

TOTAL VALUE OF DEFENSE ARTICLES AND SERVICES SOLD TO EACH COUNTRY/PURCHASER AS OF 30 SEPT 94 UNDER FOREIGN MILITARY SALES (SEE PART II FOR CONSTRUCTION SALES)—UNCLASSIFIED—Continued

(Dollars in Thousands)¹

Countries	Accepted-FY 94
NHPLO	30,188
Niger	5
Norway	159,240
OAS HQ	427
Oman	1,253
Panama	416
Paraguay	234
Portugal	8,420
Qatar	4,031
Rep of Philippines	21,238
Saudi Arabia	837,881
Senegal	39
Seychelles	1
Shape	2,354
Sierra Leone	18
Singapore	456,340
Spain	58,212
Sri Lanka	204
St Kitts and Nevis	851
St Lucia	851
St Vincent + Gren	638
Sweden	33,932
Switzerland	37,159
Taiwan	360,891
Thailand	218,564
Tonga	15
Trinidad—Tobago	1,189
Tunisia	18,480
Turkey	2,194,101
Uganda	7
United Arab Emirates	266,663
United Kingdom	586,375
Uruguay	1,773
Venezuela	18,956
Zambia	128
Zimbabwe	216
Classified totals ²	370,160
Subtotal	12,811,979

Construction Sales—Part II

Antigua and Barbuda	267
Bolivia—Intl Narc	3,207
Cape Verde	121
Colombia—Intl Narc	93
Ecuador—Intl Narc	97
Egypt	939
El Salvador	2,734
Germany	32,763
Ghana	583
Honduras	97
Israel	152
Niger	153
Seychelles	39
Uganda	228
United Kingdom	11,904
Subtotal	53,378
Total	12,865,357

¹ Totals may not add due to rounding.

² See the classified annex to the CPD.

MAKING IN ORDER IMMEDIATE CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FOR THE 104TH CONGRESS

SPEECH OF

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 4, 1995

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rules change which would require a 60-percent majority to pass an income tax increase.

For over 200 years parliamentary rules of the House have conformed to the principles established under the Constitution of the United States which provide for rule by the majority.

Majority has always meant one more than 50 percent of the House.

The Constitution originally recognized only five instances wherein a two-thirds vote was required: To impeach, override a veto, pass constitutional amendments, ratify treaties, and expel Members of the House. In no case was it contemplated that a 60-percent vote be required to pass legislation. Ordinary law-making has always required only a simple majority vote.

The Senate rule with regard to getting 60 votes to stop a filibuster is purely procedural. It is not a requirement to pass a bill. It is a requirement only to take it up. The House allows bills to come up under suspension of the rules with a two-thirds vote, but provides that failing that it may come up in regular order with a rule.

The rules that govern the operation of the House cannot supercede the U.S. Constitution. The House cannot by a majority vote alter the force and effect of the U.S. Constitution and how it has been interpreted for the past 200 years. To change that requires a constitutional amendment.

The new majority of the House that has well pleaded its case of fairness, should follow its own advice.

Of course with the Republicans in charge of the agenda in the House, it is not likely that an income tax increase will come to the floor for a vote. That being the case there will not likely be a test of this supermajority rule under their tenure. And of course since this is only a Rule of the House of Representatives, when the Democrats return as the majority party this rule can be expunged.

It is highly irregular to allow a fundamental change in how a bill becomes law to be effected by a change in the rules of the House. This circumvents history, tradition, and parliamentary precedents, all of which form the basis of the provisions in the Constitution of the United States which set out when and only when a supermajority would be required. That is the only logical interpretation and explanation as to why the Constitution bothered to set down the instances when such super majorities would be in order. If it was intended that the Congress could alter these at will each time the Congress convened a new term then it would certainly not have taken the time to make this explicit in five cases.

Quite the contrary, the writers of the Constitution knew the mischief that supermajority votes, the so-called minority rights protections,

could do to the governing of our country. To assuage the small States they deliberately created the Senate with the guarantee of two votes no matter the size or lack of population. But in the House majority rule concepts had to be safeguarded as fundamental to the true definition of the "peoples' House." To abrogate the rule of simple majority and create a super minority in the House as well would greatly alter the balance of power and dilute the voting power of each Member.

The Constitution is the fountain and spirit of our democracy. Its foundation should not be uprooted by procedural rules changes designed for political gamesmanship where it is clear that under no circumstances with this majority will there be any likelihood that an income tax increase bill will be reported to the floor.

