

been established by the parliaments of England, France, Germany, the Netherlands, and the European Commission. Clearly, OTA has a national and international reputation for excellence.

Coming from a State where agriculture is of pre-eminent importance, I am struck by the number of important analyses OTA has provided in the agriculture area, a policy area where one might not normally think of complex or highly technical issues. For nearly 20 years, OTA has provided exceptional support on agriculture technology and policy to Congress. As we begin the Farm Bill debate this year, we are already armed with a major, new assessment from the agency—"Agriculture, Trade and the Environment"—which presents several ways to achieve trade growth and environmental quality in complementary fashion.

OTA is completing another study using the best scientific expertise available in the country to identify agriculture's environmental priorities for better targeting of the Conservation Reserve Program and others under continuing budget stress. In a second study, OTA is assessing ways that agricultural research can generate new technologies at a faster pace, so as to ensure continued growth in trade while still meeting environmental, food safety, and public health goals. Another assessment now underway examines the roles biologically based pest controlled technologies can play in reducing the risk and use of pesticides while maintaining competitiveness. This subject affects several farm bill titles, including research, technology transfer, and land management.

In closing, I'll emphasize several points. First, it is imperative that Congress retain an independent analytical function. We don't want to rely on executive branch agencies.

Second, OTA's work cannot be picked up adequately by GAO or CRS, which focus on entirely different types of studies. The idea that OTA's work somehow could be contracted out is also unworkable. We would either be beholden to organizations supplying studies slanted to their own interests, or if we were willing to pay top dollar for the type of long-range studies OTA now undertakes, we would lose the important capacity inherent in an established professional staff to give testimony or to assist with legislative proposals sometimes years after the studies have been completed.

Third, policy questions are increasingly complex and technical. Environmental risk assessment and telecommunications are just two examples of complicated policy issues that confront Congress this year. Our colleagues have pointed out many others in the areas of national security, health, agriculture, and the environment. We make important policy choices every day, and we need OTA to help us sort out fact from fiction.

I ask my colleagues to support the Fazio and the Houghton amendments to restore OTA and to hold on to the important mission of this agency in support of our congressional decision-making.

TRIBUTE TO ANDREW G. CANGEMI

### HON. MICHAEL P. FORBES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 28, 1995*

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, it is no coincidence that Andrew G. Cangemi is the 1995 recipient of the Mental Health Association's Community Service Award at an event honoring Clinton Court. Mr. Cangemi exemplifies how one individual, like one new living option for people with a history of mental illness, can make all the difference in the world.

On a daily basis, Andy Cangemi touches many lives. Andy serves as an associate vice president of the Nassau County Council, Boy Scouts of America, and is a member of its board of directors. In 1994 he received the distinguished Citizen Award from the Scouts. He has received citations from the county of Nassau, towns of Huntington, Hempsted, and Islip for his work in the community. He particularly enjoys his volunteer work with the Northport Youth Soccer League.

As president of the Advancement for Commerce and Industry, a business organization of several hundred members, he has worked tirelessly to promote a working partnership between government and business to revitalize economic, environmental, and social conditions on Long Island.

As a partner in Sigel, Fenchel & Peddy, P.C. he is a member of both the Nassau and Suffolk Bar Associations. He is active in the Nassau County Judicial Advisory Council, the Columbian Lawyers Society, and the Sons of Italy. He has served as chairman of the Nassau County Bar Association's Condemnation and Tax Certiorari Committee, and as a lecturer for the Nassau Academy of Law.

Andy Cangemi's inspiration and vitality flows out of his background. As a neighborhood boy from Brooklyn, he considers himself fortunate to work his way up and have had the opportunity to become a practicing attorney. His interests in community services is an expression of the great responsibility he feels to give back. The energy he devotes represents a coming together of the personal and the professional man.

I've had the privilege of being a part of many important initiatives on Long Island, and I am proud to help MHA build Clinton Court. This project will be a model for affordable housing that will enable people with psychiatric disabilities to become productive, independent members of our community.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to know Andy Cangemi and I am proud today to be able to commemorate his many accomplishments. He is an example of the best of Long Island and of this Nation, a hard-working man who gives his time tirelessly to those less fortunate than himself. He demonstrates that in today's busy world compassion is still possible and relevant.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH  
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

SPEECH OF

### HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 22, 1995*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1854) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes:

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, the rule for this bill is frequently controversial because the provisions of the legislative appropriations bill affect our personal offices, our committees, and the offices and people supporting this institution. We all have personal knowledge of much of the subject matter, but there are many different perspectives about the standards we should be setting for ourselves and the way we should be administering the House. Those perspectives ensure controversy, and as the floor manager of the legislative appropriations bill for the last 13 years, I've managed my share of them. That honor now falls to my good friend, RON PACKARD, as the new chairman of the Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee.

