outstanding Members of this U.S. House of Representatives.

I came back most impressed with Snuffy Smith, the admiral, and General Crouch, who have charge of our troops. These men know what they are doing. These troops are ready; they are well trained. It is not risk-free, but the western alliance and America's status in this world is at stake in this matter.

One person said something that will last with me forever, and that is that the people in the Balkans need a period of decency.

I have never seen such devastation as we saw in Sarajevo. I ask of this House when we consider, if we do, any resolution, that we take into consideration the immense need to support the troops of the United States of America.

NOT A BALANCED BUDGET

(Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, in today's USA Today on page 7 is an ad that contains the following advertisement where the National Republican Party offers a million dollars to the first citizen who can prove that the following statement is false: ''In November 1995, the U.S. House and Senate passed a balanced budget bill.'' Then it goes on to talk about the increases in spending for Medicare.

In November 1995 the House and Senate passed a budget bill that increases the annual operating deficit of this country by $33 billion. You see, next year's annual operating deficit will be $296 billion, of which $118 billion will be stolen from the trust funds that you good people are paying into on your Social Security and other programs.

That is not a balanced budget. Mr. Barber, you can write the check care of the University of Southern Mississippi scholarship fund. You are out $1 million.

DISCHARGING COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS AND REREFERRAL TO COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE OF H.R. 2415, TIMOTHY C. McCAGHREN CUSTOMS ADMINISTRATIVE BUILDING

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent the Committee on Ways and Means be discharged from consideration of the bill (H.R. 2415) to designate the U.S. Customs Administrative Building at the Ysleta/Zaragosa Port of Entry located at 797 South Ysleta in El Paso, Texas, as the ''Timothy C. McCaghren Customs Administrative Building,'' and that the bill be rereferred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

CORRECTIONS CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). This is the day for the call of the Corrections Calendar.

The Clerk will call the first bill on the Corrections Calendar.

REPEALING SACCHARIN NOTICE REQUIREMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1787) to amend the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act to repeal the saccharin notice requirement.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1787

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

SECTION 1. NOTICE REQUIREMENT REPEAL.

Section 403 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 343) is amended by striking paragraph (p).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS] and the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] each will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS].

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. BILIRAKIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1787, legislation to repeal an unnecessary saccharin notice requirement that, with the passage of time, has become redundant and unnecessary.

In 1977 Congress passed a law preventing FDA from banning the use of saccharin. As an interim measure, the law required stores that sold products containing saccharin to post warnings until package labeling would include the required warning.

As warnings are now on all packages containing saccharin, there is no reason to maintain an unnecessary warning requirement. Eliminating this requirement will save retailers—and ultimately consumers—from unnecessary compliance costs.

I want to commend the sponsors of this legislation for bringing this bill forward, especially the gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY]. I also want to commend the Speaker's Advisory Group on Corrections that includes the ranking member of the Health and Environment Subcommittee that identified this bill as a candidate for the Corrections Calendar.

I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. It is a good candidate for the Corrections Day Calendar because this bill would correct a provision in law that requires the posting of a warning sign about the potential dangers of saccharin which is really no longer necessary. It was put into the original law dealing with saccharin at a time when we thought there ought to be a warning until such time as the label itself on the product contained the information to advise consumers.

I think that the gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY], my friend and colleague, is to be commended for bringing this issue to our attention. This is a bill that no one should disagree with. It is correcting a problem. I think that it is overdue. I would urge support for this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY].

(Mr. BILBRAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1787. First, I would like to begin by thanking the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BURR], who joined me in introducing this common sense correction bill back in June.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY], who have guided this bill through subcommittee and committee and brought it to this process of corrections day with the support of the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH].

The focus of this bill's correction is a classic example of the need of the correction day and the intent that was stated by the Speaker in the days that he introduced it. This bill is a good example of how we can streamline existing law and make more sensible, effective law out of a system that needs updating.

H.R. 1787 will eliminate a once-needed but now unnecessary regulation while continuing to provide consumer information and protection to small business owners and consumers alike.

