of this subcommittee. While I do not oppose privatization, I believe that each proposal calling for it must be subjected to an exhaustive and deliberative review.

TRIBUTE TO ROLAND DAVID DEL CID

HON. JULIAN C. DIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1995

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay special tribute to a young man in my district, Roland David Del Cid, who will be honored by the Boy Scouts of America on August 21, 1995. On that day, Troop 113 will bestow upon Roland the highest honor of Eagle Scout at his honor court ceremony.

An honor graduate of Culver City High School, Roland has demonstrated dedication to athletics and academics. He was a varsity starting player on the Culver City High School football and baseball teams. Additionally, Roland maintained a 4.2 GPA and is ranked in the top 10 of his graduating class of 270. Roland has been recognized as a scholar-athlete by the National Football Foundation and College Football Hall of Fame, and he has received several other honors for his scholastic and athletic accomplishments. This fall, he will enter the Wharton School of Business at the University of Pennsylvania where he plans to major in economics.

During his career in the Boy Scouts, Roland has continued to dedicate himself to the improvement of his community and his troop. He has held several positions in the troop, including scribe, patrol leader, assistant patrol leader, senior patrol leader, and troop guide. Roland is also known to be active in recruiting and training younger scouts. Together with the rest of Troop 113, Roland has volunteered at homeless shelters, worked on food drives, and planted trees.

Roland's commitment to volunteerism is best exemplified by his Eagle project, in which he organized a highly successful blood drive. Culminating 3 months of organization and planning, the blood drive collected over 60 pints of blood which was donated to the American Red Cross. I commend his dedication to this project and community service.

Mr. Speaker, Roland is an exemplary young man who has shown great commitment to his family, community, and education. I urge my colleagues to join me, Troop 113, and Roland's friends and family in congratulating him on earning the rank of Eagle Scout, and in extending our best wishes for continued success in the future.

FOOZLE OF THE WEEK AWARD

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1995

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I confer the ''Foozle of the Week'' award on my colleague, Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. HEFLEY has earned this award by giving his ''Porker of the Week'' award to the National Institutes of Health [NIH] for its $5.5 million grant to the University of Colorado. He claimed that the grant will merely fund research on ''why people get fat.'' Hardly the case.

The NIH grant will establish the Colorado Clinical Nutrition Research Unit [CNRU], the only regional research unit of its kind between Chicago and Los Angeles. CNRU will study three areas: obesity and diabetes, pediatric nutrition, and trace mineral metabolism. The grant will also support a project on nutrition and premature infants that will help determine the best diet for the first days of life, as well as a study on proper nutrition and fitness for adolescents. Not only are nutrition and proper eating habits key to a healthy life, but their emphasis is still lacking in medical training.

Contrary to what my colleague has stated, obesity is not a problem that can be solved by simply eating properly and exercising regularly. Medical experts will tell you that there is no known, definitive cause of obesity.

Mr. HEFLEY also claimed that the NIH money will not be used for research on cancer, AIDS, or juvenile diabetes. The truth is that obesity is associated with diabetes and certain types of cancer, as well as with heart disease, atherosclerosis, hypertension, strokes, and many other illnesses that cost this Nation millions of dollars in health care every year.

The CNRU project brings Colorado into the forefront of national research in nutrition. My colleague says that a Colorado university does not need to study obesity, since obesity is not a major Colorado problem. That is like saying that we should only study skin cancer in California, or that we should restrict study of gerontology to Florida. The Colorado delegation should be proud that the University of Colorado has consolidated nutritional research in the Rocky Mountain region and is on its way to becoming a national leader in health research. I know that I am.

PORKER OF THE WEEK AWARD

Mr. HEFLEY. Madam Speaker, I would like to tell you about the National Institutes of Health and its multimillion-dollar grant to the University of Colorado. This multimillion-dollar grant is not for cancer research, as one might expect, or for AIDS research, or aid to children in developing countries, or for juvenile diabetes, or any of the things you might think this kind of money would go for. But what it is for is to study why people get fat.

Now, it does not take this kind of money, it does not take any money, to figure out what will result from too many trips to the refrigerator. In fact, you could spend a fortune just buying the magazines and books that contain the already countless studies on this subject. Thousands of them have been done.

Sure, it does appear that there is a certain medical explanation for some obesity, but most of the studies seem to indicate that the way you eat and the way you exercise explains most of the problem.

It is ironic that this study is being done in Colorado, which has the lowest percentage of overweight people in the Nation.

So the National Institutes of Health gets my porker of the week award this week.

CU NUTRITION CENTER BECOMES REGIONAL RESEARCH SITE

The University of Colorado Center for Human Nutrition has received a five-year, $5.5 million grant from the National Institutes of Health to form a regional nutrition research unit, the only one of its kind between Chicago and Los Angeles.

The Colorado Clinical Nutrition Research Unit (CNRU), one of 10 in the country, will focus on research in three areas: obesity and diabetes, pediatric nutrition and trace mineral metabolism. The grant will fund pilot research projects and several ''core labs'' to support research already funded from other sources.

