

to face up to this. Mr. Speaker, the alternative in the private sector would be, again, you would go to jail, because you would violate the ERISA laws and standards set up by this Congress.

The only difference is this is a public entity, so we are not here to impose any harm, we are not here to impose any tax, we are here to say that, you know, the piper must be paid; that we can't continue robbing Peter to pay Paul in this fashion, that we must act in a sensible, responsible fashion.

With that, Mr. Speaker, again, I thank you for bringing this to the attention of this Congress, and for the RECORD, that we, and I as the chairman, and you as members of this Government Reform and Oversight Committee, we saw the problem, we identified the problem, we proposed a solution, and we are committed to work with all the Members of this Congress to try to bring, again, this important responsibility that we have, that we are cast with, into some order, into some fashion, and so that people look back and they say, "You know, what did they do in 1995? Did they ignore this, or did they find a solution?"

We propose that solution, we offer it to the Congress. We hope they won't play politics, that they will be out there with public employees and others stirring up the pot, and saying, "No, no, no, this will go away," because I tell you, Mr. Speaker, this will not go away. It must be addressed. We must have responsible leaders and responsible actions, just as you have outlined here, and just as you present in the fashion that you have in this special order tonight.

I personally thank you. I thank you on behalf of our subcommittee and committee, and I thank you on behalf of a future generation of Federal retirees and people that are in the system now and counting on us to act in a responsible fashion.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I have been in committee and did not know there was a special order on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman says he would like to work together. It would have been nice if we had had somebody here who perhaps has a little different perspective than the gentleman from Florida. As he knows, a number of studies have been done within the past few weeks which indicate that the problem of which the gentleman has spoken, apparently for about an hour, does not exist.

That is not to say that we don't contribute \$19.8 billion a year. We do. We contribute that money, as all of you know, for the purposes of funding a retirement system for our employees. I understand the gentleman has been very concerned about saying we ought to have a fund on hand.

Social Security, of course, is off the table. There is no fund on hand, as the gentleman well knows, for Social Security, which is our largest unfunded liability, if you will, in certain senses. But I am disappointed, Mr. Speaker, that I was unable, given the timeframe, to participate in this debate. This is a good debate. This is a debate we ought to have. My friend, I understand, mentioned that earlier.

I am fully prepared to participate in that debate. What I am, however, concerned about is that a system that affects 2 million people is being rushed to judgment without having the ability to get the votes in your committee.

The markup was adjourned. It now is before the Committee on Rules and included in your tax bill to pay for your tax cut.

□ 1630

I regret that the time has expired, but I look forward to discussing with my colleagues this issue. It is an important issue.

I believe the facts will show that there is not the depth of the problem that I think my colleagues perceive and that there are ways and means to solving the problem, without getting large sums by putting a tax on existing Federal employees, which averages about 10 percent in the coming 2 to 3 years.

I thank my colleague for yielding.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO RESTRICT FLIGHTS OVER CERTAIN AREAS OF HAWAII'S NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

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

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, the air tour helicopter industry in the State of Hawaii has recently experienced tremendous growth that is forecasted to continue. Helicopter tours provide a unique opportunity to view the natural beauty of parts of my State, especially the distinctive characteristics of Hawaii's national parks. The elderly, disabled, and others who would otherwise be unable to see the parks on foot are enabled by helicopters.

However, despite these advantages, noise disturbances in the parks have increased with the growth of the industry that have agitated hikers, campers, adjacent residents, and native animal species whose precious habitat is being conserved by the parks. A balance must be struck between the helicopter industry and those rightfully wishing to enjoy the parks, which my legislation seeks to achieve.

I am reintroducing legislation that would apply specifically to overflights above Haleakala National Park, Hawaii Volcanoes National Park, Kaloko Honokohau National Historic Park, Pu'u Kohola Heiau National Historic Site, and Kalaupapa National Historical Park.

My bill applies to helicopter and fixed-wing flights over the designated park system units in Hawaii through the establishment of an above-ground standoff altitude of 1500-feet

and flight-free zones over specific parks. My bill would also address additional safety concerns by requiring short-term sightseeing flights which begin and end at the same airport and are conducted within a 25-mile radius to comply with stricter Federal Aviation Administration [FAA] flight standards.

Currently, the FAA has in place emergency regulations for commercial air tour operators in Hawaii requiring a 1500-foot minimum standoff distance or above-ground-level, implemented in October, 1994. FAA promulgated these regulations in response to a significant increase in the number of air tour crashes in Hawaii, including two in July 1994—one resulting in three fatalities. The regulations also included additional measures to improve safety within the industry: thorough self-review, use of flotation devices such as pontoons and lifejackets, pre-flight safety briefings, and mechanical recommendations for the operation of air tour vehicles.

Despite these regulations, many of my constituents continue to report tour helicopters flying and hovering at low altitudes near their homes and over the parks. The FAA has reported 20 enforcement actions raised against air tour operators for violations of the regulations. For these reasons, the need for my legislation is even more necessary. Similar legislation has already been put into place and successfully implemented for air tour operators at Grand Canyon National Park.

It is indisputed that Hawaii's commercial air tour industry is an integral part of the State's economy. However, the industry must be required to improve its standards of safety and noise control for the good of the State's residents, visitors and natural resources.

I urge my colleagues to support and take swift action on my legislation.

BOB JOHNSON: A GIANT IS GONE

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

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, one of the giants of Texas government is gone. As I speak, Bob Johnson, my friend and a dedicated servant of the people of Texas, is being laid to rest in the Texas State Cemetery in Austin.