The need for this bill, Mr. Speaker, became apparent last year when 54 retail companies in California were served a complaint under the State's bounty hunter statute. This complaint alleged that the stores had failed to maintain a saccharin warning sign in violation of Federal law. In April of this year, more than 20 supermarket companies in North Carolina were threatened with lawsuits for failure to have the warning signs posted.

Mr. Speaker, many of these stores that are affected are mom-and-pop operations and the signs might have got lost, might have been stolen, could have fallen behind the charcoal briquettes in the front of the store. They may have even been unaware that the regulation existed at all.

□ 1500

In any event, I think we can agree that a lawsuit on this ground would

qualify as ridiculous. H.R. 1787 removes this threat from small retailers around the country while continuing to require the consumer warnings continue to be placed on the packages of the products that contain saccharine.

Mr. Speaker, I have here a letter which underscores the need of H.R. 1787, which I would ask to be included in the RECORD, and it describes the writer's intent to sue a food store chain for $2.5 million for violating the saccharine warning notice requirement, and I quote from that letter: ''for the direct endangerment of my personal health over the years.''

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say my friend and colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN], who originally wrote the law, has reviewed my bill and agrees that while the warning notice requirement served its purpose in 1977, it is no longer required in 1995. I appreciate the support of the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN], his sense of historical perspective and the strong bipartisan support of my colleagues from this sensible and noncontroversial bill.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I need to say the American people want to see more bipartisan support, more bipartisan cooperation across the aisle, and they also want us to be brave enough to do what is best no matter which side brings up a good idea. Mr. Speaker, this is one of those things that needs to be improved. The original author recognizes that the time has passed for this regulation to be in force, and I ask the rest of the House to join with the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] and this gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY] in correcting a problem that should not be allowed to exist any further and also to prove that bipartisan support and cooperation is for the benefit of the American people who, after all, we all represent here in the people's House.

Mr. Speaker, the letter is submitted for the RECORD, as follows:

To whom it may concern: I , Herein wish to submit my intentions to file suit against the following food store chains. For the sum of $2.5 million dollars each. For the direct endangerment to my personal health over the years, through the consumption of hazardous products, and through the non compliance of the F.D.A. regulation 21–101.11. However, after speaking with an attorney in regards to this matter, it was suggested that I may have other opsections available such as (2) Reporting this to the commissioner of the F.D.A. (3) Report to the T.V., and news media how all 22 of the major food chains in the Wilmington area, Some how over looked an FDA public health warning regulation for years. Or, (4) Submit this letter to all the food chains or stores involved and hope to come to some kind of discreet, and brief respective financial compensation regarding this matter, on my behalf, without involving the F.D.A. or the publics opinion. Inclosed is a list of the stores, that are currently in direct violation of code 21–101.11 of the F.D.A. regulations.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH].

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. BILIRAKIS and Chairman BLILEY for all their hard work to see that we have these two bills on the floor for consideration today. The corrections process is dependent on the cooperation of the authorizing committees. Mr. BLILEY and his staff, and Mr. BILIRAKIS and his staff have been very cooperative and have really been key to the success of corrections day. I would also like to thank Congressman WAXMAN, a member of our corrections day process, who has spoken in support of H.R. 1787. H.R. 1787 will repeal a duplicative saccharin labeling requirement. This bill is so simple and makes so much sense it is a wonder we even have to spend time to discuss it, but unless we act this relic of a law will remain on the books causing financial hardship to thousands of small businesses.

The substance of the bill has already been explained, and there is not a lot one can say without belaboring the obvious. So, I will restrict my comments to the need for speedy passage of this bill.

The other body has several bills which have passed this House without any objection under the corrections calendar. in fact, including the two bills which will pass today, we have sent 11 pieces of corrections legislation to the other body in less than 5 months. All but one of those 11 bills passed the House by voice vote or without opposition. Working in a bi-partisan fashion and with the help of our committee chairmen this House has made corrections day successful. It is my hope that before we leave for the Christmans break we can have all of these bills on the President's desk.

I am calling on the other body to take up these bills as quickly as possible. If there are disagreements, we can work them out, but let's not delay these much needed corrections any longer.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment my colleagues on identifying a redundancy in Federal law and working together to eliminate it. As has been stated, current law requires grocery stores to post a notice on the potential dangers of saccharin in addition to the labeling of the food product itself. Clearly, one notice is enough.