This year 33 amendments were offered to the Rules Committee—however, only 11 were accepted.

The structure of this rule stands in stark contrast to the open rule adopted for consideration of the military construction appropriations bill, which was considered immediately prior to this one.

Although some good questions will be debated today, I am troubled by the important subjects that will be skipped.

Thoughtful amendments were submitted on a number of issues affecting the way we conduct business here. Amendments were submitted including:

First, ensuring the frequent flier miles earned by Government travel will only be applied to Government travel,

Second, eliminating funding for the Joint Economic Committee, and

Third, eliminating the discrepancy between congressional retirement benefits and other congressional employees.

I'm particularly concerned that the Republican majority on the Rules Committee voted down three amendments to the rule offered by their Democratic counterparts:

First, the Brewster/Harman lockbox amendment—this is a good concept that has been endorsed overwhelmingly by the House in the past. It's too bad we won't have a chance to consider it again when it comes to cuts in our won backyard.

Second, an amendment offered by Mrs. SCHROEDER to abolish the Joint Tax Committee. Mrs. SCHROEDER made a good argument at the Rules Committee comparing the Republican attitude toward the Select Committees of Hunger, Narcotics, Aging, and Children, Youth and Families—which were eliminated at the beginning of this Congress—and whether we should be considering joint tax in this same vein. Unfortunately, the House won't have a chance to make the comparison.

Third, last but hardly least, a gift ban proposed by our freshman colleague, JOHN

BALDACCI from Maine. The GOP freshmen came in with big reform plans for Congress. Now, when a gift ban is proposed, we're told that this is not the proper legislative vehicle for considering it, that it is too difficult to make these determinations in this bill.

Fortunately, there are some good questions the House will have an opportunity to discuss:

First, clerk-hire, official expenses, and mail. We'll be considering an amendment to cut costs more severely in the accounts affecting our personal offices even as a major cost-shifting effort is contemplated that will have a significant impact on the day-to-day operations of our personal offices.

Second, the proper funding level for Members' mail. We've slashed funding for mail significantly in the last few years—we'll have another chance to see if the Members feel we've finally done enough.

Third, the operation of the Government Printing Office and our depository libraries program. It is fitting that we consider the proper funding level for depository libraries especially as we move to an increased level of electronic dissemination of documents.

I'm grateful to the Rules Committee that we will also have a good debate about the vital support organizations for Congress that help us do our job.

There is a good amendment offered by Mr. CLINGER and our colleagues, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. CONDIT, and Mr. DAVIS to add funding to the Congressional Budget Office [CBO] in support of the important work they have been given in the unfunded mandates legislation passed by Congress earlier this year. I'm concerned about the offset they are offering in abolishing funding for the American Folklife Center, but it is important to talk about the resources needed for CBO to do their job properly for us.

Two good amendments take up the question of the Office of Technology Assessment [OTA]. My amendment is a straight restoration of OTA with a 15 percent cut in line with our cut to the General Accounting Office. Mr. Houghton's amendment would cut OTA further—to \$15 million—and make further savings by shifting their box on the organizational chart to Congressional Research Service.

I'm also grateful to the Rules Committee for allowing us to take up this important question of the authority of the Joint Tax Committee regarding refunds for our largest taxpayers.

This authority was, in my opinion, mistakenly eliminated in this bill. Joint tax works closely with the U.S. Treasury and provides a vital legislative check on their work, finding errors in approximately 9 percent of the cases reviewed and easily paying for the limited resources we devote to this function each year. There are solid reasons for joint tax performing this function, and I'm pleased that we will have a chance to point those out to the membership.

We will have some good debates. But the Rules Committee has left out too many important questions and has continued their intransigence in permitting the House to debate a gift ban. I oppose this rule, and I ask my colleagues to send this rule back to the Rules Committee to open up this debate and permit us to take up additional important questions that affect this institution and the way we conduct the people's business here.

## TRIBUTE TO CHRIS K. MOUROUFAS

### HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1995

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Chris K. Mouroufas, a proud Greek-American, a great civic leader, and an extraordinary friend who passed away this month.

