

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as a student of the Constitution, I am reminded of the wisdom of the Founding Fathers in establishing three branches of government. Also recognizing as the President is the head of this Nation that there should be advice and consent from the other body of this Congress. All of us as Americans respect that process and have watched that process help govern this Nation for the years that it has been a Nation under our Constitution.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would argue very vigorously today that there is a crisis in government and one that must be remedied by the people. We recognize that in this three branches of government there are checks and balances. But there should not be a runaway government.

We understand through statistical analysis and polls that this President was reelected because there were the view of the American people that they wanted to go in a direction of moderation, not in a radical right direction. And so they voted for a President that they thought would have the powers to select the judiciary for the 21st century. In that judiciary would be combined individuals who would decide cases in a moderate and respectful manner of the law. It would include judges who affirmed and approved and understood that affirmative action was still legal.

But it seems, however, that the other body refuses to confirm and affirm those appointments by the President of the United States who cannot pass their own political litmus test. This is a travesty and this is against the underpinnings of advice and consent that have been given under the Constitution. We need to stop this runaway process. We need to allow the President of the United States to appoint those judges that are needed, some 81 vacancies, denying the American people their justice and saying to those who believe under the Constitution that issues like affirmative action and choice are the law of the land being rejected because they do not pass a political litmus test.

We come again to another crisis, Mr. Speaker. That is the confirmation of Dr. Satcher, Dr. Satcher, who has been nominated by the President of the United States to be the U.S. Surgeon General and be the Assistant Secretary of Health at the Department of Health and Human Services, someone who is a fine scholar but also a medical professional.

The health of the people is really the foundation upon which all their happiness and all their powers as a State depends. This was spoken by Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield, in a speech in 1877.

What we find here is a bottleneck in the other body, using an unfortunate and negative litmus test to refuse to confirm Dr. Satcher. He has had a distinguished career, an eloquent spokesperson and a proven health profes-

sional. He qualifies to succeed in this role.

The surgeon general's job is to develop medical consensus and articulate a broad public health vision, tasks for which Dr. Satcher is well prepared. As Director of the Center for Disease Control and Prevention, the Administrator of the Agency for Toxic Substances and Diseases Registry, and as the former president of Meharry Medical College, Dr. Satcher has made a lasting impression on the public health of this Nation. In fact, through his leadership at the CDC, childhood immunization rates have increased dramatically, growing from 55 percent in 1992 to 78 percent, and vaccine-preventable childhood diseases have been reduced to the lowest level in American history.

Under Dr. Satcher's direction, the CDC has also placed a greater emphasis on prevention. For example, the CDC's comprehensive breast and cervical cancer screening program increased from 18 to 50 States, and the agency highlighted the importance of physical activity and good health by encouraging Americans to become more physically active.

Why, however, is Dr. Satcher's confirmation being held up? Because of some false litmus test about abortion. Because of some belief that he may be prochoice or pro a procedure, none of which should have anything to do with the head of this country's medical message being confirmed or not confirmed, particularly when Dr. Satcher has indicated that it is his desire to lead this country in a comprehensive way of providing an opportunity for more Americans to be healthy.

He is highly respected and supported by the American Medical Association, the American Academy of Family Physicians, the American Academy of Pediatrics, Dr. Louis Sullivan, the President of Morehouse School of Medicine and former Secretary of Health and Human Services under Republican administrations, and numerous other medical groups.

The Office of Surgeon General has been vacant too long. This is a travesty.

Dr. Satcher wrote in 1977 to Senator WILLIAM FRIST, himself a doctor: Let me state unequivocally that I have no intention of using the position of Assistant Secretary for Health and Surgeon General to promote issues related to abortion. That is it, plain and simple. What more do you need? You cannot take away from an individual his right to his opinions and his belief. Stop the travesty. Follow the Constitution. Proceed with the advice and consent from the other body, proceed to nominate and affirm judges that can be independent and Surgeon Generals that can be independent.

□ 1300

NAME CHANGE FOR WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT SHOULD NOT HAPPEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow this House will take up a bill to strip George Washington's name from Washington National Airport and to rename it the Ronald Reagan National Airport.

