

(3) This process produces a monster bill.

This bill is simply overwhelming. What we have before us—all 1754 pages—is not really the entire bill. It does not yet include the Medicare package. There are several other bills that are hundreds of pages themselves—such as H.R. 1561 and the welfare reform package—that this bill incorporates by reference.

This reconciliation package will include bills that majority votes in committees rejected. The "Freedom to Farm" bill, for example.

It includes bills the bulk of which the House has rejected, such as the mining patents and national park concessions proposals.

It includes bills such as the Cuba bill, that have passed the House and Senate in very different forms. There is every reason to send this bill to conference under regular process.

It includes bills—for instance, the Commerce proposal—created by a task force made up only of Members of the majority party, after committees have reported out different measures and some committees—such as the International Relations Committee—were apparently instructed by the Leadership not to act at all.

(4) This process will include a tightly constrained rule.

Reconciliation bills traditionally impose severe constraints on time for debate and the opportunity to amend. You will undoubtedly prescribe a restrictive rule, a rule designed to keep the package intact.

The Senate accords only 20 hours of debate (12 minutes per Member) on the bill. In this bill, that means just over one minute per page.

We have had only a few days to digest this enormous bill. And the contents of the bill we take up on the floor are anyone's guess—I expect your rule will include significant "self-executing" changes.

We will probably know even less about the contents of the reconciliation conference report before we must vote on it.

(5) This process is not defensible because the ends do not justify the means.

I understand that the current Leadership has a very different view of the committee system. If the Leadership is driven only by outcome then process is irrelevant. Having the votes at the end of the day is all that matters.

I believe that the essence of democracy is process, and that the end does not justify the means, that the means is as important as the end.

That means a process that guarantees that all Members will have an opportunity to be heard, if they do not have the chance to prevail.

It means a process that allows every Member to offer amendments and to vote, and every constituent to track how their representative has voted as a bill winds its way from committee, to the floor, to conference, and to the President.

It means a process that allows those who have spent time developing expertise in a particular area to have a seat at the negotiating table.

Eliminating consideration by committees, by one House, silencing voices, reducing the number of people at the negotiating table may get bills through the House faster. You may get bills out of conference more quickly. But in the end we will not get better laws. And we will erode the foundations of this institution.

CONCLUSION

We are subverting the entire legislative process here, decision by decision. We are taking bills to the floor that have not been

written or even considered by the committees of jurisdiction and expertise.

Protecting the committee system in this House should not be a partisan issue. Safeguarding the legislative process is not partisan.

For these reasons, I urge you to support Mr. Hall's efforts to strip the foreign affairs reorganization provisions from H.R. 2517. I would also support any efforts to strip the Commerce and Cuba provisions from this bill.

And I ask that you think very seriously about the entire way you're planning to move this reconciliation package. Subverting the legislative process does a grave disservice to this body, and to the American people.

TRIBUTE TO HTC ALBERT MONROE ON 20 YEARS OF NAVY SERVICE

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 31, 1995

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I don't need to tell anyone in this Chamber about my high regard for veterans, and for the men and women who serve in the Armed Forces. That service is always rendered at great sacrifice, and often at considerable danger. The entire country owes a debt of gratitude to the Americans who have served.

I'd like to single out one of those patriotic Americans today. HTC Albert Monroe of Ballston Lake, NY is retiring after 20 years of outstanding service in the U.S. Navy.

Mr. Speaker, geography makes this a maritime Nation, situated as we are between two large oceans, with the responsibility, as leader of the free world, of keeping our sea lanes free. This places a primary burden on our Navy. The backbone of that Navy, Mr. Speaker, is its noncommissioned officer corps, of which Chief Monroe is a shining example of leadership and service. To the usual burdens of military life are added occasional long deployments at sea, where the psychological pressures would multiply without such leaders as Chief Monroe.

The Navy looks to its chief petty officers as the most important link in the chain of command, the transmitters of orders and monitors of morale. Chief Monroe has met these challenges, as proven by the award of five Good Conduct Medals: a Meritorious Unit Commendation, and Navy Commendation Medal, among his other decorations.

Mr. Speaker, I have inspected our new, all-volunteer Armed Forces on every continent and on most of our U.S. installations. They are the best-trained, best-equipped, and most motivated military forces in our history, and I am proud of them. That level of excellence is directly due to the presence of career personnel like Chief Monroe.

I congratulate Chief Albert Monroe for his 20 years of service, and wish him, his wife Susan, and children Craig and Hollie all the best in the future. Mr. Speaker, I ask you and all Members to join me in a salute to this outstanding American.

