

and Vegetable Association; Upstate Milk Cooperatives, Inc.; Utah Council of Farmer Cooperatives; Wisconsin Agri-Service Association.

July 23, 1996.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Last week, the House Commerce Committee reported by a vote of 45-0 compromise language on H.R. 1627, "The Food Quality Protection Act." We congratulate Chairman Bliley, Chairman Bilirakis, Mr. Dingell, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Waxman and many other members of the House who have worked to resolve the "Delaney paradox" and the problems it presents for farmers and consumers.

Although the agreement contains provisions we do not support, it does address many issues which are of critical importance to agriculture:

Safety Standard: The bill replaces the antiquated, "zero tolerance" Delaney standard with a health-based "safe" standard for food pesticide residues. "Safe" is defined as "reasonable certainty of no harm" which is interpreted as a one in a million additional lifetime risk. This is a standard which is essentially the same as the "negligible risk" standard in the original bill. This key provision removes the threat of unjustified cancellation of more than 50 safe crop protection products which are now jeopardized by the Delaney Clause.

Benefits Consideration: Tolerances could be exceeded to avoid a significant disruption in domestic production of an adequate, wholesome and economical food supply or if the pesticide protects consumers from a greater health risk. Benefits consideration is broadened from current law in that it is extended from raw agricultural products to include processed food. However, benefits consideration is limited under the agreement to 10 times a negligible risk for one year or more than two times a negligible risk over a lifetime. Although Farm Bureau does not support this new limitation, we are pleased that the bill preserves benefits consideration and extends it to processed food.

National Uniformity: The bill establishes national uniformity for food pesticide residues. States could not adopt tolerances which are more stringent than those set by EPA, except with respect to tolerances established through benefits consideration. In those circumstances, states would be required to petition EPA and establish that there was an imminent dietary risk to the public.

Minor Use Pesticides: It is our understanding that the FIFRA provisions of H.R. 1627 which have been reported by the House Agriculture Committee will be attached to the Commerce Committee provisions. Included are new incentives and streamlined procedures for so-called "minor crop" chemicals—crop protection products whose relatively small market does not justify the high cost of registration. This provision is essential to fruit, vegetable and horticultural growers in virtually every state.

Miscellaneous Provisions: Although we support the above provisions, Farm Bureau has some concerns with certain provisions of the Committee agreement. These include provisions relating to estrogenic effects of agricultural chemicals, infants and children, civil penalties for food adulteration and a "right to know" provision for consumers.

At this time, no one can determine with certainty the long-term, cumulative impact of these changes on specific commodities and on the availability of crop protectants necessary for farmers to produce the wide variety of safe, affordable and abundant agricultural commodities that the public demands. While we support many of the reforms in this package, we also recognize that there will be

unanticipated problems stemming from regulatory and business implementation of this legislation. On balance, however, we believe that this legislation represents an improvement over current law and we support moving the legislation to the Senate.

RICHARD W. NEWPHER,
Executive Director, Washington Office.

JULY 18, 1996.

Hon. THOMAS J. BLILEY, Jr.

Chairman, Committee on Commerce, Rayburn House Office Building, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The following environmental, education, public health, and consumer advocacy organizations would like to offer our support for the compromise substitute amendment for H.R. 1627, "The Food Quality Protection Act of 1995" that goes a long way towards better protecting the health of consumers from toxic pesticides on their food.

The compromise addresses the deadlock between the industry who oppose the Delaney clause and the organizations that support better protection for children and the public health, by establishing a comprehensive federal program to make pesticide levels in food and the environment safe for infants and children. The bill establishes a health-based standard and a strict timetable for pesticide tolerance setting that adheres tightly to the recommendations of the 1993 National Academy of Sciences Committee on Pesticides in the Diets of Infants and Children.

Although we are pleased with the extent to which the bill was changed to better protect public health, we have reservations with the sections that will allow benefits consideration for cancer-causing pesticides and preemption of states rights to set more protective tolerances than federal limits for pesticides. We are hopeful that these provisions will be revised upon further consideration of this legislation.

Our support for this bill is contingent upon the understanding that the bill will not be changed in any way that would allow for a weakening of public health protections.