I oppose this legislation. My opposition and the opposition of other Members to this bill has nothing to do with personal feelings about President Reagan and his family. In fact, we wish them the best. The debate on this bill should not be about President Reagan or his policies.

I want to repeat this. This debate is not about President Reagan or how best to honor his legacy, this debate is about the majority's efforts to push through a bill that will have serious consequences with little debate and no serious consideration.

In the 7 years I have been a Member of Congress I have never seen greater arrogance than has been exhibited by the majority party in their efforts to enact this legislation. This is an arrogant abuse of power. Washington National Airport is in my district. I have never been consulted about this legislation. I was never asked to appear at a hearing, because there was no hearing. And no one from the other side has even bothered to ask my constituents what they thought about it. If they had, they would find that we do not want this name changed.

Every Member of this House should think how they would feel if the Congress were to vote tomorrow to rename the airport in their district without even consulting them. This bill was drafted without consulting Senators WARNER and ROTH, Virginia's representatives in the other body.

This bill was drafted without consulting the Washington Metropolitan Airport Authority, the body that Ronald Reagan created to govern the Washington National Airport. It was drafted without consulting the Federal Aviation Administration that has to change all the tickets and the rerouting and their whole computer network. The airlines operating out of National were not consulted or the businesses located around the airport in my district. Each of these entities will be significantly and adversely impacted by this bill and each deserves a voice in this decision.

Rather than honor Ronald Reagan and his family and his philosophy of devolving Federal power to State and local governments, this Congress is completely ignoring the expressed wishes of local government when it acts in such an imperious, dictatorial manner. Both Arlington County and

the City of Alexandria have gone on record as firmly opposing this renaming bill.

The Greater Washington Board of Trade, which is the equivalent of our regional Chamber of Commerce, opposes this legislation. These local organizations reflect strong public sentiment against H.R. 2526. So rather than respect the conservative principles of Ronald Reagan, this Congress is diminishing the history of the airport and the President for which it was named to glorify another President.

Our local airport was named Washington National Airport for a very good reason. George Washington lived less than 10 miles away from it, on the very same route. He lived at the end of the street where Washington National Airport is located, Mount Vernon. When it was built, President Roosevelt and airport architects wanted the original terminal to bear a resemblance to Mount Vernon, which it does.

Virginia is a State which is proud to have produced so many Presidents and Founding Fathers for this Nation. We do not want to have the name of our first President taken off the busiest airport in our State. Rather than honor President Reagan's belief in limited and preferably local government, this Congress is about to enact a bill that will saddle the Washington Metropolitan Airport Authority and hundreds of local businesses in and around Washington National Airport with great and unnecessary expenses.

The most ironic, and some would say saddest, part of this entire debate is that we are trying to overturn one of President Reagan's accomplishments. It was, after all, President Ronald Reagan who in 1986 signed legislation that ceded Federal control over Washington National and Dulles Airports to the State and regional authorities. That 1986 law granted to the Washington Metropolitan Airport Authority control over these airports. They were not even consulted.

This is wrong. It is an outrageous abuse of power. It should not be done. Do not do it.

By signing that legislation, President Reagan assured that the federal government would get out of the business of running regional airports. He was correct in doing so. He was acting in a manner that was consistent with this core philosophy, which was to devolve power to the state and local governments.

Now, twelve years later, my Republican colleagues want to ignore completely the spirit and purpose of that law and force this name change on unwilling local authorities.

Lest anyone think that this is just a partisan concern, or that we are acting in a petty manner, I ask them to consider not my comments but the comments of former Virginia Governor Linwood Holton, who was also a former chairman of the Washington Airports Authority.

In a letter to me last week, the Governor stated his strong opposition to H.R. 2526. He expressed the concern that this bill defeats the purpose of the 1986 airports law and the underlying lease for the airports between the fed-

eral government and the airports authority. That lease grants to the authority—and not to this Congress—the control over all operational issues relating to the airport. And that includes its name!

Governor Holton goes on to articulate the concerns that many of us have about the cost of this name change and its impact on the traveling public.

These are not the concerns of some partisan Democrat, but of the first Republican elected to statewide office in modern Virginia history.