''This award launches Colorado into the forefront of national research in nutrition,'' said Michael K. Hambidge, MD, professor of pediatrics and director of the CU Center for Human Nutrition. The Center, established in 1988, is part of the University of Colorado Health Sciences Center.

One project that will benefit from the grant is a three-year weight control program that focuses on nutrition and fitness for students at Lincoln High School.

''One third of American adults are inactive and overweight, and rates in adolescents are at least that high,'' said James Hill, PhD, associate professor of pediatrics and program director. ''Inactive, overweight teens often become inactive, overweight adults, and they can develop a number of serious health problems, including cardiovascular disease and diabetes.''

Students in the program take classes three times a week in nutrition and ''lifetime'' activities such as rollerblading, bicycling, walking and aerobics. They will also undergo a number of measurements several times during the year, including underwater weighing to determine body composition and a stationary bike riding to measure aerobic capacity.

''We hope to prove that an intervention program like this can have a positive health impact on adolescents,'' Dr. Hill said. ''Hopefully, it can also be adapted to other schools.''

The CNRU grant will also support a pilot project on nutrition and premature infants, directed by Patti Thureen, MD, assistant professor of pediatrics. Dr. Thureen is studying protein utilization in extremely low birth-weight infants to determine the best diet for their first days of life.

''There is already some evidence that what you feed larger premature babies in their first month of life may affect their long term developing,'' she said. ''We think the same may be true for tinier babies.'' Her patients weigh less than 1,000 grams, or approximately two pounds, and are 10 to 15 weeks premature.

Premature infants are traditionally fed a mixture of water and glucose intravenously for the first two to three days after birth. Dr. Thureen and her colleagues think that the infants may grow better if they are fed a diet closer to that which they receive from the placenta in utero—a mixture of water, protein, fat, vitamins and minerals.

The CNRU will consolidate nutrition research in the Rocky Mountain region, helping others extend their research beyond what they can do for themselves, said Dr. Hambidge. The Center already coordinates research with Colorado State University through the CU–CSU Nutrition Consortium, and Dr. Hambridge hopes to form similar partnerships with other universities in the region.

COMMENDATION FOR COL. JAY McNULTY

HON. G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1995

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, August 31 will mark the end of a very distinguished

career in the U.S. Army with the official retirement of Col. Jay McNulty. It also will mean the House of Representatives will lose the services of an individual who is the epitome of professionalism.

For slightly over 28 years, Jay has served in his Nation's uniform with great distinction. He served two tours of duty in Vietnam, first with the 11th Armored Cavalry Regiment (Blackhorse) and then the 1st Squadron of the 1st Regiment of Dragoons (Blackhawk). As a former armored officer myself in World War II and during Korea, I feel a special kindredship with Jay because of our similar military duty.

Since 1993, Colonel McNulty has served as Chief of Army Liaison to the U.S. House of Representatives. I am sure my colleagues will join me in commending Jay for the many times he has been of help to them and their constituents. He has served the Army well in this position.

On a more personal note, I appreciate the excellent job Jay did in planning and making arrangements for our trip to observe the 50th anniversary of D-day in England and Normandy last year. I believe we had the largest congressional delegation to ever attend a single event, not to mention the many other delegations from other countries. The trip was a logistical nightmare, but thanks to Colonel McNulty and his dedicated staff it was one of the smoothest trips I have been on.

Jay, we will miss you and certainly wish you well in the future as you take on new challenges. We thank you for your service to the House and the Nation. You truly have been a credit to the uniform you wear.

THE IMPORTANCE OF SECTION 29 TO LANDFILL GAS PROJECTS

HON. NANCY L. JOHNSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 31, 1995

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to extend a tax credit in section 29 of the Internal Revenue Code for producing gas from biomass or synthetic fuels from coal. The credit expires at the end of next year. My bill would extend it for another 4 years through the year 2000.

This tax credit was originally enacted in 1980 in the aftermath of the oil embargo as an inducement for Americans to look for fuel in unusual places. The country had just gone through oil shortages, long lines at gasoline stations, spiralling inflation, and record-high interest rates driven by the increase in energy prices, followed by a deep recession. We were determined not be be held hostage again. To this end, Congress enacted a series of measures intended to use what fuel we have more efficiently and to give business incentives to tap sunlight, wind, geothermal fluid, biomass, and similar resources for fuel.

The section 29 tax credit was part of the strategy. It was a credit of $3 for the equivalent of each barrel of oil in energy content produced from a list of unconventional fuels. The list included gas from Devonian shale, tight sand formations, coal seams, geopressured brine and biomass, and synethetic fuels from coal. None of these fuels could be economically produced without the credit. Congress provided for a phaseout of the credit if oil prices ever reached high enough levels again so that the market would produce them on its own. Both the amount of the credit and the phaseout prices are adjusted each year for inflation.