Although Bob Johnson served four terms in the Texas House of Representatives, his greatest service was as director of the Texas Legislative Council and parliamentarian of the Texas House from 1963 to 1980 and parliamentarian of the Texas Senate from 1991 until his death on March 27, 1995, at the age of 66.

The offices he held, however, do not tell the full story of Bob Johnson or of his importance to my State and to those who have served it.

Although he sat at the left hand of the Speaker—a critical adviser to the presiding officer both on and off the floor—during my tenure in the Texas House of Representatives at a time when some of my colleagues and I led a vigorous opposition to the leadership, he was always honest, straightforward, and as helpful to the forces for reform as to those in control.

Bob Johnson was to Texas State government what great teachers are to schools.

He taught hundreds, perhaps thousands, of legislators, their staff members, and other State officials the importance of learning well, of studying hard, of playing by the rules, of keeping one's word, of surviving defeat, and of winning gracefully.

Bob Johnson was a teacher, a counselor, and a friend.

He was as honest and sincere in his advice to those with whom he disagreed as he was to those with whom he agreed—to Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives. And his advice was consistently excellent on matters of policy, procedure, and law. He was a pro.

He was patient beyond measure in counseling the young, whether they were staffers fresh from college or novice legislators. He valued loyalty and straightforwardness.

Bob Johnson was big and tough. But he was both a gentleman and a gentle man.

When Bob Johnson retired from government service in 1980, only to be lured back in 1991 by his dear friend of 40 years, Lt. Gov. Bob Bullock, the *Houston Chronicle* reported:

No one could say of Bob Johnson that he sat on the sidelines and watched life go by. He may be one of the wailing testimonies to the Madison Avenue phrase that you only go around once in life, so grab for the gusto.

He's a ditch digger turned truck driver turned football player turned professional rodeo cowboy turned legislator turned parliamentarian and legislative staff member and, soon, turned lawyer-lobbyist.

Not to mention farmer, rancher, hunter and all around gusto-grabber.

Governor Bullock and others with whom he served in the Texas Legislature from 1957 to 1963 called him Brother. And he was a brother to so many in every sense. Many of us who met him later looked upon him as a father-figure and mentor. Some called him Big Daddy.

Even today, as he is laid to rest in the Texas State Cemetery beside some of the most renowned figures in Texas history, it is hard not to smile when I think of Bob Johnson lumbering over to me in the House Chamber, throwing an arm around my shoulder, chiding me gently or encouraging me in just the right way with caring charm and good natured wit.

Bob Johnson's name is not a name that is known to most Americans or even most Texans, but he has certainly earned a place in our history and in our hearts.

He was universally loved and respected. I will never forget him or that he taught and prodded me to do better in my job.

For almost 40 years, Bob Johnson was a fixture in the Texas Capitol.

He fit especially well in that colossal building, symbolic of our expansive State, both of which he deeply loved. He was a giant, large in stature and

huge in his contributions to his State and to those entrusted with making it work for the people.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

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

Mr. Speaker, I share his regret and appreciate the gentleman's remarks. I appreciate him giving me the minute left.

For 1 minute, let me say that the issue of Federal pensions is a serious issue, and it ought to be dealt with seriously.

In point of fact, we are at a time now where the majority party is proposing a major revision in the Federal employees' pension program with less than 2 days of hearings, a markup that was scheduled on the 3d or 4th or 5th day after the 2d day of hearings. That markup was adjourned without resolution and without any motions with reference to the proposal and has now gone directly to the Rules Committee in the Republican's tax package for the purposes of paying, as said by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, Mr. KASICH, \$11 billion of the bill to cut taxes on wealthier Americans.

Now, the fact of the matter is what it does is it increases the taxes on average Americans who are Federal employees by approximately 10 percent. That is not fair.

Furthermore, it is my understanding the gentleman from Florida, the chairman of the committee, who is my friend and who has talked to me about this, wants to consider this matter in a responsible fashion.

I take him at his word. We ought to not have this in the tax package. We ought to take it out of the tax package. It is not necessary to fund the tax bill, and we ought to have hearings on it. We ought to come to grips with the facts on it. We ought to see who is correct, and then we ought to dispose of this issue.

I am not afraid, as an advocate of Federal employees, to look at the facts, to analyze the facts, and to argue what we ought to do to be fiscally responsible. But what I am an opponent of is rushing this to judgment which I think is very unfair, unwise, bad policy, and certainly is going to undermine the morale and the promise that we have to our Federal employees.

I understand the gentleman from Florida said that he did not want to undermine those who had given service to their Government. These folks have. To act in this precipitous fashion, in my opinion, respectfully to the gentleman from Florida, does in fact undermine our relationship to our employees. I would hope that we do not take this action.

I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding the time.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 1345, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY AND MANAGEMENT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1995

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H.R. 1345.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I rise to note that the minority is not going to object.

But let me say we do want to raise a serious issue, that although this has been discussed with the minority, and I know it would not have been brought up, I presume, without such discussion, this is a very unusual procedure to bring up a unanimous consent request other than for speaking time in the period of time for special orders.

The minority, and I speak specifically, for the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON], does not want to slow up this legislation. This is obviously very important legislation. We understand the majority's moving this legislation. But we do want to register our concern that this unusual procedure be an exception and not a practice. We do not intend to object at this time.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, those comments are noted, and we appreciate the cooperation.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE JOHN R. KASICH, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable JOHN R. KASICH, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, March 29, 1995.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that I have been served with a subpoena issued by the Municipal Court for Manville, New Jersey.

After consultation with the General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is not consistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. KASICH,
Chairman.