Mr. Speaker, President Reagan has been and will continue to be honored by the American people. His name will be on the Navy's next *Nimitz*-class aircraft carrier. The new international trade center downtown will be dedicated in April as the Ronald Reagan Building. And there is a courthouse in California named after President Reagan.

These honors are appropriate and enjoy bipartisan support.

Let's not subject the President and his family to a divisive debate over renaming Washington National Airport. H.R. 2526 is a bill that is opposed by our local governments in Virginia. It is opposed by the business community. It runs counter to the spirit and purpose of existing law. It diminishes Virginia history and the legacy of George Washington. And it establishes a bad precedent for this House.

I urge the Republican leadership to withdraw this ill-advised and hastily drawn measure.

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

MCLEAN, VA, January 29, 1998.

DEAR JIM: I am writing to you in regards to the pending legislation to change the name of the Washington National Airport to "Ronald Reagan National Airport." I had the honor of working closely with the Congress and Secretary of Transportation Elizabeth Dole in advancing the Metropolitan Washington Airports Act of 1986 to transfer Washington National Airport out of the Federal Government to the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority. This legislation of course was signed into law by President Reagan. The Airports Authority was created by the Commonwealth of Virginia and the District of Columbia. The Federal Government leased Washington National Airport and Washington Dulles International Airport to the Authority for fifty years beginning on June 7, 1987. I was privileged to serve as Chairman of the Authority at that time and I signed that lease on behalf of the Authority.

The purpose of the transfer, as recited in the lease itself, was to achieve "local control, management, operation and development" of the airports. I am very concerned that after ten years of this lease arrangement, the Congress now proposed to take unilateral action to change the name of the airport. This is not at all consistent with either the literal terms or the purpose of that lease agreement. Further, the change to the name as proposed, while honoring a president for whom I have the greatest respect, would be detrimental to the airport and its users and affect the traveling public in ways certainly not intended by the drafters of this legislation.

The lease grants the Authority complete control, power, and dominion over the airports. The intent of Congress, Virginia and the District of Columbia in this arrangement is clear. Even though the Federal Government continues to own the underlying land, the airport is to be treated as any other air-

port, not as a federal facility. In the past, there have been changes made to the lease at the request of Congress and the changes have been brought about by a mutually agreed upon amendment to the lease to secure the consent of the Airports Authority. The proposed name change legislation does not acknowledge the need to obtain the consent of the Authority and this is inconsistent with the intended relationship between the Federal Government and the Authority.

As for the consequences, the removal of "Washington" from the airport name removed the location and market identifier that is obviously very important to travelers and shippers at points distant from the Washington area. It is worth noting that well over half of those who travel through National are not residents of the Washington region. The word "Washington" provides immediate market and location information. Without it, there will be confusion that does not exist today about where the airport is and what market it serves. The cost of such loss of identity and confusion may not be readily quantified, but I believe that it would be substantial. There also are other costs such as the costs to local businesses who have associated their identities with Washington National Airport.

In conclusion, the legislation which transferred Washington National Airport to the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority granted to the Authority the control and oversight of the airport. Unilateral action by the Congress to take the drastic action of changing the name of the airport is inconsistent with both the spirit and the intent of the transfer.

Very truly yours,

LINWOOD HOLTON.

LEGISLATION TO KEEP SOCIAL SECURITY SOLVENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. As you well know, Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Budget for the last 3 hours has been meeting, talking to Mr. Raines, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget. My concern and what I noted to Mr. Raines was the fact that Social Security is in jeopardy.

I have introduced the only bill in this U.S. House of Representatives that has now been scored by the Social Security Administration to keep Social Security solvent, so I applauded the President when he suggested that we put Social Security first. However, as I said to Mr. Raines, in examining the budget that was delivered yesterday, Social Security was not put first. Social Security was put ninth, not first.

And I explained the problem of the expanded spending in this budget, where ahead of Social Security was an expanded Medicare program; ahead of Social Security was the high cost of this global warming agreement; ahead of Social Security was \$37 billion expanded role for government in education, where Washington is going to decide more of the decisions and pass more regulations as they pass through that money back to local communities; ahead of Social Security was new penalties for moms who stay at home to