

bottle of cranberries fetching several shillings in London, the colonists began picking as much of the wild fruit during autumn as they could get their hands on. They even tried to pacify their king with the berries: In 1677 the colonists sent "ten barrels of cranburys," along with Indian corn and 3,000 codfish, as a peace offering to Charles II, who was angry with the New World residents for minting their own coins.

In 1816 American Revolution veteran Henry Hall made a discovery that would change the nature of cranberry-harvesting forever. At his seaside farm on Cape Cod, Hall decided to cut down some trees growing on a hill overlooking the beach. Wild cranberries grew in a marsh behind the hill. With the trees gone, the wind whipped sand onto the vines. Hall expected the plants to die, but the opposite occurred: The cranberries flourished under the sand while competing weeds disappeared. Hall began transplanting his vines, fencing them in and covering them with sand.

Thus cranberry cultivation was born.

Stephen Lee, a native of Ireland, bought 2,000 acres of New Jersey pinelands in 1868. The area, he discovered, was perfect for growing the cranberries. Woodlands and freshwater marshes pockmarked the landscape, while he could easily flatten the sandy soil to cultivate the fruit.

During the 1870s Lee and his son, James, carved out a series of cranberry bogs, most of which are still in use. Cranberry farming in those days was not necessarily profitable, and for the next two generations the Lee family struggled. As the Great Depression took hold, the family shut down the farm operation and moved to a nearby town.

Meanwhile, cranberry growers elsewhere had developed new methods to improve their harvest. Around the turn of the century, Wisconsin farmers found they could harvest twice as many berries by flooding their bogs then scooping up the floating fruit. (Flooding also gets rid of insects and protects against frost.) A few years later Boston attorney and cranberry grower Marcus Urann had another idea: a canned sauce made from cranberries that, according to the label, was "like homemade." In 1930 he merged his company with two other firms to form the Ocean Spray cooperative, owned today by the very farmers who grow the berries.

One of those farmers, U.S. Navy veteran Stephen V. Lee, Jr. (great-grandson of the Stephen Lee mentioned earlier), survived both the Normandy invasion and fiery battles in the South Pacific during World War II before returning to New Jersey to pick up the pieces of the family farm.

Lee borrowed \$4,000 from Ocean Spray and began the arduous task of reclaiming the land. Starting with some of the original vines his ancestor had planted, he restored the bogs and constructed new ones. "It takes about seven years to develop a productive bog," he says.

Eventually Lee's cranberry bogs began to pay off, while the industry itself was expanding its product lines to include juices that were, according to the ads, "a food drink that aids digestion."

Then came "Black Monday."

Seventeen days before Thanksgiving 1959 federal authorities announced that some Oregon and Washington cranberries were contaminated with a herbicide that was known to cause cancer in laboratory rats. The Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare suggested that Americans "pass up cranberries this year." Growers protested, claiming a person would have to eat 15,000 pounds of contaminated cranberries every day for years to get cancer. Vice President Richard Nixon solemnly ate four helpings of cranberry sauce on television to demonstrate

that the fruit was safe. But the damage was done. "We took a terrible loss that year," says Lee. "Nobody was buying the stuff. It took a few years for us to recover."

Today, cranberries aren't seen as posing a health threat; in fact, they're widely considered beneficial. In 1994 doctors at Harvard Medical School released a study that confirms an old folk remedy: Cranberry juice really does help prevent urinary-tract infections. The researchers reported that the women who drank ten ounces of cranberry beverage daily for six months were 58 percent less likely to have such infections than the women who drank a placebo beverage. Scientists had thought the berries' acidic nature knocked out infection, but the new study suggests that cranberries contain a compound that prevents infectious bacteria from adhering to the bladder walls. The doctors studied only older women because they are most prone to the infections. (Women in general have a much higher rate of urinary-tract problems than men.)

Motivated in part by such discoveries, Americans now consume more than 340 million pounds of cranberries a year. In the past decade Ocean Spray's sales have nearly tripled to more than \$1 billion annually.

"When I was young, there weren't a lot of choices with cranberries. You ate sauce—and more sauce," says Stephen V. Lee III, who returned home in 1973 to help run the family farm after serving as a flight instructor at the U.S. Air Force Academy in Colorado. Today Stephen III runs the business end of the operation—a task his mother, Marjorie, performed until her death in the early 1970s. "My parent's policy was that their children should go off and try other occupations before deciding on careers as cranberry farmers," he says.

His younger brother, Abbott, decided on his career several years ago after studying agriculture at a nearby college. Today he maintains the family's 125 acres of cranberry bogs, using innovative harvesting equipment he himself invented to reduce manpower needs.

The brothers' father, Stephen V., Jr., bounds across a dirt mound bordering one of the bogs and scoops up a handful of berries from a flooded area. "There's a rule of thumb with a family farm like this," he says. "The first generation acquires the land, the second generation improves it, and the third gets to spend the money."

