key provider of comprehensive primary care. It delivers medical care to approximately 7,000 patients out of a total population of 28,000. It also has the only pharmacy available in Uvalde County. Some patients travel as far as 60 miles to get to this health center for treatment. The Uvalde County Clinic is also vitally important in that it trains medical students, physician assistants, and residents from our medical schools in the State.

For the hardworking people of Laredo, TX, the Gateway Community Health Center, of which Mike Trevino is the executive director, is a source of health care for the indigent population in the area. It serves approximately 12,000 patients, 83 percent of whom are uninsured. This center, with its focus on patient-centered care, reaches out with special programs for diabetes, hypertension and other chronic diseases, while promoting wellness and prevention.

My friend, Ventura Gonzales, operates the Vida y Salud Health Systems, Inc. in Crystal City. This is an area where unemployment is high and health needs are growing. This center serves nearly 12,000 patients, providing service to approximately 70 percent of the uninsured in that area. Remarkably, in an area where there is no other provider, this center has achieved a 93.3 percent immunization rate for children. It is a major employer in the area, and next to the school board, represents the second largest industry in my congressional district.

Today, in improving this reauthorization, we are helping the communities of my district and communities across this Nation protect public health and expand access to health care. It is also important to emphasize that health centers are built by community initiative. A limited Federal grant program provides seed money to empower communities themselves to find partners and resources to develop centers, to hire doctors and needed health professionals, and to build their own points of entry into the Nation's health care delivery system.

For these reasons I support America's health centers. It is a cost-effective way to do a job that needs doing. This is why I have consistently fought very hard in the appropriations process to provide funding for these health centers.

America's health centers meet today's rigid fiscal demands for cost effectiveness, efficiency, and accountability. They do a tremendous job reaching out to energize communities and their people to meet critical health needs and promote greater personal responsibility for good health. They work because they are partnerships—partnerships of people, Government, businesses and communities working together to improve health.

Mr. Speaker, I support the passage of S. 1044.

PROVIDING FOR RELOCATION OF PORTRAIT MONUMENT

SPEECH OF

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday September 26, 1996

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not intend to object, but I would like to express my reservations about this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, today as we end the 104th Congress we will vote on a resolution to move the statute of Susan B. Anthony, Lucretia Mott, and Elizabeth Cady Stanton from the Capitol Crypt to the Capitol Rotunda.

The struggle over this statute of the leaders of our suffrage movement has a long and tumultuous history. More than 75 years ago, Alice Paul and the National Woman's Party commissioned sculptor Adlaide Johnson to create a statute to commemorate the passage of the 19th amendment and to celebrate those remarkable women whose lives were devoted to gaining for women the right to vote and the opportunity to participate fully in American life.

On February 15, 1921, Susan B. Anthony's 101st birthday, the statute was welcomed into the Rotunda—6 months after American women won the right to vote. Yet 2 days later, it was moved into storage in the Capitol Crypt. That same year, Congress ordered workers to scrape off the statute's blasphemous feminist inscription, which in gold gilt had read: ''Woman, first denied a soul, then called mindless, now arisen declared herself an entity to be reckoned.''

Since 1921, many resolutions to move the statute have failed, including ones in 1928, in 1932 and 1950, when Congress refused to approve bills that would have let the suffragists out of the basement.

In 1963, when the crypt was renovated and opened to the public, the statute was open for viewing. Still, treatment of the statute did not improve. Placed a few feet from a souvenir stand, the statute does not even carry a sign identifying the women by name. And the memorial's name has been changed from ''The Woman Movement'' to ''The Portrait Monument.''

To commemorate the 75th anniversary of women's suffrage, a bipartisan group was established in 1995 to move the statute to the Capitol Rotunda. On July 14, 1995, Senator TED STEVENS introduced Senate Concurrent Resolution 21, which called on the Architect of the Capitol to restore the Portrait Monument to its original state and place it in the Rotunda of the Capitol. It also sought to make arrangements for the rededication ceremony of such statute in the Rotunda and procession in cooperation with the 75th anniversary of Woman Suffrage Task Force. Senate Concurrent Resolution 21 unanimously passed the Senate on July 17, 1995.

Unfortunately, Republican House Members objected to passage of the same authorizing resolution because they objected to using $75,000 in Federal funds to move the statue. Since then the Woman Suffrage Statute Campaign, a project of the National Museum of Women's History, has raised the $75,000. The group raised $40,000 on their own. A pledge of $25,000 came from Abbott Laboratories, and a $10,000 pledge came from a woman in Connecticut.

As I wrote in my letters to Speaker Gingrich asking him to act on moving the Portrait Monument, ''American women ask as they asked President Wilson for the right to vote. How long must we wait?''

This resolution before us today, House Concurrent Resolution 216, places the 9-ton statue in the Capitol's most prestigious hall, and finally breaks the all-male lock on the statues in the Rotunda. It is a victory for all American women who believe that it is important to honor our American female heroes, in the same manner that we honor our American male heroes.

