

(Mr. STUDDS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] for his graciousness. This is, indeed, an utterly nonpartisan success. It is bipartisan. In fact, I never expected it to be completely bipartisan in my life. It has always had majority and minority support, and I never expected it to be on both sides, but here we are.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say a word and supplement what the gentleman says. This is really a success story, a decade after the passage of the original act, an inspiration to fishermen and to managers that conservation can in fact work.

Ten years ago striped bass stocks along the Atlantic coast had declined to dangerously low levels as a result both of overfishing and pollution. Fishermen and managers alike were concerned that this fishery would soon become endangered. In an unprecedented move, Congress passed the Striped Bass Conservation Act, designed to support State efforts to reverse this trend. The management program established under the act was at the time of its inception in 1984 unique.

It relies upon the States to develop regulations for their waters that are consistent with the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission's management plan for striped bass. If a State fails in its efforts, a Federal moratorium is imposed.

This partnership was so successful that in January of this year, the commission declared the striper to be fully recovered. The implementation of the Federal-State partnership embodied in the act has restored the striper to its former glory as one of the most important sport and commercial fisheries on the East Coast. Fishermen in my State from Martha's Vineyard to Mattapoisett are celebrating the return of the striper, but are mindful of the need to continue the conservation and management programs that have brought this fishery back from the crash of the preceding decade. This bill will ensure this is the case, and I enthusiastically urge Members to support it today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to another gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. PALLONE.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to thank the two gentleman, my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON], and my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS], for putting together this legislation. In particular, both of them have been supportive of language which was placed in the bill that would ensure public participation on all striped bass management plans.

Many people who are involved with striped bass management know that there is a large and vociferous group of recreational fishermen out there who become very concerned about any changes that are made in the manage-

ment plan. One of the things that they continually tell us is that they want to be involved at every stage in whatever management plan changes are put forward.

This bill and the language that is in the bill guarantee that public participation will do what is necessary to make sure that they have their opportunity to be heard.

I certainly want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] for their cooperation in putting that language in the bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of the Striped Bass Conservation Act amendments and I compliment the author of the bill, JIM SAXTON, for his leadership in moving this important measure.

The Atlantic coast stock of striped bass are found in waters from North Carolina to Maine. They are highly migratory but move primarily along the coast within the 3-mile zone, which is subject to State fishery management.

While striped bass populations have fluctuated dramatically in the past, the population suffered a drastic decline in the 1970s. In fact, striped bass harvests dropped from 15 million pounds in 1973 to 3.5 million pounds in 1983.

In response to this serious problem, Congress approved an emergency striped bass study and the Atlantic Striped Bass Conservation Act of 1984. This law requires all affected coastal States to implement management measures to conserve and protect the remaining stocks of Atlantic striped bass.

While the resurgence of striped bass is a major fishery management success, H.R. 1139 will ensure that this remarkable recovery is not compromised in the days ahead.

As reported from my committee, this legislation will reauthorize both the Striped Bass Conservation Act and section 7 of the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act, which funds ongoing striped bass population studies. In addition, the bill focuses attention on stripers in the Delaware River and encourages greater public participation in the writing of management plans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge an "aye" vote on H.R. 1139 and again compliment JIM SAXTON and GERRY STUDDS for their outstanding leadership in this major conservation effort. I would hope more of our fishery management efforts prove to be this successful in the future.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON], that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1139, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous material, on the bill just considered and passed.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1361, COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 139 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H.R. 139

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1361) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with section 302(f), section 308(a), or section 401(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered by title rather than by section. The first two sections and each title of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. Points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute for failure to comply with clause 5(a) of rule XXI or section 302(f) or section 401(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all

time yielded is for the purposes of debate only.

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to present this wide open rule for the fiscal year 1996 authorization of our smallest—but hugely important—national armed services, the Coast Guard. I am delighted that our Rules Committee, by unanimous voice vote, agreed to bring this important bill to the House floor under an open rule, allowing all Members the chance to offer amendments under the standing rules of this House. I wish to commend Chairman SHUSTER, Chairman COBLE, and ranking members MINETA and TRAFICANT of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for their efforts in bringing us H.R. 1361.

