

less neurotic, damned, healthy, saved, de-based and great. That does not mean you send the grocer to fix your your plumbing. . . . [You] try to reach beyond characterization to political impact."

A subsidiary industry of the news business is the post-election conference or seminar on how we went wrong in our work. Why did we commit so much "tabloid journalism"? Why was coverage of the "real issues" so lousy? Why didn't we better understand the candidates, their characters, their personalities?

When all this psycho-babble is over and the next campaign comes around, we tend to repeat the same scenario because we can't help ourselves, because the habits of journalism are too hard to kick, because our history is too hurried, because truth and news are not the same.

TRIBUTE TO W.D. "BILL" FARR

HON. WAYNE ALLARD

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 14, 1995

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in honoring Mr. W.D. "Bill" Farr for his 40 years of service on the board of the Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District [NCWCD]. Mr. Farr was a true pioneer in the development of water for Colorado's front range.

During the drought years of the 1930's, the importance of water to farmers, fishermen, and other users on the front range became all too clear. In response, a friend of Mr. Farr's established the Northern Colorado Water Users Association, which would later become the NCWCD. One of the association's first projects, with which Mr. Farr was intimately involved, was to push for the construction of the Colorado-Big Thompson project [C-BT]. In 1954, the C-BT became fully operational and brought a supplemental supply of water from the western slope to seven northeast Colorado counties. Mr. Farr was certainly correct when he said that the "C-BT is like a second Poudre River. Without it, we would not have the front range we see today."

In 1955, Mr. Farr became a board member of the NCWCD. In the 1970's, Mr. Farr was instrumental in planning the C-BT's windy gap project and headed the municipal subdistrict of the NCWCD that built facilities below Granby Lake. As such, he is known as the father of the windy gap project.

Mr. Speaker, so that the House may fully appreciate W.D. Farr's unrivaled contribution to water development in Colorado, let me run through a brief chronology of his involvement with this issue: 1931—became board director with the Town-Boyd Lateral Co. of Eaton; 1942—named president of the board of the Sweet Jessup Canal of Carbondale; 1947—became board director of the Greeley-Loveland Irrigation Co.; 1955—became board director with the Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District; 1970—named first chairman of the Municipal Subdistrict of the Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District; 1971—became president of the National Cattlemen's Association; 1973—appointed to the Water Pollution Control Advisory Board of the U.S. Department of the Interior by President Richard Nixon; 1974—named chairman of the Region 208 Areawide Planning Commission of the Larimer-Weld Council of Gov-

ernments; 1975—became first chairman of the Colorado Water Resources and Power Development Authority; 1975—became member of the Colorado Water Congress; 1985—named the Wayne Aspinall Water Leader of the Year by the Colorado Water Congress; 1994—represented the Farr Family at the dedication of the Farr pumping plant at Granby reservoir. The plant is part of the Colorado-Big Thompson project.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, W.D. Farr's service to the State of Colorado cannot be overstated, and I thank you for joining me in recognizing his 40 years of service with the NCWCD. As the Representative for the mostly rural and agricultural Fourth Congressional District of Colorado, I have a deep appreciation for the life-time commitment W.D. Farr has made to ensuring that the front range has an adequate water supply year after year.

Thank you, W.D. Farr.

PESONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DOUGLAS "PETE" PETERSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 14, 1995

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the United States-Russian Joint Commission on POW/MIA's, I was asked to attend critical meetings with the government leaders of two former Soviet Republics during the week of November 6. This work precluded my attendance in the House and as a result I missed a number of rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: Rollcall No. 765—Yea, rollcall No. 766—Yea, rollcall No. 767—Yea, rollcall No. 768—Yea, rollcall No. 769—Yea, rollcall No. 770—Yea, rollcall No. 771—Yea, rollcall No. 772—Nay, rollcall No. 773—Nay, rollcall No. 774—Yea, rollcall No. 775—Nay, rollcall No. 776—Yea, rollcall No. 777—Yea, rollcall No. 778—Nay, rollcall No. 779—Nay, rollcall No. 780—Yea, rollcall No. 781—Nay, rollcall No. 782—Yea, rollcall No. 783—Nay, rollcall No. 784—Nay, rollcall No. 785—Nay rollcall No. 786—Nay, rollcall No. 787—Nay.

PURPA: COSTING CONSUMERS BILLIONS OF DOLLARS

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 14, 1995

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw your attention to another Federal regulation which has outworn its welcome, the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act [PURPA]. Born in the energy crisis of the 1970's, PURPA was designed to encourage renewable energy sources which would provide power more efficiently. We clearly have made great strides in producing energy in our country and a great many small, independent power producers have introduced us to alternative forms of power generation. These producers play a central role in fueling the wholesale power market. However, like many Government mandates, PURPA has created a backlash which runs counter to its original goals of less costly, more efficient power generation, and allows a

loophole whereby producers that burn primarily fossil fuels qualify as independent wholesale generators. But even worse, Mr. Speaker, PURPA has become downright harmful to American taxpayers, consumers, laborers and business.