SEVEN-YEAR BALANCED BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. ROBERT W. NEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2491) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996:

Mr. NEY. Mr. Chairman, as the House debates a budget reconciliation I would like to give my support to the provisions in the bill renewing generalized system of preferences [GSP] duty-free import program. This program was designed as a way to help less developed nations export into the U.S. market. The GSP Program allows duty-free imports of certain products into the U.S. from over 100 GSP-eligible countries. The bill wisely provides that import-sensitive products are not to be subject to GSP treatment. Ceramic tile is a clear example of an import sensitive product and is exactly the type of product which should not be subject to lower tariffs under the GSP Program.

Imports have dominated the U.S. ceramic tile market for the last decade and they currently capture nearly 60 percent of the market. This extraordinary level of import penetration is a result, in part, of over 30 years of documented unfair predatory foreign trade practices including dumping, subsidies, customs fraud import diversion, and abuse of a loophole in the GSP. The American ceramic tile industry, though relatively small, is efficient and competitive at normal tariff levels.

From its inception in the Trade Act of 1974, the GSP Program has provided for the exemption of "articles which the President determines to be import-sensitive." In light of the history of unfair trade in ceramic tile and the significant and growing import participation in the U.S. ceramic tile market, the U.S. industry has been recognized by successive Congresses and administrations as import sensitive, dating back to the Dillon and Kenney rounds of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT]. During this period the American ceramic tile also has been forced to defend itself from over a dozen petitions filed by various designated GSP-eligible countries seeking duty-free treatment for ceramic tile into this market. If just one petitioning nation succeeds in gaining GSP benefits for ceramic tile, then by law, every GSP beneficiary country is also entitled to GSP duty-free benefits for ceramic tile. If any of these petitions were granted, it would eliminate American tile jobs and could destroy the industry.

A major guiding principle of the GSP Program has been reciprocal market access. Current GSP eligible beneficiary countries supply almost one-third of the U.S. ceramic tile imports and they are increasing their sales and market shares. U.S. ceramic tile manufacturers, however, are still denied access to many of these foreign markets. Many developing countries maintain exclusionary tariff and non-tariff mechanisms which serve to block the entry of U.S. ceramic tile exports into these markets. Industrial countries, including the European Union [EU], may use less transparent

methods such as discriminatory product standards and testing methods to control their ceramic tile imports and, in some cases, to divert ceramic tile manufactured in third countries over to the U.S. market by imposing restrictions on those third country exports to the EU.

I am in support of the reauthorization of the GSP Program and trust that import-sensitive products such as tile will not be subject to GSP.

MORE THAN A DIFFERENCE OF DEGREES

HON. GEORGE P. RADANOVICH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 31, 1995

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, a respected leader of California's agriculture community, Bill Mattos, has hit the nail on the head. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the rule he rightly ridicules is one that tolerates as fresh chicken sold to consumers that is frozen so stiff it could drive nails.

For the enlightenment of our colleagues and to illustrate once again the folly of letting frozen masquerade as fresh, because that is what Government says, I take pleasure in presenting the following editorial expression by Mr. Mattos that was published in the Capital Press Agriculture Weekly on October 27, 1995.

POULTRY LABEL CHARADE CONFIRMS PUBLIC'S CYNICISM ABOUT POLITICS

(By Bill Mattos)

When is a frozen chicken fresh?

One newspaper says, "When it's got the political muscle of the 800-pound gorilla that is the poultry lobby."

I guess that's the same frozen poultry thawed on its way to California from some of the nation's largest poultry processors.

Believe it or not, Congress spent more than four hours recently debating chicken labeling, then barred the U.S. Department of Agriculture from enforcing truth in labeling.

Congress just doesn't get it. Voter anger, so visibly demonstrated in the last two federal elections, was not simply about one party vs. the other. Rather, it was directed at the status quo—a sense that in Washington, the concerns of deep-pocketed special interests outweigh the common good.

Recent action in both the House and Senate shows the lengths members will go to please special interests. In the midst of hefty debate on a welfare "revolution" and Medicare "overhaul," Congress found it necessary to vote on whether chicken that has been frozen to rock-solid temperatures can be thawed and called "fresh."

After weeks of serious debate, with California's representatives arguing the merits of freshness, Congress decided that yes, indeed, it should be legal to label defrosted poultry as "fresh."

This legislative squawking is ludicrous. But it means serious, added profits to a few big chicken producers in the Southeast who use these "fresh" labels to sell chicken to unsuspecting consumers nationwide at a higher price.

Consumers who buy fresh food believe it has never been frozen. That's why USDA officials in August announced that chicken producers can no longer put deceptive "fresh" labels on poultry that has been iced to below 26 degrees, and subsequently thawed for sale in grocery stores.

USDA policymakers didn't create this rule overnight. Two years ago, they began study-

ing the issue. They tested the freezing point of poultry—and discovered the meat becomes crystallized at 26 degrees. They held field hearings in cities throughout the country. They drafted a rule and published it in the Federal Register to solicit public comments.

And the public responded: USDA's mailbox received thousands of letters from irate consumers, all of the leading consumer advocacy organizations, as well as chefs, who felt the rule was important enough for them to write in.

