

Why have our committees requested input from Advocacy? Simply because the office tells it like it is even if it puts Advocacy at odds with the administration.

This is the Office to whom this House of Representatives assigned new responsibilities of reviewing proposed regulations by Federal departments and agencies to identify those with anti-small business impact. Why did the House enlarge the duties of the Advocate? Simply because we know how effectively the Office has functioned as an advocate before other Federal offices.

Some critics have charged that Advocacy has been an abysmal failure in reducing the regulatory and paperwork burden.

Tell that to the small businesses which use simplified registration filings with the Security and Exchange Commission.

Tell that to the 4 million firms with less than 10 employees which will be able to use one simplified tax form for all wage and tax reports instead of up to 15 separate forms.

Tell that to the millions of small businesses which have a lesser burden in dealing with the Government.

And, when you tell them of this criticism, small businesses will tell you that the criticism is wrong. These small businesses will tell you that the Office of Advocacy is effective. They will tell you that is why that last month the White House Conference on Small Business as one of the top recommendations said that the Office should be permanently maintained as an independent entity.

I also want to point out that some of the criticism is not simply a difference in opinion. In some cases the facts used to support the criticism are wrong.

Criticism. Advocacy staffers helped created a brochure to lobby for President Clinton's health-care plan;

Fact. GAO reported that this is not true.

Criticism. Advocacy sent a letter to Congress arguing against tax relief for small businesses.

Fact. Advocacy opposed elimination of a special tax incentive to encourage investments in small firms. Advocacy did conclude, however that if the trade-off for the proposed reduction in capital gains tax rates was the elimination of the small business preference, small business would be better off if the rates were not reduced. The Office did support other parts of the tax bill which helped small business, such as increasing expensing, increased estate and gift tax credit and clarification of deductions for an in-home office.

Criticism. Advocacy "spent last Friday * * * faxing a 9-page 'Game Plan' to congressional offices outlining a lobbying strategy" to save the office, an activity characterized as illegal lobbying;

Fact. The document in question was an internal office document which was never used nor authorized for release to any congressional office. As far as we know, it was not sent to anyone, except for the one copy that was surreptitiously made available to a congressional critic of the office; and SBA's Inspector General has determined that the memo was not a violation.

A letter from the inspector general attached a memo from the assistant inspector general for investigations which concluded:

"Because there is no evidence of actual lobbying and no evidence contrary to the stated intent of the preparation of the document by

Mr. * * *, it is my recommendation this case be closed without a referral for prosecutive opinion."

Finally critics have asserted that small business associations are the "real independent voices for small business" and "do a better job of monitoring small business policy than the Office of Advocacy." These small business associations disagree.

Major small business organizations unanimously support continuation of the Office of Advocacy, including the National Association for the Self-Employed, the National Federation of Independent Business, National Small Business United, Small Business Legislative Council and the United States Chamber of Commerce.

The Office of Advocacy has performed as a champion for small business interests when it has been given a chance to do so. This chance, however, was denied when President Bush left the Chief Counsel job vacant for years at a time. When it has received strong presidential support as it did from President Carter, who appointed Milt Stewart as the first Chief Counsel for Advocacy, or from President Reagan, who appointed Frank Swain as Chief Counsel, or from President Clinton, who appointed Jere Glover, the office truly serves as a champion for small business.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. GARY A. FRANKS

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1976) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendments which eliminate the Market Promotion Program in the Agriculture appropriations bill. The Market Promotion Program, a prime example of corporate welfare, gives millions of Federal dollars to multibillion-dollar corporations for the promotion of American products in foreign countries. During a time when so many Americans are asking to us to balance the budget, how can we keep funding corporate welfare in the guise of the Market Protection Program?

Four amendments to the Agriculture appropriations bill would either make cuts or eliminate the Market Protection Program. First, the Zimmer-Schumer amendment prohibits any of the bill's funds from being used to pay the salaries of persons who carry out the Commodity Credit Corporation's market promotion program. Second, the Obey amendment cuts the bill's funds from being used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel for certain large producers who participate in the MPP. Third, the Kennedy amendment prohibits the CCC from using funds to promote the sale or export

of alcohol. Finally, the Deutsch amendment prohibits funds from being used to promote or provide assistance for mink industry trade associations. The amendments make the cuts in the Market Promotion Program to get the wealthy American corporations off of welfare.

