

here to call the attention of my colleagues to this political exercise that contributed nothing.

The column follows:

WHITEWATER INVESTIGATION WAS A COSTLY
PARTISAN GAME

(By Senator Paul Simon)

The Senate Whitewater investigation resulted in a political exercise that contributed nothing, except to add to public cynicism and confirming the already widespread belief that in Congress we are playing partisan games rather than tending to the nation's and the public's real needs.

Obviously some people broke the law in the Whitewater events, but the evidence indicated neither a violation of the law nor of ethical standards by Bill Clinton or Hillary Clinton while he served either as President or as Governor of Arkansas.

But the misuse of the FBI files is another matter. Both the White House and the FBI are at fault. The President probably is not personally involved, but it happened in his White House and administration and it should not be treated as a minor mess-up by the President or his staff. The misuse of police powers by governments is as old as governments themselves, and something that must be constantly guarded against.

The abuse of the FBI files comes at a time when there are two other abuses.

One is the Senate investigation which spent almost \$2 million, received testimony from 139 witnesses, and took more time than any investigation of a sitting President in our history—longer than the Watergate or Iran-Contra hearings. "Where there is smoke there must be fire" is an old saying, but those hearing were designed to create smoke. Not only is there a product of questionable worth, we took testimony from many individuals who never in their lives thought they would testify before a Senate Committee, such as secretaries. Some were terrified by the combination of coming before a committee and being on national television.

A second abuse is the multiplying like rabbits of special counsels—really special prosecutors—with no limits on their expenses and their ability to use huge resources from the FBI and other agencies. I voted for the law creating the special counsel, but now I sense we need a better answer.

Since the FBI and the work of U.S. attorneys fall under the jurisdiction of the Attorney General, my sense is that we should review the possibility of a change in how we structure that office. It differs from other cabinet posts in its broad police and prosecutorial responsibilities, and the recent FBI debacle and the runaway habits of the special prosecutors, might provide an incentive to the next Congress and President to look at this question.

For example, we might have an Attorney General appointed for a 10-year term, with a small bipartisan group giving the President a list of five names to choose from, and also giving him the ability to request a new list of names if he found them unsatisfactory, but still requiring confirmation by the Senate. And then have no special prosecutors.

This is not a criticism of Janet Reno, who is a much-above-average Attorney General. Another example of a good appointment is President Gerald Ford's naming of Ed Levi, then president of the University of Chicago. No one felt that at any time Gerald Ford could get Ed Levi to do anything but what he believed was in the best interests of the nation. That is the way it should be.

My hope is that out of the present mini-storms something constructive can happen.

THE AGRICULTURE
APPROPRIATIONS BILL

• Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I wish to make a few remarks regarding the fiscal year 1997 appropriations bill for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies programs, which the Senate passed nearly unanimously yesterday.

This appropriations bill is arguably the most important for my State of North Dakota. Agriculture is my State's No. 1 industry, accounting for over one third of our annual economic activity. This bill provides important funding for many USDA activities important to my State, including valuable research, rural development, and, of course, commodity programs. I want to express my appreciation to the chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee for the excellent work they have performed putting this bill together.

Senator COCHRAN and Senator BUMPERS have an extremely difficult task balancing the needs of many important programs funded by this bill with the very difficult budget situation we are facing as we strive to balance the budget. I know the committee received a great number of requests to provide funding for programs and activities that are important to the agricultural sector of our economy, and I realize they could not possibly fund every program or activity at the levels requested. I do want to express my appreciation for the support the committee has provided for the programs in this bill, especially in light of their overall allocation.

I also want to express my appreciation for the help of the staff of the Appropriations Committee, Becky Davies, Hunt Shipman, Galen Fountain, and Jimmie Reynolds, for their excellent work on behalf of the chairman and ranking member.

Mr. President, at this point I would like to comment briefly on two important programs, and express my desire that the House-Senate conference committee will support the programs at the funding level provided in the Senate bill.

First, I want to express my strong support for the funding provided in the Senate version of this bill for the State mediation grants program within the Department of Agriculture. The Senate Appropriations Committee has provided \$2 million for this important program, and I commend subcommittee Chairman COCHRAN and Senator BUMPERS for including funding for this program. Regrettably, the House of Representatives did not provide any funding for the State mediation grants program. It is my hope that Senate and House conferees will realize the benefits of this program and fund the State mediation grants program at \$2 million.

The State mediation program was created in response to the agricultural crisis of the late 1980's, and the program continues to be valuable to farm-

ers and ranchers today. Mediation programs enable farmers and ranchers to meet with their creditors or the local Farmers Home Administration office in a confidential atmosphere which promoted civil discussion, mutual understanding, and in most cases, a fair settlement.