Mr. Mouroufas lived the American success story. Born in Messina, Greece, he emigrated to the United States, built a prosperous business, and became widely known in the Greek-American community for his willingness to help newcomers. He was a leader in the affairs of the city of San Francisco, having been appointed to the San Francisco Protocol Committee by mayors George Moscone, DIANNE FEINSTEIN, and Art Agnos. In addition, Mayor Agnos named Mr. Mouroufas to the San Francisco Film Commission, where he served as chairman.

Mr. Speaker, Chris Mouroufas was a prominent member of the San Francisco Bay area who selflessly gave his time and talents to make our community a better place. What he cherished most was his family and his family of friends. He was a man of his word, a man of loyalty and a man of integrity. When Chris Mouroufas extended himself in friendship, it was a bond for life. I know, I was blessed to be his friend. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring him and all he did as a noble citizen of a nation he embraced, served, and loved, and extend our deepest sympathies to his beloved wife, Tula, and godson, Christopher.

## SAYING NO TO MOBUTU

### HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, President Mobutu of Zaire has ruled his country for over 30 years, during which period he has become one of the world's richest individuals by impoverishing his fellow countrymen. I wish to place into the RECORD the following exchange of letters between International Relations Committee Chairman BENJAMIN A. GILMAN and I and the Department of State concerning the issue of granting a visa to President Mobutu to visit the United States.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, DC, June 21, 1995.

Hon. LEE H. HAMILTON,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HAMILTON: Thank you for the letter which you and Chairman Gilman sent to the Secretary on May 19 expressing concern about a possible visit to the United States by President Mobutu of Zaire. We assure you that President Mobutu will not be coming to Washington and that the U.S. visa sanction directed against him and his entourage remains in effect. We agree that President Mobutu needs to demonstrate by his deeds rather than statements that he is committed to a genuine transition to democracy in Zaire. We appreciate your bipartisan support for our Zaire policy.

As you know, the President issued a proclamation in June 1993 suspending the entry

into the United States of immigrants and nonimmigrants who formulate or implement policies impeding a transition to democracy in Zaire or who benefit from such policies, and the immediate families of such persons. The intention of the proclamation was to send a strong message to President Mobutu that his obstruction of Zaire's transition to democracy was not without penalty. The visa sanction has been—and remains—one of our most effective measures to influence Mobutu and his entourage, and we have seen no change on the part of the Zairian president which would warrant a reversal of this policy.

President Mobutu has not applied for a visa to the United States, but if he or persons acting for him do so, we will remind him that he remains subject to the visa proclamation. On the basis of rumors of an impending visit, our Charge d'Affaires in Kinshasa made a formal demarche to the office of the Presidency, outlining our continuing concerns about the slow pace of the transition, and reiterating that President Mobutu remains subject to the visa sanction.

Rumors of a Mobutu visit to Washington appear to have been generated entirely by the Zairian president and a number of lobbyists in his employ. His agents attempted—unsuccessfully—to obtain an invitation for Mobutu to address a variety of private organizations. When it became clear that neither invitation nor visa would be forthcoming, President Mobutu's spokesman in parliament announced that the Zairian leader had decided to postpone travel in view of the outbreak of the Ebola virus in Kikwit.

You should know that there is a strong possibility that President Mobutu may attend the 50th U.N. General Assembly in New York this fall. While the Presidential proclamation on visas would permit us to refuse a visa to Mobutu for a bilateral visit, our international obligations under the U.N. Headquarters Agreement would likely require us to permit his entry to attend the General Assembly.

We hope this information is useful to you. If we can be of further assistance to you on this or any other matter, do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

WENDY R. SHERMAN,  
Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs.

COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS,  
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, May 19, 1995.

Hon. WARREN CHRISTOPHER,  
Secretary of State,  
Department of State,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It has come to our attention that President Mobutu of Zaire may be seeking to visit the United States in the near future. We urge you to continue your policy of not granting an entry visa to the United States to President Mobutu of Zaire.

We strongly believe that such a visit should not take place. The visa restriction policy is one of the few instruments of leverage the U.S. has on President Mobutu and his regime. While we hope that President Mobutu is serious in his recent statements concerning a return to democracy in Zaire and improved human rights, there is ample reason for skepticism. Allowing Mobutu to visit the United States before any substantial steps have been taken toward resolving the on-going political crisis in Zaire would be an unwarranted retreat from the policy of both the Clinton and Bush Administrations.

Zaire under Mobutu represents perhaps the most egregious example of the misuse of U.S. assistance resources. The U.S. has given Zaire nearly \$1.5 billion in various forms of