The Federal Government and American taxpayers can no longer afford these corporate handouts. I urge my colleagues to support these amendments and eliminate the MPP.

IT IS TIME WE TRULY TAKE BACK OUR NEIGHBORHOODS

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1995

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to bolster our Nation's crime fighting efforts and to encourage citizens to get involved in crime prevention. I am joined in this effort by Congressman STUPAK, cochairman of the Law Enforcement Caucus—of which I am a member.

The Taking Back Our Neighborhoods Crime Fighting Act will give a \$50 tax credit to people actively involved in neighborhood watch groups and other organizations committed to the reduction of local crime.

I am proposing this tax credit because neighborhood watch works. It is the most effective crime reduction program available to our communities. Throughout the country, neighborhood watch groups have made people feel safer and more secure in their homes, parks, and streets.

Neighborhood watch establishes relationships among neighbors—and it establishes partnerships between neighborhoods and their police officers. Citizens are trained how to watch out for their families, monitor their neighborhoods, how to be observant and reliable witnesses, and how to assist their local police. Police chiefs and officers around the country firmly believe in neighborhood watch and have endorsed the idea of encouraging participation through tax credits.

Over the last decade, in my congressional district, we have pioneered the concept of community oriented crime fighting, and we have seen the difference it makes.

Serving on the San Diego Council for 5 years before I came to Congress, I worked hand in hand with residents to attack crime. We helped establish neighborhood watch groups. We went on walking patrols through the streets and created support networks among neighbors. We established drug free zones to keep dealers away from our schools. And we organized a graffiti patrol to clean up our neighborhoods and restore pride in our community.

We also worked directly with local police to create innovative crime fighting strategies. We instituted walking patrols in the streets, in the schools, and in the neighborhoods. Police officers got to know the neighborhoods they protected and the people in them. They talked to residents, and residents knew exactly who to call if they saw someone in trouble.

These efforts have been successful. During the last year in San Diego, we have seen a reduction of at least 10 percent in every major category of crime.

And most importantly, we were empowered, we felt stronger, we fostered a sense of community, and we saw that we could make a difference in peoples lives.

Neighborhood watch groups have proven to be an effective and economical approach to providing a better and more secure society for ourselves and our children.

Giving people in neighborhood watch groups a \$50 tax break will support the many citizens already involved in crime prevention and encourage more community participation.

I ask my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation. Working together—and only by working together—can we truly start to reclaim our streets.

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE,
JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDI-
CIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2076) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, the 1996 Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Appropriations Act is a clear, non-nonsense declaration of what this Republican Congress stands for. Time and time again the American public tells us that the main concern is crime, and for too long this concern has fallen on deaf ears. In our Contract With America we promised to act on that concern and I am proud to stand here today and say to the American people "We have taken action."

The Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Appropriations Act reflects the priorities of the American public. We have slashed wasteful bureaucracies, we have downsized low priority programs, and we have cut foreign aid and put the money back in America. Why should taxpayers pay for international efforts to stop killing abroad when in their own backyard people are murdering each other? We can't fight a war abroad until we've won the war at home. Make no mistake about it, this is a war. Crime in America has killed millions and ruined the lives of many more. Our anti-crime initiatives represent a major offensive in this war against crime. We recognize that crime cannot be defeated by politicians and bureaucrats in Washington. It is up to the local communities and States to lead the assault and that is why we have given them the means to fight crime directly, in the best way they see fit. This is only the beginning, we have a long fight ahead, but one we are committed to winning.

INTRODUCTION OF THE YELLOW-
STONE BRUCellosIS-FREE MAN-
AGEMENT ACT

HON. PAT WILLIAMS

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1995

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Yellowstone Brucellosis-Free Management Act to provide a comprehensive and practical strategy to address the problems of brucellosis in the Yellowstone.

Yellowstone, our Nation's first national park, represents the true flowering of the idea of public lands set aside for the use and enjoyment and education of all the American people. It is unsurpassed in scenic beauty and natural features and remains today of America's outstanding wildlife sanctuaries, little altered by human settlement.

Yellowstone provides refuge for rare and endangered species such as the threatened grizzly bear, the rare mountain lion and wolverine, bald eagles and trumpeter swans, the Yellowstone cutthroat trout and arctic grayling. The public lands surrounding Yellowstone offer complementary scenic vistas, recreational opportunities and outstanding wildlife habitat.

This greater Yellowstone area represents the largest undeveloped land of wilderness quality in the lower 48 States, and it includes the largest free-ranging herds of elk and bison in the world.

However, it is those herds, and particularly the bison, which have raised concerns about the risks of brucellosis which is carried by some animals in both herds. The dilemma is how do we protect the delicate wildlife interrelationships, the unique genetics of Yellowstone's wildlife and yet address the potential threat of brucellosis in the wildlife population and its possible transmission to livestock outside the park and resulting economic consequences to the livestock industry.

My legislation protects livestock producers from that threat and the harm of unfair economic sanctions by establishing a comprehensive framework for the National Park Service to address and manage and control brucellosis in the Yellowstone area.

For far too long, the bison-brucellosis controversy has swirled with hearsay, unsubstantiated claims and fear. This bill replaces fear with facts, rumor with research, supposition with science and, most important, it replaces talk with direct and specific action to remove the threat of brucellosis.

In the short term, this bill sanctions the interim bison management plan signed by the U.S. Forest Service, the State of Montana and Yellowstone National Park. It concurs with the need for a long term environmental impact statement in the form of a bison management plan. It also establishes the Yellowstone Brucellosis-Free Management Area with special regulations to provide economic stability in terms of the brucellosis-free status for the States of Montana, Wyoming, and Idaho as long as the interim plans are in effect within the Yellowstone area.

One of the most important features of the bill is the prohibition on unfair or arbitrary sanctions imposed by APHIS on other States or livestock producers of Montana, Wyoming, and Idaho because of the presence of brucel-

losis in wildlife within the Greater Yellowstone area.

In the long term, the bill directs the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to cooperate with the States of Montana, Idaho, and Wyoming in seeking the elimination of the diseases brucellosis from the Greater Yellowstone ecosystem. To accomplish this goal, the bill provides strong direction and authority for science-based management of the diseases.

The bill provides recognition of the facts that American Indians have long-standing spiritual and cultural ties to the American bison and, as such, have shown an interest in participating in the disposition of surplus bison for subsistence or to restore herds on American Indian lands.

Mister Speaker, this is a good bill for Montana's livestock producers. It protects their legitimate interests at the same time it provides for proper long-term management of Yellowstone's bison. This is a good bill for the bison. This is a good bill for the Yellowstone.

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE,
JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDI-
CIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. RON WYDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 25, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2076) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to thank the 179 Members of this body who signed on to my letter asking Speaker GINGRICH to preserve the Legal Services Corporation [LSC]. Additionally, I would like to thank those Members—AMO HOUGHTON, STEPHEN HORN, DAVID SKAGGS, HOWARD BERMAN, JACK REED, and CONNIE MORELLA, among others—who personally talked to other Members of Congress to help stave off further cuts to the Legal Services Corporation.

Legal services is literally the last line of defense against destitution for many deserving Americans. Last year, LSC-funded programs provided assistance to over 50,000 women seeking protection against abusive spouses, 240,000 elderly seeking help ranging from fraud to Medicare, 2,600 veterans seeking help with veteran's benefits, and 9,000 abused and neglected children. There are many in this country who would find themselves trapped in disastrous often life-threatening situations were it not for legal services attorneys.

I would also like to make several points about the contention that the private bar could somehow replace legal services attorneys. I began my career in public service running the Oregon Legal Services Program for the elderly. I came away from my experience with a strong belief that there is a critical role for the private sector to play in providing legal assistance to the poor.

During the time I worked with Legal Services, I organized hundreds of private attorneys to assist in expanding access to the courts for