EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN MEMORY OF LUCIAN C. CRUTCHFIELD AND WILLIAM F. BROOKS

HON. MICHAEL R. McNULTY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1995

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, on March 5, 1995, in a small town in northern Italy two United States B–25 Airmen, 2d Lt. Lucian C. Crutchfield of San Antonio, TX and Flight Officer William F. Brooks of Cohoes, NY, both killed during World War II, will be recognized at a ceremony in which a granite memorial will be dedicated in their honor. Mr. Larry Pisoni, now a U.S. citizen, and coordinator of the event entitled ''Thank You America,'' explains his realization of a lifelong dream in the attached article which appeared in the Capital, an Annapolis, MD, newspaper, on February 7, 1995.

[From the Capital, Feb. 7, 1995]

ANNAPOLIS MAN PLANS RETURN TO ITALY TO DEDICATE MONUMENT FOR U.S. FLIERS

(By Michael Cody)

In the 50 years since Nazi soldiers executed two U.S. airmen near his hometown in Italy, Lorenzo Pisoni has taken America's heroes as his own.

Next month, 12 miles from Vezzano and thousands of miles from his new home in Annapolis, Mr. Pisoni 57, will dedicate a monument to 2nd Lt. Lucian C. Crutchfield of San Antonio, Texas, and Flight Officer William F. Brooks of Cohoes, N.Y.

They were among a crew of seven aboard a B–25 bomber that was shot down on Feb. 27, 1945, while trying to cripple a railroad through the Adige River valley.

Mr. Pisoni was 7 then, and was called ''Enzo'' by family and friends. He was having lunch in a second-story room when he saw each member of the crew bail out, and each parachute open.

Many years later, while examining U.S. documents, Mr. Pisoni confirmed that the plane went down at 11:57 a.m., just as he was eating his meal. From 1943, when Allied bombing began in earnest, until the end of the war, he never saw another plane destroyed.

Some of the B–25 crew members were taken prisoner by Nazi soldiers. Others escaped capture with help from brave, anti-Nazi partisans.

''It was risky. The German law compelled them to turn them in right away. If they didn't, they could have killed them—they had to keep the people in terror,'' Mr. Pisoni said.

The feared SS took 2nd Lt. Crutchfield, the co-pilot, and Flight Officer Brooks into custody.

The next day, Enzo went to his little town's square. He doesn't remember why. Possibly it was the rumor of American prisoners that drew him.

He saw the prisoners, led by two Nazis—one tall, and one small.

The Americans looked healthy and honest, not at all the monsters described in Nazi propaganda.

The group walked out of town, south ward toward Arco, a much larger city. Along the mountain trail in the Italian Alps, partisans said, 2nd Lt. Crutchfield slipped. Flight Officer Brooks stooped to help him.

Both were shot and killed. The SS reported they were trying to escape.

''They just mowed them down,'' said Charles Reagin, of Cory, Ind., the plane's radio operator, who was captured separately and spent the rest of the war in a prison camp.

The news traveled quickly, even among a populace hardened to conflict.

''My life was greatly influenced by this episode,'' Mr. Pisoni said. ''They (the SS) said they wanted to escape, but no one believed that.''

And long after the war, when he had graduated from an Ohio college and had become a U.S. citizen, Lorenzo ''Larry'' Pisoni drove past the spot in Italy and thought of the men who died for another country as well as their own.

''It's time to say thank you,'' he said, describing a March 5 ceremony he helped plan. The airmen's survivors and 12,500 Italian families are invited.

The regional administration of Trentino-Alto Adige has lent its support to the event, and a local stonecutter has donated granite for the monument.

''At this spot, on Feb. 28, 1945, two American airmen were shot by Nazis,'' its tablet will say, in two languages. They were two of more than 38,000 Americans who gave their lives on Italian soil during World War II to help Europeans of good will regain freedom and democracy.''

An Alpine bank is practicing American songs in honor of 2nd Lt. Crutchfield.

Mr. Pisoni, who splits his time between Annapolis and Vezzano, said he expects all five surviving crew members to attend, including Mr. Reagin, pilot Jay DeBoer of Virginia Beach, Va., and navigator Robert Cravey of Thomaston, Ga.

Mr. DeBoer escaped from the Germans crossing the Swiss border disguised as a monk, while Mr. Cravey was hidden by an Italian family.

''It's going to be an emotional thing,'' said Mr. Reagin, a retired Air Force master sergeant. ''Not only going back with the guys, but going to that spot.''

Mr. Pisoni, owner of Gourmet Italia, a pasta-importing firm, said he didn't start the monument effort to reconstruct what happened. ''I like to consider this a symbol of what the United States has done for Europe. The U.S. is the only country in the world that has helped its former enemies.''

IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 227—THE INTERSTATE WASTE ACT OF 1995

HON. HAROLD ROGERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1995

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, the American people said loudly and clearly that they want Washington bureaucrats out of their hair. This is especially true in the hardworking, patriotic areas of eastern Kentucky. Well, I agree with these citizens, and that is why I rise today in strong support of H.R. 227, the Interstate Waste Act of 1995, and urge its immediate passage by the House.

I firmly believe that local citizens ought to have the right to make decisions regarding their lives. As we return power to our communities, we should start with the regulation of out-of-State trash. Simply stated, local citizens should have the final say whether their town becomes a national garbage dump—not the Supreme Court or Washington know-it-alls.

H.R. 227 is the way to accomplish this goal. It says that, and I'm quoting from the bill.

[E]ffective January 1, 1996, a landfill or incinerator in a State may not receive for disposal or incineration any out-of-State municipal solid waste unless the owner or operator of such landfill or incinerator obtains explicit authorization from the affected local government to receive the waste.

What a concept. Local people making local decisions. In Kentucky, we call this horse sense. Washington could sure use a strong dose of that, Mr. Speaker.

But seriously, this is a fundamental right of our local communities, and they have waited far too long for us to give them that right. We were close last year—the House passed the bill unanimously in the 11th hour of the session. But unfortunately, the session ended before the Senate could take action.

But we are moving again this year. I have spoken to my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OXLEY], who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade and Hazardous Materials which has jurisdiction over this bill. He has assured me that this legislation will get a fair hearing in the subcommittee and he is confident that we can bring it before the full House for floor consideration.

Mr. Speaker, this is a critical issue that we must deal with and I am committed to seeing that H.R. 227 is acted on this year.

We need jobs, clean water, and good roads in Kentucky—not tons of trash from Florida.

PREVENTION OF PROGRESSION TO END-STAGE RENAL DISEASE

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1995

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address this issue of kidney disease and its progression to end-stage renal disease [ESRD]. The Social Security Act section 1881 has established the ESRD Program as part of Medicare in order to provide treatment for patients with renal failure. Currently there are about 200,000 beneficiaries of the ESRD Program. The average ESRD patient is now costing the health care system—primarily Medicare—an estimated $51,000 per year, or $4,250 per month. The number of patients entering the ESRD Program is increasing, and these patients are sicker than in the past. Obviously, delaying the onset of kidney failure could greatly improve a patient's quality of life and

simultaneously save Medicare substantial amounts of money.

An ESRD patient can choose either transplantation or dialysis. Without these measures, kidney failure is lethal. Dialysis, a mechanical cleansing of the blood, is disruptive to an individual's lifestyle and negatively impacts on one's quality of life. The work force is diminished daily as patients learn that they must begin dialysis treatment. In fact a recent study found that only 11 percent of the interviewed patients were employed. If we focused our energies on delaying the day which a patient must accept the burden of dialysis, we could realize a cost savings and improve the patient's quality of life.

As a result of the evidence before us, I am today introducing legislation to require the Medicare agency to conduct a 3-year demonstration program to quantify the cost and benefits associated with identifying patients who are approaching renal failure, providing a range of services to them, and thus effectively delaying the onset of complete renal failure. The demonstration will attempt to determine whether the savings from a prevention program, including improvement in quality of life measurements and job retention, exceed the cost of the preventive services themselves.

The prevention of progression to renal failure should be the primary focus when constructing treatment goals for patients with renal disease. While all the preventive measures that will consistently produce an increase in survival are as yet undetermined, there is a wealth of evidence that many patients can be effectively managed so as to delay the day that dialysis is needed to survive. I feel that the medical community knows enough about such preventive strategies and the patient populations that would most benefit from them to explore the idea of extending the Medicare ESRD benefit package to these patients prior to dialysis.

A recent NIH consensus panel concluded that because comorbid factors affecting the outcome of renal disease are present prior to the onset of renal failure, patients should referred to a renal team for evaluation before dialysis begins. This team should consist of a physician, nurse, social worker, dietitian, and mental health professional and focus on the reduction in mortality and morbidity of the patient. There should be an interest in controlling hypertension and diabetes, reducing cardiovascular risk factors, correcting metabolic, endocrinologic, and hematologic abnormalities, treating underlying illnesses, evaluating and modifying psychological and social stressors, and setting nutritional parameters.

More specific guidelines for the prevention of progression to renal failure that can be undertaken encompass the following: First, encouraging smoking cessation, reducing obesity, increasing aerobic exercise, reducing the intake of fat and cholesterol, correcting anemia, monitoring calcium and phosphorous; second, implementing the most recent American Diabetic Association guidelines for strict management of diabetes; third, reducing exposure to environmental toxins including analgesic abuse, lead poisoning, and other nephrotoxins; fourth, managing hypertension through prescription of angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitors and calcium channel blockers preferentially; fifth, regulating diet to maintain normal acid-base balance and intravascular fluid volume; and sixth, evaluating and correcting malnutrition.

Diabetes is the No. 1 cause of renal failure in the United States. Approximately 25–35 percent of new ESRD patients have diabetes as the underlying etiology. Greater than 65 percent of all ESRD is due to diabetes and hypertension combined. The intensive management of both hypertension and diabetes has the benefit of reducing the time to the onset of dialysis. Although the progression to ESRD is rare in people with hypertension, there is the paradox of its continuing increase despite improvements in blood pressure control in the general population and reduction in mortality from other complications associated with hypertension. Cardiovascular mortality accounts for approximately 50 percent of deaths in patients receiving dialysis, highlighting the need for control of risk factors such as hypertension, smoking, anemia, obesity, and lipid abnormalities.

Furthermore, the racial differences manifested in the increased risk of hypertension-related ESRD for blacks, and the excess risk of ESRD for low income, poorly educated blacks and whites must stimulate new evaluation of these problems. The correlation between lower socioeconomic status and ESRD has been examined, with several inter-related factors possibly playing a role, including: lack of appropriate access to health care, lack of a primary care physician, lack of insurance, and non-compliance with a treatment regimen. Further examination of the relationship between hypertension, renal disease, and the interrelated factors must be undertaken in order to develop and implement viable treatment regimens that will have lasting effects.

The patients in the ESRD Program have not only suffered through the tremendous burden of kidney failure, but their quality of life is further worsened by factors that can be corrected. The medical community needs to identify patients with renal disease prior to the onset of renal failure in order to reduce the burden of dialysis, thereby allowing these patients to remain viable members of the work force. The benefits of weight loss, regulation of fat intake, and reduction of stress have all become commonplace in the layperson's repertoire of medical knowledge. Strict control of diabetes, hypertension, diet, and psychological stressors can also have a real benefit for patients with kidney disease in reducing the onset of renal failure, subsequently improving the quality of life, and ultimately retrieving some patients from the brink of dialysis.

RISK ASSESSMENT/COST BENEFIT ANALYSIS

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1995

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, Republicans continue to move forward with their agenda for a smaller, less costly, less intrusive government. Last week House Republicans took the first step in rolling back the regulatory tide. Passage of the Regulatory Transition Act gives the American taxpayers a time out from the crushing regulatory load. Now we must work for long term regulatory reform.

The regulatory reform provision within our contract with America introduces commonsense approaches that will assist Federal agencies in prioritizing regulatory decisions-ensuring that limited public resources are targeted to the greatest needs our Republican proposal favors cost effective regulation to address real risks.

All regulatory agencies must use risk assessment, sound science, and cost-benefit analysis for all regulations. Federal agencies must check to see if the regulation makes sense before taxpayers bear the costly burden, each year Government regulations cost approximately $600 billion.

The Republican commonsense approach to regulatory reform works for a smaller, less costly, and less intrusive Government risk assessment and cost benefit analysis will force the Federal Government to be accountable for their actions. The American people deserve to know that their tax dollars will be used wisely to serve their needs, not the needs of the Federal Government.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT WAGNER

HON. CARLOS J. MOORHEAD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1995

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute Mr. Robert Wagner, an outstanding resident of my congressional district. I have been privileged to become acquainted with Mr. Wagner over the years through his many community activities and through his strong interest in public policy.

A veteran of World War II, Mr. Wagner served honorably from 1940 until 1945. After graduating from Georgetown University's School of Foreign Service in 1948, he launched a successful business career in south Pasadena. Mr. Wagner's loyalty to his alma mater continued, however, and he was honored by Georgetown for his many consistent years of alumni service.

Mr. Wagner has demonstrated tireless service on behalf of senior citizens and is, in fact, my appointee to the 1995 White House Conference on Aging. He has been a senior senator in the California Senior Legislature since 1988. This work earned him a Distinguished Public Service Proclamation from the mayor of South Pasadena. Mr. Wagner is retiring from the Senior Legislature this year where I am sure he will be missed.

In addition, he has somehow found time to contribute his energies to various civic and humanitarian organizations in and around South Pasadena. These efforts have not gone without notice. Mr. Wagner has been the recipient of the YMCA Service to Youth, award, the Rotary Club Merit Award, a Certificate of Appreciation from the University of Southern California, and the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors Award for distinguished public service.

Robert Wagner offers proof that one dedicated citizen can make a positive impact on the community in which he or she lives. I am glad to take a moment to publicly recognize his many years of volunteer service and devotion to those around him. We certainly wish Robert, his wife Bernice, and their three children the best.

THE SEMICONDUCTOR INVESTMENT ACT OF 1995

HON. NANCY L. JOHNSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1995

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to join my Ways and Means Committee colleagues, Representatives ROBERT MATSUI, PHIL CRANE, and BARBARA KENNELLY, as well as Congresswoman ANNA ESHOO, in introducing the Semiconductor Investment Act of 1995. This legislation will enhance the international competitiveness of the U.S. semiconductor industry by changing the statutory life of semiconductor manufacturing equipment to more accurately reflect the industry's rapid pace of technological change. This change in the tax depreciable life of semiconductor manufacturing equipment from 5 years to 3 years will enable U.S. semiconductor manufacturers to recover capital costs incurred in maintaining state-of-the-art facilities over a period that more closely approximates economic life.

Semiconductors are at the core of all aspects of the information highway. They drive technological advances in computers, telecommunications and consumer electronics, and change our society in ways ranging from telecommuting to electronic banking to promoting citizen access to legislation through the Internet. Semiconductors are at the heart of the $500 billion U.S. electronics industry that employs more than 2 million Americans. The U.S. semiconductor industry alone provides over 200,000 high-skilled American jobs and has recently regained its position as the world's leading producer of chips. It is a highly capital intensive industry that demands continuing changes to manufacturing infrastructure.

This dynamic industry is based on ever-evolving technology. The rapid pace of technological change makes semiconductor manufacturing equipment obsolete, technologically and economically, soon after being placed into service. Recent economic studies and normal business practices indicate that such equipment should qualify for a 3-year depreciable life under tax depreciation rules because two-thirds of the equipment's economic usefulness is exhausted in the first 2 years and the equipment's full economic life is less than 4 years. However, current U.S. tax rules depreciate semiconductor manufacturing equipment over 5 years, a period significantly longer than the equipment's true economic life. As a result, the U.S. semiconductor industry is at a competitive disadvantage with foreign firms whose cost recovery rules more accurately reflect economic reality.

Japanese semiconductor producers, for example, may depreciate up to 88 percent of their manufacturing equipment in the first year. U.S. producers, on the other hand, may depreciate only 20 percent in the first year. Thus, existing U.S. cost recovery rules are a key factor in determining whether firms build new plants in the United States or overseas. In view of the fact that the global semiconductor industry is expected to invest $120 billion in capital expenditures during the remainder of this decade, we need more accurate cost recovery rules to ensure that much of that investment is made here—not overseas.

To compete in today's global market, our domestic manufacturers must be able to recover the cost of their capital investments in a timely manner. Reducing the depreciable life of semiconductor manufacturing equipment to 3 years will enable U.S. semiconductor manufacturers to invest the capital needed to keep pace with rapid technological changes and strengthen their international competitiveness.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that, as the Committee on Ways and Means reviews the operation of the existing cost recovery rules in the context of the Contract With America, we may have the opportunity to update this narrow, but economically significant, aspect of our cost recovery rules. I urge my colleagues to join us as sponsors of this initiative to keep the United States the home of cutting-edge semiconductor technology.

REGULATORY TRANSITION ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 450), to ensure economy and efficiency of Federal Government operations by establishing a moratorium on regulatory rulemaking actions, and for other purposes:

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman: I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 450, the Regulatory Transition Act. This is an ill-conceived bill with unknown and unintended consequences. For example, this bill could halt trade sanctions against China if passed in its current form.

Health and safety regulations are also at risk. Passage of this bill could result in another outbreak of the E. coli bacteria if food inspection regulations are not implemented.

In addition, testing standards for urban water supplies would also be endangered, possibly resulting in another outbreak of cryptosporidium which contaminated the water supplies of Washington, DC and Milwaukee.

Mr. Chairman, regulations need to be reformed, not eliminated. This bill poses a serious threat to the health and safety of all Americans.

The enormously broad scope of H.R. 450 represents an assault on one of the basic functions of the Federal Government—protecting public safety and health.

In calling for a regulatory time-out on things like consumer, worker, and environmental protections, the Republican extremists are attempting to dismantle some of our Nation's most critical health and safety standards and protections.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

TRIBUTE TO DR. CHARLES W. JENSEN III

HON. CHRISTOPHER SHAYS

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1995

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to extend my condolences to the Jensen family of Riverside, CT, for the loss of their son and brother. Dr. Charles W. Jensen III, 34, a doctor of dental medicine in Greenwich, CT, who died suddenly last Monday morning at his office in Greenwich.

A resident of Stamford, he previously lived in Greenwich and Darien. He had been practicing dentistry for almost 8 years and had just taken over the practice from his father, who retired at the end of December.

Dr. Jensen was an avid sportsman whose special interest was sports fishing. His other interests were softball and golf, and he was a member of the Innis Arden Golf Club.

Born August 24, 1960, in Goldsboro, NC, he moved to Greenwich when he was a year old. He was a 1979 graduate of Greenwich High School, graduated magna cum laude from Fairleigh Dickinson University and was a 1987 graduate of the University of Connecticut Dental School. He was a member of the American Dental Association, the Connecticut State Dental Association, and the Greenwich Dental Society.

In addition to his father, he is survived by his mother, Rachel Vuono Jensen of Riverside; three brothers, James S. Jensen of Silver Spring, MD, Thomas F. Jensen of San Ramon, CA, and Daniel T. Jensen of Riverside; two sisters, Mary Beth Jensen of Park City, UT, and Kathleen Bellissimo of Los Altos, CA; and his girlfriend, Rachel Gregg, of New Canaan, CT.

Charlie will always be remembered as a genial, engaging person of rock solid integrity. The very mention of his name elicited a warm smile and a laugh from all those who knew him. Whether fishing off the shores of Nantucket, boating on Long Island Sound, or caring for his patients in the dental office, Charlie will always be remembered as a wonderful brother, trustworthy friend, and a dedicated professional.

John W. Moffly IV, a long-time friend of the Jensen family, recently stated, ''I so much admired Charlie, not only as a professional, but as a person * * * he took such great interest in his patients that I never had a single doubt that whatever the problem, he would find the right solution * * * certain doctors rise above the norm and earn special recognition for their talent, dedication and humanity. This was Charlie.''

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Charles W. Jensen III will be very, very missed.

TRIBUTE TO LES T. DAVIS

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1995

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to bring to my colleagues' attention the work of a true pioneer in the field of

supercomputing on the occasion of his retirement. Lester ''Les'' T. Davis, chief operating officer and one of the cofounders of Cray Research, Inc. in Chippewa Falls, WI, recently announced he would retire after 22 years with the company.

Cray Research began in Chippewa Falls in 1972 as a small start-up company with a handful of employees. Les Davis took financial risks, made personal sacrifices, and worked extraordinarily long and hard to create the first broadly used supercomputer. That in turn created a new industry, and with it the company that became synonymous with supercomputing. Cray now has 5,000 employees worldwide.

Mr. Davis has served as the heart and soul of Cray Research, exhibiting both technological and managerial leadership. In addition to his role as the technical and design leader of the company, he has also been Cray Research's No. 1 salesperson, winning and retaining many global customers over the years with his thorough knowledge of Cray architecture, software, and applications.

Mr. Davis has made a significant contribution to the people of Chippewa Falls by helping to increase the economic development in that area for over two decades. He also has made an exceptional contribution to our Nation in advancing America's leadership in the critical field of supercomputing.

I want to thank Mr. Davis for his vision and the spirit he instilled in our Nation's scientific community. We all wish him the best in whatever his future holds.

A TRIBUTE TO JAMES F. BOATRIGHT

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1995

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a distinguished public servant, Mr. James F. Boatright, as he retires on March 3 from his position in the Department of the Air Force. Mr. Boatright's Federal career spans 39 years of service. He served as a commissioned officer in the Army and then entered the Federal civil service where he has served in the Bureau of Reclamation, the Army Corps of Engineers, the Army Research and Development Laboratory, and with the Air Force. Since 1979 he has served with great distinction as the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Installations. It is in this capacity that we in the Congress has become acquainted with and appreciative of the many talents of Jim Boatright.

During the buildup of our military forces throughout the early 1980's, Jim Boatright spearheaded the efforts of the Department of the Air Force to modernize its facilities championing quality of life in both the workplace and the living environment long before it became the catchword of the Department of Defense. His efforts succeeded in providing benefits to all members of the Air Force, active, reserve and civilian, as well as to their dependents who accompanied them to Air Force installations worldwide. Those installations have come to be regarded as a source of pride throughout the Department of the Air Force and have served to set the standard of excellence for which others strive.

With the onset of downsizing of our military forces, Jim Boatright became the focal point for the Air Force in its planning to downsize its infrastructure. Throughout the first three rounds of base closure Jim Boatright has directed the Air Force efforts to reduce and he did so with the same dedication and professionalism which has been characteristic of his career.

The quality of his performance has been recognized by numerous awards, including the Presidential Meritorious Executive Rank Award, the Presidential Distinguished Executive Rank Award and the Department of Defense Distinguished Civilian Service Award. He is the only two-time awardee of this latter prestigious award. Clearly these awards bespeak the respect of those for whom and with whom he has worked in the Department of Defense. In his relations with the Congress, particularly the Armed Services Committees and the Defense subcommittees of the Appropriations Committees, he was respected above all else for the integrity with which he dealt with us.

Mr. Speaker, I salute Jim Boatright for his many achievements throughout his distinguished career and I wish him good health and godspeed as he and his wife Gloria begin their most well earned retirement.

REGULATORY TRANSITION ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 450), to ensure economy and efficiency of Federal Government operations by establishing a moratorium on regulatory rulemaking actions, and for other purposes:

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the bipartisan Condit-Combest amendment to H.R. 450, the Regulatory Transition Act. This amendment seeks to extend the regulatory moratorium on rule making to include further listings of endangered species and the designation of critical habitat under the Endangered Species Act [ESA].

Congress is preparing to reauthorize and reconstruct the Endangered Species Act. Until this is done, or until the end of the 104th Congress, the Interior Department should not be permitted to continue to acquire land for habitat designation. The Condit-Combest amendment ensures that this kind of activity is stalled until Congress has time to improve the Endangered Species Act.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has been charged and entrusted with the protection of America's unique animal species, but this must be balanced with the rights of private land owners, especially ancestral land owners. As Congress and the Committee on Resources reauthorizes the Endangered Species Act, I will fight to bring diligent science and responsible Federal action back into the equation. Scrupulous science should be the hallmark of critical habitat designation, not impetuous land grabbing.

On October 1, 1993, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service acquired title to 370 acres designated as excess by the U.S. Navy at Ritidian, Guam, for a wildlife refuge headquarters. This land grab came even after strong objections by my office and the Government of Guam to the U.S. Department of the Interior.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's rationale to establish a refuge for Guam's declining bird population is based on weird science. The refuge was established to protect several bird species that have ellegedly become endangered. However, these populations are declining because of the introduction of the nonindigenous brown tree snake, not the lack of suitable habitat. Habitat protection will only lead to the protection of the brown tree snake and the further decline of these species. This is one example of how good science and not arbitrary habitat protection could improve the Endangered Species Act. Alternatives to habitat protection should be considered by Congress as it reforms the ESA. Land grabs such as this one must not be allowed to continue in the name of habitat preservation.

In addition to grabbing 370 acres for a refuge headquarters, the Fish and Wildlife Service has imposed on Guam a 22,873 acre wildlife refuge to protect those endangered bird species. The Federal Government continues to believe that Uncle Sam knows what is best for the people of Guam. It does not. The people of Guam know what is best and insist in shaping their own destiny and that of the island.

Guam's answer to this problem is a comprehensive land conference process taking into account historical injustices as well as the need to protect our endangered bird species and the presence of the military. The Federal Government's answer is to arbitrarily dictate 25 acres per endangered bird with no regard to sound science. Guam wants to protect its endangered species, but what we are left asking ourselves this question: What is the Federal allocation for an endangered people?

While it appears that the Federal Government has lost any sense of coherent policy toward Guam, Guam will not continue to allow bureaucracies to impose their will on our people. Whether that bureaucracy is the Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Park Service, the Department of the Interior, or the U.S. military, we will stand against any abusive action. No longer will the people of Guam wait to see what regulation or other action the Federal Government will inflict on us next.

This type of bureaucratic insolence has caused even environmentalists like myself to be opposed to the actions of the Fish and Wildlife Service. These actions are out of control and I believe a moratorium is necessary for this agency to consider its actions with regard to regulations issued under the Endangered Species Act for habitat preservation. I support a review of ESA, of its successes and its failures. Decision making should be shifted closer to the people and away from Washington so that Federal action can be more responsive to our local communities.

REGULATORY TRANSITION ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 450), to ensure economy and efficiency of Federal Government operations by establishing a moratorium on regulatory rulemaking actions, and for other purposes:

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 450, the Regulatory Transition Act of 1995. We cannot and should not, in an attempt to reform regulations, shirk our responsibility to act in the best interest of the American people by totally curtailing essential regulations that protect the public. This flawed and hurried legislation will not only fail to truly reform the few regulations that need it but will endanger the American public by stripping away the services and protections Congress is obligated to provide.

The bill before us today, the Regulatory Transition Act of 1995, will not only attempt to undo many of the important accomplishments of the U.S. Congress, Federal agencies, and the President of the United States but also seeks to undermine many of our most important efforts to improve the quality of life for all Americans.

The stated purpose of the Regulatory Transition Act is to impose a moratorium on regulatory rulemaking actions by Federal agencies. The bill establishes a moratorium period beginning on November 9, 1994, and ending June 30, 1995. Except for a few special interest exceptions granted to friends of the new majority, any regulatory action taken during this period would be suspended until July 1, 1995.

While I agree that Congress should reform regulations where needed, this proposed measure goes well beyond this legitimate objective of balancing responsibilities. In fact, this bill is specifically designed to inhibit the will of the people by creating artificial obstacles to congressional support for programs the current majority has long sought to weaken, if not totally eliminate, including laws that protect the environment, strengthen crime control, and heighten worker and citizen safety.

H.R. 450 will have a devastating impact on the environment. As a Representative of the urban district of Cleveland, OH, I have witnessed the severity of the environmental problems this Nation and its inner cities now face. The quality of most urban air and water in this country is in dire need of immediate attention.

Mr. Speaker, without regulations concerning the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, and or others promulgated by the Environmental Protection Agency or OSHA—all measures that represent significant steps toward remedying the effects of environmental devastation and injustice—the American people and all future generations will be harmed forever.

I am certain that no one in this House would want to increase the risk of disease, dysfunction, and premature deaths caused by exposure to toxic emissions from cadmium, lead, mercury, or dioxin. But that is exactly what H.R. 450 would do. It would slam the door on an EPA rule that would reduce emissions from cadmium, lead, and mercury from municipal waste incinerators.

Of equal importance is the negative impact of H.R. 450 on the FDA rule designed to ensure that mammograms for breast cancer detection are properly administered and interpreted. The breast cancer incidence rate in women increased from 85 per 100,000 in 1980 to 112.3 in 1991. This trend calls for more intensive breast cancer screening that includes mammography, a procedure which clearly reduces death from the disease. FDA regulation would enhance our effort to alter the course of the breast cancer epidemic. But none of these regulations written for the good of the public may survive and Republicans plan to dismantle the general public's Federal protection against needless death.

This bill will also significantly compromise citizen and worker safety. Last year, over 10,000 American workers died in the workplace. Another 70,000 were permanently disabled, and more than 100,000 contracted fatal occupational illnesses. H.R. 450 will greatly inhibit our ability to protect the American population from unsafe products, dangerous working conditions, and avoidable disasters. I cannot in good conscience endanger American workers by supporting this bill.

In addition to endangering the health and lives of Americans, approval of H.R. 450 would result in additional Government waste. Surprisingly enough, the antilitigation Republicans have included in this legislation provisions that will lead to a proliferation of administrative lawsuits. H.R. 450 creates a new cause of action for those who claim that they have been adversely affected by Agency action. This law will lead to a myriad of lawsuits brought by anyone who does not like some regulation created by the Federal Government, wasting time, money, and limited Government resources.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is unprecedented in its scope. Few areas of Federal regulation will be unaffected by this measure, yet, with very little opportunity for open hearing, and with limited debate, this act has been placed before us. A measure of this kind requires detailed analysis of the impact it may have on the American people, but no such review has or will take place. In the current rush to force this bill to the floor of this House, the will of the American people will certainly be compromised.

Furthrmore, Mr. Speaker, this legislation will not only have a dramatic and disastrous impact on future regulation, it will also affect existing regulations. Important rules essential to efficient clarification, tailoring, and consolidation, by enhancing standards, or by enhancing the scope of the original regulation, will all be inhibited by this bill.

Important measures placed in jeopardy by this proposed legislation include virtually every aspect of governmental activity, from the protection of our citizens' civil rights to ensuring safe food and drink for our children. Any proposed regulation that is designed to protect workers and citizens from unnecessary injury, protect the environment, or promote equity, will be subject to exclusion under this bill.

Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that H.R. 450 and the circumstances under which it is presented in this House is an attempt to mislead the American people to believe that cookie-cutter, simplistic solutions will cure what ails this Nation. Nothing could be further from the truth. As our Nation faces an epidemic of pollution, discrimination, and poverty, the solution to these problems will not be found in quick fixes like H.R. 450. The American people elected us to act in their best interest, not compromise their welfare because Government refuses to have the courage to meet its obligations. I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

GOP WELFARE PLAN IGNORES WORK

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1995

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the so-called welfare reform legislation developed by Republicans fails to address the single most urgent need for ending the current welfare system: putting people to work.

The Republicans have walked away from their early commitment to work as a key component of welfare reform. In the Contract With America, half of the welfare caseload would have been required to work by 2003. And the contract promised nearly $10 billion to pay for the new work requirement programs; the pending Republican bill has no money, and no work programs to speak of. In fact, as the New Republic points out, the great model program in Michigan by Republican leaders would authorize activities like checking a book out of a library as constituting work activity.

The Democratic leadership of the House, together with the Clinton administration, has endorsed a much tougher policy that would require recipients to accept work and training, and would require States to provide welfare recipients with a plan for moving from dependence to self-sufficiency.

Only in such a way will we end not only welfare, but poverty, too. By contrast, the Republican legislation promises only to throw people off welfare, whether or not any effort has been made to prepare them for self-sufficiency. The Republican scheme will mean millions of former welfare recipients without jobs, without homes and without any way to provide for their children. It will mean even more homelessness and huge additional costs for local communities and property taxpayers who will have to support this army of the impoverished through local general assistance programs.

In short, the Republican plan is not to end poverty, but to throw people off welfare. That will solve neither their problems, nor ours. We cannot allow the Republican plan to masquerade as welfare reform.

[From the New Republic, March 13, 1995]

WORKFARE WIMP-OUT

(By Mickey Kaus)

Call me naive, but I almost believed House Republicans when they pledged in their ''contract'' to reform welfare through ''a tough two-years-and-out provision with work requirements.'' Making welfare recipients work, after all, is wildly popular (if it weren't, it wouldn't be in the contract). Newt Gingrich's political action committee once even listed ''workforce'' as one of the ''Optimistic Positive Governing Words'' it recommended to fellow revolutionaries. I figured Gingrich himself had talked so much about the need for a ''mandatory requirement of work for everybody'' that he might

actually mean it, or at least would be too embarrassed to admit he didn't mean it. I underestimated him.

House Republicans unveiled their welfare reform plan on February 10. Most welfare-watchers expected the new bill to dilute somewhat the contract's work provisions. But few expected the abject abandonment of any credible attempt to require work. Yet that's more or less what Representative Clay Shaw, the lead Republican on welfare reform, announced. The new GOP bill, which has cleared Shaw's subcommittee, is not only weaker on the work issue than President Clinton's welfare proposal, it is in some respects weaker than the current welfare law Republicans deride.

It's certainly a long way from the Contract with America. The contract would have required work by those who had received welfare ''for at least twenty-four months.'' Work meant ''an average of not fewer than thirty-five hours per week.'' No funny business. By 2003, 50 percent of the welfare caseload (which currently consists of more than 5 million households) would be working.

The rationale behind these provisions was obvious: if potential welfare recipients (mainly young women) knew they were really going to have to work after two years, they might think twice before doing the things (mainly becoming single mothers) that put them on welfare in the first place. But Republican governors, it turns out, don't like work requirements much—in part because putting a welfare mother to work costs money (an extra $6,000, over and above the cost of benefits, to pay for supervisors and day care, according to the Congressional Budget Office).

Why raise state taxes to make welfare recipients perform community-service work—annoying public employee unions in the process—when you can do what Michigan's Republican Governor John Engler does: cycle recipients through inexpensive education and ''job search'' programs while claiming to be a great reformer? Engler's inflated reputation was recently punctured by journalist David Whitman (see ''Compleat Engler,'' TNR February 6). But that didn't stop him from leading the charge to gut the contract's work requirements when House Republicans decided, after the election, to negotiate with GOP governors over replacing the federal welfare program with a ''block grant'' to the states.

Engler's mission was successful. Look first at the numbers. The bill unveiled by Shaw requires that, in 1996, states place 2 percent of the welfare caseload ''in work activities.'' The requirement rises to 20 percent—not the contract's 50 percent—by 2003. In meeting this requirement, governors could count the 6 percent of recipients who already work at least part-time. Another 5 percent are already required to work by a 1988 reform law now in effect (which the Republican bill would repeal). That makes 11 percent already working. With a little creative bookkeeping—say, by counting all those who work, even for a few days, over the course of a year—most governors could meet the 20 percent ''work activity'' standard without doing anything they're not already doing.

But creative bookkeeping won't be necessary, because the Shaw bill lets the states decide what a ''work activity'' is. It needn't be actual work. Under the bill, a governor could declare, as Engler has, that checking a book out of a library counts as a ''work activity.'' Leafing through the want ads might also qualify, or circulating a résumé or attending a ''self-esteem'' class.

Republicans criticized President Clinton's ill-fated two-years-and-work plan because it only would have required approximately 500,000 recipients, or about 10 percent of the caseload, to be in a work program by 2003. But at least in Clinton's plan those 500,000 people would really have to be working. (An additional 900,000 or so would be in education and training programs.) The House Republicans say they will put ''at least 1 million cash welfare recipients in work programs by 2003,'' but the ''work'' could be completely phony. Workfake, you might call it.

It is all the more likely to be fake because the Shaw bill provides no money to make it real. The Contract with America, in a fit of honesty, earmarked $9.9 billion to pay for its work programs. The new bill contain no new funds. It does retain language that seems to requires states to make recipients work—sorry, ''engage in work activities''—after two years. But GOP aids admit this provision is ''mostly rhetoric'' not meant to be obeyed. There are no penalties for states that ignore it. (If it were obeyed, a lot more than 20 percent of the caseload would wind up ''working.'')