Again we would like to extend our thanks and appreciation to the members of Congress and their staff who played a part in producing this bill.

Sincerely,

American Preventative Medical Association; Center for Science in the Public Interest; Citizen Action; Environmental Working Group; National Audubon Society; National Wildlife Federation; National Parent Teacher Association; Natural Resources Defense Council; Physicians for Social Responsibility; Public Voice; World Wildlife Fund.

AMERICAN CROP PROTECTION ASSOCIATION
PRAISES COMPREHENSIVE FOOD SAFETY ACT

WASHINGTON, DC, July 24, 1996.—The American Crop Protection Association voiced its support of the "Food Quality Protection Act of 1996," a bi-partisan bill to reform the nation's food safety laws that Tuesday was passed by the House of Representatives 417-0.

Jay J. Vroom, ACPA president, said, "The action is an overwhelming affirmation of the value and benefits of modern agricultural technology to the consumer, our children and the American farmer. With our allies and friends across food and agriculture, the crop protection industry is proud to have helped lead the way for modern, science-based food safety reform."

The Senate is expected shortly to follow the House's lead and vote to replace the 1958

Delaney clause with a single safety standard for pesticide residues on both raw and processed foods. Under the legislation, which was more than 10 years in the making, pesticides will be deemed safe when they are approved by the Environmental Protection Agency as meeting a new, health-based safety standard, defined as a "reasonable certainty of no harm."

The bill mandates implementation by the EPA of the 1993 recommendations of the National Academy of Sciences for providing additional safeguards for infants and children. "The Academy's recommendations have been at the heart of ACPA's fight for food safety reform," said Vroom. "This is particularly gratifying victory for us because it assures that modern, sound science will undergird our food safety laws and that farmers will continue to have the tools to produce the most abundant and affordable supplies of food and fiber in the world."

Regarding industry's relationship with the EPA, Vroom said, "We want to continue the productive working dialogue we have established with the Agency during the course of negotiations for this legislation. For example, one of our hopes is to successfully conclude work underway by EPA, ACPA and other registrant groups to provide additional user fee resources to the Agency for enhancing new product application decision making."●

WELFARE REFORM

● Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, 2 days ago I voted against the so called welfare reform bill which passed the Senate. I wish to explain my reasons for that vote.

The time has come to change the Nation's welfare system. We should enact much-needed, workable reforms, such as requiring all able-bodied recipients to work, turning welfare offices into employment offices, providing adequate child care and requiring strong child support enforcement. While the bill just passed by the Senate achieves some of these goals, it does so in a way that I believe will ultimately end up doing more harm than good. And the damage will be done not only to innocent children but to State and local governments and to taxpayers, who may end up bearing even more of the burden than they currently do.

Last fall, I voted for welfare reform legislation in the expectation that we could develop a better bill. A good bill would encourage adults to work without threatening the well-being of children or unduly burdening the States that need welfare assistance most. It would enable flexible planning at the State and local levels, without dismantling the social safety net.

Unfortunately, the highly political environment in which we find ourselves has not permitted the development of such a bill. The forces of reaction in our country have persuaded many that the main cause of our problems is welfare cheats and the current election campaign has spawned a competition between politicians to prove their machismo by getting tough.

The conference report that emerged on HR4 last fall was a worse bill than what the Senate had previously passed.

I joined over a quarter of the Senate who voted for the Senate welfare reform bill but rejected the changes made in the conference report. I said then that we should not trade in an admittedly imperfect system for one that is certainly not better, and perhaps may prove much worse. The same is true today.

I have been persuaded by the process of debate and projections on the likely impact of this bill on my State that this welfare bill will do far more harm than good. It will cause hardship to State and local governments, throw more than a million more children into poverty and hurt rather than help the Nation's efforts at true welfare reform.

