and woman, and that their interests can be lost in all the special pleading.

Hoosiers are rightly concerned about the influence lobbyists have in our federal government. The efforts of lobbyists can at times go too far—giving lavish gifts to influential Members, helping to funnel large contributions to campaign coffers, using strong-arm tactics to get action on their particular agenda, and drafting entire sections of bills or official committee reports. Current lobbying regulations requiring the public disclosure of lobbyists' expenses and activities are vague and are generally considered inadequate.

Lobbyists' efforts can cancel each other out. Members of Congress often witness a clash of sophisticated and aggressive interest groups attempting to achieve contradictory policy goals. They push and pull in so many different directions that nothing seems to move anywhere. They add many issues to the public agenda and that just makes it much more difficult to get legislation passed—hence gridlock and a greater level of public dissatisfaction.

NEED FOR REFORM

All of this has brought about more pressure for lobbying reform. I support several reforms. We should require disclosure of who is paying the lobbyist, how much is being paid, what federal agencies and congressional committees are being lobbyied, and the issues involved. Lobbyists should be required to identify how much is being spent on activities such as mass mailing campaigns. We should prohibit Members of Congress and their staffs from accepting gifts from lobbyists. Voters have a right to be skeptical about some of the gifts Members can now legally take. We should also require the public disclosure of bill language or committee report language drafted by lobbyists. The Senate recently passed measures to impose a gift ban and to improve lobbying disclosure; the House should follow suit.

Lobbying reform is needed, but it must be balanced. We must not reach too far and try to restrict legitimate lobbying activities and public contact with Members of Congress. Almost any attempt by the government to limit private and nongovernmental entities from using their own private funds to lobby will be difficult due to the First Amendment. Individuals who lobby on their own behalf or volunteers who lobby on behalf of a group should not be covered. In regulating lobbyists we have to be very careful to protect free speech and specifically careful to exclude from regulation contacts from churches and related groups.

CONCLUSION

Lobbying will always remain an important part of our political process because of the First Amendment right to petition the government for redress of grievances, but there are abuses that need to be checked. Our goals should not be to try to stamp out lobbying entirely, but to improve the current system so that it becomes more open and accountable and enables us to take the multiplicity of interests in this country and forge them into the national interest.

TRIBUTE TO DON BOSCO TECHNICAL INSTITUTE

HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1995

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Don Bosco Technical Institute. Bosco Tech is celebrating 40 years of service to the San Gabriel Valley and the Greater Los Angeles area. Since 1955, young men have tackled the rigorous and challenging curriculum that this notable high school offers.

Like most high schools, Bosco Tech offers college preparatory academic courses, interscholastic athletics and extracurricular activities. What sets this school apart from the rest is the intensive instruction and practical experience in technology. Students specialize in technological areas such as, design, electronics and computer, graphic communication, manufacturing, materials science, power and transportation, and construction technology. Students select one of these areas to concentrate on after first taking introductory courses in at least four of the previously mentioned subjects. Based on their preference, as well as faculty and parental consultation, students select a final technological major.

Bosco Tech students also have the option of remaining at the school for a fifth year of study. During this time, they can attain an associate of science degree in their selected areas of specialization. Whichever option a student chooses, he will be significantly more prepared for the challenges that await than many of his peers.

The methods used at Bosco Tech are a definite success. Their acceptance rate at major colleges and universities for graduates is unparalleled in the Greater Los Angeles area. Bosco Tech alumni are leaders in their fields and communities. It is no surprise that they attribute much of their success to their time spent at Bosco Tech.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to this widely recognized and respected school. For 40 years, Don Bosco Technical Institute has invested in the future of America by preparing tomorrow's leaders.

SALUTE TO THE CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF OUR LADY OF MOUNT CARMEL RECTORY

HON. THOMAS M. FOGLIETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1995

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute the centennial anniversary of Our Lady of Mount Carmel Rectory.

In 1896, Our Lady of Mount Carmel Rectory was established on 2319 South Third Street, in South Philadelphia. Our Lady of Mount Carmel Rectory has witnessed many changes throughout the years. Our Lady of Mount Carmel Rectory has been blessed with 10 pastors since its creation including the founding pastor, the Rev. Bernard F. Gallagher, to the present pastor, the Rev. Gerald D. Canavan. Today the church hosts many organizations to reach out to its parishioners: Catholic Youth Organization, Senior Citizens' Club, Parish Choir, Pastoral Council. The parish also maintains a grammar school of 457 pupils which will lead Our Lady of Mount Carmel into the next century.