House Republicans don't even try very hard to pretend they haven't caved on the work issue. It was the price, they argue, of getting the governors to agree to a stingy ''block grant,'' and to accept the contract's cutoff of aid to young unwed mothers. Priorities! Bizarrely, the Newtoids sacrificed the popular parts of the contract (''make 'em work'') to save the unpopular parts (''cut 'em off''). It was too much even for some conservatives. Robert Rector, the Heritage Foundation's welfare expert, called the Shaw work provisions a ''major embarrassment,'' Jack Kemp issued a statement warning that Republicans were squandering welfare reform in the pursuit of a decentralized ''funding mechanism.''

Shaw now says he will try to shore up the work provisions—specifying what counts as a ''work activity,'' for example. But it may be difficult to convince the governors to endorse a major tightening—after all, the chief virtue of Shaw's bill, for them, was that it let them weasel out of the contract's work requirements.

It also may be too late. The premise of the GOP's new state-based welfare bill is that the nation's governors are reformist tigers who need only to be unlashed by the bureaucrats in Washington. But the governors have now shown their hand, and it's obvious to all that they have no appetite for radical reform especially reform based on work. Instead, they have with great effort turned the contract's ambitious plan into a bill that allows them to preserve the status quo. Even the controversial cutoff of young unwed mothers may be mainly an accounting trick. (States can simply pay the benefits out of their ''own'' funds.) The Republicans' welfare reform is looking less like a menace and more like a fraud.

SAVING LIVES—SETTING STANDARDS FOR DIALYSIS

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1995

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, there are approximately 200,000 Medicare beneficiaries in the Endstage Renal Disease [ESRD] Program, initially established by the Social Security Act § 1881. This debilitating disease costs approximately $10 billion per year translating to a cost of $51,000 per patient.[1] Dialysis treatment for the ESRD patient is in essence an artificial kidney, and while there have been multitudes of research papers and numerous conferences addressing the issue of standards for dialysis treatment, the development of these standards has been a slow process. There is presently a need for quality assessment and continuous quality improvement (QA & CQI) within dialysis facilities, reformation of reimbursement schedules, improved data collection, and the introduction of industry-wide treatment standards for the benefit of the patient as well as the providers.

In recent years, numerous studies have shown relatively unexplained and dramatic differences in survival rates between kidney dialysis facilities. While it is often explained that facilities with higher mortality rates also treat sicker patients, this only explains part of the story. Mortality rates between facilities range from 0 to 43 deaths per 100 dialysis years, which means that there are other causes of death attributable to the treatment centers that cannot be explained by how sick their patients are.[2] To be blunt, some facilities are allowing their patients to die prematurely and needlessly. I believe that there is now a relative consensus among kidney disease experts that if certain quality standards are met during the course of dialysis treatment, a patient has an improved chance of prolonged survival.

Mortality rates for dialysis patients remain consistently greater than 20 percent.[3,4] Similarly, renal failure has a significant impact on the life expectancies of its victims. According to a recent NIH Consensus Panel, at 49 years of age, the average life expectancy of a patient with ESRD is 7 years, compared with 30 years for an age-matched person without ESRD.[5]

The mortality rates for patients with ESRD are increased for men, whites, elderly, diabetics, and patients with impaired functional status and malnutrition.[2,3,6–8] Survival is further complicated by the changes within the ESRD patient population and the growing list of comorbidities that contribute to their worsened state of health. Although differences between patient subgroups can result in variable risk factors for death, it seems that dialysis treatment times consistently effect the mortality rates of renal failure patients.

Dialysis functions as an artificial kidney by removing waste products from the blood, and the standard for dialysis should be expressed in terms of the formula KT/V. This formula has been offered as the most effective measurement in determining the adequacy of hemodialysis treatment. Most authors agree that the KT/V must be at least 1.0 or greater to achieve an adequate dose of dialysis, and many have concluded that levels as high as 1.2–1.4 are necessary to reduce mortality.

Therefore, I am introducing a bill today to require the Secretary of HHS to deny payment to a facility after January 1, 1997, if a majority of its patients do not receive a dialysis treatment which sufficiently cleans the blood. Hemodialysis must be supplied to achieve a delivered KT/V of 1.2. This bill will also establish contingencies whereby dialysis facilities could calculate treatment effectiveness using the urea reduction ratio [URR] instead of the KT/V. In simple terms, the URR measures the percentage of waste products cleansed from the blood over the course of a single dialysis treatment. The standards would be set to achieve a delivered URR of ≥ 65 percent. Although the URR does not have the accuracy

Footnotes at end of article.

of the KT/V, it requires only simple mathematics without the need for computer software and can provide a useful verification of treatment effectiveness. It is understood that there are other factors affecting the outcome of patients on dialysis; however, dialysis has become quantifiable and, therefore, should be utilized to effectively realize treatment goals.

Putting this in layman's terms, it is possible to measure the amount of dialysis a patient will receive by knowing the duration of treatment, the amount of waste products in the blood, and the quantity of blood that the dialysis filter will clear of those waste products during treatment. In essence, the longer a patient remains on a dialysis machine, the more likely they are to achieve the 1.2 figure.

It is appalling to think that some facilities would cut the amount of time on the dialysis machine in order to save money. Quality dialysis facilities have shown us that they can make money and still provide adequate time on the machine. Furthermore, statistical studies have demonstrated that increased time translates into less death. I believe there is enough medical consensus on this point that it would be improper for Medicare to continue to pay for facilities that do not provide adequate levels of dialysis as measured by the KT/V value. That is what my bill seeks to do: Force those facilities which are not providing sufficient dialysis to improve their level of care in accordance with a set of industry-wide standards, and ultimately stop the premature death of their patients.

Many studies have shown the correlation between increased treatment time and decreased mortality rates. [7,9–14] However, it has been argued that the combination of falling real-dollar reimbursement rates and increases in the required bundle of services have caused not only a decline in the amount of dialysis being delivered but also a reduction in the ability of dialysis centers to provide adjunct resources such as dietary counseling, social work management, mental health information, and vocational rehabilitation. As Congress considers this legislation, it also needs to examine and address this whole range of issues impacting on the lives of dialysis patients.

Medical science is continually evolving, of course, and future information may provide us with a better measure of dialysis or show us that 1.2 is not the right number to strive for. Therefore, my bill authorizes the Secretary to adjust the KT/V value or substitute a different formula if a report is sent to Congress explaining the wisdom of such a change. My bill also addresses the issue of monitoring dialysis facilities in order to assess their compliance with the above standards.

Once the progression to chronic renal failure has occurred, the main goals of the medical community should be to maintain and improve, if possible, the quality of life of the end-stage renal disease patient. Treatment plans should focus on prescription and delivery of adequate dialysis, attention to the social and psychological factors that influence survival and functional outcome of hemodialysis patients, provision of dietary counseling and management, assessment and reduction of malnutrition, control of hypertension, strict management of diabetes, maintaining vascular access, and provision of vocational rehabilitation.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I urge the renal community to evaluate the need for reform within the dialysis industry to reduce the untimely deaths of so many patients with kidney failure.

REFERENCES

[1] VanValkenburgh D and Snyder S. Challenges and barriers to managing quality in an end-stage renal disease facility. ''American Journal of Kidney Diseases'' 1994;24(2):337–345.

[2] McClellan W and Soucie M. Facility mortality rates for new end-stage renal disease patients: Implications for quality improvement. ''American Journal of Kidney Diseases'' 1994;24(2):280–289.

[3] Levinsky N and Mesler D. Measuring, managing, and improving the quality of end-stage renal disease care. ''American Journal of Kidney Diseases'' 1994;24(2):235–246.

[4] Lowrie E. Chronic dialysis treatment: Clinical outcome and related process of care. ''American Journal of Kidney Diseases'' 1994;24(2):255–266.

[5] Consensus Development Conference Panel. Morbidity and mortality of renal dialysis: An NIH Consensus Conference statement. ''Annals of Internal Medicine'' 1994;121(1):62–70.

[6] Levin N. Adequacy of dialysis. ''American Journal of Kidney Diseases'' 1994;24(2):308–315.

[7] Lowrie EG and Lew NL. Death risk in hemodialysis patients: The predictive value of commonly measured variables and an evaluation of death rate differences between facilities. ''American Journal of Kidney Diseases'' 1990;15:458–482.

[8] Owen WF, et al. The urea reduction ratio and serum ablumin concentration as predictors of mortality in patients undergoing hemodialysis. ''NEJM'' 1993;329:1001–1006.

[9] Collins AJ, et al. Urea index and other predictors of hemodialysis patient survival. ''American Journal of Kidney Diseases'' 1994;23:272–282.

[10] Held PJ, Levin NW, Bovbjerg JD, Pauly MV, and Diamond LH. Mortality and duration of hemodialysis treatment. ''JAMA'' 1992;265(7):871–875.

[11] Hakim RM, et al. Adequacy of hemodialysis. ''American Journal of Kidney Diseases'' 1992;20:107–124.

[12] Blagg C. The US Renal Data System and the Case-mix Severity Study. ''American Journal of Kidney Diseases'' 1993;21(1):106–108.

[13] Hakim RM, Breyer J, Ismail N, Schulman G. Effects of dose of dialysis on morbidity and mortality. ''American Journal of Kidney Diseases'' 1994;23(5):661–669.

[14] Parker T, Husni L, Huang W. Survival of hemodialysis patients in the United States is improved with a greater quantity of dialysis. ''American Journal of Kidney Diseases'' 1994;23(5):670–680.

INTRODUCTION OF DERIVATIVES DEALERS ACT OF 1995

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1995

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Derivatives Dealers Act of 1995. This legislation is aimed at providing a framework for improved supervision and regulation of previously unregulated dealers and assuring appropriate protections for their customers.

Today's newspapers report on the disastrous consequences of derivatives losses by Barings PLC—one of Great Britain's oldest merchant banks. According to these reports, Baring's has lost at least $950 million due to unauthorized derivatives trading by a 27-year-old trader in its Singapore office. This sorry episode underscores the risks inherent in failing to assure that regulators have adequate tools on hand to minimize the potential for OTC derivatives to contribute to a major disruption in the financial markets, either through excessive speculation and overleveraging, or due to inadequate internal controls and risk management on the part of major derivatives dealers or end users. Despite the best efforts of the Bank of England to rescue Barings, apparently the scale of the losses is so great that as collapse could not be averted. As a consequence, both European and Asian financial markets are in turmoil today. The bill I am introducing today will help assure that no similar disaster befalls American derivatives dealers or our financial markets.

Derivatives are financial products whose value is dependent on—or derived from—the value of some underlying financial asset such as a stock, bond, foreign currency, commodity, or an index representing the value of such assets. Some derivatives have been around for many years, such as the exchange-traded futures and options used by investors and dealers seeking to hedge positions taken in the stock and bond markets, or to speculate on future market movements.

Within the last few years, however, such exchange-traded futures and options have been supplemented by a vast and dizzying array of over-the-counter [OTC] derivatives. These include forwards, swaps, options, swaptions, caps, floors, and collars that may be linked to the performance of the Japanese stock market, the dollar-deutschemark exchange rate, the S&P 500, or virtually any other asset. Today, the total outstanding value of the principal underlying such over-the-counter derivatives is estimated to be over $12 trillion.

The dynamic growth of the OTC derivatives market is the direct result of developments in computer and telecommunications technology and breakthroughs in modern portfolio management theory that have created a new world of cyber-finance that is reshaping U.S. and global financial markets. These new financial instruments are an important component of modern financial activity and provide useful risk management tools for corporations, financial institutions, and governments around the world seeking to respond to fluctuations in interest rates, foreign currency exchange rates, commodity prices, and movements in stock or other financial markets.

While OTC derivatives are frequently used to hedge foreign currency or interest rate risks or to lower borrowing costs, there has been a proliferation of increasingly exotic, customized financial contracts or instruments that enable dealers and end users to make speculative synthetic side bets on global financial markets. This development has raised concerns over the potential for OTC derivatives to increase, rather than reduce risk of financial loss or contribute to a future financial panic. In addition, the concentration of market-making functions in a small number of large banks and securities firms, the close financial interlinkages OTC derivatives have created between each of these firms, and the sheer complexity of the products being traded raise serious concerns about the potential for derivatives to contribute to serious disruptions in the fabric of our financial system. My bill will help assure that Federal regulators have the ability to effectively monitor the activities of certain heretofore unregulated derivatives dealers.