I urge this House to uphold the Constitution and vote down this blatantly political maneuver intended to depict all who stood up for the Constitution to be those who would vote for an income tax increase.

It is tyranny when the majority sacrifices the principles of the Constitution to make a political point.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION SHOULD STUDY ACCIDENTS CAUSED BY TRUCK DRIVERS FALLING ASLEEP AT THE WHEEL

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1995

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to direct the U.S. Secretary of Transportation to conduct a 1-year study of accidents related to drivers of commercial vehicles who fall asleep at the wheel. The Secretary would have to make recommendations to the Congress on how to reduce the number of accidents related to this problem. I had attached this provision to legislation approved last year by the House to designate the National Highway System. Unfortunately, an agreement could not be reached between the House and the other body on an NHS bill, and no final action was taken in the last Congress.

According to the U.S. Department of Transportation, in 1992 there were 33,965 accidents involving truck drivers. Of these, 601 accidents were traced directly to truck drivers falling asleep at the wheel—resulting in 45 fatalities. However, in many accidents in which the driver is killed it is difficult to determine for sure whether or not the driver fell asleep. As a result, the real number of truck accidents related to drivers falling asleep at the wheel is more than likely much higher.

The National Transportation Safety Board has estimated that when a heavy rig truck driver crashes and dies, an average of 4.2 innocent victims are killed. An ongoing survey of truck drivers in Ohio being conducted by the National Center for Sleep Disorders in Massillon, OH, has revealed that only 6 percent admit to having an accident related to sleepiness, but 54 percent of truck drivers surveyed know of a fellow truck driver who has died in an accident related to fatigue or sleepiness.

Mr. Speaker, there is a serious safety problem on our highways. My bill attempts to address this problem by directing DOT to study the problem in-depth and recommend to Congress ways to address the problem and reduce the number of accidents related to truck drivers falling asleep at the wheel.

Last year Republicans and Democrats on the Public Works and Transportation Committee, of which I am a member, strongly supported this provision. I urge all my colleagues to lend their support to the bill.

H.R. —

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. COMMERCIAL MOTOR VEHICLE ACCIDENTS.

(a) **STUDY.**—The Secretary of Transportation shall conduct a study of methods to reduce accidents on Federal-aid highways caused by drivers falling asleep while operating a commercial motor vehicle used to transport freight.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall transmit to Congress a report on the results of the study conducted under subsection (a).

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

HON. TIM JOHNSON

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1995

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, Fred Wertheimer, president of Common Cause, recently wrote House Speaker GINGRICH a letter in which he urged the Speaker to schedule and support early action on comprehensive campaign finance reform legislation, as well as strong gift ban and lobby reform legislation.

Attached to Mr. Wertheimer's letter were several statements that Speaker GINGRICH has made in the last several years on this important subject, and I am submitting the text of the two documents into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today.

COMMON CAUSE,

Washington, DC, January 4, 1995.

House Speaker NEWT GINGRICH,
U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER GINGRICH: On August 22, 1990, in a speech to The Heritage Foundation, you said: "The first duty of our generation is to reestablish integrity and a bond of honesty in the political process. We should punish wrongdoers in politics and government and pass reform laws to clean up the election and lobbying systems. We must insure that citizen politics defeats money politics. This is the only way our system can regain its integrity. Every action should be measured against that goal, and every American should be challenged to register and vote to achieve that goal."

We agree.

As you become Speaker of the House of Representatives today, you have a unique moment in history in which to make good on your words. You have a unique opportunity to lead an effort to reform the corrupt system in Congress which you have criticized throughout your House career.

As you also stated in your speech before The Heritage Foundation: "Congress is a broken system. It is increasingly a system of corruption in which money politics is defeating and driving out citizen politics. * * *

[H]onesty and integrity are at the heart of a free society. Corruption, special favors, dishonesty and deception corrode the very process of freedom and alienate citizens from their country."

I am enclosing other examples of statements you have made over the years about the importance of integrity in government and the need for political reform.

You and the newly elected Republicans in the House have told the country that you are committed to changing the way Washington works.

But citizens throughout this nation clearly understand that there is no way to change the way Washington works without fundamental reform of the corrupt influence money system. This requires effective campaign finance reform and a tough gift ban for Members of Congress.

In your words, "The first duty of our generation is to reestablish integrity and a bond of honesty in the political process."