□ 1445

Mr. Speaker, as Members know, this year marks the first time the Coast Guard authorization has been moved through the Transportation Committee and, by all accounts, the transition has gone smoothly. This rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, to be equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. It makes in order the committee's amendment in the nature of a substitute as the original bill for the purpose of amendment and provides that the substitute shall be considered as read by title. Members should be aware that this rule does provide four specific waivers, including three technical budget act waivers related to section 205 of the bill, and a waiver of the rule that prohibits appropriations within legislative bills, related to section 201 of the bill. This waiver should not cause Members any heartache, since it is necessary to allow the shifting of funds from pre-existing accounts in order to pay for damages to homes of Coast Guard personnel caused by hurricane Andrew. I think that is eminently fair and makes great good common sense and I do not think it is particularly precedent-setting. Let us hope not.

The budget act waivers are necessary because of a provision in the bill that allows Coast Guard officers who were twice passed over for promotion, and have 18 years of service, to continue in active duty until they have served 20 years and are eligible for retirement.

Technically this provides new entitlement authority, although subcommittee Chairman COBLE assured the Rules Committee that this is not in any way a budget buster. In fact, the total cost of this provision has been estimated to at less than \$500,000 a year.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Rules Chairman SOLOMON and the committee of jurisdiction for ensuring that Members have a detailed explanation of the waivers needed for this bill. I think it is most important that all committees take seriously the standing rules of the House and come to the Rules Committee well prepared to discuss any specific rules violations in their bills—whether technical or substantive. This to me is great progress in the 104th Congress. I think it makes pretty clear what the issues are and what is being protected and what is not and what the justifications may be.

Finally, this rule provides the minority with its traditional right to a motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Coast Guard may be small in size but it is mighty in missions. It is something of a jack of all trades—its responsibilities cover a broad expanse of activity, from drug interdiction and border control to search and rescue. At any given time the Coast Guard might be called upon to support military deployments—as in the Persian Gulf—or respond to disasters—as in the midwestern floods of 1993. Especially in coastal areas—but also across this land—Americans depend on the reliability and efficiency of the Coast Guard. Because of its reputation for excellence and its unfailing willingness to tackle new missions, the Coast Guard has repeatedly been asked to shoulder more duties. In response to the Haiti crisis in the past 2 years, the Coast Guard was asked to become a floating picket line to deter desperate Haitians from taking to the seas in unsafe boats. Coast Guard personnel be-

came directly involved in rescue operations and the very difficult process of repatriation in that Haitian affair as we know. While the exodus from Haiti has ebbed momentarily, just last week, the administration announced a change in its policy toward Cuban refugees that once again places the Coast Guard on the front lines of enforcement upon the high seas, to turn back Cuban rafters and enforce a more orderly process of immigration. That is no small order for them to undertake that. But despite its ever expanding list of missions, the Coast Guard has not been given corresponding resources to ensure that its traditional responsibilities do not suffer. In the last Congress, this House adopted language reaffirming our commitment to providing additional resources to the Coast Guard if new missions are added to its plate. That is just common sense. If we ask them to do more, we are going to give them the money to pay for it.

Today, I am pleased that the committee has agreed to include that language in its amendment, so we will have that again this year. On a more parochial note, Mr. Speaker, under this open rule all of our colleagues will have the opportunity to assist our local communities and private citizens who are involved in seeking to navigate the confusing bureaucracy of the Jones Act. In my district, we have one city and four private citizens who find themselves wound up in redtape as they seek to use vessels for legitimate municipal or commercial purposes. H.R. 1361 already includes a provision that covers one of the southwest Florida victims of the Jones Act redtape in my case, and I am pleased that the committee amendment will include waivers to address the other three cases I know about, and perhaps the bulk of my colleagues' concerns as well will be included in that amendment. If not, if there is still more to be done in this area, this open rule allows Members the chance to bring their amendments forward. I hope all Members will support this open rule, and this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following for the RECORD:

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,¹ 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS

[As of May 5, 1995]

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Open/Modified-open ²	46	44	23	74
Modified Closed ³	49	47	8	26
Closed ⁴	9	9	0	0
Totals:	104	100	31	100

¹ This table applies only to rules which provide for the original consideration of bills, joint resolutions or budget resolutions and which provide for an amendment process. It does not apply to special rules which only waive points of order against appropriations bills which are already privileged and are considered under an open amendment process under House rules.