In addition, my bill will help assure that our financial regulatory structure includes appropriate customer protections in place in the form of full disclosure, accurate financial accounting, appropriate sales practices, and restrictions against fraudulent or manipulative activity.

While the Barings PLC disaster underscores the some of the risks and dangers associated with derivatives, the Subcommittee on Telecommunications and Finance, which I chaired in the last Congress, has been closely monitoring the financial derivatives market for the

last 3 years. In June 1992, I wrote to the General Accounting Office [GAO] to request a comprehensive study of the derivatives market. At that time, the subcommittee noted that the trading of new and complex derivative products by financial institutions and their customers had greatly increased in recent years, creating a corresponding need to assure that knowledge of how to manage and oversee the risks associated with these products was keeping pace.

The GAO derivatives study submitted on May 19, 1994, in response to the subcommittee's request, has identified some serious gaps in the current legal and regulatory structure relating to OTC derivatives.

The GAO made a number of important recommendations for reforms in the regulation of financial derivatives disclosure, financial accounting, and dealer regulation. Of particular concern to me was GAO's finding that serious gaps existed in the current legal and regulatory framework that allows derivatives dealers affiliated with securities firms or insurance companies to largely escape the type of regulations which are already in place for derivatives dealers affiliated with banks. GAO also identified potential gaps in antifraud and antimanipulation enforcement authority, and sales practice regulation. In response, the GAO recommended that this ''black hole'' be plugged by granting a Federal regulator, such as the Securities and Exchange Commission, appropriate authority to conduct examinations and set capital standards for these currently unregulated dealers.

The subcommittee closely examined the derivatives markets and the findings and recommendations of the GAO study in oversight hearings held on May 10, 19, 25, and July 7th of last year. Based on the information gathered in the course of these hearings and other inquiries, I have crafted a piece of legislation which would close the most glaring legal gap affecting the derivatives markets—the presence of virtually unregulated OTC derivatives dealers in the market.

This bill will close the regulatory ''black hole'' that has allowed derivatives dealers affiliated with securities or insurance firms to escape virtually any regulatory scrutiny. It will give the SEC the tools needed to monitor the activities of these firms, assess their impact on the financial markets, and assure appropriate protections are provided to their customers against any fraudulent or abusive activities. It is not a radical restructuring of the derivatives market; it is focused laser-like on the real gaps that exist in the current regulatory framework that need to be closed, and closed now before we have our own Barings PLC disaster right here in America.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor and support this important legislation.

TO EXTEND A NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM TO AMERICAN SAMOA

HON. ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1995

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bill to provide permanent funding for a nutrition program in American Samoa.

The American Samoa Nutrition Assistance Program currently in existence is funded on an annual basis out of discretionary funds from the Department of Agriculture. The national Food Stamp Program is not available in American Samoa, and the program in Samoa serves as a modified Food Stamp Program in that only the blind, severely disabled, and poor elderly are eligible for benefits. Benefits are also limited in that they vary between $50 and $125 per month, depending on the income of and the assets owned by the recipient.

Unfortunately, the method of annual appropriations used for American Samoa's Nutrition Assistance Program is unsatisfactory in that the level of funding, or perhaps more appropriately the existence of any funding, is subject to annual appropriations. I can see no reason why funding for the Food Stamp programs for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and for all but one of the U.S. Territories should come from one source, and the funding for American Samoa's program should come from a different source.

Mr. Speaker, I believe American Samoa's nutrition assistance program is a model to be followed by other U.S. jurisdictions in that no benefits are available for the able-bodied. As I stated earlier, the only recipients are the poor blind, severely disabled, and the elderly. The cost of the program for fiscal year 1995 is $5.5 million, a cost which could easily be absorbed within the multi-billion dollar contingency fund of the national program, and I urge my colleagues to join me in addressing this variance in national policy and support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the bill to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

H.R. —

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM TO AMERICAN SAMOA.

The first sentence of section 601(c) of Public Law 96–597 (48 U.S.C. 1469d(c)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', and the Secretary of Agriculture shall extend a nutrition assistance program conducted under the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.) to American Samoa''.

TERESA McGOVERN

HON. JOHN JOSEPH MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1995

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, last December, Senator George McGovern's daughter, Teresa, died in Madison, Wisconsin—losing her long battle with alcoholism. Terry was a remarkable young woman who cared deeply about others and cared passionately for this country. I recall meeting her in Boston back in 1972 when her father ran for the presidency. She was intelligent, articulate and totally dedicated to making our Government reflect the very best in our Nation.

Since her death, the McGovern family has courageously talked publicly about the ravages of Terry's alcoholism and their attempt to deal with it. In an excellent article which recently appeared in Parade magazine, George McGovern eloquently and painfully describes the impact that this disease had on his daughter and his family.

The article follows:

WHAT I LEARNED FROM MY DAUGHTER

(By George McGovern)

On the 10th day of June, 1949, my wife, Eleanor, gave birth to a 6-pound, 14-ounce baby girl, whom we named Teresa. ''She's a beautiful little porcelain doll,'' said an admiring artist friend. We agreed that we had brought forth a creature of remarkable beauty and charm. That was the way I saw her for the next 45 years, through laughs and joys, anxieties and tears.

From the beginning, Teresa blossomed into an engaging, fun-loving, quick-witted child—a special joy in our family. She later developed a notable sense of compassion, insight and sensitivity toward others, communicating easily with people about their concerns and aspirations, disappointments and victories.

The day of Teresa's birth was hot and dry in Mitchell, S.D., the temperature around 90 degrees. Forty-five years later, on Dec. 12, 1994, the ground was covered with snow in Madison, Wis., and the temperature was far below freezing. That night, Teresa died in the snow in a lot, out of sight of passersby. ''Hypothermia due to exposure while in a state of acute alcohol intoxication,'' read the Dane County coroner's report.

We had dreaded such a report for years. Terry's troubles seem to have started as early as high school, when she had the first indications of depression and then experimented with alcohol with teenage friends. She seemed to have been born with a vulnerability to both depression and alcoholism. To whatever extent genes influence these matters, there is a pattern of alcoholism in some of my Irish ancestry, just as there is a pattern of depression in some of Eleanor's English and Norwegian ancestry.

Terry's dependence on alcohol seemed both to enhance and to result from the depression. It was a vicious circle. When she achieved periods of sobriety she sometimes was afflicted with a depression that seemed to trigger a relapse into alcohol consumption. When doctors finally found a medication that was somewhat successful in combating her depression, the medication often would be neutralized by drinking bouts that she seemed powerless to control.

A glass or two of wine or a cocktail can be a pleasant and relaxing experience for most people. But to the 15 million or more Americans like Terry who are alcoholics, there is no such thing as a casual glass of wine. In Terry's case, she drank until she collapsed or blacked out. During her last five years, she was admitted to Madison's Tellurian detoxification center 76 times. Sometimes she checked in voluntarily. More frequently she was taken there after she had collapsed in a bar or on the street or in her home.

Terry couldn't seem to stop drinking, but she fought the addiction with tenacity for most of her life. With pressure from Eleanor and me, as well as her sisters and brother, she agreed to treatment in some of the best centers in the nation. These painstaking, sometimes expensive programs, combined with attendance at AA meetings, brought her sobriety for periods of time—days, weeks or months, and once for seven years, as she gave birth to and lovingly nurtured her daughters, Marian and Colleen, who remained the central passions of her life—except for alcohol, her hated master.

She devoured pamphlets and books on alcoholism. She searched the Bible and other spiritual sources for guidance and insight.

She pursued ''users'' in recovery who would share their secrets with her. She talked to her patient, unfailing mother about her struggle.

My office staff knew Terry had a problem that frequently took precedence over all else in my life. Especially in the years since I left the U.S. Senate in 1981, Terry has never been far from my consciousness and concern. In the 1960s and early '70s, the Vietnam War and the excesses of the Cold War became such obsessions with me that I ran for the Presidency in 1972 to offer a different course. But Terry became my obsession in the 1980s and '90s. Only another parent with an alcoholic or otherwise chemically addicted child can begin to comprehend the endless concern and anxiety, anger and resentment, excited hopes and disappointments, exhausting and sometimes frightening experiences that go with loving and caring for an alcoholic offspring.

Two years ago, while having lunch with Michael Deaver, a long-time aide to former President Reagan, I mentioned my deep concern over Terry's drinking problem. He arranged for her to go through one of the finest treatment programs in the nation—Father Martin's Ashley rehabilitation center in Havre de Grace, Md. After six weeks of a seemingly successful recovery, Terry was urged to live for the next six months in the protective environment of a halfway house. Terry, however, was desperate to return to Madison to be near her daughters, so she rejected this advice. Eleanor agreed to go with her to Madison and stay until Terry could get settled. With her usual patience and love, Eleanor remained with Terry for two weeks. On the day of her departure, Terry started drinking again. Eleanor returned home—her heart broken one more time.

A few months later, we persuaded Terry to enter a program at the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, Md. She cooperated with all aspects of the agenda, and so did Eleanor and I, which involved counseling and group-discussion sessions with family members of other patients. We were highly encouraged by Terry's seeming success.

On the morning of the completion of the program, I happily brought Terry home. She asked if she could use the car for a few minutes to pick up a prescription at a drugstore nearby. Three hours later, I was called by a friendly bartender who told me that Terry had collapsed from drinking. It pains me even now to recall the sad and bitter disappointment, the personal regret and doubt about my own judgment that followed.

One of the things I learned from experiences like this was to separate my feelings toward the alcoholic whom I loved from the alcoholism which I hated. Some of her friends would tell me that there were two Terry's—the sober one whom they cared about and the intoxicated one whom they could not stand. I understand this well-meaning sentiment, which I sometimes held. But it is wrong. There was never more than one Terry—a Terry who usually brought joy to her friends but at other times transferred to others her own suffering. If a member of the family were suffering from cancer or AIDS, we would not say that we love them when they are healthy but despise them when they are ill. So it should be with alcoholism, a frequently fatal disease. The same disease that hurts the alcoholic's family and friends hurts and demoralizes the alcoholic vastly more.

I developed an exchange with Terry that seemed to work for both of us. ''Who is ahead today—you or the demon?'' I would ask. She loved that way of posing the problem. It's okay to love your family member or friend and despise the demon that attacks him or her.

What parents discover is that they are powerless to overcome the addiction that's destroying their precious creation. A friend of Terry's, from one of America's most celebrated families, says she saved his life by persuading him to go forward with alcohol treatment. He sent us a eloquent letter in which he wrote: ''Senator, not all the Senators of all the Congresses could legislate a person sober. And Mrs. McGovern, no amount of love expressed by good mothers like you can birth sobriety.''

You can assist, advise, agonize, pay and pray, but you cannot deliver sobriety. And in many cases, neither can the victim, no matter how hard she or he tries.

However, another thing I learned is that you must never abandon hope. Never give up on the alcoholic, and don't let him or her give up. If you have a spiritual faith or wish to develop one, use the power of prayer. Share that hope and faith with the victim. Terry died at age 45. She probably would have died at 18 or 30 or 40 had it not been for her faith and the faith of others.

I believe that alcoholism and other chemical dependencies constitute America's No. 1 social problem. Every year, victory eludes 100,000 Americans like Teresa, who die of alcoholism. Countless others suffer from the loss of employment, the neglect of their families the breakup of marriages, a sense of shame and defeat—all of this, plus constant danger and distress.

We must support the good treatment centers and urge public officials to support adequate funding for alcoholism research and rehabilitation. Unfortunately, funds recently have been cut back. The price of this ''economy'' includes more suffering and death from alcohol and other drugs, more loss of productivity, and more disorder and crime. For every dollar saved in cuts, we will spend several times that much in future costs—some of which are immeasurable.

IF SOMEONE YOU LOVE IS AN ALCOHOLIC:

More than 15 million Americans drink too much, according to some experts. Alcoholism has no known cure, but the National Council on Alcoholism and Drug Dependence (NCADD) says the disease can be stopped. In fact, there are more than 1.5 million Americans in recovery. Here are some of the council's recommendations when dealing with an alcoholic:

1. Recognize that alcoholism is a disease and not a moral failure or lack of willpower.

2. Learn as much as you can about the disease. Many libraries have sections on alcoholism, addiction and related subjects.

3. Don't become an ''enabler.'' An enabler is a person close to the alcoholic who supports or ''enables'' the drinking by pretending that there isn't a problem (denial), or by protecting or lying for the alcoholic.

4. Avoid ''home treatments.'' Don't try to solve a loved one's drinking problem by preaching, complaining, acting like a martyr or reasoning with the drinker. An alcoholic needs help from experts, such as Alcoholics Anonymous.

5. Get help for yourself. One of the hallmarks of the illness is that it affects everyone close to the alcoholic. Many treatment programs provide help for those affected by another person's drinking.

REGULATORY TRANSITION ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. RONALD D. COLEMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 450), to ensure economy and efficiency of Federal Government operations by establishing a moratorium on regulatory rulemaking actions, and for other purposes:

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to the bill H.R. 450. While I support the intentions of the bill, I feel that a regulatory freeze is not only a clumsy but also a dangerous way to achieve the important goal of regulatory reform.

The most frustrating aspect of this legislative session is that day after day, we must face the growing reality of the increasing irrelevance of the House of Representatives. While this body has become the center of American jingoism and bumper sticker solutions, it is quickly moving off the radar screen of policy relevance. A brief glance at the bill H.R. 450 tells us why this is happening.

The stated goal of H.R. 450 is a good one to ensure the economy and efficiency of the Federal Government. This has been one of the most vehemently pursued goals of the Clinton Administration. With a firm commitment to reinventing government, the Administration has doggedly pursued the goal of regulatory reform. They have put an end to the explosion of senseless regulations that occurred under the Republican administrations of Ronald Reagan and George Bush. In short, the stated goal of this bill is already being pursued systematically, intelligently, and relentlessly under President Clinton. The simple fact is that the goals of H.R. 450 are being achieved already. The only reason that the majority party feels compelled to take up the regulatory struggle is because they know it is a good chance to take the wind out of the sails of the Clinton administration. It is a bill entirely motivated by politics.

But the problems of this bill don't end with its redundancy. H.R. 450 is also bad policy. In order to achieve the stated goal of government economy and efficiency, the bill proposes a moratorium on regulations that is retroactive through November of last year. Freezing regulations is not an intelligent way to streamline government. This is an excellent example of the extremism of the Republican party in this House.

Freezing all Federal regulations will potentially expose the people of America to countless dangers. The EPA has indicated that standards to reduce the presence of lead and dioxins in the air will be put on hold, as will efforts to remove dangerous disinfectant byproducts and microbiological contaminants in water. Further, the development of safe alternatives to ozone depleting chemicals will be put on hold. The Department of Labor will not be able to finish outlining the regulations that will guide the implementation of the Family Medical Leave Act. The Department of Agriculture will not be able to prevent the importation of animals and animal products infected with bovine spongiform encephalopathy, or

work to prevent the spread of lethal avian influenza in chickens. The Department of Transportation notes that H.R. 450 would stop regulations designed to make commuter planes meet the safety requirements of larger carriers, and to prevent natural gas pipeline explosions. These are just a few examples of the manner in which the moratorium could pose a direct threat to the health, safety and economic well-being of the American people.

Republicans are correct when they assert that Americans and American businesses are fed up with senseless regulations. But they are horribly off the mark when they propose that freezing all regulations is the solution to this problem. The exemptions that they have offered for regulations protecting health, safety, and property are vague at best, and give the latter inexplicable ascendancy over the first two. There is no guarantee that important regulations will be allowed enactment under H.R. 450. I cannot support such carelessly crafted legislation, and I am surprised at those who can.

The practice of performing delicate policy operations with a meat axe has characterized the actions of the House from the beginning of the session, and it is eroding the credibility of this body. Even as we rush to pass bills that are poorly crafted, the Senate is carefully weighing the implications of each piece of legislation. This is not a question of partisan politics. The Republicans have a majority in the Senate as well. And yet there, they recognize the great importance of designing legislation that not only sounds good, but that works as well. We should do the same. H.R. 450 is another example of an important issue that has been drastically oversimplified. Freezing reforms is not the answer to the regulatory explosion, and it is a proposal that places American lives at risk. Therefore, I will not support this legislation.

I do not believe that the 435 Members of this body ought to be consigned to irrelevance in the policy sphere. But unless the Republican Party stops focusing on the laminated card in the Speaker's breast pocket, and starts concentrating on the difficult, deliberative, and complex task of framing policy and instituting reform, we are doomed to 50 more days of meaningless endeavors. I fear that the words of Macbeth will be a fitting epitaph for the Republican Contract, which thus far has frequently proven to be a document ''full of sound and fury, signifying nothing.''

TRIBUTE TO JUSTIN AARON HARRIS

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1995

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay respectful tribute to a young man from my district who has made the ultimate sacrifice, giving his life in service to our country in a foreign land. Justin Aaron Harris, a Marine Sergeant, was tragically killed last week when his helicopter went down at sea after hitting a ship off the coast of Mogadishu. He died on February 19, 1995, leaving a wife, Chantay, and a young son, Justin, Jr., his parents, Peggy and Joe, a sister, Julie Morrison, brothers, Joe, Jeffrey, Jerry, and Javan Harris and scores of relatives and friends who mourn the loss of a promise-filled life cut short. We offer them our hearts in empathy as they face this deep tragedy. We hope that his vision for America and his devotion and belief in service to our nation and oppressed people around the world will make this cross a little easier to bear. We pray the memories his family and friends shared in his too-brief life will sustain them all. Justin knows as we all know, the price of freedom is not free. He laid down his life in service to us.

A poem was read at his memorial service, held in his hometown of Toledo, Ohio on February 25, 1995. The author apparently unknown, it symbolizes Justin's and his family's faith and offers a meaning to his passing, helping all to understand and to gain strength:

I'M FREE

Don't grieve for me, for now I'm free
I'm following the path God laid for me.
I took his hand when I heard Him call
I turned my back, and left it all.
I could not stay another day
To laugh, or love, or work, or play
Tasks left undone must stay that way
I found that place at the close of the day.
If my parting has left a void,
Then fill it with remembered joy.
A friendship shared, a laugh, a kiss
Oh yes, these things I too will miss.
Be not burdened with times of sorrow
I wish you sunshine of tomorrow.
My life's been full, I savored much
Good friends, good times, a loved one's touch.
Perhaps my time seemed all too brief.
Don't lengthen it now with undue grief.
Lift up your heart and share with me . . .
God wanted me now
He set me Free!

Justin Aaron Harris, age 23; always remembered, always honored, always loved.

SUSTAINABLE CONSUMPTIVE USE OF MARINE RESOURCES

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1995

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, this Nation has had an enviable and successful record, both domestically and internationally, of fostering sound conservation and scientific management of wildlife and marine resources. Through statutes, regulation and international treaties, the United States has traditionally taken a leadership role in demanding science-based information and data upon which to shape policy and programs for the conservation of plants, animals, and fish. An integral part of wildlife and resource management is the concept of consumptive use of such renewable resources under proper and professional management.

In the February issue of the American Spectator there is a most thought provoking article by David Andrew Price regarding the issue of whaling by coastal and island nations. With the exception of a small science-based harvest of whales by natives in Alaska, the United States is no longer a consumer or producer of whale products. For other nations, however, whale products have been a traditional source of food for thousands of years. The serious question is whether or not such traditional harvests should be blocked when limited taking in no manner would have an adverse impact on populations stocks. Further, ignoring science in the management of one species of wildlife based upon a response to a protectionist philosophy sets a dangerous precedent. Wildlife and marine resources cannot afford to be managed on the basis of some subjective ethic that ignores science and appropriate management.

I commend Mr. Price's article to my colleagues on a most important issue of sustainable use of renewable marine resources and the role of the United States in that policy.

[From the American Spectator, February 1995]

SAVE THE WHALERS

(By David Andrew Price)

One morning last January, Arvid Enghaugen, a resident of the Norwegian coastal town of Gressvik, found his whaling boat sitting unusually deep in the water. When he climbed aboard to investigate, he found that the ship was in fact sinking; someone had opened its sea cock and padlocked the engine-room door. After breaking the lock, Enghaugen discovered that the engine was underwater. He also found a calling card from the Sea Shepherd Conservation Society, a small, California-based environmentalist group that specializes in direct actions against whalers. Counting Enghaugen's boat, Sea Shepherd has sunk or damaged eleven Norwegian, Icelandic, Spanish, and Portuguese vessels since 1979.

The boat was repaired in time for the 1994 whaling season, but Enghaugen's problems weren't over. On July 1, while he was looking for whales off the Danish coast, live Greenpeace protesters boarded the ship from an inflatable dinghy and tried to take its harpoon cannon. Enghaugen's crew tossed one protester into the sea, and the rest then jumped overboard; the protesters were picked up by the dinghy and returned to the Greenpeace mother ship.

A week later, after Enghaugen's boat shot a harpoon into a whale, a team from another Greenpeace vessel cut the harpoon line to free the wounded animal. A group again tried to board the whaler, and the crew again threw them off. Enghaugen cut a hole in one of the Greenpeace dinghies with a whale flensing knife. For the next two weeks, Enghaugen and crew were dogged by Greenpeace ships and helicopters.

Although the activities failed to stop Enghaugen's hunt, their public relations war in America has been a different story. Over the past twenty years, the save-the-whales movement has been so successful in shaping public sentiment about the whaling industry that the U.S. and other nations have adopted a worldwide moratorium on whaling. Part of the credit must go to the animals themselves, which are more charismatic on television than Kurds, Bosnians, or Rwandans, who have engendered far less international protection. The movement owes most of its success, however, to the gullibility of Hollywood and the press in passing along bogus claims from whaling's opponents.

The mainstay of the case against whaling—that it threatens an endangered species—is characteristic of the misinformation. It is true that European nations and the United States killed enormous numbers of whales during commercial whaling's heyday in the nineteenth century, but to say that ''whales'' are endangered is no more meaningful than to say that ''birds'' are endangered; there are more than seventy species of whales, and their numbers vary dramatically. Some are endangered, some are not. The blue whale, the gray whale, and the

humpback were indeed depleted, but those species were later protected by international agreement long before the existence of Greenpeace or Sea Shepherd. (There have been abuses. Alexei V. Yablokov, special adviser to the president of Russia for ecology and health, has revealed that the whaling fleet of the former Soviet Union illegally killed more than 700 protected right whales during the 1960's but the International Whaling Commission's institution of an observer program in 1972 essentially put an end to the Soviet fleet's illegal activities.)

The only whale species that Enghaugen and his fellow Norwegian whalers hunt is the minke, which Norwegians eat as whale steaks, whale meatballs, and whaleburgers. As it turns out, minke whales are no more in danger of extinction than Angus cattle. In 1994, thirty-two Norwegian boats killed a total of 279 minkes, out of an estimated local population of about 87,000 and a world population of around 900,000.

In 1982 the IWC voted to suspend commercial whaling for a five-year period starting in 1986. The ostensible purpose was to permit the collection of better data on whales before hunting resumed. Norway lodged a reservation exempting itself from the moratorium, as the IWC treaty permitted, but it complied voluntarily.

Whaling nations soon learned, though, that the majority of nations in the IWC—including the United States—intended to maintain the ban indefinitely, no matter what the numbers showed. Canada left the IWC in 1982, and Iceland left in 1992. Norway terminated its voluntary compliance in 1993. To protest the commission's disregard of the facts about whale stocks, the British chairman of the IWC's scientific committee resigned that year pointing out in his angry letter of resignation that the commission's actions ''were nothing to do with science.'' The IWC continued the moratorium anyway at it next meeting.

A 1993 report by the Congressional Research Service observed that the data on whales undercut the conservationist argument, and that ''if the United States argues for continuing the moratorium on commercial whaling, it may have to rely increasingly on moral and ethical appeals.'' The ban on whaling is no longer about conservation, in other words, but about the desire of many Americans and Western Europeans to impose their feelings about whales upon the whaling nations (which include Iceland, Russia, Japan, and the Inuits of Canada and Alaska).

Popular notions of whales' human-like intelligence, often cited by opponents of whaling, have little real support. Whales possess large brains, but that proves nothing about their mental agility. Margaret Klinowska, a Cambridge University expert on cetacean intelligence, holds that the structure of the whale brain has more in common with that of comparatively primitive mammals such as hedgehogs and bats than with the brains of primates.

