather than 7 years. There is criticism no matter what you do.

Frankly, as it relates to the Washington, DC, public schools, I would like to see them open the system up even more so that parents could choose from private, religiously affiliated schools as well, but they are taking the most important first steps, as we are with the budget.

And so, Madam Speaker, when we see pigs beginning to fly, I do not think we should criticize them for not staying up too long or taking too long to get the job done. These are important news items. It is all about more freedom, more independence, and getting more bang for our buck.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MORELLA). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

AMERICANS WANT FASTER FDA DRUG APPROVALS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, life-saving new drugs do take too long to reach the people who need them. From my district in Montgomery County, PA, I have heard many a compelling story from constituents with cancer, A.L.S., Lou Gehrig's disease, epilepsy, or AIDS, who speak of the difficulties in obtaining these life-saving, life-extending drugs. They need them because the approval process in our country is so prolonged and, in effect, they have to turn to other countries where the products are available.

Is it not ironic that most of the life-saving drugs that are produced in the

world are produced here in the United States, but our patients and our constituents are the last to receive them because of over-regulation and delays in the system which can be cleared up.

Do not get me wrong. The Food and Drug Administration serves a valuable purpose in maintaining high safety and efficacy standards. However, it is important to note that the FDA's actions directly affect the lives of patients and the ability of physicians to provide state-of-the-art care for their patients. What we need to have is a speeded up process to approve or disapprove drugs so that the investments made by biotech and pharmaceutical companies can result in having saved lives and the quality of those lives extended for many years to come.

In addition, the FDA regulates businesses that produce 25 percent of America's gross national product, so the agency's actions also impact on our country's economic well-being. The United States is far and away the world leader in pharmaceutical and biotech discovery, but many firms are moving clinical trials overseas because of needless trends that do not bode well for the economic future of the United States.

This can all be changed by legislation; by making sure that we speed up the process of FDA approval so that our constituents will have the benefit of these life-extending and live-saving drugs.

In my 13th Congressional District of Pennsylvania alone, we have 10 facilities of 4 major pharmaceutical companies that employ 11,000 people. Here they are at work very hard every day to make sure that we save lives and improve those lives. I would not want to see any of those companies or constituents lost their jobs because FDA regulation is so overburdened and so over-regulated that we delay, in fact, the service and the medical care for our constituents.

Americans want safe medicines. They want a strong FDA that will keep unsafe products off the market. But they also want to see more emphasis on quicker access to medicines, faster clinical trials, and the delivery of those services and devices to them. That is why I am introducing, working with colleagues on both sides of the aisle, to have the Life Extending and Life Saving Drug Act passed here in this 104th Congress. We need to take the action as soon as possible for the great benefit of our Nation's patients and our constituents. I look forward to working with my colleagues and the chairmen of the important committees, like Commerce's THOMAS BLILEY, to make sure we act critically, quickly, and in an efficient manner so that our constituents will be served and, in fact, an industry that is so vital to the country moves forward with economic stability.

WAKE UP, CONGRESS; WAKE UP, AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FOLEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOLEY. Madam Speaker, first I would like to thank the employees of this House of Representatives who endured hours and hours of debate while this House went into 24-hour session the other evening: The cloakroom staff, the individual staff of the Members of Congress, the Clerk's office, the stenographers that had to take down every word, the pages that have come from around our Nation that have helped the Members, the whip teams and everyone else.

It was quite a spectacle. It was sad for me as a freshman Member of Congress to watch the delay after delay, the motions to rise, the various tactics in order to stall the progress of this House.

I came here to make a difference, to make change. And I know at times there are disagreements and I am certain at times the Republicans did it last time to a Democratic-controlled Congress, but I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stop this nonsense.

The American public is watching and they are sick and tired of watching Congress go into the night, go into the early morning hours, go 24 hours a day, spending taxpayers' dollars while these fine employees of the House of Representatives have to be away from their homes, while the young pages 16 and 17 years old are up all night long. That is wrong.

So the Democrats and Republicans have to become more responsible in this process and they have got to stop the nonsense and start doing the people's business. Start working on legislation that will change America's problems. I mean we must have had seven motions to rise the other day, which takes over 17 minutes per vote to do that work.

So we spent hours of wasted time coming back and forth to the Chamber. People think it is funny in the Chamber. They laugh. How long can this go on? Let us take to the mattresses. The American public who are watching on C-SPAN or reading in the newspapers of Congress' action are embarrassed. I am embarrassed as a Member of Congress for the actions we took the other day.

Let me talk about another problem that is confronting America and we have got to deal with it, and that is child abuse. The other day we may have read in the national newspapers about a young child named Wolfie whose parents abandoned him at a mall. A husband and wife abandoned their 3-year-old child and left him wandering in a mall thousands of miles away from their home.

In South Carolina a woman allows two young children to be driven into a lake and drowned. In Florida two par-

ents killed their 7-year-old daughter and left her in a closet for 4 days.

To those out there that have that type of mental illness, put your child up for adoption. Do not take that child's life. You know, children are being taken advantage of. Sexual abuse of our children, this has got to stop.

Members of Congress cannot legislate the protection of children, but neighbors have to be careful and watch out for those around them, the vulnerable children of our society that are falling prey to the sick individuals that would take their lives.

Reading the story of young Wolfie, I can only imagine the terror in his mind when his parents leave him in a mall and drive off in a car and they are found in a park in Maryland 3,000 miles away. Left in California, a 3-year-old child in a mall.

Many of you may have remembered the story of Adam Walsh, who was kidnaped from a mall in Florida, who was beheaded. They still do not have the killer. I understand they are pursuing somebody who may have been involved.

I think it is important that America wake up. The children are our future. When we talk about balanced budgets, we keep talking about children, saving the children's future, taking away the debt that is being piled on our children's future.

Madam Speaker and Members of this Congress, it is time to stop talking about the children in abstract and start talking about protecting their very precious lives, start talking about protecting children from the sick individuals that would destroy their futures and destroy their opportunities.

I ask God to bless the parents of children and, again I say to them, if you are not happy with your child, if you are not happy being parents, put your child up for adoption and let somebody love your child the way that they need to be loved to become responsible citizens.

Again, my hats are off to the dedicated employees of the House of Representatives who have endured many, many hours of debate and their willingness to put in that time to make America the great and strong Nation that it is.

WHY AMERICANS ARE ANGRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam Speaker, I want to just briefly this afternoon touch on two issues: One, maybe offer some explanation as to why the American people are so angry. We keep reading in the media about the angry white male, but I think it is not only the angry white male. A whole lot of people of all colors and ages are angry, and also on the floor of this House we hear a lot about class struggle. Class struggle. Let me say a word about that also if I might.