

in the Lutheran Church, president of the National Lutheran council and president of the California Lutheran College in Thousand Oaks. He now holds the title of president emeritus of California Lutheran university and continues to maintain his ties to the school.

Dr. Olson's impressive career accomplishments are rivaled only by a tireless dedication to his community and extensive record of public service.

He has served on the Ventura County grand jury, the board of directors of the Conejo Valley Historical Society, the United Fund of Ventura County, various boards of education, the Cultural Center Planning Committee and has been a member of the Thousand Oaks Rotary Club since 1963.

In addition to these numerous professional and philanthropic commitments, Dr. Olson and his wife of nearly 60 years, Helen, have raised two daughter and a son.

In short, Mr. Speaker, I believe that Dr. Raymond M. Olson has truly served his family and his community through a lifetime of service and selflessness.

He was recently selected as the 1995 Patriotic Citizen of the Year by the Conejo Valley chapter of the Military Order of the World Wars and was presented with the Chapter's Silver Patrick Henry Medallion. This recognition was truly appropriate, because one of the basic tenets of the organization is that it is better to serve than to be served.

Dr. Olson has lived his life in strict adherence to this belief and has backed up this opinion with an unparalleled record of action and dedication to others. I commend him to all in this body and congratulate him on his award.

STATEMENT RECOGNIZING NORENE COLLER THE 1995 REGION 2 EPA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AWARD RECIPIENT

HON. SUE W. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1995

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my congratulations to Norene Coller, a constituent of mine who was recently awarded an Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] Environmental Quality Award for region 2, which includes New York, New Jersey, and Puerto Rico.

Over the past 20 years, Ms. Coller has devoted herself to improving the quality of the environment in region 2, and to increasing public involvement in environmental action. As a biology teacher in Hyde Park, NY, Ms. Coller has involved her eighth grade students in innovative environmental brainstorming exercises. A renowned volunteer of the Dutchess County Environmental Management Council [EMC], Ms. Coller has served as the council's chairperson since 1982. And under her direction, EMC has fulfilled the needs of the community by formulating a comprehensive agenda to battle the growing problems associated with hazardous and solid waste management. Ms. Coller's energetic direction, as both an educator and public servant, has increased the quality of the environment of region 2.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me in recognizing the fine achievements of Ms. Coller.

She is to be commended for her dedicated service to the community, and should be noted as a true friend of the environment.

HOOSIER FARMERS URGE CONTINUED SUPPORT FOR EXPORTS AND RESEARCH

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the results of my 1995 farm bill questionnaire. The questionnaire responses indicate most Hoosier farmers are willing to accept less funding for farm programs, but only in the context of broader spending reductions. While farm programs should not be singled out for funding cuts, I am pleased—but not surprised—that Hoosier farmers are willing to do their fair share to balance the budget. Among the different agricultural programs, cuts in crop support payments received the broadest acceptance, with nearly 63 percent favoring reductions.

Hoosier farmers gave their strongest support to funding for promoting U.S. exports and agricultural research and education. I agree with this shift in priorities. The 1995 farm bill should be more market-oriented while preserving our competitive edge in world markets.

Of those responding, 64 percent had participated in Federal farm programs in the last 5 years, 75 percent of whom received 10 percent or less of their yearly farm revenue from direct payments. Farmers also expressed their support for limiting farm payments for wealthier farmers, while rejecting proposals to guarantee all farmers a minimum income. Hoosiers also support Congress' decision last year to abolish the Disaster Assistance Program.

I thank the many Hoosiers who answered the questionnaire, and I appreciate their careful consideration of these important agricultural issues.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

(The results may not add up to 100 percent due to rounding and multiple responses.)

1. What general policy direction do you favor for the 1995 farm bill?

	(percent)	
Extend current programs	13.3	
Extend current programs with changes	37.6	
Replace with an alternative	13.7	
Eliminate farm programs	35.4	

2. Current federal spending on programs that directly benefit farmers is approximately \$18.8 billion per year. The overall level of funding is likely to decrease for 1996, and Congress may reorganize spending priorities among the following programs. For each category please indicate whether you think spending should be increased, decreased, or kept the same.