It didn't quite work that way for the Lee patriarch, however. "My sons are the fifth generation," he chuckles. "And they're the ones who are really getting to enjoy the fruits of all this labor."

EMPLOYER TRIP REDUCTION PROGRAMS

HON. CURT WELDON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1995

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 325. As an original cosponsor of this legislation, I am pleased that this noncontroversial measure can be brought before the House today under the Corrections Day Calendar.

I grew up in a small oil refinery town just outside of Philadelphia. I can remember vividly the smell of burning oil in the air on a daily basis. Because of this experience, I have always supported strong clean air regulations. I voted for the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 [CAAA] and believe the goal of reducing air pollution should not be abandoned.

Over time, however, certain provisions of the Clean Air Act have proven to be unworkable. The implementation of employee trip reduction [ETR] requirements of the CAAA are of great concern to many businesses and employees in the Seventh Congressional District.

Due to a single air quality reading in Chester, PA, the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] designated the Philadelphia Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area [AMSA] as a severe nonattainment area under the CAAA. ETR is one of several strict mandates required by the CAAA for regions of the Nation which are classified as severe.

Significant scientific concerns have been raised about EPA's air quality monitoring and the single data point from Chester which places the entire Philadelphia CMAA into the severe category. Based on these and other concerns, I wrote to then-Governor Casey asking him to press the EPA to reclassify Philadelphia from severe to serious. Regions classified as serious are required to clean up the air sooner than those classified as severe, but are not required to establish ETR programs.

The ETR Program—while never fully implemented—would likely have proven costly to businesses with little real significant reduction in air pollutants. Last Spring, Governor Ridge announced that he would not implement the ETR requirements. The EPA concurred and publicly stated it would not force States to implement the program.

The legislation before us today will allow States like Pennsylvania to willingly opt out of the ETR Program without the threat of third party lawsuits based on noncompliance. This legislation is important for areas like Philadelphia where attainment goals are needed for improved air quality but where these goals can be reached without a costly unfunded mandate on businesses in and around the region.

I strongly support H.R. 325 and commend Congressman MANZULLO for his efforts to bring this bill to the floor today.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2076, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 6, 1995

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, the conference report on the bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies has been discussed at some length by a number of my colleagues on this side of the aisle. I share their serious concerns with the deficiencies of this legislation that have been so eloquently expressed by my friend and colleague from Wisconsin, Mr. OBEY, and by my friend and colleague from West Virginia, Mr. MOLLOHAN.

I want to focus my remarks on the serious defects of this bill with regard to the international obligations of the United States. The conference report that we are considering reduces by one-half our Nation's contributions to

international peacekeeping activities. Mr. Speaker, this is an incredibly short-sighted reduction.

By supporting such peacekeeping activities under the auspices of the United Nations, we are encouraging our involvement and participation in activities to keep the peace in a number of areas around the world. By fostering international peacekeeping, we are encouraging the participation of other nations and the participation of the military forces of other countries in activities that encourage peace and stability in many regions of the world. We have supported and fostered such efforts in a number of areas around the world, areas which are important to the United States—Cyprus, the Sinai, Cambodia—to name only a few. Our contribution to such peacekeeping efforts is an indication of our commitment to international action to maintain stability and encourage respect for appropriate international behavior.

Second, this conference report reduces by almost one quarter, 24 percent, U.S. contributions to international organizations, which fund the U.S. share of activities in the United Nations, the International Atomic Energy Agency, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and other such international organizations. These are not good will donations to these organizations; these are international treaty obligations of the United States. These organizations support important national security and foreign policy interests—international sanctions against rogue regimes such as Iran, Libya, and Iraq; efforts to reduce nuclear proliferation and other weapons of mass destruction; common international efforts to maintain Middle East peace and security, including the struggle to maintain the borders of Israel and Kuwait; the promotion of an open international trade framework; the control of diseases, such as the Ebola virus; and the promotion of human rights.

These short-sighted reductions in funding in this legislation impede the ability of the United States to carry out these vital national security and foreign policy objectives. Furthermore, the draconian cuts in funds severely hamper the State Department's ability to press for much-needed reforms at the United Nations and at other international organizations. Under strong pressure from many of us here in this body, the administration—under both Democratic and Republican leadership—has made considerable progress in pressuring for managerial, administrative, and budgetary reform. The unilateral reduction of our contributions seriously undermines our ability to continue to press for these needed reforms.

For half a century—since the end of World War II—the United States has spent enormous sums of money for our military forces to protect our national security and to further our international objectives. We pursued farsighted policies that had broad bipartisan support. Unfortunately, now that the cold war is over, we have not been willing to continue even the relatively modest spending that is required to protect these more cost-effective security and foreign policy interests. This is extraordinarily imprudent. This ought to be changed, and changing this legislation is the place to begin.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the adoption of this legislation before us today. We can—and we should—do better.