In April 1996, Our Lady of Mount Carmel Rectory's parishioners will proudly celebrate their 100th anniversary with events beginning in October 1995, and lasting through Sunday, April 14, 1996, with a concelebrated Mass at which the Most Reverend Anthony J. Bevilacqua, Archbishop of Philadelphia will be the main celebrant.

I hope my colleagues will join me today in wishing Rev. Gerald D. Canavan and the congregation of Our Lady of Mount Carmel Rectory a very happy 100th anniversary. I wish Our Lady of Mount Carmel Rectory the very best in its next 100 years of service to the American Catholic community in South Philadelphia.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1995

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, although I intended to vote for S. 21, the Bosnia and Herzegovina Self-Defense Act, on August 1, 1995, my vote was recorded in the negative. As my voting record reflects, I have consistently supported all efforts to lift the arms embargo on Bosnia and Herzegovina.

TRIBUTE TO EUPHRATES ABBITT, OUTSTANDING EDUCATOR

HON. CARRIE P. MEEK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1995

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to join the family, friends, and coworkers of Euphrates Abbitt in recognizing her 33 dedicated, consecutive years of service to our community. Her retirement from Key Biscayne Elementary on June 23, 1995, was truly a loss for the Dade County Public Schools.

Euphrates graduated from Middle Township High School in Cape May Court House, NJ, in 1957, She began her higher learning at Edward Waters College period in Jacksonville, FL, and received a BS degree from Florida A&M University. Euphrates continued her studies in the field of education as she graduated with honors from Indiana University with a master of science in Education. She continued her postgraduate work in education at the University of Miami and Florida International University.

Euphrates Abbitt began her long career in education as a creative fourth grade teacher at Poinciana Park Elementary. She eventually taught all elementary grades. Through her hard work and willingness to learn new techniques, Euphrates soon became known among her peers for her dedication to teaching excellence.

In 1969, when integration was introduced into the Dade County Schools, Euphrates Abbitt was among those teachers who made it happen. She felt close to the students she taught, and they had confidence in her. She expresses, ''If I can reach just one child, then my efforts are worth it.''

Over the many years of Euphrates' career, she successfully carried out various assignments including serving as assistant principal and acting principal of Key Biscayne Elementary School. She has been the recipient of numerous awards, certificates, plaques, proclamations, and mementoes through the years from her community, colleagues, and students.

Mr. Speaker, this remarkable woman has dedicated her life to shaping and enriching the minds and hearts of our young people. I join with our entire community in recognizing her many years of hard work and dedication which has made such a huge impact on countless lives. Euphrates will celebrate her official retirement celebration on Saturday, September 30, 1995, in Miami. I know that my colleagues join me in honoring Euphrates Abbitt on this special day.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE PROF. EDWARD J. MURPHY

HON. PETER T. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1995

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of one of our Nation's most eminent educators and scholars, Prof. Edward J. Murphy of the University of Notre Dame Law School who passed away on July 24.

Professor Murphy taught at Notre Dame from 1957 to 1994—and during that time was acknowledged to be an unsurpassed academic authority in the area of contracts law. Professor Murphy held the first chaired law professor at Notre Dame and authored the legal textbook ''Studies in Contract Law'' which became the most widely used contracts textbook in the country.

Mr. Speaker, for 37 years Professor Murphy taught every student who attended Notre Dame Law School. It was my honor and good fortune to have been one of those students. Professor Murphy taught me contracts, negotiable instruments, and bills and notes and directed a senior contracts seminar in which I participated. I have no hesitancy in saying that Professor Murphy was the most outstanding teacher I have ever had. He was hard working and dedicated and possessed an unsurpassed ability to communicate even the most arcane topics. He was admired and respected by every student who ever sat in his classroom.

Mr. Speaker, Professor Murphy loved the law and he loved to teach. But what made Ed Murphy so unique was that his teaching transcended the classroom. He believed in values, in principles, and in ideals and he imparted them to his students in all that he taught. Professor Murphy believed in God and in his Catholic faith and never wavered when confronted by the forces of political correctness. As Notre Dame Law Professor Charles Rice noted, ''Professor Murphy uniquely integrated faith and morality with the law. What he taught is sorely needed by law students today.''

Mr. Speaker, Prof. Edward Murphy faced death as he lived his life—with courage, with dignity and with faith in God. And now I would ask this House to pay its own tribute to a man who made such a profound impact on the lives of so many. Please join me as I express my regret at the loss of Edward J. Murphy, and my profoundest condolences to Mary Ann, his wife of 41 years, his 9 children, his 22 grandchildren, and to his entire family.