I would like to acknowledge the fine work of my colleague Connie Morella for bringing this resolution to the floor today. I salute Karen Staser of the National Woman's Suffrage Statue Campaign and all of the women's organizations that have worked tirelessly to bring this initiative to fruition. It is to their credit that we are here today acting on this resolution.

Although the resolution at hand will finally move the statue, it is flawed. It would place the statue alongside statues of our male American heroes in the Capitol Rotunda—but only for 1 year.

At that time, a commission will be established of 11 interested parties that will make recommendations about the final resting place for the statue. Apparently, there are differing views as to what should happen to the statue. Why? Perhaps because half the population gaining the right to vote was not historically significant enough to merit the statue's full-time display in the Rotunda alongside statues of our great male leaders.

The Republican leadership initially opposed the move on the grounds that it would cost the taxpayers tens of thousands of dollars. They said that if money could be raised privately, the statue could be moved to the Rotunda. They then came forward with a compromise resolution that creates a Commission to decide what should be done with the Portrait Monument

We now have secured private funding to move the statue this year. When then would a compromise resolution call for possibly moving it twice? The bottom line is that taxpayer expense was never the real issue.

If this Congress was 90 percent female and 10 percent male—not 90 percent male and 10 percent female as it is today—I believe that there would not be a 1-year clause and that the women's suffrage statue would become a permanent fixture in the Rotunda.

Furthermore, statues are about history. And in historical context, moving the statue in this particular congress is incredibly ironic since many of our hard fought victories of the past were eroded and threatened in the past 2 years.

Moving this statue of these three heroines of the women's suffrage movement is a significant step in recognizing the rich history of the America's women's rights movement. Fortunately Mr. Speaker, the 104th Congress will soon be history, too.

ACCOUNTABLE PIPELINE SAFETY AND PARTNERSHIP ACT OF 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. BOB FRANKS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 27, 1996

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 1505. the Accountable Pipeline Safety and Partnership Act of 1995.

Mr. Speaker, over 2 years ago a 36-inch interstate natural gas pipeline, operated by Texas Eastern Gas Pipeline Co., exploded in Edison, NJ. For the residents of the nearby Durham Woods Apartment Complex, March 23, 1994 was a night of sheer terrors. Men,

women and children raced from their homes in the middle of the night to escape an approaching wall of fire. Miraculously only 1 person died and 29 persons were injured. The blast leveled eight apartment buildings and could be seen as far away as New York City.

This terrifying explosion alerted people throughout New Jersey to the potential hidden dangers of natural gas pipelines. This concern is certainly justified. New Jersey is the most densely populated State in the Nation and buried underground are 961 miles of interstate natural gas pipelines. In my congressional district alone, 14 out of the 34 communities I represent have natural gas transmission pipelines.

Although the pipeline industry has a good overall safety record, and the pipeline that exploded in Edison was in compliance with all Federal safety regulations, these facts are of little comfort to the victims of Durham Woods.

The accident in Edison last year demonstrate that the existing regulatory scheme governing pipelines is inadequate. It is frighteningly clear that not enough attention or resources are being dedicated to confronting the most significant dangers related to pipelines. While statistically one may be more likely to be struck by lightening than die in a pipeline accident, the potential for large-scale fatalities from a pipeline explosion are frightening and real.

After carefully analyzing this legislation and its new risk-management approach to regulating the pipeline industry, I am convinced that it will lead to enhanced safety for those living or working near pipelines.

The overall goal of this legislation is to move the pipeline safety program away from a command-and-control approach and toward risk assessment and risk management. This risk-based approach contained in the bill allows greater flexibility in developing individual safety programs for pipeline owners. But first and foremost, pipeline operators must prove that any new approach will result in the same level or an even greater level of safety provided under the current system. If the pipeline owner or operator cannot prove to the Department of Transportation that their plan meets this basic requirement to enhance safety, then the current system of regulatory controls governing pipeline safety would remain in full effect.

The impact of this bill would be to focus additional resources on areas, the present the greatest potential risk. For a highly developed State like New Jersey with hundreds of miles of pipeline in densely populated areas, this approach will have a positive impact. It will lead to more frequent inspections and greater use of safety-enhancing technologies.

Instead of spreading out resources to provide the same level of safety procedures for every mile of pipeline, whether it is located in the wilderness of Utah or next to an apartment complex in New Jersey, risk management will require pipeline operators and regulatory agencies to pay greater attention to densely populated areas.

Unfortunately, placing pipeline companies under the most stringent safety and inspection requirements is no guarantee against disaster. Two-thirds of pipeline accidents are beyond the control of pipeline companies—they are caused by third parties. These third parties are generally excavation crews that accidentally hit pipelines and never report the damage to the operator of the pipeline so that corrective action can be taken. That is the probable cause of what happened in Edison.

This bill contains a provision I drafted that is aimed at reducing accidental damage to pipelines by work crews and making sure that if such an accident does take place, it is promptly reported to the proper authorities. Under my provision for the first time it would be a Federal crime to damage a pipeline and not promptly report it to the appropriate authorities. Violators would face up to 5 years in jail and a $25,000 fine. Any fines collected under this section would be deposited in the Crime Victims Fund and spent the following year. This provision was originally part of a bipartisan pipeline safety bill I reintroduced on March 3, 1995, entitled the ''Durham Woods Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1995'' (H.R. 1126).

Public education on one-call systems is also vital. I am pleased that a provision I advocated encouraging pipeline operators to launch education programs was included in the bill. Although all States have some form of a one-call system requiring construction crews to call in when they will be working near a pipeline, the success of these programs is often hindered by a lack of knowledge about the existence of the program or how it works. This provision would increase the knowledge of the public on one-call systems.

This bill also includes a provision originally in H.R. 1126 that would remove the pay for the members of the Technical Safety Standards Committees. While this cut may be relatively small, I am committed to rooting out all unnecessary spending, be it for the space station or for the pay of the Technical Safety Standards Committees' members.

During the subcommittee markup of H.R. 1323, which is the companion House bill to S. 1505, I offered an amendment regarding population encroachment on pipeline right-of-ways. My amendment would direct the Secretary of Transportation to consider and develop new ways to increase the awareness of local planning and zoning boards regarding issues involved with population encroachment in proximity to interstate transmission pipeline right-of-ways.

The Research and Special Programs Administration [RSPA] estimates that of the 272,000 miles of natural high pressure pipelines in our Nation, only 7 percent of these pipelines are in urban areas. Despite the low percentage of pipelines located in urban areas, the potential hazard to public safety is increasing because of residential growth and development. In the case of the Durham Woods disaster, the character of the land had changed dramatically from when the pipeline that failed was constructed in the 1960's. Back then, the asphalt plant and its surrounding structures near the rupture point were isolated and surrounded by farmland and forests. By the time of the explosion, extensive urbanization had occurred within 1 mile of the rupture point.

After the Edison explosion, many of my constituents asked me why a pipeline was built so closely to a large apartment complex. In reality, the apartment complex was erected long after the pipeline was built. Zoning boards and local planning commissions need to be made aware of the risks and dangers of approving residential housing near pipelines. My amendment would increase the information available to local governments so they can make sensible, informed zoning decisions.

As a Member of Congress from the most densely populated State in the Nation, my amendment is especially important to New Jersey. As the urbanization of America continues, the problems associated with the siting of pipelines near population centers will grow. I was pleased that my amendment was adopted by the Subcommittee by voice vote.

This bill contains many other provisions that will benefit my home State of New Jersey. For example, the increased funding in the bill will be used to sustain the recently established New Jersey Pipeline Safety Office and for improvement to one-call systems.

The bill also includes a provision requiring the Office of Pipeline Safety [OPS] to gather information regarding the technical and economic feasibly of remote controlled valves for interstate natural gas pipelines, with special attention to high density population areas like New Jersey. OPS is further required to conduct a rulemaking on the issue of installation of these valves. This provision is important to New Jersey because the pipeline that exploded near Durham Woods had to be manually shut off following the explosion, which took a significant amount of time. If a remote controlled valve was in place during the time of the Durham Woods disaster, it could have lessened the property damage resulting from the blast.

Also included in the bill is a provision advocated by Mr. PALLONE and myself that makes it illegal to dump on a pipeline right of way. My colleagues may recall that near the rupture point of the Durham Woods explosion, investigators found exposed deep in the hole created by the blast vehicle parts, a drink vending machine, manhole covers and other various debris, including a stolen 1990 Ford Ranger pickup truck and other debris near the site of the Durham Woods disaster. This provision ensures that people who dump near pipelines, where the possibility of damaging the pipeline is great, will be prosecuted.

Mr. Speaker, I was heartened yesterday listening to the debate in the Senate on this bill when the junior Senator from New Jersey stated that S. 1505 ''is an improvement on the status quo and should improve pipeline safety significantly.'' Senator LAUTENBERG also states that ''this bill represents a very good step forward.'' My colleague in the Senate has been a staunch advocate for improving pipeline safety, and his support for this legislation reassures me that this bill should become law.

Moreover, my constituents have been waiting 2½ years for Congress to improve pipeline safety. It is incredible to me that at this late date, some Members still want to delay enacting a comprehensive pipeline safety bill. I know my constituents do not care who gets the political credit for passing a pipeline safety bill—they want pipelines made safer now. Furthermore, considering that New Jersey's unique pipeline safety issues are effectively addressed in this bill, I especially urge all my New Jersey colleagues to put aside partisan differences and put the safety of our citizens first by supporting this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I would oppose this bill if I thought for one second this legislation would decrease pipeline safety. My constituents in Edison lived under the old regulatory system, and on a cold night in March 2 years ago, that system utterly failed them. This bill promises to do better. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on S. 1505.