(In percent)

	Increase	Same	Decrease	Don't know
Commodity support programs ..	8.6	26.1	62.7	2.6
Conservation reserve program ..	8.9	33.8	55.0	2.3
Research and extension	19.5	39.0	39.0	3.4
Other conservation programs ...	1.4	31.1	54.4	5.7
Export promotion activities	27.9	36.5	31.8	3.9
Crop insurance	10.0	33.5	50.8	5.8
Farm credit programs	9.3	31.1	52.0	7.5

3. If commodity programs must be reduced, which of the following deficit-cutting options would you favor?

	(percent)
Cutting target prices	12.1
Raise acreage reserve program (ARP) levels	11.0
Raise loan rates	12.9
Reduce \$50,000 payment limitation cap	38.8
Establish income ceiling	48.7

4. Some farm groups have suggested abolishing all current farm programs and using the funds for an income support level of 70 percent of each farmer's historical income. Farmers would then be free to farm according to their interpretation of the markets, with the assurance that in a bad year they would receive no less than 70 percent of their usual income. Do you:

	(Percent)
Favor this concept	21.9
Favor this concept with changes	16.6
Oppose this concept	60.4

5. The Conservation Reserve Program [CRP] pays farmers a yearly fee per acre to keep certain land out of production. The program decreases soil erosion, encourages wildlife and boosts commodity prices by controlling supply. CRP expires this year. Should Congress:

	(Percent)
Continue CRP as is	26.2
Focus payments on more environmentally sensitive areas	22.6
Phase out CRP	35.3
Allow more acres in CRP with reduced payments	15.9

6. There are growing concerns among consumers about the possible effects of pesticide use on the environment and public health. If pesticide use should be monitored, which one of the following proposals would you most support?

	(Percent)
Promote extension programs to curb pesticide use	22.5
Establish more controls over pesticide use	8.7
Provide more incentives for alternative farming practices	36.1
Do not change current policy	32.8

7. The Ad Hoc Disaster Assistance Program has been replaced by a much broader Federal crop insurance program. Instead of irregular and expensive disaster payments, farmers in USDA programs will now enroll in a basic catastrophic insurance policy, with subsidies to provide more comprehensive insurance. Which of the following options do you favor?

	(Percent)
Keep the current system	33.9
Return to the ad hoc disaster payments	5.6
Modify the current crop insurance system	35.7
Eliminate all federal emergency assistance	24.8

8. The Uruguay round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT] reduces agricultural subsidies in foreign countries. Because U.S. subsidies are already far lower than our competitors', other countries will make larger cuts in their farm programs. Would you favor further reductions in worldwide farm subsidies, even if some commodity prices and U.S. farm programs might be reduced?

	(Percent)
Yes	49.7
No	19.2
Don't know	31.1

9. Food and nutrition programs are often described as "indirect" farm programs because they increase food purchases by some \$30 or \$60 billion per year. They are also a source of urban support for the farm bill. Which of the following food and nutrition proposals do you most favor?

	(Percent)		(percent)		(percent)
Continue current funding for food programs	40.3	Yes	64.4	More than 50 percent	10.9
Increase funding for food programs ...	7.2	No	35.6		
Reduce funding for food programs	30.7	11. If yes, about what percentage of your yearly farm revenue came from Federal farm programs?		12. Overall, do you think you are better off, worse off, or about the same economically as you were 5 years ago? Better off—21.7 percent; Worse off—35.8 percent; and About the same—42.4 percent.	
Eliminate food programs	19.7		(percent)		
Allow cash payments instead of food programs	2.0	0 to 5 percent	50.2	13. How do you think you will be doing 5 years in the future? Better off—19.9 percent; Worse off—37.2 percent; and About the same—42.9 percent.	
10. Have you participated in the Federal farm programs over the last 5 years?		5 to 10 percent	24.9		
		10 to 15 percent	8.7		
		15 to 20 percent	2.7		
		20 to 50 percent	2.7		