

can only go down so far on this path of evidence, but he cannot go down too far. He cannot stumble across things that may come up in the nature of that investigation.

If they had done that to the independent counsel in the Espy case, they would have never discovered Jim Lake and his scheme to provide illegal contributions to a Federal candidate.

That is the nature of an independent counsel, to be independent and as free to go as far as the facts and the truth take that individual; not as far as the facts and the political realities of the political debts and the political obligations take that investigation, but as far as the facts and the truth take that investigation.

□ 1245

The time has come for the chairman of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to admit they cannot do a job that will satisfy the needs of the Members of this House of Representatives in terms of telling their constituents that we have a different way of doing business, that we have a different way of handling congressional ethics, that we have a different way of handling the transgressions of those ethics because it is now Speaker GINGRICH, as opposed to Speaker Wright, or it is not Speaker GINGRICH, as opposed to 9 or 10 other Members of Congress, that had independent counsels. Let us meet the standard that Speaker GINGRICH has set our for the House, and that is an independent counsel.

#### TOURISM: THE WORLD'S LARGEST INDUSTRY AND GREATEST JOB CREATOR

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LONGLEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I have an important statement here which might take me longer than 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, thank God for the tourists. Here in Washington, in the small towns and big cities across America, the sight of a camper or a tour bus packed with people eager to spend money in local motels, restaurants, and gift shops is an answer to many a prayer. Each one of these vacationers is an economic miracle funding and fueling a massive industry, travel and tourism. That is America's second-largest employer and provides billions of dollars in revenue for every State, city, and town across America.

In today's changing world of high technology and increasing mobility, tourism is an economic sleeping giant. Futurist John Naisbitt has written that tourism in the next century will be the largest industry not only in America, but worldwide, and I agree. I believe that Naisbitt is right. Travel and tourism is also awakening politically from its slumber.

Mr. Speaker, we now have 302 members of our Travel and Tourist Caucus, an indication of how important this industry is to Congress. In 1995 travelers in the United States will spend an estimated \$535 billion. This is real economic muscle. Today we support 14 million jobs and provide \$493 billion in wages and salaries. That comes out of travel and tourism. The revenue generated by travel and tourism will total \$127 billion in Federal, State, and local taxes. That is what travel and tourism contributes to our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell you exactly what it means for each and every household in America. It means that you are paying \$652 less in taxes. Let me repeat that, \$652 less in taxes for each household, every year because of travel and tourism. This decrease in taxes comes to the American taxpayer from the travel and tourist industry and from the tourists.

Given these statistics, Mr. Speaker, convincing government to actively support travel and tourism should be easy. But, as my colleagues know, in spite of the growing support for the travel and tourism industry, the United States is losing ground. We must seriously focus on travel and tourism so that we can add jobs and income here in America.

In the recent hearing I held right here on Capitol Hill in our Economic Policy and Trade Subcommittee, Greg Farmer, Under Secretary of Commerce for Travel and Tourism, delivered some startling news.

He pointed out that the United States ranks 33d in the world among nations spending funds to promote tourism. That is even behind Malaysia and Tunisia. For the past 3 years, the U.S. market share in tourism has declined from 18 percent down to 15 percent. This means a lot of jobs and a lot of revenue right here in America, and the message is clear. The United States has invested less money in tourism, and now we are paying the price for that neglect. We are losing our share of the international tourist market.

We cannot allow that to continue to happen, and, Mr. Speaker, this means one thing for the working people in America: lost jobs. In the past 3 years the United States has lost 177,000 tourist jobs to other countries. Why? Because travelers are choosing destinations other than the United States, and we must reverse that trend, and that is what we are attempting to do in the Travel and Tourism Caucus. We want to bring travel and tourism, which has a great story to tell, here to the Congress, America, and around the world because travel and tourism is the incoming tide of a strong economy.

The need for action in this area is clear, and that is why we have, in my opinion, 302 members of the Travel and Tourist Caucus. Caucus members know that travel and tourism is America's economic prosperity, and it must be considered as two sides of the same coin.