THE 1995 FARM BILL

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, August 30, 1995, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE 1995 FARM BILL

When Congress returns to Washington after Labor Day, it will begin action on the 1995 farm bill. Farm programs are a bewildering variety of production limits, loans, income support payments, conservation programs, export promotion, research, and rural development. This year they are caught in the debate between budget constraints and the traditional constituencies that support farm programs.

Without much doubt, these programs have contributed to the stability and strength of American agriculture. American farmers produce the safest and cheapest food supply in the world. Americans spend less than 15% of their income on food—far less than our major competitors. While the number of Americans working on farms may be small (2%), almost 20% of the country is involved in production, processing, marketing, transport, sale, and export of agricultural products. Agriculture's success strengthens the American economy.

But, like most areas of the federal budget, farm spending will be reduced over the next several years. The debate in Congress centers on the depth and composition of those cuts. Unfortunately, the congressional leadership may include major farm programs in a huge omnibus budget reconciliation bill. This seven-year budget bill will include major changes in Medicare, welfare, defense, student loans, taxes, and hundreds of other agencies and programs. It will be thousands of pages long. Because of the enormous size of the reconciliation bill, debate on the farm bill may be severely limited on the House floor. Several different farm bill proposals are pending.

SINGLE-PAYMENT PLAN

This proposal would replace all commodity programs with one yearly payment. This plan would cut farm assistance almost a half, from about $9 billion this year to $5 billion in 2002. Farmers would receive one reduced payment each year based on a percentage of their historical payments. Farmers would not have to raise crops to receive payments, but they would be required to maintain existing conservation plans.

One advantage of this proposal is that it separates payments from crop planting requirements, and farmers would be more free to farm according to the market. A disadvantage is that, in bad years, farm payments would still decrease, and many farmers could be forced out of business. This proposal also makes no effort to reform current conservation programs, which favor Great Plains states at the expense of hillier areas such as Southern Indiana.

LOWER TARGET PRICE PLAN

Another proposal would make equally deep cuts, but keep the basic programs. For most crops, the government currently sets a target price and pays farmers a deficiency payment when prices fall below the target. This plan would lower those target prices 2 to 3 percent each year for seven years. That means that deficiency payments would eventually be paid only if prices dropped to extremely low levels. This plan would keep the link between production and payments and allow reforms in other programs. However, if payments are cut too low, farmers might leave the programs, threatening erosion control and other conservation efforts to protect safe drinking water.

OTHER PROPOSALS

Urban Members have proposed abolishing farm programs entirely, or reducing payments to large corporate farms. Other Members have suggested an alternative budget that still balances the budget by 2002, but makes only one-third of the cuts in farm programs described above. It is not clear which of these proposals will be considered on the House floor.

MY GOALS

I believe we should move aggressively to a market-oriented farm policy. Farmers must have increased planting flexibility to respond to world markets, and regulations must be significantly reduced. Cuts in farm programs will be necessary to balance the budget, but farmers should not bear a disproportionate share of the burden.

Regulation: Regulation should be reduced. Farm programs must be streamlined and made more flexible at the local level, with an emphasis on voluntary incentives rather than mandates. All regulations should be based on sound science, and the cost of regulations should be weighed against their benefits.

Research: Agricultural research and extension have given U.S. farmers their competitive edge. I do not believe agricultural research should be reduced. With global competition and market reforms, research should be a top agricultural priority. Research boosts production and develops innovative agricultural products, such as ethanol, soydiesel, and biodegradable ink.

Trade: The United States should aggressively act to open new markets for American farmers. We should continue strong export promotion programs to maintain U.S. market share, so long as our competitors do the same. Small businesses, such as food processors and forest product manufacturers in Southern Indiana, depend increasingly on exports for growth. U.S. export promotion programs should be aimed more at these smaller businesses.

Conservation Programs: Important conservation programs should continue. The Conservation Reserve Program (CRP), which removes environmentally important land from production, should be targeted to more environmentally sensitive areas, such as rolling hills, waterways, and wildlife areas.

Supply Management: Programs that limit crop production should be cut back. Current production controls stabilize prices in years of surplus by removing land from production. This reduces crop supplies and increases prices. However, when U.S. farmers produce less, foreign farmers gain world market share and American agribusiness loses money. Strict supply management programs place U.S. farmers at a competitive disadvantage.

CONCLUSION

In the next few weeks, I am concerned these important considerations may be lost in the rush to complete a mammoth budget reconciliation bill. Farm legislation is too important to brush off with minimal consideration in the overall budget and reform debate.

The farm bill must maintain the strength of American agriculture and move toward free market principles. The farm bill should increase farmer flexibility, decrease regulations, preserve a safe and stable food supply, and provide family farmers with a decent return for their labor and investment.