I am concerned, though, that down the line the remaining notice requirement will be repealed even though it is a necessary consumer protection. Let me tell you why.

Today, in Federal law, there is a requirement that private insurance companies provide notice to Medicare beneficiaries if a health insurance policy they are selling duplicates Medicare benefits. In the Republican Medicare plan, this notification requirement is eliminated.

Again, under the Republican Medicare plan a notification requirement is to be eliminated that alerts Medicare beneficiaries that a policy they are considering purchasing may duplicate insurance coverage they already have under Medicare. The notification requirement isn't a second notice that is eliminated. There is only one requirement of notification, and it is to be repealed.

Let me walk-through why I am raising a word of caution today regarding H.R. 1787. Current Medicare law states that:

It is unlawful for a person to sell or issue [to a Medicare beneficiary] a health insurance policy with the knowledge that the policy duplicates health benefits to which the person is entitled under Medicare . . . unless there is disclosed in a prominent manner the extent to which benefits under the policy duplicate Medicare benefits.

This simple notice saves senior citizens from wasting millions of dollars each year on what one consumer organization has described as ''illusory policies which pay out little or nothing to Medicare beneficiaries.''

In contrast to the action taken today with H.R. 325 in full public view, buried in the Republican Medicare bill that passed the Congress last month was a provision that deletes this important notification requirement. Why?

There are a few well-heeled insurance companies that sell these disease specific, or dread-disease policies, and they have an interest in having ignorant consumers. And they have an interest—a stockholder share you might say—in the new Republican majority. These insurance companies expect a return on their investments. To give them that return, the interests of elderly Americans were brushed aside and the notification requirement was erased.

To protect Americans from similar anti-consumer actions in the future by the Republican majority, maybe we need to maintain two of everything in Federal law. When at some point down the line Republicans need to provide a sweetener for a particular special interest, they can delete one provision but leave the second one intact so consumers can maintain needed consumer protections.

I am not opposed to the bill we are considering today. By passing H.R. 1787, we will eliminate a redundancy but maintain a notice that is a necessary consumer protection. The notice to Medicare beneficiaries warning them that they are being sold a worthless or near-worthless insurance policy also is worthy of maintaining.

In fact, in opposing the Republican Medicare effort the National Association of Insurance Commissioners stated that the Republican Medicare bill ''would strip seniors of the protections afforded by the disclosure statement.''

Again, I'd like to compliment the work of Mr. WAXMAN and Mr. BLILEY on bringing H.R. 1787 to the floor but reiterate my word of caution that we not go to the extreme as was done in case of Medicare. Despite what well-heeled lobbyists may say, ignorance is not bliss. Ignorance can be dangerous to consumers.

Luckily for Medicare beneficiaries, we have a Democratic President in the White House who has made a commitment to protect the physical and financial health of the seniors of America. He has vetoed the Republican Medicare bill. Now, their damaging special-interest provisions can be eliminated and consumer protections maintained.

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my strong support for this legislation and commend the gentlemen from California and North Carolina for their work on this matter. I believe this bill provides a realistic framework for reforming the saccharin notification regulations placed on groceries, while also protecting the public's health and need to know.

Back in the late seventies, when diet-conscience Americans were guzzling Tab soda and putting Sweet and Low in their iced tea, it became important that consumers become aware of any health threats posed by the use of saccharin. Today, however, we are facing a situation in which saccharin has not only been replaced as the main sweetening agent, but labels identifying its use dot the labels of all products that contain it.

H.R. 1787 recognizes that now that market and health forces have diminished the use of saccharin in food and drink, there is no longer a need for information overkill on this subject. This legislation simply allows grocery stores the chance to back away from the requirement of posting warning signs in their stores about saccharin's potential health effects. I believe this prudent progression will still allow consumers the appropriate warning of their favorite product's labels, while at the same time remove this bothersome requirement from our Nation's many grocery stores, from the Kroger's to the Mutach Food Market in Marblehead, OH.