Next week, as my colleagues know, on Monday and Tuesday a week from today and tomorrow, we are having our first ever White House Conference on Travel and Tourism. We are having some 1,700 people from every congressional district in America here on Capitol Hill, and from that conference we are going to take the recommendations and implement them into legislation. We can get in step with travel and tourism, the greatest economic engine that is propelling America into a stronger economy. By the year 2000, more than 661 million people will be traveling throughout the world, and, Mr. Speaker, I just want to add that travel and tourism will have more impact on our country and in our world economically than any other industry.

#### ACTIONS, NOT WORDS, ARE IMPORTANT

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I have come to talk a bit about words, words, words, words and how we often think we know what they mean, but they are not meaning what we think they mean so often as they are used by the Republicans in this time.

First of all, the words "family friendly." This was going to be a big "family friendly" Congress. Well, guess what they are selling first? They are selling the day care center for staff, and the day care center has been gagged. When you call and say, "What's going to happen to you, are you going to move somewhere?" they say, "We have been ordered not to talk to anybody about it." That does not sound very family friendly to me, and so, when you hear family-friendly, just think of the child care center for the staff being put on the auction block by these guys and see if you think that is family friendly.

Now the other thing that we hear about is independent counsel. We now hear that we are moving toward an independent counsel. Well, when you think of independent, independent means independent. But we hear the big hangup as to why we cannot have an independent counsel is because they want to find a way to leash the independent counsel, put blinders on the independent counsel, and keep the independent counsel in a cage. That is not an independent counsel. That is a lap dog, and no one wants a lap dog from the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct as we look into these issues dealing with the Speaker's ethics charges.

We also hear the big fight about, that was in the paper today, about the Speaker and his bulk sales in the newest, newest charge that has been piled up in front of the door of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, and what does the word "bulk" mean? The newspapers today are filled with

all sorts of articles on what does the word "bulk" mean. Were 200 books a bulk sale? Well, that was yesterday's news because today's news in the St. Petersburg Times says the 200 appears to be 400 books. Are 400 books to Capital Formation a bulk sale? How many books does it take to make a bulk, and how many books does it take to really get people's attention? There is also they will say, well, but when you look at ex-Speaker Wright's books, he sold a whole lot more. Yes, but he sold them at 5 bucks, you know. So, does the price count? Does how much comes back to the person count? I mean what is all of this nonsense?

Once again what we really need here is action and not words, action, action, action, and I have never seen so much inaction with so much to act on. Maybe that is why we are seeing the inaction, and maybe that is why we do not want a real independent counsel who has got to be these huge fights as to how do we call him independent and make him something else?

So I just say, as I get more and more frustrated, I keep remembering what my grandmother always told me: It is in the actions and not in the words, it is in the deeds and not in the words. It is in what people do and not what they say, and it is in the record and not the rhetoric because the rhetoric over here sounds wonderful, warm, fuzzy, family friendly, independent counsel, oh they are not bulk sales that the Speaker was selling, yatta, yatta, yatta, yatta. Well, guess what? When you peel away all of those wonderful, warm, fuzzy things, you find out they are selling the day care center, and they cannot even talk to you about it. Hum, makes me suspicious.

The reason we have not had any action on the independent counsel is they do not really want it to be independent except in name. We will call them that, but we will make them something else. We will make them kind of a lap dog, and that when you come to the issues around the Speaker's different charges, of which there are more and more piled up at the door, they want to dismiss them away and argue about them in the press.

That is not what is supposed to happen. We are supposed to have somebody on the outside with subpoenas and proper authority go out and find out what the real issues are rather than day-by-day are going through and finding all sorts of charges flying around in the newspaper, and one newspaper reporter found this, and another newspaper reporter found that, and another newspaper reporter found. Maybe we ought to hire them. I mean, if we are not going to hire anybody, maybe we ought to hire them; I do not know.