CIVILITY IN CONGRESS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 13, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington report for Wednesday, December 6, 1995, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

CIVILITY IN CONGRESS

In his recent press conference announcing why he would not be a candidate for President, Colin Powell mentioned the "incivility that exists in political life today". He's right. In national politics and in Congress we have seen a clear decline of basic civility. This year in Congress there have been mean personal attacks, shouting across the aisle, shoving matches, hissing and booing, and Members going out of their way to antagonize those of the other party. Press accounts have described the situation in Congress as "nasty", "full-scale partisan warfare", and "the politics of poison". Partisan tensions are as bad as I can remember. As one senior Member recently noted, "Boy, it's mean out there."

President Clinton recently called for more mutual respect in public discourse, echoing the sentiments of President Bush who called for an end to the "climate of ugliness" on Capitol Hill. The situation certainly isn't as bad as in other countries where we see brawls and fistfights breaking out among members of parliament, but it does merit some attention.

HINDERS LEGISLATION

The bitter, contentious exchanges in Congress certainly do not reflect well on the institution, lead to public cynicism, and make the job of legislating more difficult. As Thomas Jefferson stated, "It is very material that order, decency, and regularity be preserved in a dignified public body." Excessive partisan bickering poisons the atmosphere of Congress and hurts the ability of Members to come together to pass legislation for the good of the country. In a democracy like ours, the willingness of Members of Congress to listen and to talk to each other in a civil way is essential to our ability to reach a consensus on the difficult policy issues facing our nation—from balancing the budget to sending troops to Bosnia.

Certainly spirited debate is appropriate for the many important policy questions before Congress. Members have strong feelings on particular issues, and naturally get upset when they believe that programs very important to their constituents are being gutted or when they feel the other side is putting up unnecessary roadblocks to their legislative agenda. But Members can carry the legitimate debate too far and argue in ways that undermine serious policy deliberation.

PAST HISTORY

The problem of a breakdown of civility in Congress is certainly not a new one. In past years, especially during periods of national turmoil such as the Civil War or the civil rights movement, there have been major breakdowns in decorum. Over the years, Members have been formally punished by the House for making statements such as describing another Member as one "who is the champion of fraud, who is the apologist of thieves, and who is such a prodigy of vice and meanness that to describe him would sicken imagination and exhaust invective". Heated debate at times led to fistfights, pistol duels, and, a frequent response in earlier days, hitting another Member over the head with a cane.

ENFORCEMENT

Congress has two basic ways of disciplining Members for inappropriate speech. If the remarks occur during debate on the House floor, another Member can object and request that the speaker's "words be taken down". If the words are ruled inappropriate by the Chair, the speaker either can withdraw the statement or be prohibited from speaking on the floor for the remainder of the day. Broader enforcement can come from the House Standards of Official Conduct Committee—the House ethics committee—which has been given wide-ranging powers to punish Members for any actions which do not "reflect creditably on the House of Representatives". Formal charges could be filed against a Member, and the Standards Committee could recommend a range of sanctions. In the past, Members have been formally censured by the full House for disorderly words spoken in debate.

REMEDIES

The vast majority of the contacts between Members of Congress are civil and courteous. But there are intemperate exchanges—often getting extensive media coverage—which hurt the ability of the institution to properly function. Several steps would be helpful in minimizing them.

First, the Standards of Official Conduct Committee should issue an advisory opinion to all Members of Congress spelling out to them what are the proper limits of discourse and what are the consequences of going beyond the limits. The Standards Committee has a separate Office of Advice and Education which was set up specifically for such an advisory role to help head off misconduct before it occurs.

Second, we need more consistent enforcement by the Chair and by the Standards Committee. Rulings by the Chair can be spotty and inconsistent, and the rules requiring penalties for improper remarks have at times been waived. The Standards Committee has failed to act on some fairly egregious cases of improper speech in recent years.

Third, outside groups can be helpful watchdogs in keeping an eye on Members' statements. A bipartisan group like the Former Members of Congress, for example, could play a useful role in monitoring and publicizing proper and improper discourse on the floor.

Fourth, we need tougher enforcement by the voters. At times a Member of Congress might rise to prominence through a negative, confrontational style. If other Members think the nasty approach to politics works, they will emulate it. The voters need to send a clear signal that negative and nasty doesn't work.

Finally, Members must take it upon themselves to uphold appropriate standards of debate. In the end, it is up to each of us in Congress to set the proper tone and to work with our colleagues to maintain decorum.

CONCLUSION

Breakdowns in civility in Congress can reflect the passions of the moment, the polarizing nature of the policy issues, or even a less civil tone in the larger society. But that is no excuse for letting particularly intemperate and inflammatory speech go unchecked. Reining in the excesses can go a long way toward improving the ability of Congress to tackle the tough legislative agenda before us.

(Information was taken from a Congressional Research Service report, "Decorum in House Debate")