

TOTAL VALUE OF DEFENSE ARTICLES AND SERVICES SOLD TO EACH COUNTRY/PURCHASER AS OF 30 SEPT 94 UNDER FOREIGN MILITARY SALES (SEE PART II FOR CONSTRUCTION SALES)—UNCLASSIFIED—Continued

[Dollars in Thousands]<sup>1</sup>

Countries	Accepted-FY 94
NHPLO .....	30,188
Niger .....	5
Norway .....	159,240
OAS HQ .....	427
Oman .....	1,253
Panama .....	416
Paraguay .....	234
Portugal .....	8,420
Qatar .....	4,031
Rep of Philippines .....	21,238
Saudi Arabia .....	837,881
Senegal .....	39
Seychelles .....	1
Shape .....	2,354
Sierra Leone .....	18
Singapore .....	456,340
Spain .....	58,212
Sri Lanka .....	204
St Kitts and Nevis .....	851
St Lucia .....	851
St Vincent + Gren .....	638
Sweden .....	33,932
Switzerland .....	37,159
Taiwan .....	360,891
Thailand .....	218,564
Tonga .....	15
Trinidad—Tobago .....	1,189
Tunisia .....	18,480
Turkey .....	2,194,101
Uganda .....	7
United Arab Emirates .....	266,663
United Kingdom .....	586,375
Uruguay .....	1,773
Venezuela .....	18,956
Zambia .....	128
Zimbabwe .....	216
Classified totals <sup>2</sup> .....	370,160
<b>Subtotal .....</b>	<b>12,811,979</b>
<b>Construction Sales—Part II</b>	
Antigua and Barbuda .....	267
Bolivia—Intl Narc .....	3,207
Cape Verde .....	121
Colombia—Intl Narc .....	93
Ecuador—Intl Narc .....	97
Egypt .....	939
El Salvador .....	2,734
Germany .....	32,763
Ghana .....	583
Honduras .....	97
Israel .....	152
Niger .....	153
Seychelles .....	39
Uganda .....	228
United Kingdom .....	11,904
<b>Subtotal .....</b>	<b>53,378</b>
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>12,865,357</b>

<sup>1</sup>Totals may not add due to rounding.  
<sup>2</sup>See the classified annex to the CPD.

MAKING IN ORDER IMMEDIATE CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FOR THE 104TH CONGRESS

SPEECH OF

**HON. PATSY T. MINK**

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 4, 1995*

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rules change which would require a 60-percent majority to pass an income tax increase.

For over 200 years parliamentary rules of the House have conformed to the principles established under the Constitution of the United States which provide for rule by the majority.

Majority has always meant one more than 50 percent of the House.

The Constitution originally recognized only five instances wherein a two-thirds vote was required: To impeach, override a veto, pass constitutional amendments, ratify treaties, and expel Members of the House. In no case was it contemplated that a 60-percent vote be required to pass legislation. Ordinary law-making has always required only a simple majority vote.

The Senate rule with regard to getting 60 votes to stop a filibuster is purely procedural. It is not a requirement to pass a bill. It is a requirement only to take it up. The House allows bills to come up under suspension of the rules with a two-thirds vote, but provides that failing that it may come up in regular order with a rule.

The rules that govern the operation of the House cannot supercede the U.S. Constitution. The House cannot by a majority vote alter the force and effect of the U.S. Constitution and how it has been interpreted for the past 200 years. To change that requires a constitutional amendment.

The new majority of the House that has well pleaded its case of fairness, should follow its own advice.

Of course with the Republicans in charge of the agenda in the House, it is not likely that an income tax increase will come to the floor for a vote. That being the case there will not likely be a test of this supermajority rule under their tenure. And of course since this is only a Rule of the House of Representatives, when the Democrats return as the majority party this rule can be expunged.

It is highly irregular to allow a fundamental change in how a bill becomes law to be effected by a change in the rules of the House. This circumvents history, tradition, and parliamentary precedents, all of which form the basis of the provisions in the Constitution of the United States which set out when and only when a supermajority would be required. That is the only logical interpretation and explanation as to why the Constitution bothered to set down the instances when such super majorities would be in order. If it was intended that the Congress could alter these at will each time the Congress convened a new term then it would certainly not have taken the time to make this explicit in five cases.

Quite the contrary, the writers of the Constitution knew the mischief that supermajority votes, the so-called minority rights protections,

could do to the governing of our country. To assuage the small States they deliberately created the Senate with the guarantee of two votes no matter the size or lack of population. But in the House majority rule concepts had to be safeguarded as fundamental to the true definition of the "peoples' House." To abrogate the rule of simple majority and create a super minority in the House as well would greatly alter the balance of power and dilute the voting power of each Member.

The Constitution is the fountain and spirit of our democracy. Its foundation should not be uprooted by procedural rules changes designed for political gamesmanship where it is clear that under no circumstances with this majority will there be any likelihood that an income tax increase bill will be reported to the floor.

I urge this House to uphold the Constitution and vote down this blatantly political maneuver intended to depict all who stood up for the Constitution to be those who would vote for an income tax increase.

It is tyranny when the majority sacrifices the principles of the Constitution to make a political point.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION SHOULD STUDY ACCIDENTS CAUSED BY TRUCK DRIVERS FALLING ASLEEP AT THE WHEEL

**HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, January 9, 1995*

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to direct the U.S. Secretary of Transportation to conduct a 1-year study of accidents related to drivers of commercial vehicles who fall asleep at the wheel. The Secretary would have to make recommendations to the Congress on how to reduce the number of accidents related to this problem. I had attached this provision to legislation approved last year by the House to designate the National Highway System. Unfortunately, an agreement could not be reached between the House and the other body on an NHS bill, and no final action was taken in the last Congress.

According to the U.S. Department of Transportation, in 1992 there were 33,965 accidents involving truck drivers. Of these, 601 accidents were traced directly to truck drivers falling asleep at the wheel—resulting in 45 fatalities. However, in many accidents in which the driver is killed it is difficult to determine for sure whether or not the driver fell asleep. As a result, the real number of truck accidents related to drivers falling asleep at the wheel is more than likely much higher.

The National Transportation Safety Board has estimated that when a heavy rig truck driver crashes and dies, an average of 4.2 innocent victims are killed. An ongoing survey of truck drivers in Ohio being conducted by the National Center for Sleep Disorders in Massillon, OH, has revealed that only 6 percent admit to having an accident related to sleepiness, but 54 percent of truck drivers surveyed know of a fellow truck driver who has died in an accident related to fatigue or sleepiness.