Allow me to submit for the RECORD an article which recently appeared in one of New York's capital region papers, *the Schenectady Gazette*. While focusing primarily on a case in my home State of New York, the message of the author, Charles Conine, holds true throughout many regions of the country.

[From the Schenectady Gazette]

FEDERAL RULE KEEPS N.Y.'S ELECTRIC RATES HIGH

(By Charles T. Conine)

Niagara Mohawk last week proposed opening its service territory to full competition. This may be the first of many such actions by utilities to stop the financial bleeding caused by the Public Utilities Regulatory Policies Act (PURPA), a little-known boondoggle from the 1970s that costs consumers tens of billions, deprives the government of billions in taxes, wastes resources and eliminates skilled industrial jobs.

If the House of Representatives is looking for a regulation to reform, it should consider this one. Ending PURPA would find support from Republicans, Democrats, organized labor and consumers.

PURPA was adopted during the oil shortage of 1978 to promote renewable, domestic energy sources and increase energy efficiency. But instead of small, independent projects fueled with renewable energy, PURPA has spawned hundreds of unnecessary electric-generating plants, most of which burn fossil fuels.

PURPA developers can force public utilities to buy their electricity at a premium, regardless of whether the power is needed. PURPA developers also pay less in taxes than utilities do. The combination can be economically devastating for a state. New York, California, Pennsylvania and Maine have been hardest hit, but Colorado, North Carolina, Oklahoma and New Jersey also have their share of "PURPA machines," as these projects are called.

UNNEEDED POWER

Let me tell you what PURPA has done to consumers and workers in upstate New York. This year, Niagara Mohawk has been forced to buy \$1 billion of unneeded electricity from independent power producers, \$400 million more than it would have cost the utility to generate the same electricity. In other words, business and residential customers will pay \$400 million more this year for PURPA electricity, a figure that will continue to rise.

And because NiMo does not need the additional electricity, it has been forced to shut down power plants and eliminate the jobs of 2,000 electrical workers. Our union has worked closely with management to make changes in work practices and work flexibility, but the situation keeps getting worse.

These are prime industrial jobs that support many service jobs in the community—teachers, insurance agents, merchants, restaurant workers. The higher cost of electric power also puts other industrial jobs at risk and stifles growth. The only business that's growing in upstate New York is the moving business.

The loss of tax revenue also hurts. For example, the Nine Mile Point nuclear plant pays \$52 million a year in local property taxes. Nearby is an independent power plant of equivalent size that burns natural gas, owned by Sithe Energies USA, a subsidiary controlled by Campagnie Generale des Euax

of France. The huge Sithe plant pays less than \$1 million in local property taxes. Incredible as it sounds, we are giving tax breaks to foreign investors so they can overcharge American consumers and hurt our industrial competitiveness.

A utility's long-term marginal cost to build and operate a gas-fired power plant is currently 2.5 cents per kilowatt hour, yet the PURPA contract price for most New York state projects is 6 cents per kilowatt hour, with contract lifetimes as long as 25 years. The flat 6-cent rate was canceled in 1992, but all existing and planned projects were "grandfathered" at this absurdly high price.

After 17 years of abuse, Congress has taken a few timid steps to close the door on new PURPA projects, but lawmakers and regulators have been extremely reluctant to revisit existing PURPA rates, on the dubious legal theory that a forced sale constitutes a "contract" between a utility and a PURPA developer. By this logic, so does a mugging. The only difference is scale. American consumers will pay \$37 billion more than the current market price for PURPA electricity over the next five years.

What can Congress do at this point? A solution needs to focus on the most abusive provisions of PURPA, those that permit large-scale, fossil-fueled PURPA projects, as long as a little bit of industrial steam is produced on the side. Small, renewable energy projects represent only 20 percent of PURPA capacity.

A solution also needs to focus on consumers—commercial, residential and industrial—not on the investors and financiers who backed PURPA projects, or on the "sanctity of contracts." Investors were well aware of the risks inherent in an artificial market created by government regulation.

One solution would be to make these projects compete in the wholesale electricity market, as new independent power plants already do. Since the National Energy Policy Act of 1992, the wholesale electricity market has been open to all comers. One-quarter to one-third of the electricity generated in the United States today moves on the competitive wholesale market. Electricity has a market price. This free-market solution would protect non-abusive PURPA projects while offering a fair price to the financially abusive.

Republican Sen. Don Nickles of Oklahoma has opened the debate with a bill in the Energy and Natural Resources Committee that would end new projects but preserve existing rates. This is too timid. Unless these financial boondoggles are ended, several utilities will be in Chapter 11 before this Congress ends.

If the House leadership is serious about getting costly and ineffective regulations off the books, PURPA offers an opportunity to bring together business, labor, and consumers in a \$37 billion reform.