Whales can be trained to perform stunts and other tasks, but so can pigeons and many other animals that have never been credited with the cerebral powers of homo sapiens. And the idea that whales have something like a human language is, at present, pure folklore. Like virtually all animals, whales make vocalizations, but there is no evidence that they are uttering Whalish words and sentences. Their famed ''singing'' is done only by the males, and then during but half the year—a pattern more suggestive of bird-song than human speech.

Much of the popular mythology about cetacean intelligence comes from crank scientist John Lilly, a physician who became convinced in the 1950s that whales and dolphins are not only smarter and more communicative than humans, but also have their own civilizations, complete with philosophy, history, and science that are passed down orally through the generations. His conclusions about the animals' mental skills were based partly on his observations of captive dolphins at his lab in the Virgin Islands, but mainly on wild flights of conjecture. Lilly also predicted in the late seventies that the State Department would eventually negotiate treaties with the cetaceans, and that humanity's progress in its dealings with them would lead the Galactic Coincidence Control Center to send agents to planet Earth to open the way for extraterrestrial contacts with us. The anthropomorphization of the whale reached new heights with a 1993 open letter to the Norwegian people from Sea Shepherd president Paul Watson, who predicted, ''The whales will talk about you in the same vein as Jews now talk of Nazis. For in the eyes of whalekind, there is little difference between the behavior of the monsters of the Reich and the monsters behind the harpoon.''

Cetacean behavior researchers have rejected Lilly's claims. Dolphin investigator Kenneth Norris of the University of California Santa Cruz, who was among the first to study dolphins in the wild and is responsible for much of our knowledge about dolphin sonar, writes that they have ''a complicated animal communication system, yes, but for an abstract syntactic language like ours, no compelling evidence seemed, or seems, to exist.'' The late David and Melba Caldwell, who studied dolphin behavior at the University of Florida, maintained flatly that ''dolphins do not talk.'' In their view, ''dolphins probably are just exceptionally amiable mammals with an intelligence now considered by most workers, on a subjective basis, to be comparable to that of a better-than-average dog.''

Louis Herman, director of the University of Hawaii's marine mammal laboratory and an opponent of whaling, has been studying the behavior of captive dolphins since 1967. Herman says he has seen no evidence that the natural vocalizations of dolphins constitute a language. And for whales? ''There's no reason to think the situation would be different with other cetacean species,'' he answers.

What American policy on whaling enforces is simply a cultural preference—one comparable to our distaste for horsemeat, which is favored in France. The whale-savers have succeeded in shaping policy by selling the idea that whales are different; that they are endangered underwater Einsteins. That's why Icelandic filmmaker Magnus Gudmundsson, who has produced a documentary showing Greenpeace's machinations on the issue, is correct in calling the movement ''a massive industry of deception.''

INTRODUCTION OF THE OMNIBUS ADOPTION ACT OF 1995 AND THE HEALTH CARE AND HOUSING FOR WOMEN AND CHILDREN ACT

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1995

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Today, I reintroduced two important bills which will have a direct and substantial impact on women, children, and families nationwide. These bills—the Omnibus Adoption Act of 1995 and the Health Care and Housing for Women and Children Act—both promote the joining of needy children and caring families through the loving option of adoption.

There is no doubt that there are children patiently and hopefully awaiting adoption. Over the past decade, between 50,000–60,000 children found adoptive homes each year. This figure is down from 89,000 in 1970; but that is not indicative of fewer needy children. In fact, over this same time period, the number of children in foster care increased to more than 407,000 and the number of children born out-of-wedlock increased three-fold to 1,165,000.

The National Council for Adoption [NCFA] estimates that between one and two million individuals and couples want to adopt. But there are obstacles in their way. Some of these obstacles are financial; some are merely education; some are cultural. The Omnibus Adoption Act of 1995 takes aim at these hurdles with the intention of leveling them.

Furthermore, evidence suggests that the benefits of adoption to birthmothers are overwhelmingly positive. In fact, some research indicates that those women who do choose to make an adoption plan for their children will be less likely to live in poverty, more likely to complete high school, and less likely to have additional unplanned pregnancies. We must provide Federal support to these pregnant women and all pregnant women who lack the means to pay for prenatal and maternal health care.

The centerpiece of the Omnibus Adoption Act is the means tested $5000 tax credit. According to the NCFA, the average cost of an adoption is $14,000 and it is not uncommon for this figure to reach upwards of $25,000. Often this includes prenatal care for the birthmother and child, counseling for the adoptive family, and legal fees. For a middle-income family already on a tight budget, this one-time up-front cost can be prohibitive.

The targeted tax credit would be available in full to families earning less than $60,000 and in part to families earning between $60,000 and $100,000. In this way, it is able to give as much help as possible to the families which need it the most. And while this tax credit has a limitless reward, it has a very modest cost. The Republican staff of the Budget Committee estimated last year that the adoption tax credit would cost $900 million over 5 years.

You may recognize this provision from the Republican Contract with America as well. I am pleased that this aspect of my bill has been included in the Contract's Family Reinforcement Act [H.R. 11].

Other provisions of the Omnibus Adoption Act are equally valuable and popular. For instance, the bill establishes a national advisory council on adoption to monitor the progress of the various adoption related programs which exist and which the bill institutes. The bill also establishes a national adoption data collection system. These two provisions will work hand-in-hand to further advance adoption options. As does a section stating the sense of Congress that every State implement and enforce uniform adoption laws ranging from detailed home studies for prospective adoptive families to health benefits for birthmothers and adopted children.

The Omnibus Adoption Act establishes a program of graduate study fellowships to encourage our best young minds to research and develop innovation in adoption programs. Additionally, the bill organizes a grant program within the Department of Education offering

grant funding to States which implement adoption education programs. The Boston Globe, in a editorial highly supportive of this bill in general and the tax credit provision in particular, noted that this was an idea that deserves close study.

Another provision in the Omnibus Adoption Act which the Globe thought worthy of closer study clarifies Federal and military employee adoption benefits. This would allow these families to use sick leave for adoption purposes. They would also be eligible for reimbursement through Federal health benefit plans for the prenatal and maternity care of the birthmother in their adoption plan. The bill specifically prohibits surrogate parenting arrangements with regard to this provision.

The final two provisions of the Omnibus Adoption Act are so critical to the promotion of adoption and the health of birthmothers and their children that I have introduced them as a separate bill as well—the Health Care and Housing for Women and Children Act. These provisions establish material health certificates and grants for rehabilitation of housing for use as maternity homes. Maternal health certificates could be used by low-income pregnant women who seek assistance in carrying their child to term at maternity homes. Here they could get housing, medical care, educational and vocational training, adoption counseling, and other supportive services. To ensure that maternity homes are available to these women, a grant program would be established to give non-profit organizations aid in rehabilitating old housing for use as maternity homes.

The American Enterprise in its January/February 1995 noted the central role which maternity homes once played in helping young, low-income women to carry their pregnancies to term and how that role has unfortunately diminished. Writer George Liebmann observed that:

> Current American welfare policy is plagued by an ideology of cash entitlement. What the poor really need today is not a check but a powerful set of rehabilitative social services. These should be offered by private community groups, without any illusion of moral neutrality. Rescuing an underclass is by definition a highly moralistic undertaking.

This is the historical mission of the maternity home. They provide therapy and support through the grouping of several young women in similar circumstances under one roof. They provide rehabilitation through education, vocational training, health care, and counseling. Furthermore, they offer discipline and supervision to women who have often lived on streets and in neighborhoods devoid of such backbone. This is crucial to the health and welfare of both mother and child. And it can all be provided by community groups with a commitment to care.

Over the past two sessions in which I have introduced these bills, they have enjoyed broad bipartisan support from more than one hundred Members. I encourage my colleagues to respond to the needs of homeless children and the families who long to help them by cosponsoring both the Omnibus Adoption Act and the Health Care and Housing for Women and Children Act.

HONORING THE STUDENTS OF FAIRFAX HIGH SCHOOL

HON. THOMAS M. DAVIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1995

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to some students at Fairfax High School in Fairfax, Virginia. These students represented the Eleventh Congressional District in the We The People Competition on February 14, 1995 in Richmond, Virginia. These students ranked in third place in the statewide competition with a score of 897, studying for months to become experts on the Bill of Rights. This is significant when I remind members that Fairfax County was the home of George Mason, the author of the Bill of Rights. By all accounts, these fine students have demonstrated expertise on those rights.

The We The People program is the most extensive education program in the country developed to teach young people about the Constitution and the Bill of Rights and the principles and values they embody. The course of instruction, using the specially designed With Liberty and Justice for All text, is followed by a test designed to measure the students' constitutional literacy. High school classes may then elect whether to enter a series of competitions at the congressional district, State, and national levels.

Administered by the Center for Civic Education and funded by the U.S. Department of Education by an Act of Congress, the program is currently being implemented in every Congressional District in the country, the four Trust Territories, and the District of Columbia. When combined with the noncompetitive elementary and middle school levels, more than 20 million students have participated in the program over the past 7 years.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge these fine students at this time: Pretty Bhatt, Alicia Bridges, Lucy Brown, Paul Cavazos, Maya Crumbaugh, Anita Grover, Brian Johnson, Brooke Kemp, Margarita Koushinova, Christy McMillian, Kevin McPherson, Moghees Nezam, Jonathan Park, Iana Phillips, Jake Spatz, Thanh Tran, Beth Ulan, Patrick Varney, Alex Will, Laurie Wright, and Rabiah Yusef.

Mr. Speaker, I know that all of my colleagues join me in commending these fine students for becoming experts on the Bill of Rights and for joining in the battle of ideas with their peers on all levels of competition.

TRIBUTE TO THE LEAGUE OF UNITED LATIN AMERICAN CITIZENS

HON. ED PASTOR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1995

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call my colleagues' attention to the efforts of one organization to prevent the youth of our Nation from becoming school dropouts. The League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) will be holding its Annual Youth Leadership Conference on Friday, March 17 on the campus of Pima Community College in Arizona. Approximately 1,500 at-risk 7th through 12th graders from around the State will be participating in this day of education and motivation. They will be directed by business, government and community leaders through 40 workshop sessions designed to teach goal-setting skills and instill the value that staying in school is a necessity in facilitating their success in life. Muralist, Judith Baca will be this year's keynote speaker. I am confident this program will leave its young participants with a sense of hope for the future and the realization that their education is the cornerstone in their preparation to become tomorrow's leaders.

LULAC, the conference organizer, was founded in 1929 and is the Nation's oldest Hispanic-American civic organization. Its purpose is to assist underprivileged Hispanics through a variety of programs which promote economic development, cultural heritage, and political involvement. For the past 6 years, the League has targeted the prevention of dropouts as a high priority for all volunteer efforts in Arizona. This year it will team up with the Metro Educational Commission, Pima Community College, the University of Arizona, the Tucson Police Department, and the Pima County Sheriff's Department in promoting education as the road to persistence and success in the Hispanic community.

I would like to commend and extend my gratitude to all involved in LULAC for their untiring efforts to preserve the promise of tomorrow by working to keep America's young people in school. I have no doubt that the leadership conference will be resounding success and a model for other events around the country.

SSI FOR SAMOA

HON. ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1995

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, American Samoa is the only jurisdiction of the United States that is not served by the SSI program, nor its predecessor program, the Aid to the Aged, Blind, or Disabled [AABD]. SSI and AABD are basically the same in design. The only significant difference between the two programs is funding. With SSI, benefits and the cost of administering the program are fully financed by the Federal Treasury. As for AABD, the Federal Government pays 75 percent of benefits up to a specified limit and the States absorb the remaining 25 percent. Administrative cost is shared by both the Federal Government and the States at 50 percent each.

Under current law, in order to receive SSI benefits, a low-income elderly, blind or disabled individual must reside in one of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. For qualified individuals who reside in Guam, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands, similar benefits are available to them through the AABD program. Unfortunately, the elderly, blind and disabled individuals in American Samoa who have low or no income are not covered by either program.

Mr. Speaker, this is yet another example of a vital program extended to all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, Virgin Islands, and the Northern Mariana Islands,

but not American Samoa. I believe this may have been an oversight when Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands were included in the AABD program in 1950, and Guam after 1952.

