

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION  
TO REAUTHORIZE THE NA-  
TIONAL EARTHQUAKE HAZARD  
REDUCTION ACT, H.R. 2249

**HON. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 24, 1997*

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing with my colleague on the House Science Committee, Mr. BROWN, legislation to reauthorize the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program [NEHRP]. Since its inception in 1977, NEHRP has contributed greatly to what we know about the science of earthquakes as well as to reducing our Nation's vulnerability to earthquakes. Earth science and seismological research performed through NEHRP has produced maps and seismic data from which we can determine seismic risks in a given location. And, NEHRP helped to develop the knowledge base that enables design and construction of new structures that are less likely to collapse during an earthquake.

The bill we are introducing today enables the program to continue its good work in earthquake research and hazards mitigation. Specifically, this legislation authorizes approximately \$105 million in fiscal year 1998 and \$107 million in fiscal year 1999 for the four NEHRP agencies, the Federal Emergency Management Agency [FEMA], the United States Geological Survey [USGS], the National Science Foundation [NSF], and the National Institute of Standards and Technology [NIST]. In addition, the bill provides \$3 million in each of fiscal years 1998 and 1999 to the USGS for operation of the Global Seismic Network [GSN].

There are several provisions of this legislation which I would like to highlight which we believe will strengthen NEHRP and provide for a more robust earthquake science and engineering research infrastructure into the next century: First, the legislation authorizes \$8 million specifically for the USGS's external grants programs. This action is consistent with the Science Committee's ongoing efforts to recognize and support external programs within the science agencies. Second, this bill requires the Director of USGS to develop a seismic hazard warning system which will enable our Nation's vital lifelines such as electric utilities, gas lines, and high-speed railroads, to receive warnings in advance of an earthquake. It is hoped that these warnings will be provided in time to shut down the lifelines, thereby guarding against the catastrophic effects that occur when such facilities are ruptured or damaged by earthquakes. Third, this NEHRP reauthorization requires an assessment of regional seismic monitoring networks to determine the state of facilities and equipment. Fourth, the bill authorizes the Director of NSF to use funds to develop earth science teaching materials and to make them available to local schools. Fifth, the legislation directs the Director of USGS to improve hazards assessments of seismic zones in the United States. Sixth, the bill requires the Director of FEMA to assess and report on disaster training capabilities and programs offered by the agency. Seventh, finally, the bill requires the Director of NSF to work with the other NEHRP agencies to develop a plan to effectively use earthquake

engineering research facilities, which includes upgrading facilities and equipment and integrating innovative testing approaches.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation Mr. BROWN and I are introducing today is reflective of the Science Committee's bipartisan efforts on behalf of Federal science and technology programs. The bill is a manifestation of a jointly shared goal to ensure that the Nation has a vital earthquake research enterprise which will continue to greatly contribute to better earthquake awareness, more widespread and effective earthquake mitigation, and ultimately, a reduction in lives and property lost from this hazard.

NATIONAL PARENTS DAY

**HON. JAY KIM**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 24, 1997*

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind my colleagues that this coming Sunday we will celebrate National Parents Day. Unfortunately, because of our busy legislative schedule, I will not be able to attend National Parents Day ceremonies in my district this weekend.

The purpose of this annual celebration is to recognize the important role that parents play in the future of our country, based on how they bring up their children. At a time when we see more families where both parents are forced to work, we need to remind ourselves that it is not the Government's role to raise our children. Nor is it a teacher's responsibility to raise our children.

Parents need to take the primary responsibility for raising their children, instilling morals and teaching those values that we want our Nation to represent in the next century. Through active participation in all facets of their children's lives, parents can mold and shape their children into the type of citizens that can lead the United States into the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, the positive influence that parents can play in the upbringing of a child is of the utmost importance, I am pleased we take the time to celebrate this occasion, and I salute groups like the National Parents Day Coalition, for hosting events to bring this to our attention.

FAITH IN EVERY FOOTSTEP

**HON. JOHN E. ENSIGN**

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 24, 1997*

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. Speaker, "Faith in Every Footstep" is the motto of the Mormon pioneer sesquicentennial year, which culminates today with a celebration of the 150th anniversary of the arrival of members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints in the Salt Lake Valley on July 24, 1847. I rise to recognize this historical milestone in the settlement of the West and important date in Nevada's early history.

Like many other western States, Nevada's initial settlements were established by Mormon pioneers—Genoa in northern Nevada in 1851, and Las Vegas in southern Nevada in 1855. In

fact, Nevada was part of the Utah Territory before becoming the Nevada Territory. The Mormon pioneers of northern Nevada were led by Orson Hyde, while the pioneer group called to settle Las Vegas were led by William Bringham. On a warm day in mid-June of 1855, these courageous pioneers began to build a diamond in the desert. The old Las Vegas Mormon Fort is the oldest standing building in the State of Nevada.