In your words, "We should punish wrongdoers in politics and government and pass reform laws to clean up the election and lobbying systems."

In your words, "We must insure that citizen politics defeats money politics. This is the only way our system can regain its integrity."

In your new position of leadership, you now face a clear choice. You can make good on your words and lead the effort to clean up Congress. Or you can ignore your words and become the chief protector of the corrupt influence money system in Washington.

Common Cause strongly urges you to make good on your words by supporting and scheduling early action on effective and comprehensive campaign finance reform legislation, a strong gift ban and lobby reform legislation.

Sincerely,

FRED WERTHEIMER,

President

QUOTES FROM HOUSE SPEAKER NEWT GINGRICH ON GOVERNMENT INTEGRITY AND POLITICAL REFORM

[From the Washington Post Op-Ed, Feb. 21, 1979]

Thomas Jefferson wrote to John Adams sometime after the nation's founding: "This I hope will be the age of experiments in government, and that their basis will be founded on principles of honesty, not of mere force. We have seen no instance of this since the days of the Roman Republic, nor do we read of any before that. Either force or corruption has been the principle of every modern government."

There's something wrong if we allow the experiment Jefferson helped start sink back to a government based on corruption. And that something is a much greater wrong than the individual sins of one particular congressman.

The American people deserves laws made by those who respect the law—not those who steal from them. And not those who tolerate such stealing.

[From the Congressional Record, Aug. 10, 1988]

[W]e are now moving into a period into which for all practical purposes the House is becoming a House of Lords, and aristocracy of power. House Members increasingly are elected for a lifetime, so you either change them the first time out, or at most possibly change them at the end of their freshman term, but for all practical purposes people have lost the ability to change who they now have loaned power to. * * *

Now I would just suggest that from the standpoint of the citizen, not the standpoint of an incumbent politician but from the

standpoint of the citizens there are fundamental problems with a system in which the incumbent knows that the odds are better than 49 to 1 that they will be reelected if they run. * * *

I will be proposing in September a package of fairly dramatic reforms but they do not just address PACs. They also have to address the question: How do you help the challenger have a fair chance to defeat the incumbent? * * *

[W]e have to start fundamentally reforming the structure of congressional elections and the structure of incumbency advantage, because in the absence of doing that I think we are in a system which is going to grow steadily sicker, and I think that is a very, very real problem. I do not think this is something to be shrugged off.

And notice, I did not this afternoon just talk about Republicans or Democrats. I said incumbent advantage.

[Forward to "The Imperial Congress", 1989]

Madison, Jefferson and Hamilton tried to ensure against the rise of an imperial Congress. Yet, as the separation of powers continues to erode, the present-day Congress has become the most unrepresentative and corrupt of the modern era. It is a Congress that lusts for power but evades responsibility for its actions.

[From the National Press Club, Apr. 27, 1989]

And in 1974, in the middle of Watergate, I ran for office for the first time. I announced for Congress in Georgia, against a 20-year veteran who had never been successfully challenged. * * * I said, in my kickoff speech, "The American people are angry, an anger built up due to continuing frustration from a government which says one thing and does another; and they become increasingly dissatisfied when the men and they have chosen are apparently corrupt, condoning corruption, or totally indifferent to their feelings." And I would suggest to you that is a long tradition. * * *

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 6, 1989]

[To produce more competitive congressional races] it's my very strong view that we want to shift the balance of resources toward the challenger.

[From the Congressional Record Feb. 6, 1990]

I am very committed to campaign reform. I am particularly committed to campaign reform which expands the number of people who are participating in American politics, and which allows the over and the challenger a reasonable chances to effect their will.

[From the Speech to the Heritage Foundation, Aug. 22, 1990]

Congress is a broke system. It is increasingly a system of corruption in which money politics is defeating and driving out citizen politics. * * *

[H]onesty and integrity are at the heart of a free society. Corruption, special favors, dishonesty and deception corrode the very process of freedom and alienate citizens from their country. * * *

We must reestablish as the first principle of self-government that politics must be an inherently moral business. The first duty of our generation is to reestablish integrity and a bond of honesty in the political process. We should punish wrongdoers in politics and government and pass reform laws to clean up the election and lobbying systems. We must insure that citizen politics defeats money politics. This is the only way our system can regain its integrity. Every action should be measured against that goal, and every American should be challenged to register and vote to achieve that goal.