According to a recent survey in American Samoa, there are now approximately 3,500 elderly, blind and disabled individuals with low or no income. These individuals currently receive some assistance through a nutrition assistance program, but funding for this program is determined on a year-to-year basis.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the elderly population in American Samoa are caught between two systems. When Social Security went into effect in Samoa, this group of people were too old to contribute long enough to qualify for minimum benefits. On the other hand, the territorial retirement system did not begin until 1971. By that time, many of these people had already left the work force or had so little time remaining that they were also excluded from benefits under this system.

In each Congress since 1990, I have introduced legislation to include Samoa's elderly, blind and disabled population in the SSI program to address their critical financial needs. In 1990, it was estimated that approximately 1,600 such individuals resided in the Territory. The Congressional Budget Office estimated that if SSI was in place in American Samoa in 1993, Federal outlays would be about $3 million higher than under current law.

Mr. Speaker, I know we are going through a difficult time in budgeting our revenue. I also know all Americans will have to sacrifice to bring our budget into balance. As we go through this process, I simply want to ask my colleagues that we not ask the most vulnerable among us, namely the blind, disabled and poor elderly, to make a disproportionate share of that sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the bill to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

H.R.—

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME BENEFITS PROGRAM TO AMERICAN SAMOA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The 7th sentence of section 1101(a)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1301(a)(1)) is amended by inserting 'and title XVI (as in effect pursuant to the amendment made by section 301 of the Social Security Amendments of 1972)' before 'also'.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 1614(e) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1382c(e)) is amended by inserting ', American Samoa,' before 'and'.

(2) Section 1614(a)(1)(B)(ii) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1382c(a)(1)(B)(ii)) is amended by inserting 'or national' after 'citizen'.

SEC. 2. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by section 1 shall take effect on October 1, 1995.

HEARING CARE FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES ACT

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1995

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation H.R. 1057 which would cover audiology services for Federal employees.

More specifically, this measure would amend the statute governing the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program [FEHBP] by requiring FEHBP insurance carriers to guarantee direct access to, and reimbursement for, audiologist-provided hearing care services when hearing care is covered under a FEHBP plan.

The statute that this legislation would amend is 5 U.S.C., section 8902(k)(1), which allows direct access to services provided by optometrists, clinical psychologists and nurse midwives, yet fails to allow direct access to services provided by audiologists in FEHBP plans covering hearing care services.

My legislation would not increase health care costs since it would not mandate any new insurance benefits. On the contrary, the bill should reduce the costs of hearing care by facilitating direct access to health care providers who are uniquely qualified and generally used to diagnose the extent and causes of hearing impairment.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this measure, H.R.1057.

At this point in the RECORD I request that the full text of my bill be inserted for review by my colleagues.

H.R. 1057

Be it enacted by the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the ''Hearing Care for Federal Employees Act''.

SEC. 2. Section 8902(k)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting the word ''audiologist,'' after the word ''optometrist'' wherever it appears in that section.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, February 28, 1995, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MARCH 1

9:00 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Superfund, Waste Control, and Risk Assessment Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine proposals to authorize State and local governments to enact flow control laws and to regulate the interstate transportation of solid waste.
SD–406

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the National Endowment for the Arts.
SD–192

Appropriations
Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of Energy, focusing on atomic energy defense activities.
SD–116

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the United States civilian space program.
SR–253

Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings on S. 395, to authorize and direct the Secretary of Energy to sell the Alaska Power Marketing Administration, including title II, proposed Trans-Alaska Pipeline Amendment Act.
SD–366

Finance
To hold hearings on proposed legislation to change the Social Security earnings limit and repeal the tax on 85% of Social Security benefits.
SD–215

Labor and Human Resources
To continue hearings to examine the impact of welfare reform, focusing on the child care system.
SD–430

Veterans' Affairs
To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans Affairs to review the legislative recommendations of the Disabled American Veterans.
345 Cannon Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, Farm Credit Administration, and the Food and Drug Administration of the Department of Health and Human Services.
SD–138

Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of State.
S–146, Capitol

11:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the National Endowment for the Humanities.
SD–192

Foreign Relations
To continue hearings on the ratification of the Treaty Between the United States and the Russian Federation on Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (START II Treaty) (Treaty Doc. 103-1).
SD–419

2:00 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Forests and Public Land Management Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 391, to authorize and direct the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to undertake activities to halt and reverse the decline in forest health on Federal lands.
SD–366

Select on Intelligence
To hold closed hearings on intelligence matters.
SH–219

2:30 p.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Aviation Subcommittee
To hold hearings to review the recommendations of the President's Airline Commission.
SR–253

MARCH 2

9:30 a.m.
Armed Services
To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of Defense and the future years defense program.
SR–222

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Business meeting, to consider the nomination of Robert Pitofsky, of Maryland, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner.
SR–253

Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings on S. 167, to revise certain provisions of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, S. 433, to reaffirm the Federal Government's commitment to electric consumers and environmental protection by reaffirming the requirement of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 that the Secretary of Energy provide for the safe disposal of spent nuclear fuel beginning not later than January 31, 1998, S. 429, to revise the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 to allow commercial nuclear utilities that have contracts with the Secretary of Energy under section 302 of that Act to receive credits to offset the cost of storing spent fuel that the Secretary is unable to accept for storage on and after Jan. 31, 1998, and S. 473, to establish as the nuclear energy policy of the U.S. that no new civilian nuclear power reactors shall be built until adequate waste emplacement capacity is available.
SD–366

Finance
To hold hearings to examine middle income tax proposals.
SD–215

Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts and Humanities Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965, focusing on the National Endowment for the Humanities.
SD–430

Special on Aging
To hold hearings to examine Social Security and disability policy issues, focusing on the large growth of the Supplemental Security Income and Social Security Disability Insurance programs.
SD–562

9:45 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on U.S. telecommunication policy.
SR–253

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of Transportation.
SD–192

Environment and Public Works
Drinking Water, Fisheries, and Wildlife Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on efforts by the United States Forest Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service to comply with recent court decisions requiring consultation on forest plans under Section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act.
SD–406

Governmental Affairs
Business meeting, to mark up S. 4, to grant the power to the President to reduce budget authority, and S. 14, to amend the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to provide for the expedited consideration of certain proposed cancellations of budget items.
SD–342

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Business meeting, to mark up H.R. 889, making emergency supplemental appropriations and rescissions to preserve and enhance the military readiness of the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995.
S–128, Capitol

Foreign Relations
Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine U.S. policy towards Iran and Iraq.
SD–419

MARCH 3

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the National Credit Union Administration, the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Resolution Trust Corporation-Inspector General.
SD–138

10:00 a.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine proposals to reform Federal habeas corpus regulations, focusing on the elimination of prisoners' abuse of the judicial process.
SD–226

MARCH 6

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Office of National Drug Control Policy.
SD–192

Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings on S. 333, to direct the Secretary of Energy to institute certain procedures in the performance of risk assessments in connection with environmental restoration activities.
SD–366

Joint Printing
Organizational meeting to consider pending committee business.
H–164, Capitol

MARCH 7

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Parks, Historic Preservation and Recreation Subcommittee
To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Resources' Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Lands to review the health of the National Park System.
SD–366

Veterans' Affairs
To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to review the legislative recommendations of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.
345 Cannon Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of Commerce.
S–146, Capitol

Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine the jury process, focusing on the search for truth in trials.
SD–226

Indian Affairs
To hold oversight hearings to review Federal programs which address the challenges facing Indian youth.
SR–485

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of Labor.
SD–192

MARCH 8

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the United States Geological Survey, Department of the Interior.
SD–116

Energy and Natural Resources
To hold oversight hearings on domestic petroleum production and international supply.
SD–366

Governmental Affairs
To resume hearings on proposed legislation to reform the Federal regulatory process, to make government more efficient and effective.
SD–342

Small Business
To hold hearings on the proposed "Regulatory Flexibility Amendments Act".
SR–428A

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for rural economic and community development services of the Department of Agriculture.
SD–138

2:00 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Forests and Public Land Management Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on Forest Service appeals.
SD–366

2:30 p.m.
Indian Affairs
To hold oversight hearings to examine the structure and funding of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.
SR–485

MARCH 9

9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings on proposed legislation to strengthen and improve United States agricultural programs, focusing on cost issues of certain farm programs.
SR–332

Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider the nomination of Wilma A. Lewis, of the District of Columbia, to be Inspector General, Department of the Interior; to be followed by a closed briefing on international aspects of petroleum supply.
S–407, Capitol

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the National Transportation Safety Board.
SD–192

Judiciary
To hold hearings on S. 227, to provide an exclusive right to perform sound recordings publicly by means of digital transmissions.
SD–226

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of Health and Human Services.
SD–138

Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the United States Secret Service, Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, and the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, Department of the Treasury.
SD–192

MARCH 10

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the National Science Foundation, and the Office of Science and Technology Policy.
SD–138

Joint Economic
To hold hearings to examine the employment-unemployment situation for February.
SD–562

MARCH 14

9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To resume hearings on proposed legislation to strengthen and improve United States agricultural programs, focusing on wetlands and farm policy.
SR–332

Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of Defense.
SD–138

MARCH 15

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Smithsonian Institution.
SD–116

Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD–366

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for farm and foreign agriculture services of the Department of Agriculture.
SD–138

Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of Justice.
Room to be announced

MARCH 16

9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To resume hearings on proposed legislation to strengthen and improve United States agricultural programs, focusing on taxpayers' stake in Federal farm policy.
SR–332

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Drug Enforcement Agency, both of the Department of Justice.
S–146, Capitol

Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation.
SD–192

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of Education.
SD–192

MARCH 22

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior.
SD–192

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Natural Resources Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture.
SD–138

MARCH 23

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, and the National Passenger Railroad Corporation (Amtrak).
SD–192

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms and the United States Customs Service, Department of the Treasury.
SD–192

3:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services.
SD–138

MARCH 24

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.
SD–138

MARCH 27

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Executive Office of the President, and the General Services Administration.
SD–138

MARCH 28

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior.
SD–116

MARCH 29

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Food Safety and Inspection Service, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Agricultural Marketing Service, and the Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, all of the Department of Agriculture.
SD–138

Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Judiciary, Administrative Office of the Courts, and the Judicial Conference.
S–146, Capitol

MARCH 30

9:30 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to review the legislative recommendations of AMVETS, American Ex-Prisoners of War, Vietnam Veterans of America, Blinded Veterans Association, and the Military Order of the Purple Heart.
345 Cannon Building

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation.
SD–192

MARCH 31

9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To resume hearings on proposed legislation to strengthen and improve United States agricultural programs, focusing on agricultural credit.
SR–332

Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Court of Veteran's Appeals, and Veterans Affairs Service Organizations.
SD–138

APRIL 3

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, and the Office of Personnel Management.
SD–138

APRIL 4

9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To resume hearings on proposed legislation to strengthen and improve United States agricultural programs, focusing on market effects of Federal farm policy.
SR–332

Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.
SD–138

APRIL 5

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
SD–192

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Agricultural Research Service, Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service, Economic Research Service, and the National Agricultural Statistics Service, all of the Department of Agriculture.
SD–138

Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Bureau of Prisons, both of the Department of Justice.
S–146, Capitol

APRIL 6

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Federal Emergency Management Agency.
SD–138

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of the Treasury and the Office of Management and Budget.
SD–116

APRIL 26

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for energy conservation.
SD–116

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Food and Consumer Service, Department of Agriculture.
SD–138

Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Legal Services Corporation.
S–146, Capitol

11:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for fossil energy, clean coal technology, Strategic Petroleum Reserve, and the Naval Petroleum Reserve.
SD–116

APRIL 27

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Federal Transit Administration, Department of Transportation.
SD–192

MAY 2

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture.
SD–138

MAY 3

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Environmental Protection Agency, the Council on Environmental Quality, and the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry.
SD–192

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of Agriculture.
SD–138

MAY 4

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the United States Coast Guard, Department of Transportation.
SD–192

MAY 5

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for Environmental Protection Agency science programs.
SD–138

MAY 11

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior.
SD–116

1:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services.
SD–116

MAY 17

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the Department of the Interior.
SD–192

CANCELLATIONS

FEBRUARY 28

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1996 for the United States Postal Service.
SD–116

Special on Aging
Business meeting, to consider pending committee business.
SD–562

MARCH 1

9:30 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
To resume hearings on proposed legislation to reform the Federal regulatory process, to make government more efficient and effective.
SD–342