² An open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule. A modified open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule subject only to an overall time limit on the amendment process and/or a requirement that the amendment be preprinted in the Congressional Record.

³ A modified closed rule is one under which the Rules Committee limits the amendments that may be offered only to those amendments designated in the special rule or the Rules Committee report to accompany it, or which preclude amendments to a particular portion of a bill, even though the rest of the bill may be completely open to amendment.

⁴ A closed rule is one under which no amendments may be offered (other than amendments recommended by the committee in reporting the bill).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS

[As of May 5, 1995]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 38 (1/18/95)	O	H.R. 5	Unfunded Mandate Reform	A: 350-71 (1/19/95).
H. Res. 44 (1/24/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 17	Social Security	A: 255-172 (1/25/95).
		H.J. Res. 1	Balanced Budget Amdt.	
H. Res. 51 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 101	Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 52 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 400	Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l. Park and Preserve	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 53 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 440	Land Conveyance, Butte County, Calif.	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 55 (2/1/95)	O	H.R. 2	Line Item Veto	A: voice vote (2/2/95).
H. Res. 60 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 665	Victim Restitution	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 61 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 666	Exclusionary Rule Reform	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 63 (2/8/95)	MO	H.R. 667	Violent Criminal Incarceration	A: voice vote (2/9/95).
H. Res. 69 (2/9/95)	MO	H.R. 668	Criminal Alien Deportation	A: voice vote (2/10/95).
H. Res. 79 (2/10/95)	MO	H.R. 728	Law Enforcement Block Grants	A: voice vote (2/10/95).
H. Res. 83 (2/13/95)	MO	H.R. 7	National Security Revitalization	PQ: 229-100; A: 227-127 (2/15/95).
H. Res. 88 (2/16/95)	MC	H.R. 831	Health Insurance Deductibility	PQ: 230-191; A: 229-188 (2/21/95).
H. Res. 91 (2/21/95)	O	H.R. 830	Paperwork Reduction Act	A: voice vote (2/2/95).
H. Res. 92 (2/21/95)	MC	H.R. 889	Defense Supplemental	A: 282-144 (2/22/95).
H. Res. 93 (2/22/95)	MO	H.R. 450	Regulatory Transition Act	A: 252-175 (2/23/95).
H. Res. 96 (2/24/95)	MO	H.R. 1022	Risk Assessment	A: 253-165 (2/27/95).
H. Res. 100 (2/27/95)	O	H.R. 926	Regulatory Reform and Relief Act	A: voice vote (2/28/95).
H. Res. 101 (2/28/95)	MO	H.R. 925	Private Property Protection Act	A: voice vote (3/1/95).
H. Res. 104 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 988	Attorney Accountability Act	A: 271-151 (3/1/95).
H. Res. 103 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 1058	Securities Litigation Reform	A: voice vote (3/6/95).
H. Res. 105 (3/6/95)	MO			
H. Res. 108 (3/6/95)	Debate	H.R. 956	Product Liability Reform	A: voice vote (3/8/95).
H. Res. 109 (3/8/95)	MC			PQ: 234-191 A: 247-181 (3/9/95).
H. Res. 115 (3/14/95)	MO	H.R. 1159	Making Emergency Supp. Approps.	A: 242-190 (3/15/95).
H. Res. 116 (3/15/95)	MC	H.J. Res. 73	Term Limits Const. Amdt.	A: voice vote (3/28/95).
H. Res. 117 (3/16/95)	Debate	H.R. 4	Personal Responsibility Act of 1995	A: voice vote (3/16/95).
H. Res. 119 (3/21/95)	MC			A: 217-211 (3/22/95).
H. Res. 125 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 1271	Family Privacy Protection Act	A: 423-1 (4/4/95).
H. Res. 126 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 660	Older Persons Housing Act	voice vote (4/6/95).
H. Res. 128 (4/4/95)	MC	H.R. 1215	Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	A: 228-204 (4/5/95).
H. Res. 130 (4/5/95)	MC	H.R. 483	Medicare Select Expansion	A: 253-172 (4/6/95).
H. Res. 136 (5/1/95)	O	H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act of 1995	A: voice vote (5/2/95).
H. Res. 139 (5/3/95)	O	H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Auth. FY 1996	