The scope of the State mediation grants program was expanded when the United States Department of Agriculture's [USDA] Reorganization Act of 1994 became law. Now, farmers and ranchers in States which have certified State mediation programs may choose mediation in a variety of disputes with USDA, such as conservation compliance, wetland determinations, and grazing rights.

The demand for this mediation program continues to exist. Nineteen States have certified State mediation programs, and USDA is working with more States to establish certified programs. Mediation is a proven method of sensible and economical dispute resolution. In producers' disputes with USDA, mediators provide the voice of reason and help all parties take a realistic approach to the administration of Federal programs and the requirements of compliance.

A group of my colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats, joined me in a letter to Chairman COCHRAN earlier this year, requesting full funding for the State mediation grants program. It is my hope that Senate and House conferees will realize the benefits of this program and fund the State mediation grants program at the Senate-passed level of \$2 million.

Mr. President, I also want to indicate my support for the funding provided in the Senate version of this appropriations bill for the Alternative Agricultural Research and Commercialization [AARC] Corporation, and express my hope that the conferees on this legislation will be able to fund AARC at the Senate-passed level.

This level of funding is justified by the major opportunities for developing markets for alternative agricultural products, and by evidence that the AARC program is providing the necessary bridge from private sector research to commercialization for these products. AARC is a venture capital fund designed to boost farm income by commercializing new uses for agricultural products. Recipients of AARC funds repay AARC's investment, plus a risk charge. AARC's system is revolutionary because it provides actual business financing and hands-on business and technical assistance, as well as competitive research grants and links with the public and private sectors.

In my view, AARC has only begun to tap the potential for commercializing new products in the domestic market. AARC promotes new industrial uses of our farmers' commodities like fiber board from wheat straw, windshield wiper fluid from ethanol, cat litter from waste peanut hulls, and many others. Finding new uses for our commodities and promoting value-added

enterprises in our rural communities are important ways AARC can help promote more jobs, higher incomes, and fresh opportunities in rural America. In AARC's first 3 years in operation, the Center invested \$22.3 million in 54 projects in 28 states, matched by more than \$75 million from private partners—a 3 to 1 match.

It is my hope that conferees will realize the benefits of the AARC Corporation, and provide funding at the Senate-passed level of \$10 million.●

A MISSTEP BY THE UNITED STATES

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, the United States unfortunately has openly opposed a second term for United Nations Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali.

I have written about this hard-working, effective leader in a column that is sent to newspapers in Illinois, and I submit it here to call to the attention of my colleagues this policy that has not made us any friends.

The column follows:

A MISSTEP BY THE UNITED STATES

(By Senator Paul Simon)

Suppose a local Rotary Club had the community's most wealthy and powerful citizen, Sam Smith, as a member. Imagine that the Rotarians had a dues system that reflected the ability to pay, so that wealthy Sam Smith paid more in dues than any other Rotarian.

To complicate the story, Sam Smith is far back in the payment of his dues, so far back that the money he owes amounts to almost the total budget of the club for a year.

The president of the Rotary Club is up for reelection, and most of the members want him reelected, but Mr. Big, Sam Smith, says no.

How popular do you think Sam Smith would be with the other Rotarians? Would his influence rise or fall? And what will the other Rotarians do in their election of a president?

The story is true.

Only the "club" is called the United Nations. The wealthy deadbeat member is called Sam, Uncle Sam. Most of the UN members believe that Secretary General Boutros-Ghali is doing a good job, despite being hampered by approximately \$1.4 billion that the United States owes but has not paid.

But the United States has made clear that we want to veto his reelection as Secretary-General.

The other nations, already too often unimpressed by our uncertain leadership in foreign policy, are not pleased with what we are doing, believing it is dictated by domestic political considerations.

In 1978, President Jimmy Carter designated me as one of the delegates to a two-month session of the United Nations, and I have followed the UN and its work with more than casual interest.

My impression is that overall the United Nations performs a vital service and a good job, not perfect, and that Boutros-Ghali has been a hard-working, effective leader—hampered in part by the United States talking to a great game, but not paying our dues.

Egypt is the home of the Secretary-General, and as an Egyptian he is also an African. Africa sometimes is called "the dark continent." It is more accurately described as the ignored continent.

One little-known fact is the gradual spread of democracy in Africa, some of them fledgling democracies that deserve more encouragement from the United States and other nations.

African countries take pride in having Boutros-Ghali as the Secretary-General.

Our opposition to him is coupled with other realities that they see: President Clinton has never visited Africa. Secretary of State Warren Christopher has not visited any sub-Saharan country since he has been Secretary, compared to 24 visits to Syria.