NATIONAL HOME HEALTH CARE MONTH

HON. JERRY F. COSTELLO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 14, 1995

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Home Health Care Month. Illinois has the distinct honor of being recognized as establishing the Nation's first Home Care Association. The Illinois Home Care Council was founded in 1960.

Home care saves money and allows many elderly Americans the chance to spend their

golden years at home with their families. Since its introduction, home care has received broad support across party lines.

Home care has rapidly grown since its start in the early 1960's. Council members sustain its growth through frequent meetings with governmental agencies and other health care associations. By keeping abreast of current issues home care has helped shape different aspects of health care legislation.

Thousands of nurses, therapists, physicians, and home care aides have devoted their lives to providing in-home health care to the sick and disabled. Please join me as I acknowledge all of them for their continued support of home care patients.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF YITZHAK RABIN

SPEECH OF

HON. THOMAS M. FOGLIETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 8, 1995

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, Yitzhak Rabin was a noble warrior in his nation's struggle for independence, a cold realist to the dangers posed by her Arab neighbors during times of war, and ultimately a bold statesman in his country's crusade for peace. Today, we mourn the tragic passing of this truly remarkable soldier, statesman, and now peacemaker.

Yitzhak Rabin did not reach the pathway to peace easily. As a young man, he knew all too well the blood, tears and sweat in the fight for an independent Jewish homeland. As a soldier, he was the architect of many of Israel's greatest victories against her Arab neighbors bent on her demise.

Matching his courage on the field of battle, Yitzhak Rabin once again led the Jewish people in the quest for a new tomorrow. Putting down the sword and greeting his former enemies with a handshake, he demonstrated to the world that peace is possible.

His is a noble legacy.

But, to truly pay homage to this legacy, we must continue on the road to peace to which Yitzhak Rabin gave his life. The forces of darkness can only be vanquished and peace brought to this troubled land if we continue the dialogue which has brought former enemies together. However, this road will be difficult and filled with uncertainty, and it is for this reason that now more than ever the United States must stand shoulder to shoulder with the people of Israel as we continue this journey.

MOTION TO DISPOSE OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 2586, TEMPORARY INCREASE IN THE STATUTORY DEBT LIMIT

SPEECH OF

HON. BRIAN P. BILBRAY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 10, 1995

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, when I was sent to Congress, my top priority was balancing the Federal budget. The people of the 49th district told me over and over again that

Washington's practice of leaving our children debt, instead of a brighter future, was unacceptable.

The new majority in Congress heard this resounding mandate from the public, and we acted. We submitted the first balanced budget since 1969. President Clinton did not submit a balanced budget.

Now we are faced with a stalemate between Congress and the President. I know that there is considerable public anger over what some may see as gridlock. However, I believe that this debate is about principles versus agendas.

In our 7 year Balanced Budget Reconciliation Act, our tax cuts for working families were offset by reducing the growth of non-entitlement spending, while continuing on the glidepath to a balanced budget. We also eliminated the subsidy to the wealthiest senior citizens participating in Medicare part B—single seniors with incomes over \$75,000 and couples with incomes over \$125,000 will begin to pay higher premiums.

President Clinton refuses to embrace our commitment to the principle that we will no longer tolerate mortgaging our children's future; we promised to balance the budget and we kept that promise. President Clinton's agenda is diverting attention from the indisputable fact that he does not support a balanced budget.

The Republican proposal for Medicare part B is included our measure to keep the Government running through December 1. President Clinton's states that his specific objection, and the reason for his veto of this measure, was over Medicare part B.

Medicare part B is the voluntary program which covers doctor's visits and outpatient care. Because the program is voluntary beneficiaries have not paid into a trust fund, as they have for Medicare part A, the hospital portion. Under current law, beneficiaries pay 31.5 percent of the premium for part B. Taxpayers subsidize the rest of the premium.

What we are proposing is to maintain the percentage at its current level—31.5 percent. Because the costs of the program will rise next year, as they have every year, the dollar amount will rise from \$46.10 to approximately \$53 in 1996—an approximately \$8 per month increase.

However, President Clinton is actually advocating dropping the percentage that premiums are calculated at to 25 percent and then raising them substantially again after the 1996 elections. The President is playing election year politics with the Medicare part B issue. He would cut revenues—by dropping the percentage to 25 percent—and then would have to raise the percentage again in order to make up for this shortfall. This is highly irresponsible.

Not only does President Clinton oppose a balanced budget, but this position on Medicare part B means that he believes taxpayers should subsidize a higher share—75 percent—of the costs of this voluntary program. It is exactly this logic which has resulted in the inevitable insolvency of the Medicare program is nothing is done to save it.

We have remained steadfast to the principle of our balanced budget; President Clinton has resorted to a diversionary political agenda rather than negotiating in good faith with Republicans. Nothing less than the future we leave to our children is at stake.