The credit was originally scheduled to expire in 1989. It has been extended three times.

The last time—in 1992—Congress drastically cut back the list of fuels that qualify to only two: gas from biomass and synthetic fuel from coal. An example of gas from biomass is methane produced by decomposing garbage at landfills.

To a degree, the logic for continuing the credit shifted by 1992. In the case of landfill gas, the credit produced important environmental benefits by collecting a dangerous greenhouse gas that might otherwise be released into the atmosphere. This was on top of tapping a potentially useful fuel that was otherwise going to waste. In the case of synthetic fuels from coal, the country has tremendous coal reserves, but coal can be a dirty fuel and there was a desire to continue efforts to develop coal-based fuels as an alternative to burning straight coal.

Why extend the credit again? My main interest is in seeing an incentive remain on the books to tap methane gas at landfills. We still are not doing enough in this area.

Methane gas at landfills is a serious health and safety hazard. It must find an outlet or it can explode. During the 1980's, there were more than two dozen life-threatening explosions and at least three deaths at U.S. landfills.

There are two possible outlets for landfill gases. Gas can migrate underground to adjoining properties, where it can kill or stunt vegetation by displacing oxygen from the ground. Alternatively, it can escape into the atmosphere. Contaminants in the gas contribute to air pollution and mix with sunlight to create smog.

Landfill operators control the gas either by installing so-called passive systems, like trenches, barriers and vents to prevent gas from migrating underground and to give it an outlet into the atmosphere, or by installing so-called active systems where the gas is pumped to the surface and either flared, vented, or collected for use as a fuel.

Use as fuel is still rare. There are approximately 6,000 landfills in the United States. At the end of 1990, gas was geing collected for fuel at just 97. In 1995, the figure is still only 143.

Last year, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency created a special Landfill Methane Outreach Program in an effort to encourage more collection of landfill gas for use as fuel. Methane is a greenhouse gas that contributes to global warming. It is the second largest contributor to global warming after carbon dioxide, and landfills are the single largest source of methane emissions, accounting for more than a third of total methane.

Greenhouse gases are expected to increase by 14.5 percent during the 1990's. The Clinton administration committed in April 1993 to hold greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels. The Landfill Methane Outreach Program is an effort to avert this increase. EPA is preparing a report to Congress on barriers to landfill gas projects, it has set up a hotline to cut through redtape, and it is in the process of signing cooperative agreements with States and utilities to encourage more landfill gas production.

Air pollution officials—not just at EPA but also at the State and local levels—are eager to see the tax credit extended. The credit is just starting to have an effect at landfills. Most landfill owners have only recently become aware of it, and the pace of landfill gas development is increasing noticeably. It took almost 15 years to get the word out. There was almost a 50-percent increase in landfill gas projects in the last 5 years. The credit needs more time to reach its potential.

EPA estimates that approximately 750 of the 6,000 landfills in the United States are candidates for landfill gas production. The experts believe it will not happen without the credit.

My bill would do four things.

First, it would extend the credit. The credit is currently scheduled to expire for projects placed in service after December 1996. Under the bill, this deadline would be pushed back 4 years through the year 2000.

Second, it would push back the so-called expiration date for the credit by a commensurate number of years. Under current law, landfill gas projects must be in service by next year, but if they meet this deadline, then they qualify for tax credits on the gas produced through the current expiration date, 2007. My bill would push back the expiration date by 4 years through 2011.

Third, my bill would eliminate a complication concerning expiration dates. There are two different expiration dates in the statute currently. The credit expires for pre-1993 projects in 2002. It expires for more recent projects in 2007. My bill would collapse these dates into a single expiration date of 2011 for all projects. There is a misconception that having made an investment to get a landfill gas project off the ground, the developer will continue producing gas after the credit expires. Many projects will not. Landfill gas production is not economic at most sites without the credit. Production will case, notwithstanding the capital investment the developer made to get the project going initially, because he cannot afford to operate at a loss. In addition, there are continuing capital costs that must be made to keep a project operating. Landfills expand. Garbage shifts underground. Pipes that have been put underground to collect the gas break or bend and new ones must be installed.

Finally, my bill would make a technical change in section 29 that, at a 1994 House Ways and Means Committee hearing, the Treasury Department said it does not oppose. To qualify for section 29 tax credits today, the person producing the gas must sell it to an unrelated party. The reason for this requirement is obscure. Most landfill gas is used to generate electricity for sale to the local utility. Landfill gas projects are structured currently so that ownership of the gas collection equipment is in different hands than the electric generating equipment. It would be simpler if the producer of the gas could use it himself to generate the electricity. My bill would allow him to do just that. The bill would treat the unrelated-party sale requirement as having been met in cases where the producer uses the gas to generate electricity which is sold to an unrelated party.

The Ways and Means Oversight subcommittee, which I chair, held a hearing on May 9, 1995, about whether to extend certain expiring tax benefits, including the section 29 credit. I look forward to extending the credit later this year before work on new landfill gas projects