While you can lead a horse to water, Mr. Speaker, you cannot make it drink. While all of us would prefer a risk-free society, it just is not possible. People who are worried about their health will read labels and warnings signs no matter how numerous or large they are. I believe H.R. 1787 recognizes this fact and hopefully will end the new rash of nuisance lawsuits springing up in this country over this matter. I urge all my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and (three-fifths having voted in favor thereof) the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1787, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

EMPLOYER TRIP REDUCTION PROGRAMS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 325) to amend the Clean Air Act to provide for an optional provision for the reduction of work-related vehicle trips and miles travelled in ozone nonattainment areas designated as severe, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 325

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

SECTION 1. OPTIONAL EMPLOYER MANDATED TRIP REDUCTION.

Section 182(d)(1)(b) of the Clean Air Act is amended by to read as follows:

''(B) The State may also, in its discretion, submit a revision at any time requiring employers in such area to implement programs to reduce work-related vehicle trips and miles travelled by employees. Such revision shall be developed in accordance with guidance issued by the Administrator pursuant to section 108(f) and may require that employers in such area increase average passenger occupancy per vehicle in commuting trips between home and the workplace during peak travel periods. The guidance of the Administrator may specify average vehicle occupancy rates which vary for locations within a nonattainment area (suburban, center city, business district) or among nonattainment areas reflecting existing occupancy rates and the availability of high occupancy modes. The revision may require employers subject to a vehicle occupancy requirement to submit a compliance plan to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of this paragraph.''.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. OPTIONAL EMPLOYER MANDATED TRIP REDUCTION.

Section 182(d)(1)(B) of the Clean Air Act is amended to read as follows:

''(B) The State may also, in its discretion, submit a revision at any time requiring employers in such area to implement programs to reduce work-related vehicle trips and miles travelled by employees. Such revision shall be developed in accordance with guidance issued by the Administrator pursuant to section 108(f) and may require that employers in such area increase average passenger occupancy per vehicle in commuting trips between home and the workplace during peak travel periods. The guidance of the Administrator may specify average vehicle occupancy rates which vary for locations within a nonattainment area (suburban, center city, business district) or among nonattainment areas reflecting existing occupancy rates and the availability of high occupancy modes. Any State required to submit a revision under this subparagraph (as in effect before the date of enactment of this sentence) containing provisions requiring employers to reduce work-related vehicle trips and miles travelled by employees may, in accordance with State law, remove such provisions from the implementation plan, or withdraw its submission, if the State notifies the Administrator, in writing, that the State has undertaken, or will undertake, one or more alternative methods that will achieve emission reductions equivalent to those to be achieved by the removed or withdrawn provisions.''.

Mr. BILIRAKIS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS] and the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] will each be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS].

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. BILIRAKIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the Health and Environment Subcommittee and the full Commerce Committee were able to report H.R. 325, legislation to amend the Clean Air Act regarding the employer-trip-reduction program.

Very briefly, the legislation repeals the current Federal requirement that 11 States and an estimated 28,000 private employers implement the employer-trip-reduction program. The legislation makes the employer-trip-reduction program discretionary on the part of States, and provides a simple and straightforward method by which States can designate alternative methods to achieve equivalent emission reductions.

H.R. 325 removes a Federal Clean Air Act requirement which many have found to be overly burdensome. The present statutory language of section 182(d)(1)(B) requires a specific State implementation plan, or ''SIP'' revision, for the ETR program. It also requires compliance plans to be filed by private employers and requires a 25-percent increase in the average vehicle occupancy of vehicles driven by employees. All of these Federal mandates are now abolished and replaced with a voluntary program.

Under the reported bill, States will decide for themselves whether they wish to implement employer-trip-reduction programs—known by the acronyms ETR or ECO—as part of their efforts to meet Federal Clean Air Act standards. With regard to current ETR SIP revisions which have already been approved or submitted to the Environmental Protection Agency, a formal SIP revision will not be required. Instead, States will be free to designate alternative efforts they have undertaken or will undertake to achieve equivalent emissions.

I want to acknowledge the hard work and assistance of several Members with regard to this legislation. Representative DONALD MANZULLO introduced the underlying bill and assembled a list of 166 cosponsors from both sides of the aisle.

Chairman JOE BARTON, of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, devoted an entire hearing to the ECO program and helped to construct a solid committee record which underpins today's legislative effort. Representatives DENNIS HASTERT and JIM