

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

through the city in support of the Special Olympics. As we all know, this program gives handicapped children and adults the opportunity to participate in athletic events.

Because of laws prohibiting open flames on Capitol Grounds, and because of safety concerns about activities taking place thereon, this resolution is necessary to permit the relay to occur. The resolution authorizes the Capitol Police Board to take necessary action to insure the safety of the Capitol, and the Architect of the Capitol may set forth conditions on participation in this event.

Activities will begin on Capitol Hill where the U.S. Capitol Police will host opening ceremonies and thereafter over 1,000 law enforcement officials will relay the torch through the city to Gallaudet University where the D.C. Special Olympics Summer Games will be held.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very worthwhile endeavor and I strongly encourage my colleagues to support the resolution which authorizes the event.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague in supporting use of the Capitol Grounds for the Special Olympics Torch Relay Run. As has been the custom, law enforcement officials from over 65 Federal and local agencies will relay the special olympics torch through the District to Gallaudet University to signal the beginning of the Special Olympics.

The event is scheduled this year for May 19. Since this date is a week from this Friday, we need to act on this legislation expeditiously.

This is a very worthwhile event which benefits not only the families and participants but also the volunteers and sponsors who contribute their time and efforts for handicapped children and adults.

I ask my colleagues to join in supporting this resolution.

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, the Special Olympics is a program which gives handicapped children and adults the opportunity to compete in sporting events and thereby enhance their self-esteem and self-image.

The Torch Relay Run through the Capitol Grounds is an annual event which this committee has traditionally supported and I am very pleased once again to support the resolution authorizing use of the grounds for this very worthwhile endeavor.

I commend both the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST], chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Economic Development, and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE], the subcommittee's ranking Democrat for moving this resolution in a timely fashion. The event is scheduled for May 19.

I join my colleagues in urging passage of this resolution.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 64

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF RUNNING OF SPECIAL OLYMPICS TORCH RELAY THROUGH CAPITOL GROUNDS.

On May 19, 1995, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate may jointly designate, the 1995 Special Olympics Torch Relay may be run through the Capitol Grounds, as part of the journey of the Special Olympics torch to the District of Columbia Special Olympics summer games at Gallaudet University in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. RESPONSIBILITY OF CAPITOL POLICE BOARD.

The Capitol Police Board shall take such action as may be necessary to carry out section 1.

SEC. 3. CONDITIONS RELATING TO PHYSICAL PREPARATIONS.

The Architect of the Capitol may prescribe conditions for physical preparations for the event authorized by section 1.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and include therein extraneous material, on House Concurrent Resolution 64.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 743

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask unanimous consent to remove my name as cosponsor of H.R. 743, the Teamwork for Employees and Management Act.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from the vote when rollcall No. 304 and rollcall No. 306 were taken last week. I would have voted in the affirmative in both matters if I had been present.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous matter on H.R. 1361.

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

There was no objection.

COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 139 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1361.

□ 1507

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1361) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes, with Mr. DICKEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COBLE] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] will each be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COBLE].

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, many Americans, and for that matter many Members of this body, do not really know the Coast Guard. I want to introduce the Coast Guard that I know to those uninformed about America's oldest continuous sea-going service.

The Coast Guard is the butt of many jokes, some submitted good-naturedly, some submitted maliciously. Many refer to the Coast Guard as the shallow water Navy, hooligan Navy, as shallow-water sailors or hooligan sailors.

Even Hollywood gets into the act. A recently released movie depicted a military force about to depart on a combat mission. The commander of the force said to his group, "Be careful, men." One of his troops replied, "If I wanted to be careful, I would have joined the Coast Guard."

This comment, of course, drew wild laughter from the moviegoers and was yet another example of a joke at the expense of the Coast Guard. Permit me to identify those who do not consider the Coast Guard a joke.

The wife whose husband was adrift in a treacherous sea was rescued by the Coast Guard. The husband whose wife was stranded at sea in a disabled vessel rescued by the Coast Guard. Property owners whose property could have been destroyed by oil spills, property protected and saved by the Coast Guard. Seamen who rely upon accurately marked aids to navigation maintained by the Coast Guard. The mama and daddy whose child is hauled from the grasp of an angry sea by a Coast Guard helicopter crew.

In the poem, Mr. Chairman, entitled "The Coast Guard Cutter," the poet vividly and emotionally portrays these lifesavers as legitimate heroes: