

the other family, and only one person from Teshika's family still lives. Actually towns became rivers. We have the scene of Tarboro here. East Tarboro was completely flooded. That was the area that the President visited, in that area. The waters have now receded, yet those businesses cannot function because they stayed underwater so long. Right next to East Tarboro is a town called Princeville. Princeville is a town that was founded by newly freed slaves in 1884, became incorporated in 1885, in fact was the first town of American free slaves to be incorporated. That whole town was flooded and stayed underwater at least 10 days. That whole town is lost. Forty percent of Edgecombe County was lost. Princeville is not the only community. There was Kinston. Much of that town was lost. It is a town of 35,000 people. Downtown, they had six hotels. Only two were not flooded. Many of the shopping centers in Rocky Mount were flooded. Water systems were closed down. Wastewater systems became nonfunctional and may not function for many years to come unless they are really improved.

Our infrastructure also was greatly damaged. This one is the road of 301 which was the main highway going north and south before we had Interstate 95. I-95 was flooded. I-95 is where people go as they go to Disney World. You can imagine, they did not build I-95 inadequately. But I-95 was flooded from Emporia to Benson. This is 301, the road that used to be the main north and south thoroughfare. This big gaping hole also undergirded the Amtrak trains, the water system. We have a tremendous amount of devastation that happened to our roads, to our water system, our wastewater system, to the houses. It is reported more than 35,000 houses had some impact from actually the storm. Some 10,000 houses are reported to be uninhabitable, that they will be destroyed. They are non-functional to the extent they need to be destroyed. There was great, great devastation and a need for rebuilding and reconstruction.

This week, this floor, and I want to express appreciation to my colleagues, unanimously supported a resolution that said they empathized, sympathized with the people affected by Hurricane Floyd and they went on record as saying, further than just sympathy, they wanted to provide support. They will have that opportunity very, very soon. Hopefully there will be an emergency spending bill that will be adequate not only to respond to North Carolina's needs but the East Coast, from New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Virginia, Florida, as well as North Carolina.

North Carolina alone has a need for \$2.5 billion just for emergency. The agricultural needs in North Carolina are said to be \$1.3 billion. We have erosion of land. We have lost more than 2.3 million chickens. More than 120,000 pigs were destroyed. Wildlife was destroyed.

Horses were destroyed. There was a tremendous loss in terms of forestry, an untold amount of loss in terms of fisheries. As if that were not enough, the impact that was made on the environment and the water system, the fertilizers, the poisons, the pollutants that are in the water. So in addition to having structural loss and having loss of human life, we also have the potential of environmental loss that would be there for years to come. It is yet not known how much there would be.

I want to keep before my colleagues this urgent need of the citizens in eastern North Carolina for emergency relief certainly, and hopefully we will do the right thing for them. But beyond the emergency relief, there needs to be a commitment on the part of this Congress that we will rebuild and restore, we will put the kind of resources, bring some sort of normalcy and a sense of community as we do with our foreign investment, that here is an opportunity to respond to American people as we do, appropriately I think, in foreign countries. We need a plan that says not only do we sympathize and empathize, but we recognize that we have a commitment to restore their lives and their communities.

ON TRUCK SAFETY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, today I stand up for the 5,374 families who lost loved ones in truck accidents last year and to note that the Congress could be about ready to walk away from them.

Last week, Mr. Speaker, this House voted overwhelmingly for the transportation appropriations conference report which included a provision requiring a change in the way the Federal Government conducts oversight of the trucking industry. For the record, the vast majority of truck drivers and trucking companies do their level best to operate safely and efficiently and they are an important part of our commerce. But it is those few on the margins, Mr. Speaker, who last year took the lives of 5,374 people and 5,398 the year before that, a decade high. That is like a major airplane crash taking place every 2 weeks with regard to the deaths in the trucking industry.

Section 338 of the bill, which the President is expected to sign soon, prohibits the Department of Transportation from funding the Office of Motor Carrier and Highway Safety, the OMC, within the Federal Highway Administration. The Federal Highway Administration does a good job at maintaining and building our Nation's infrastructure but they have fallen woefully behind in the area of truck safety. This means that Congress can pass legislation directing the DOT to move the Office of Motor Carrier and Highway

Safety to a better place, or the administration can do it by executive order. Either way, Mr. Speaker, someone has got to do something and the language in the appropriations conference report requires action, action that has been lacking since myself and others have brought this issue to the attention of the Congress over the past year. The status quo where people are dying daily because of truck accidents is unacceptable.

Everyone in this Chamber and those who are watching on television, those who will later read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, have experienced the anxiety associated with being around large trucks on our Nation's highways. They are big, they are fast, they are heavy and they are dangerous. And when a truck is involved in an accident, regardless of who is at fault, it is likely someone is going to die or be seriously injured. Plain and simple, I think it is incumbent, therefore, to ensure that trucks are as safe as they can be. Under the current system, I do not think the Federal Government is doing a good enough job to make sure that is the case.

As I mentioned, last year 5,374 people died in truck-related accidents. The year before that, 5,398 people died, a decade high. Just think about those figures and let them sink in for a moment. The number of deaths associated with truck accidents is equal to a jetliner loaded with passengers crashing every other week. With an airplane crashing every other week, the Congress would be outraged. People would be calling their Congressmen on the telephones and the Congress would say, "We're committed to do something about it." The Nation would be up in arms. Hearings would be held, accident investigations would be taking place, and grieving families would be on television to illustrate the sorrow of losing a loved one.

Why, then, does the issue of truck safety, where over 5,000 people a year have died, not command the same attention? Why is the Federal office responsible for the regulation of the trucking industry, which some say is larger than the aviation industry, buried in the Federal Highway Administration with only .06 of the budget? Could it be because of the lobbyists and others who have been hired by the trucking companies?

Last year, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Transportation appropriations conference report included a similar provision. But in the dead of the night and in the waning hours of the Congress, the trucking lobbyists prevailed. As a result of that, since that time in the middle of the night when this provision was taken out, thousands have died on the road.

The Department of Transportation Inspector General looked at this issue and found that not only were lobbyists hired working against this proposal, which would force greater scrutiny on truck safety, but several of the employees of the Office of Motor Carriers,

which is responsible for regulating the trucking industry, were afraid of this provision and what would be found when we looked at truck oversight, and they, the employees of the Department of Transportation, conspired to defeat this measure. The Inspector General noted that employees of the Office of Motor Carriers who regulate the trucking industry had contacted those that they regulated soliciting their help in staving off additional scrutiny. A few employees, these are government employees, paid by the families of the people that have died, then drafted letters for the trucking industry to send to Members of Congress to defeat this proposal.

□ 1030

That is right, the regulators at the Office of Motor Carriers, these employees, paid for by the taxpayer, were meeting with the lobbyists for the trucking industry, drafting letters for them to send to Members of Congress to keep this provision from taking place, whereby thousands would continue to die.

As a result of these unfortunate circumstances, the Department of Transportation disciplined four people. They were disciplined. One left. A couple are still there, but they were disciplined.

Why did top employees of the Office of Motor Carriers, which regulates the industry, work to stymie the move? Because they knew that the state of the trucking industry was in such poor condition that it was they who would be called to account. How do we explain that deaths were up, inspections were down? At the same time that deaths were rising, the number of inspections was decreasing.

Three years ago, each safety inspector at the Office of Motor Carriers conducted five reviews per month of the companies. Two years ago each inspector did an average of 2.5 reviews per month. Last year, each inspector did only one per month. When inspections over the course of 2 years dropped from 5 inspections to one inspection per month, something must be wrong and sorely needs to be changed.

In fact, the Inspector General found one truck that left California going to Virginia, the State that I live in, made the trip in 48 hours, and when the guy pulled in, the driver, had several bottles of urine in the cab. He had not even stopped to go to the bathroom.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the trucking lobbyists, every time they see an accident where someone dies, think in terms of how they made this happen, and those employees know because of this lack of inspections, that more people are dying.

The Office of Motor Carriers knows it. The IG conducted a survey of the Office of Motor Carriers employees asking them if they thought the Office of Motor Carriers should move, and where. Mr. Speaker, less than 20 percent of those employees surveyed were opposed to moving, only 20 percent. Of

those people responsible for trucking oversight, only 20 percent wanted the status quo.

The employees of OMC deserve credit for the work they do. Most work very hard, and they are very dedicated. Unfortunately, there are some in the management who have not caught the vision. If the employees of the Office of Motor Carriers do not favor the status quo, why should the Congress?

In 3 short months, trucks from Mexico may be able to cross the border to the U.S. under NAFTA. The IG recently found that Mexico has no hours of service requirements, no log books requirements for truckers, no vehicle maintenance standards, no roadside inspections, and no safety rating systems. Can we be sure these trucks will not present a safety problem on our highways come January? All of these trucks will cross the border and be able to go throughout the entire United States.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot stop the drugs coming across the border on the trucks, and I will tell the Members, those trucks will be unsafe and many, many more people could die.

When the IG conducted a survey of the effects of NAFTA, he found today 3.5 million trucks are crossing the border from Mexico, only to designated commercial zones in the U.S. Of those 3.5 million trucks crossing the border, the Office of Motor Carriers only inspected 17,332. Of those inspected, 44 percent were in such poor condition that they were taken off the road immediately.

Some of these trucks are intended only to serve border traffic, but many others may be driving on all the highways in America, come January. If the Congress and others feel comfortable about this, allowing this situation to persist, so be it. But I in good conscience cannot. We can no longer sit idly by while thousands of Americans are dying every year on our roads and do nothing about it.

If others claim to be concerned about the provision contained in the Department of transportation appropriations conference report, I welcome the company. But do something about it. To this date, more than a year after this terrible problem was brought to America's attention, not one bill bringing relief to this situation has been brought before this House, let alone been signed into law, not one.

If Members do not like the provision contained in this year's Department of Transportation appropriations conference report, do something about it, but the status quo is unacceptable.

Let me just address for a minute some of the allegations regarding section 338 of the conference report. Some have suggested that this provision harms safety. It is nonsense and they know it. I have been urging improvements to truck safety for over a year now, and I have been out on several truck inspections where, when we go out, we see lug nuts sheared off, bald tires, brakes that are not working.

To really let the American people understand this, one out of every five trucks that we see on the highway today is so unsafe that if it would be inspected, it would be taken off the road.

The last truck inspection we went out to, we found bald tires. We found air brake systems rotted out and rusted out. There were so many violations, and they then go on and are involved in accidents that kill people.

Yesterday the Department of Transportation's general counsel testified that section 338 would prevent the DOT from conducting only two functions in truck safety, the assessment of civil penalties, and protection of migrant worker transportation, which the States have taken the lead on, anyhow. So that leaves DOT with one real shortcoming, which could have been very easily fixed in a minor technical correction bill, the ability to levy civil penalties.

DOT can still conduct border inspections, they can still place unsafe vehicles out of service, and they can still conduct an effective oversight program. To suggest otherwise is nothing more than an effort to scare this body in returning to the status quo.

Others have said, let us give the OMC time. They will make the necessary changes on their own. This Congress has given them time. If Members think times have changed, every Member should know that they are wrong. Earlier this week, the Office of Motor Carrier Management sent out an e-mail memo to all its employees suggesting that section 338 would prevent the organization from conducting further oversights.

Without judging whether the memo was intentionally false or not, it is clear the OMC still does not get it. The memo was 180 degrees inaccurate. Indeed, the Secretary had to order that a correcting memo be distributed.

When my staff called the Office of Motor Carriers to clarify the memo's inaccuracies, they were told that the Office of Motor Carrier staff would not take the call. When they asked to speak with the head of the office, which is standard procedure, they were informed that she was out of town. When they asked for who, therefore, was in charge, they were told it was one of those punished for their improper efforts last year. The person that was running the Office of Motor Carriers responsible for the memo to go out was one of the people cited by the Inspector General who was disciplined by the Department of Transportation.

When we drive on the highways today, on the Beltway, when we drive on I-81 in the Shenandoah Valley, when we drive on I-95, whether north and south of Washington, think of all those trucks, and think about how some employees who are now running the office which inspects these trucks have been so close to the trucking industry that

it has been basically an incestuous relationship, and therefore, they are trying to undermine a provision which will bring about truck safety.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, next week the Congress may consider on the suspension calendar a bill to overturn section 338 of the conference report. I urge Members to vote against the bill. If the reorganization of the motor carrier office does not take place, more people will die. We will get into next year, and next year is an election year. The contributions will begin flowing from the trucking industry to the Congress, and they will make up reasons why we do not have time to deal with truck safety.

We will also be faced with the trucks from Mexico coming across the border. Some 80 thousand more trucks could enter the market next year than this year. Many families will experience the pain and agony of getting that telephone call to say that a loved one has been involved in an accident with regard to trucks.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line to this entire issue is safety.

So if a bill comes up, I urge Members to vote no.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2561

Mr. LEWIS of California submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 2561) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2561) "making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes", having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert:

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, for military functions administered by the Department of Defense, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Army on active duty (except members of reserve components provided for elsewhere), cadets, and aviation cadets; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97-377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), to section 229(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 429(b)), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$22,006,361,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Navy on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere), midshipmen, and aviation cadets; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97-377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), to section 229(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 429(b)), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$17,258,823,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Marine Corps on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere); and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97-377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), to section 229(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 429(b)), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$6,555,403,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Air Force on active duty (except members of reserve components provided for elsewhere), cadets, and aviation cadets; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97-377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), to section 229(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 429(b)), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$17,861,803,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Army Reserve on active duty under sections 10211, 10302, and 3038 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$2,289,996,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Navy Reserve on active duty under section 10211 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$1,473,388,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Marine Corps Reserve on active duty under section 10211 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty speci-

fied in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and for members of the Marine Corps platoon leaders class, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$412,650,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Air Force Reserve on active duty under sections 10211, 10305, and 8038 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and for members of the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$892,594,000.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Army National Guard while on duty under section 10211, 10302, or 12402 of title 10 or section 708 of title 32, United States Code, or while serving on duty under section 12301(d) of title 10 or section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$3,610,479,000.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Air National Guard on duty under section 10211, 10305, or 12402 of title 10 or section 708 of title 32, United States Code, or while serving on duty under section 12301(d) of title 10 or section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, \$1,533,196,000.

TITLE II

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Army, as authorized by law; and not to exceed \$10,624,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Army, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes, \$19,256,152,000 and, in addition, \$50,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund: Provided, That of the funds made available under this heading, \$5,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be transferred to "National Park Service—Construction" within 30 days of enactment of this Act, only for necessary infrastructure repair improvements at Fort Baker, under the management of the Golden Gate Recreation Area: Provided further, That of the funds appropriated in this paragraph, not less than \$355,000,000 shall be made available only for conventional ammunition care and maintenance: Provided further, That of the funds appropriated under this heading,