Congress held its own hearings, which included testimony by noted chef Wolfgang Puck, who pounded a so-called "fresh" chicken that was rock-solid on a table in front of a House committee. Members participated in chicken bowling with "fresh" chickens that were hard as bowling balls.

The point consumers were trying to make was simple: A "fresh" chicken has never been frozen. Shoppers in search of fresh vegetables bypass the freezer case and go to the produce department. Likewise, those in search of fresh seafood head straight for the lobster tank. So why on earth did the Senate vote to provide an exception for poultry?

The answer: It puts lots of dollars in the pockets of giant poultry corporations in a few states like Arkansas and Mississippi, and costs 40 cents to \$2 more per pound for consumers who buy this "fresh" (actually, thawed) chicken.

Southeastern senators whose constituents include the largest chicken-producing conglomerates went to the Senate floor to say it was them vs. California, a state where consumers purchase lots of fresh chicken. Maybe they had a point—but only on the Senate floor. Off the Capitol grounds, it was the Senate vs. millions of consumers, and consumers lost.

In fact, the vote in the Senate was 61 to 38 in favor of defrauding consumers. Senators from the frozen-chicken states locked arms and relied on the old network to reverse a scientifically based USDA rule that was two years in the making. Subsequent objections to this ridiculousness raised elsewhere in Congress were overruled.

Kudos to Sen. Thad Cochran, R-Miss., and Sen. Dale Bumpers, D-Ark., or this legislative feat. Cochran is the chairman of the Senate subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations, the panel that holds the purse strings for the USDA. He got the ball rolling by slipping language into an appropriations bill before his committee that would prevent the department from using its funding to implement or enforce its truth-in-labeling rule.

But it was Bumpers who, during debate in the Senate, revealed the true thrust of the big chicken lobby's argument: economics. He said it was difficult to ship chickens from Arkansas without freezing them, claiming that "economically, that is not doable." So in pursuant to additional profits for several large companies, Congress overruled conventional scientific wisdom.

These actions typify what is wrong with Washington. The Congress overturned in a matter of weeks a pro-consumer, common-sense ruling by the USDA that took two years and many hours of public input, to make.

In the end, Congress chickened out and voted for the best interests of special interests, hoping consumers didn't notice.

Well, consumers and fresh poultry producers did notice, and we were disgusted.

This isn't a choice between fresh and frozen. It's a choice between consumers' interests and hard-ball politics as usual. What will it be, Washington?

SCHWARTZ, KARSIF & CO., P.C.
MARKS 35 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. JON D. FOX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 31, 1995

Mr. FOX. Mr. Speaker, when Bill Karsif and Sid Schwartz decided to enter into an accounting partnership, the two CPAs flipped a coin to determine the name of the firm. Sid Schwartz won the toss.

Since that time, some 35 years ago, Sidney A. Schwartz and William Karsif, both 67, have never looked back and have been consistently progressive in operating this CPA and financial planning corporation which still carries their names.

Schwartz, Karsif & Co., P.C., currently has offices at the Executive News, Building L, 2300 Computer Avenue, in Willow Grove, PA.

These two talented CPAs who have specialized in providing accounting services and financial planning for small businesses, will mark their 35th anniversary together on December 12 of this year with a special reception for all of their clients, business associates, and friends.

The two became friendly as a result of their membership in the Adelphi Lodge of B'nai B'rith and their neighborhood association in the East Oak Lane section of Philadelphia.

Schwartz is a graduate of the University of Pennsylvania Wharton School and Karsif is a graduate of Temple University. Both are members of the American and Pennsylvania Institutes of CPAs. Schwartz is also a certified financial planner and is active in the CFP Institute.

When they decided to form a partnership, Karsif was working in his own private practice and teaching at Pierce Business School, while Schwartz was also in his own private practice. Schwartz teases about earning \$40 per week back then, while Karsif muses about earning \$5 per hour.

The two businessmen joined together with one small office located in Center City Philadelphia and an office in the Mt. Airy section. "We knew that together we could offer better services for our clients," they note.

Through the decades that followed, their general accounting practice grew from the original partners, with one junior accountant and a secretary, to a multimillion dollar professional corporation with 24 professionals plus clerical and support staff.

SK&Co grew and acquired an expertise in many areas of small businesses including scrap metals, commercial contract cleaning services, commercial and residential real estate and construction, professional corporation in medicine and law, manufacturing, laboratory research, boarding homes, and personal care facilities. Their current client list spans businesses and corporations in some 25 States.

The firm has expanded its offices three times since its inception in 1961, moving to Cheltenham, PA, in 1971; Rydal, PA, in 1982; and finally to its spacious modern office complex in Willow Grove.

Schwartz says that the company was one of the first to run personal income tax forms on an in-house computer system and has never farmed out client work to outside service bureaus, specifically to maintain absolute confidentiality.