

Mr. WISE. Madam Speaker, as the Congress adjourns and shortly Sandy and I will get in the car with our two children and begin heading home to the western side of West Virginia, about a 7-hour drive away, we are going to ask ourselves once again: Why is it that we have to drive north to drive so far south? Or why is it that we can take the alternate route and drive so far south and then west and then we get to go north again? Why is there not a direct route, a direct route called Corridor H, a route that has been torn by controversy for many, many years but a highway that should be built.

This is going to begin a series of statements on why Corridor H should be built. Today I am going to entitle this, "Why Corridor H is a National Highway."

It is not, as some say, a narrow West Virginia road or a State interest. It is not just of local concern, nor is it a pork-barrel project. Corridor H is a vital project that has been on the books for 25 years.

Let's take a look at the map, Madam Speaker. Here we are roughly in Washington, DC. I-66 goes out toward the Virginia line and intersects with Interstate 81. The logical thing, if you were going to continue going to the west, would be to go straight, would it not? That is what Corridor H does. But instead our traffic, economic, and tourist and all other traffic, is required to go to the north to 68 or down to the south to 64 and keep going down.

Were Corridor H to be completed, and indeed 40 miles of Corridor H, 4-lane Corridor H is already completed from I-79, 40 miles to Weston, to Buckhannon, to Elkins, West Virginia. But were Corridor H, the 100 and some miles left, to be completed, what you would have is an extension of Interstate 66, a major east-west corridor that goes to I-79 and then permits you to continue going to the west, either down Interstate 79 or up and over on Route 50, another 4-lane road.

What you would have is a straight east-west corridor running all the way from the Washington metropolitan area to Ohio, Kentucky and points west.

This is truly a national highway. Indeed, it would also connect, Madam Speaker, with the inland port at Front Royal, an increasingly commercial development that is showing more success in getting goods to the port at Norfolk. But the problem is that if you are trying to bring anything from the west to the east, you are confronted by extremely mountainous and difficult terrain. Corridor H would end that. It is a major economic development corridor as well as a national highway, a highway truly of national significance.

I think it should also be pointed out that some argue that it is too expensive or environmentally damaging. What they fail to acknowledge is that the four routes that were considered, two running to the south, one running to the north and now the route that

has been adopted this way, that those routes were considered and rejected. Indeed, the least expensive route and the one that causes the least environmental disruption is the one that has been adopted.

The two southern routes threaten great environmental problems and were the most expensive to construct. So out of consideration and to meet the concerns of many who raised these objections, the fourth route, the one that is presently proposed, is the one that was adopted.

Madam Speaker, I would urge this Congress to get on about the business of constructing Corridor H and to look at I-66 as it ends at Interstate 81 and to recognize the important national significance of this road. It does not get any cheaper to build a road. The least expensive route has been selected and indeed to provide a major east-west corridor, Corridor H is the answer.

Yes, Sandy and I are going to spend 6 to 7 hours driving and we could spend far less were Corridor H constructed. It should not be constructed for our driving ease. What it ought to be constructed for is the economic growth of this entire region, not only West Virginia but parts of Virginia, Ohio, and Kentucky as well.

Madam Speaker, I will be revisiting the issue of Corridor H a good deal more in the future.

MORE FREEDOM, INDEPENDENCE, AND BANG FOR THE BUCK

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Madam Speaker, I probably will not take the full 5 minutes. As we adjourn today and Members begin to return to their districts to celebrate the Fourth of July, I think we should remember what we are really celebrating is Independence Day.

There were two events, two news items this week coming out of Washington that I think deserve some attention and may seem in some respects disparate but I think they are related. Like the fireworks displays that we are going to see in communities all across America next Tuesday, we should be talking about independence, we should be talking about freedom, but more importantly I think as it relates to government programs, we ought to be looking for ways that we can get the most bang for our buck.

□ 1430

And so I would like to talk about a couple of news items. First of all, we have an expression back in the Midwest, "When pigs fly," which is another way of saying that that is never going to happen. And I think if you would have asked people several years ago, Do you think the Congress will really get serious about balancing the budget? I think a lot of people would have said, "When pigs fly."

This week the House and Senate conferees came together and we now have a budget blueprint which will, in fact, balance the Federal budget.

Second, I want to talk about something and congratulate Marion Barry, who many times we found reasons to disagree with, and the DC school superintendent, Franklin Smith. There is an article in today's Wall Street Journal where they have agreed to support a local voucher plan for the local schools and privatize up to 11 of the most troubled schools.

I think that is terrific news. I think that is terrific news for the students in Washington, DC. I think it is about independence, I think it is about freedom, and I think it is about getting more bang for the buck.

And so when we talk about the budget, some people are saying we should take 10 years instead of 7 years to balance the budget. When I talk to my constituents, they think we ought to balance it in 3 or 4 years, rather than 7 years. There is criticism no matter what you do.

Frankly, as it relates to the Washington, DC, public schools, I would like to see them open the system up even more so that parents could choose from private, religiously affiliated schools as well, but they are taking the most important first steps, as we are with the budget.

And so, Madam Speaker, when we see pigs beginning to fly, I do not think we should criticize them for not staying up too long or taking too long to get the job done. These are important news items. It is all about more freedom, more independence, and getting more bang for our buck.

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

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

AMERICANS WANT FASTER FDA DRUG APPROVALS

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

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, life-saving new drugs do take too long to reach the people who need them. From my district in Montgomery County, PA, I have heard many a compelling story from constituents with cancer, A.L.S., Lou Gehrig's disease, epilepsy, or AIDS, who speak of the difficulties in obtaining these life-saving, life-extending drugs. They need them because the approval process in our country is so prolonged and, in effect, they have to turn to other countries where the products are available.

Is it not ironic that most of the life-saving drugs that are produced in the