But I think that it really brings more cynicism to this body, and it certainly does not do anything for institution-building in this body because people expect us to act as we speak and do as we say we are going to do, so all I do is take the floor today to say, "Please,

please, if you're going to sell the day care center, tell us how our staffs are going to be able to find child care here." Mr. Speaker, Members take their children to their office and let their staffs provide the child care. I am not sure that is quite so fair, but what do the staffs do, where do they go, and how do we make this family friendly?

And please do not gag them, and please let us find out about that, and then when we come to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, let us get an independent counsel, let us get on with this, and let us decide, let them decide, how much bulk is bulk rather than this continuing day-by-day press thing.

#### RENEWAL OF HEIRS OF CERTAIN HISTORIC CABIN PERMITS IN SEQUOIA NATIONAL PARK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation in defense of the property rights of cabin permittees at the Mineral King Area of Sequoia National Park. Many permittees in Mineral King are apprehensive about evictions from property that their families have used for decades, because the National Park Service no longer believes it has discretion to renew the permits of those permittees who die. This issue has the attributes of a Federal land seizure. What a discouraging sight it would be if these properties are boarded up and the families who have responsibly occupied these historic cabins are evicted. I believe that as a matter of public policy they should be allowed to continue using these cabins. It is in this spirit that I introduce this bill.

H.R. —

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. RENEWAL TO HEIRS OF CERTAIN HISTORIC CABIN PERMITS IN THE MINERAL KING ADDITION OF THE SEQUOIA NATIONAL PARK.

Section 314(d)(2) of the National Parks and Recreation Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 45f(d)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) by striking "be reviewed by the Secretary, and may" in the first sentence; and

(B) by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence the following: "under the same terms and conditions as those contained in such lease or permit";

(C) by striking "shall be reviewed" in the second sentence;

(D) by striking "and may" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "shall"; and

(E) by striking "the date of enactment of this Act" in the third sentence and all that follows and inserting in lieu thereof "November 10, 1978, or their heirs, and any such lease or permit shall provide that the Secretary may terminate the lease or permit only for a breach of the specific conditions detailed in the lease or permit."; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(C) In the case of any lease or permit which—

"(i) was continued under subparagraph (A);

"(ii) was held by a person who died after November 10, 1978; and

"(iii) expired on or before the date of the enactment of this subparagraph without being renewed or extended under subparagraph (B),

the Secretary shall grant a renewal or extension of such lease or permit to the heirs of the person in the same manner as leases and permits are renewed or extended under subparagraph (B) and under the same terms and conditions as those applicable to such leases or permits."

#### THE FOOD AND DIETARY SUPPLEMENT CONSUMER INFORMATION ACT OF 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, in a few weeks this Congress will begin consideration of reform of the Food and Drug Administration, the FDA.

Now the FDA now regulates 25 cents out of every dollar spent on a good or service in this economy, and its impact in our everyday lives runs very deep. It performs several important functions such as protecting public health and safety.

Mr. Speaker, on June 29 of this year I added to the debate over the FDA reform, and I introduced a bill called the Food and Dietary Supplement Consumer Information Act of 1995, and this addresses how the FDA regulates food and dietary supplements. I am aware that the issue of dietary supplement regulation was considered in the last Congress and legislation was enacted, but that legislation fell short in a number of areas and also created an unlevel playing field for foods and dietary supplements. More importantly, a recent U.S. Supreme Court decision has raised the issue whether we ought to clarify the law with respect to claims, advertising and important health information to the public on this issue.

□ 1300

One key issue that must be resolved, Mr. Speaker, is whether the American public has the right to receive and hear truthful, nonmisleading information concerning the potential and proven health benefits of food and dietary supplements.

A recent U.S. Supreme Court decision, *Rubin versus the Coors Brewing Company*, has provided us with guidance on clarifying the law with respect to claims and health information. The issue of regulation of food and dietary supplements is among the most important to my constituents. We must all eat food daily to stay healthy, that is obvious. Over 100 million Americans are now supplementing their diets on a regular basis.

There are three important issues raised by the American people and my