Codes: O-open rule; MO-modified open rule; MC-modified closed rule; C-closed rule; A-adoption vote; PQ-previous question vote. Source: Notices of Action Taken, Committee on Rules, 104th Congress.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my Republican colleagues for the rule they are recommending today. So far this year, the rules they have recommended have been 70 percent closed. This is in spite of their promises to open the process in the House.

However, since the rule before us today is an open rule, I must commend the Republican majority.

As my colleague described, this rule provides for the consideration of a relatively noncontroversial Coast Guard authorization.

It authorizes \$3.7 billion for the Coast Guard—exactly the amount requested by the administration and only slightly more than last year's authorization.

The 37,000 members of the Coast Guard provide this Nation with invaluable maritime service for everything from search and rescue to drug interdiction and this \$3.7 billion will support their good work.

I would like to commend Chairman SHUSTER and ranking member MINETA for putting together a truly bipartisan bill which should pass the House with little opposition.

I urge my colleagues to support this rare open rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to yield 4 minutes to my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN].

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to denounce the Clinton administration's decision to use this great American institution, the U.S. Coast Guard, to serve the purposes of a tyrant.

We in south Florida are very knowledgeable about the Coast Guard because of the wonderful work they perform during periods of natural disasters such as during Hurricane Andrew where they played a crucial role in the rescue operations.

Those of us who are residents of south Florida also know the Coast Guard as a humanitarian institution because, for years, the Coast Guard has rescued freedom-seeking Cubans from the waters of the Florida Straits while on their journey to freedom.

This humanitarian aspect of the Coast Guard, for which all of America should be proud, was surprisingly reversed last week when the Clinton administration announced the United States will now repatriate freedom-seeking Cubans back to the island prison they risked their lives to escape.

The President has now made the Coast Guard an extension of the Cuban authorities, in order to keep the Cuban people under the Castro repression.

Just this afternoon, the first victims of the President's latest flipflop were turned over to the bloody henchmen of Castro.

Mr. Speaker, this change of policy is an embarrassment to the longstanding record of the United States as the beacon of hope and freedom for the oppressed of the world.

With one swift and misguided decision, the Clinton administration has successfully allied itself with the bloodiest tyrant the Americas has ever known, and has crushed the aspirations of freedom for millions of Cubans.

The administration has once again proven that it does not comprehend how to deal with Cuba.

Instead of attacking the root of the problem, Fidel Castro, the President continues to treat Cuba as an immigra-

tion problem, not as legitimate foreign policy matter.

Most disturbing is that the President is using the Coast Guard to help maintain Cubans under the oppressive hand of Castro.

This accord, Mr. Speaker, was reached in secret negotiations led by Assistant Secretary of State, Peter Tarnoff.

Not even the head of the Cuban Affairs desk of the U.S. Department of State knew about these dealings, nor the Assistant Secretary for Interamerican Affairs at State.

Moreover, Congress was never consulted on the matter and the administration has been stalling on details about the talks.

Many questions still remain unanswered such as what concessions were given to Castro, and whether it is just a simple coincidence that, just few days before the new policy announcement, the administration publicly declared its opposition to the Helms-Burton bill.

The administration must come forth with answers to these and other questions which are critical to untangling the purpose of this new policy.

Mr. Speaker, the Coast Guard has been an exemplary institution of this country for decades.

We should not allow the administration to use it as a tool to aid a totalitarian tyrant.

I urge my colleagues to raise their voices against this distortion of the Coast Guard's mission.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule, and I rise in

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 Galaudet 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