Our inattention, coupled with our unfortunate open opposition to the reelection of the Secretary-General, has not made us any friends.

FOOD QUALITY PROTECTION ACT

● Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate gave final approval to the Food Quality Protection Act (H.R. 1627). This legislation will reform the scientifically outdated Delaney clause. I ask to have printed in the RECORD letters of support from commodity groups, the Food Chain Coalition, Farm Bureau, and environmental and consumer organizations as well as a letter from Senator KASSEBAUM and a statement from the American Crop Protection Association.

The letters follow:

JULY 24, 1996.

Hon. RICHARD LUGAR,

Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We are writing to urge you to support H.R. 1627 the "Food Quality Protection Act" when it is considered by the Committee. The effort to achieve food safety reform, which assures an abundant, affordable, and safe food and fiber supply has been difficult, and we applaud all those who worked to help reach an acceptable compromise.

It is important that farmers continue to have the greatest availability of crop production products which are safe, affordable and effective to ensure that they are able to meet the nation's demand for food and fiber. While we had concerns initially with some provisions in the bill, the diligent work by the Committee and assurances from EPA and USDA that the new higher standard of protection will be interpreted with common sense and reason have reassured us that this is meaningful change.

The Delaney Clause is outdated and could possibly cause the loss of many crop protection products which pose no significant health or safety risk. This legislation represents the best opportunity in a decade to modernize the Delaney Clause and strengthen federal food safety protection. We will continue to work with you to see that the new legislation accomplishes these goals and urge prompt Senate action.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

American Soybean Association, National Association of Wheat Growers, National Cotton Council of America, National Corn Growers Association, National Barley Growers Association.

FOOD CHAIN COALITION,

July 23, 1996.

Hon. RICHARD G. LUGAR,

Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, U.S. Senate, Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Last week, representatives of the Administration, industry and

the environmental community reached compromise agreement on H.R. 1627, "The Food Quality Protection Act," after several weeks of negotiations. This bill represents the best opportunity in a decade to modernize the Delaney Clause and strengthen our nation's food laws.

As Americans working to produce, process and market our nation's food supply, we urge the Senate to act promptly to pass this compromise agreement. We applaud the announcement by the Senate Agriculture Committee that it will markup the legislation on Wednesday, July 24.

There is virtually unanimous agreement that an overhaul of the outdated Delaney clause for pesticide residues is long overdue. With the very limited number of legislative days remaining this year, the need for action to accomplish that objective is now more urgent than ever.

EPA recently proposed disallowing the use of five pesticides on a number of crops under the Delaney Clause, even though the agency has repeatedly stated its belief that those pesticides pose no significant health risk to consumers. By April 1997, EPA is due to determine whether to disallow up to 40 additional uses; without corrective action, farmers could lose the use of a number of safe and effective crop protection tools that keep the American food supply abundant and affordable.

The compromise version of "The Food Quality Protection Act" has received bipartisan praise from both the House and Senate, including Senate Agriculture Chairman Lugar, as well as from EPA Administrator Carol Browner and Vice President Albert Gore. Key Republican and Democratic leaders have stated that it is their goal to see this legislation passed and signed into law by the President this year. We urge its prompt adoption by the Committee.

Sincerely,

Agricultural Council of California; Agri Bank; Agri-Mark, Inc.; Agway, Inc.; American Bankers Association; American Crystal Sugar Company; American Farm Bureau Federation; American Meat Institute; American Feed Industry Association; Apricot Producers of California; Atlantic Dairy Cooperative; Biscuit & Cracker Manufacturers Association; Blue Diamond Growers; California Tomato Growers Association, Inc.; Californian Pear Growers; Chemical Specialties Manufacturers Association; Chocolate Manufacturers Association; Gold Kist, Inc.; Grocery Manufacturers of America; GROWMARK; Harvest States; Independent Bakers Association; International Apple Institute; International Dairy Foods Association; Kansas Grain and Feed Association; Kraft Foods, Incorporated; Land O'Lakes; Michigan Agribusiness Association; Milk Marketing Inc; National Agricultural Aviation Association; National Cattlemen's Beef Association; National Confectioners Association; National Council of Farmer Cooperatives; National Farmers Union; National Food Processors Association; National Grain and Feed Association; National Grain Trade Council; National Grange; National Grape Co-operative Association, Inc.; National Pasta Association; Nebraska Cooperative Council; North American Export Grain Association; Oklahoma Grain and Feed Association; Produce Marketing Association; Pro-Fac Cooperative; SF Services, Inc.; Snack Food Association; South Dakota Association of Cooperatives; Southern States Cooperative; Tortilla Industry Association; USA Rice Federation; United Fresh Fruit