The bill will clearly increase the burden on States and local governments. Poor States will, as always, be particularly hard hit. For example, the bill requires progressively more hours of work, from a greater percent of each State's case load every year, with States losing cumulatively more funding each year they fail to hit their targets. While I am a strong proponent of work requirements as an integral part of welfare reform, I am skeptical of this approach. And I am not alone. The National Governors' Association [NGA] feels it will be very hard to meet these targets, especially because the bill allows few exemptions for those who will have the hardest time finding work. And if a State fails to meet these difficult targets they lose funding for the next year's program. The irony of this penalty is that the punishment assures that the violation will occur again and again, as a State has less and less Federal money each year to try and meet their employment targets. This leaves states with two choices—use state and local funds for education, training, and child care, or throw more people off the roles so it will be easier to hit their percentage targets.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has said that, over 6 years, this bill falls \$12 billion short of the funding needed to meet the work requirements of this legislation, and about \$2.4 billion short in child care resources. New Mexico is particularly at risk if this bill does not live up to its promise. It is one of the few States in which the welfare caseload is currently increasing, even though the benefits paid are below the national average. Who will be forced to pick up the shortfall? State and local governments will.

Further, last year in New Mexico, 239,000 recipients in 87,000 households relied on food stamps. About \$28 billion in savings realized by this bill will be in food stamps. Such cuts to funding benefits erode the integrity of the safety net. I say again that we are trading in an imperfect system for one that may prove much worse.

Legal immigrants are clearly among those who will be hurt by passage of this bill. I support the immigration bill now in Congress and its effort to make immigrants and their sponsors responsible for immigrants' welfare. But this

bill goes far beyond those provisions. There are over 3,000 aged or disabled legal immigrants receiving SSI benefits in New Mexico who may abruptly be cut off if this bill becomes law, and thousands more immigrants who have no sponsor for any number of reasons who may also lose benefits under this bill.

In the course of this debate, the Senate rejected an amendment that would have permitted States to use funds from their Federal block grant to offer vouchers to maintain basic non-cash benefits such as food, clothing, and shelter for children if their parents' benefits expire after 5 years. The refusal of the Senate to allow States to provide such vouchers will hurt New Mexico, where one third of the children less than 6 years old—almost 50,000—live in families with incomes below the poverty level.

Ours is a great Nation, enjoying low unemployment and real prosperity. Our common goal is to ensure that all Americans willing to work hard have the opportunity to share that prosperity. We all want to eliminate public assistance as a way of life while preserving temporary protections for those truly in need of help. But we must figure out a way to do this without denying the basic needs of innocent children for food, clothing, and shelter, and without driving State and local governments further into debt. •

NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS AND RECORDS COMMISSION

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of calendar No. 440, S. 1577.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1577) to authorize appropriations for the National Historical Publications and Records Commission for fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, and 2001.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the bill be deemed read a third time, passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating to the bill be placed at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 1577) was deemed read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 1577

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

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS AND RECORDS COMMISSION.

Section 2504(f)(1) of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (F) by striking out "and" after the semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (G) by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

"(H) \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 1998;

"(I) \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 1999;

"(J) \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 2000; and

"(K) \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 2001."

EXTENDING MOST-FAVORED-NATION TREATMENT FOR CAMBODIA

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of calendar No. 398, H.R. 1642.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1642) to extend nondiscriminatory treatment (most-favored-nation treatment) to the products of Cambodia, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) despite recent increases in acts of repression by the Cambodian Government and growing government corruption that has contributed to substantial environmental degradation, Cambodia has made some progress towards democratic rule after 20 years of undemocratic regimes and civil war, and is striving to rebuild its market economy;

(2) extension of unconditional most-favored-nation treatment would assist Cambodia in developing its economy based on free market principles and becoming competitive in the global marketplace;

(3) establishing normal commercial relations on a reciprocal basis with Cambodia will promote United States exports to the rapidly growing Southeast Asian region and expand opportunities for United States business and investment in the Cambodian economy; and

(4) expanding bilateral trade relations that includes a commercial agreement may promote further progress by Cambodia on human rights and democratic rule and assist Cambodia in adopting regional and world trading rules and principles.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF NONDISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT TO THE PRODUCTS OF CAMBODIA.

(a) HARMONIZED TARIFF SCHEDULE AMENDMENT.—General note 3(b) of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended by striking "Kampuchea".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) applies with respect to goods entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after the effective date of a notice published in the Federal Register by the United States Trade Representative that a trade agreement obligating reciprocal most-favored-nation treatment between Cambodia and the United States has entered into force.

SEC. 3. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

The President shall submit to the Congress, not later than 18 months after the date