

I urge Congress to heed the concerns of the American people, not the beltway bandits who would rob us of our most precious assets. I urge a "no" vote on H.R. 260.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,

Washington, DC, September 16, 1995.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

THIS STATEMENT HAS BEEN COORDINATED BY OMB WITH THE CONCERNED AGENCIES

H.R. 260—National Park System Reform Act of 1995—Hefley and eight cosponsors

The Administration strongly opposes H.R. 260 unless amended to delete provisions in sections 101 and 102 that establish a process for identifying National Park System (NPS) units that should be closed. This emphasis on closing existing parks undermines the commitment made by previous generations to protect this Nation's important natural and historic resources. The Administration supports other, forward-looking provisions in H.R. 260 that provide for a NPS Plan and the establishment of a clear process for identifying and evaluating potential new NPS units.

LEAGUE OF CONSERVATION VOTERS,

September 18, 1995.

Re oppose H.R. 260, the National Park System Reform Act.

U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The League of Conservation Voters is the bipartisan, political arm of the national environmental movement. Each year, LCV publishes the *National Environmental Scorecard*, which details the voting records of Members of Congress on environmental legislation. The Scorecard is distributed to LCV members, concerned voters nationwide and the press.

This Tuesday, the House of Representatives is expected to vote on a motion to suspend the rules and consider H.R. 260, the National Park System Reform Act. Under the guise of reforming and improving the National Park System H.R. 260 creates a politically appointed commission, whose sole responsibility would be to determine which park units should be closed. While there may be units in the National Park System that deserve scrutiny, LCV opposes the creation of a politically appointed parks closure commission and urges you to vote against passage of H.R. 260.

H.R. 260, and the parks closure commission it creates, threatens 315 units of the National Park System including: urban parks, historic sites, national monuments, national seashores, national recreation areas, and Civil War Battlefields. Instead of considering ways to improve the National Park System H.R. 260 unnecessarily creates a new layer of government and an expensive bureaucratic process, when in fact Congress already has the authority to remove units from the National Park System.

LCV views H.R. 260 as an assault on the protection of our cultural and natural heritage. By bringing H.R. 260 to the House floor on the suspension calendar Members are prevented from offering amendments which could significantly improve this flawed legislation. LCV believes that the full House of Representatives, like the House Resources Committee, should have an opportunity to vote on an amendment to delete the park closure commission. LCV urges you to oppose H.R. 260 so that this and other amendments can be offered under regular House procedures. LCV's Political Advisory Committee will consider including a vote on passage of H.R. 260 in compiling its 1995 Scorecard.

Thank you for your consideration of this issue. For further information, please call Betsy Loyless in my office at 202/785-8683.

Sincerely,

FRANK LOY,
Acting President.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 19, 1995.

H.R. 260 IS BAD FOR AMERICA—PARK CLOSURE COMMISSION COULD CLOSE PARK UNITS

DEAR COLLEAGUE: The House today is scheduled to vote on H.R. 260, legislation to establish a park closure commission which would have the authority to recommend to Congress which units of the National Park System should be considered for closure, privatization or sale to the highest bidder.

H.R. 260 specifically exempts the 54 units of the National Park System from the closure commission recommendations leaving less visited, smaller budgeted parks and important national monuments like Independence Hall, the Statue of Liberty, Mt. Rushmore, the Washington, Lincoln and Jefferson Monuments and the Martin Luther King Jr. National Historic Site on the chopping block.

Please consult the map and descriptive listing of the 369 units of the National Park System printed on the reverse of this page for more information on the specific units in your district.

H.R. 260 is highly controversial legislation which is opposed by a bipartisan coalition of Americans including the Clinton Administration, editorial boards from newspapers across the nation, and nearly every major national environmental organization. It does not belong on the suspension calendar.

When the House votes on H.R. 260 this morning, I urge a NO vote.

Who Opposes H.R. 260?

The White House.

The Department of Interior.

The National Park Service.

The League of Conservation Voters.

Environmental Action Foundation.

Sierra Club.

The National Parks and Conservation Association.

Defenders of Wildlife.

Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund.

Friends of the Earth.

Izaak Walton League of America.

American Hiking Society.

The Wilderness Society.

What papers have issued editorials against H.R. 260?

The New York Times.

The Salt Lake Tribune.

The Miami Herald.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

The Philadelphia Inquirer.

The Wichita Eagle.

The Las Vegas Sun.

Please contact Ben Finzel of my staff (x56190) with any questions or for more information.

With warm regards,

BILL RICHARDSON,
Chief Deputy Whip.

SPEAKER GINGRICH'S OWN PRECEDENTS FOR INVESTIGATING A SPEAKER

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, according to the New York Times today the Committee on Standards of Official

Conduct is beginning to allow and agree that they must appoint an outside counsel to investigate Speaker NEWT GINGRICH. The only question is what kind of authority will this outside counsel have? I ask unanimous consent to put in the RECORD at this point the Speaker's prior precedents that he had in 1988 when the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct last engaged in an investigation on a prior Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in every single one of the Speaker's demands to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct he said the outside counsel must have full authority. Those eight demands must be followed in this case, too, because no one could have said it better than Speaker GINGRICH said at that time is his letter to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. He said:

The rules normally applied by the Ethics Committee to an investigation of a typical Member are insufficient in an investigation of the Speaker of the House . . . Clearly this investigation has to meet a higher standard of accountability and integrity.

Mr. Speaker, if it was true in 1988, it is true in 1995.

GINGRICH INSISTS ON THOROUGH INVESTIGATION

WASHINGTON, DC.—Congressman Newt Gingrich (R-GA) today insisted that the House Ethics Committee give the special counsel appointed to investigate House Speaker Jim Wright the independence necessary to do a thorough and complete job. Discouraged by several news reports that special counsel Richard Phelan would be restricted in the scope of his investigation, Gingrich took a series of actions including writing to House Ethics Committee Chairman Julian Dixon (D-CA), forwarding the letter to his colleagues in the House, and speaking on the House floor on the need for a truly independent counsel with full leeway in pursuing the investigation.

In his letter to Chairman Dixon, Gingrich wrote:

"I have a number of concerns regarding the Ethics Committee's contract with and instructions for the special counsel hired to conduct the investigation into Speaker Jim Wright's questionable financial dealings.

"First, I am concerned that the scope, authority, and independence of the special counsel will be limited by the guidelines the Ethics Committee has established."

Gingrich agreed with concerns raised by Common Cause Chairman Archibald Cox in a letter to Chairman Dixon earlier this week. The Common Cause letter urged the Ethics Committee to "commit itself to the following measures:

1. The outside counsel shall have full authority to investigate and present evidence and arguments before the Ethics Committee concerning the questions arising out of the activities of House Speaker James C. Wright, Jr.;

2. The outside counsel shall have full authority to organize, select, and hire staff on a full- or part-time basis in such numbers as the counsel reasonably requires and will be provided with such funds and facilities as the counsel reasonably requires;

3. The outside counsel shall have full authority to review all documentary evidence available from any source and full cooperation of the Committee in obtaining such evidence;

4. The Committee shall give the outside counsel full cooperation in the issuance of subpoenas;

5. The outside counsel shall be free, after discussion with the Committee, to make such public statements and reports as the counsel deems appropriate;

6. The outside counsel shall have full authority to recommend that formal charges be brought before the Ethics Committee, shall be responsible for initiating and conducting proceedings if formal charges have been brought and shall handle any aspects of the proceedings believed to be necessary for a full inquiry;

7. The Committee shall not countermand or interfere with the outside counsel's ability to take steps necessary to conduct a full and fair investigation; and

8. The outside counsel will not be removed except for good cause."

Gingrich wrote to Chairman Dixon, "It is my impression from press reports that the Ethics Committee has specifically failed to meet the Common Cause standard. Furthermore, it is my understanding that the special counsel cannot go beyond the six areas outlined in your June 9, 1988, Resolution of Preliminary Inquiry. This leads me to believe that the special counsel will not be allowed to investigate the questionable bulk purchases of Mr. Wright's book, 'Reflections of a Public Man,' as a way to circumvent House limits on outside income.

"I am particularly concerned that the unusual purchases by the Teamsters Union, the New England Mutual Life Insurance Co., a Fort Worth developer, and a Washington lobbyist will not be investigated.

"I believe many will perceive this action as an attempt by the Ethics Committee to control the scope and direction of the investigation."

Gingrich requested a copy of the contract arranged between the Ethics Committee and Mr. Phelan. He also asked to know the extent of Mr. Phelan's subpoena power.

Gingrich said, "The House of Representatives, as well as the American public, deserve an investigation which will uncover the truth. At this moment, I am afraid that the apparent restrictions placed on this special counsel will not allow the truth to be uncovered.

"The rules normally applied by the Ethics Committee to an investigation of a typical Member are insufficient in an investigation of the Speaker of the House, a position which is third in the line of succession to the Presidency and the second best powerful elected position in America. Clearly, this investigation has to meet a higher standard of public accountability and integrity."

□ 1800

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. MCINTOSH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

STATE OF TENNESSEE NOW ENJOYS REPUBLICAN MAJORITY

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

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight and join my fellow colleagues from Tennessee to proudly announce to this body that for the first time since reconstruction, the Tennessee State senate has a majority of Republicans.

State Senators Rusty Crowe of Johnson City and Milton Hamilton of Union City last week made the decision to make Tennessee history.

If I am not mistaken, this is the first time since the 104th Congress convened that a State senate has seen a party switch.

And what's more, it didn't even take an election to do it.

Senator Hamilton had served as a State senator for 25 years as a Democrat. After he made his announcement to switch parties, he said, and I quote: "I'll be honest with you. I should have switched a long time ago."

Prior to his switch, Senator Crowe stated, and again I quote: "If I do it, it will be because I believe it's the right thing for my constituency."

Mr. Speaker, clearly this latest action reinforces and validates the notion that our party has a vision for the future, that the fundamental restructuring of government we are implementing at the Federal level is continually gaining support at the State level.

Tennessee is leading the way for all of America for the cause of a smaller, less costly, and less intrusive Federal Government, and like my fellow colleagues here with me tonight, I'm proud to be a part of it.

But all of this positive change just did not take place on its own. It took many hours of long, hard work in order for this revolution to be realized.

While there were many who helped what once was surely only a dream to become a reality, there are a couple of individuals who have devoted themselves to the Republican cause.

Before I close, I would like to take just a moment to acknowledge the hard work and dedication of two special people back home.

Our State party chairman, Randle Richardson, deserves as much credit as anyone for securing a Republican majority in the senate. Randle has worked

tirelessly for our party, and has devoted his life to the cause of a common-sense government.

And my predecessor, my good friend Gov. Don Sundquist, had a lot to do with this. Governor Sundquist has always extended an open and welcome hand, and we should all applaud him for his efforts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. DELAURO addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

TRAGEDY OVER PUGET SOUND

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

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I live on an island in the middle of Puget Sound, and a week ago yesterday, on Monday, I took the 6:20 a.m. ferry over to Seattle enroute to a meeting. As we left the harbor, a very sad thing happened. The captain of the ferry came on and said that we were going to have to slow down because he had had reports that a helicopter had crashed in Puget Sound and we would have to help in the search.

The fact is, as we went a little further across the sound, we saw some pieces of wreckage. A helicopter had, in fact, crashed and we spent several minutes cruising around the area trying to find survivors. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, there were no survivors and we learned that what this was was an Airlift Northwest medical helicopter coming over the island with a team of nurses to help in a medical emergency on the island, to take some people back to Seattle.

Mr. Speaker, a pilot and three medics died in this crash, and I would have to say that the captain came on the intercom on the ferry boat and said it probably best as we left the scene of the accident after looking for the survivors. He said:

Ladies and gentleman, sorry for the inconvenience, sorry we had to spend a few minutes trying to help out in this search, but you have just seen the final resting place of three true American heroes.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add just a few thoughts to what the captain of the ferry boat said on that morning. As I said, I live on Bainbridge Island and I have heard the helicopter go over my house many times bringing medical help to people who needed it on the island and could not get to a hospital. There are approximately 14,000 people living on this island and there are places like it all over the United States. Every day we counted on people at Airlift Northwest to help us out, we counted on them and they risked their lives to help us. We owe them the deepest debt of congratulations.