Today, amid the bustle of the fastest growing city in the Nation, beautiful chapels and a temple grace the Las Vegas Valley while serving as a place of worship for over 100,000 Latter-Day Saints. Las Vegas has become a place where Latter-Day Saints have settled to raise their families and serve their community.

On behalf of all the citizens of my congressional district and throughout Nevada, I salute those early Mormon pioneers who blazed the trails of the rugged West and built a lasting heritage for themselves and the State of Nevada.

On Pioneer Day, we should remember and honor all those brave men, women, and children who answered the call to settle new lands, and through faith, courage, and sacrifice built hundreds of settlements throughout the Western United States and made the desert bloom.

FISCAL YEAR 1998 AGRICULTURE  
APPROPRIATIONS BILL

**HON. ELIZABETH FURSE**

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, July 24, 1997*

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I was blocked from offering an amendment to the Agriculture appropriations bill by an unfair gag rule. This rule was written by the Republican leadership midway through debate on the Agriculture appropriations bill to change the rules for debate from an open amending process to a closed, undemocratic process.

Although we were told that no preprinting of amendments was required, the rule arbitrarily barred any amendments that weren't preprinted 2 days prior. This meant that by the time Members first heard of the new rule, it was already too late for them to meet its new restrictions. Unless, of course, you were one of the three chosen Republicans that were inexplicably grandfathered in as exceptions to the preprinting deadline.

The Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee knew that I intended to offer this amendment. I had sent out four dear colleagues letters, including one bipartisan letter signed by six other Members. Nonetheless, I was unjustly muzzled; my opportunity to have a debate on an important policy issue was held hostage to a partisan power play.

The following paragraphs describe in detail the animal damage control amendment that I would have offered had I not been silenced by an unjust rule of the majority party.

The goal of my amendment is to reduce the Federal subsidy for a practice that many Americans believe is economically unfair, ineffective as a livestock protection method, unnecessary, inhumane, a waste of money, and harmful to the environment.

My amendment requires that those who benefit from the livestock protection services

of the Animal Damage Control Program in the West pay for those services. This amendment is supported by more than 80 taxpayer and conservation organizations from across the country, including Taxpayers for Common Sense, the National Wildlife Federation, Defenders of Wildlife, the Humane Society, the U.S. Public Interest Research Group and the Green Scissors budget-cutting coalition.

My amendment is designed to eliminate the excessive, systematic, taxpayer-subsidized annual killing of hundreds of thousands of coyotes and other animals in the name of western livestock protection. Specifically, my amendment limits ADC funding for livestock protection efforts in the Western United States to \$1.9 million. This amount is enough to provide \$100,000 to each of the 19 States in ADC's Western region, which will allow them to continue predator control programs focusing on rancher education and nonlethal control techniques like guard dogs, shepherds, and the like.

By limiting expenditures for livestock protection to \$1.9 million, we provide the American taxpayers with a savings of \$11.3 million. I want to stress that this still leaves a total of \$16.6 million in the ADC budget. I repeat, this amendment will not eliminate the Animal Damage Control Program, and will not affect ADC's other activities. The only portion of the ADC budget my amendment would touch is moneys for livestock protection in the Western United States. And I take a moderate approach. I do not cut the entire subsidy for these activities as many have advocated. My amendment would still provide Federal funding for each State to have a predator control program.

Let me take a moment to mention what this amendment would not do. This amendment would not take any of ADC's money away from measures to protect public health or safety. This includes ADC activities to prevent birds from causing problems at our Nation's airports or to prevent the spread of rabies. Nor would this amendment touch any ADC activities in the Eastern United States.

The ADC has seven categories of resources they protect: aquaculture, livestock, forest and range, crops, human health and safety, property and natural resources—which includes endangered species. Let me stress again that this amendment deals only with the livestock protection category, and only in the West.

Two ADC programs that protect endangered species warrant specific mention, if only to note that they will not be cut by this amendment. First, ADC plays an important role in wolf recovery by ensuring that problem wolves that prey upon livestock are immediately controlled. Almost all of ADC's wolf control activity takes place in Minnesota, which is in their Eastern region and therefore not affected by our amendment. What little wolf control activity that occurs in the Western region can easily be funded out of ADC's budget for threatened and endangered species, which is also untouched by my amendment. Second, ADC also plays an important role in preventing the brown tree snake from being introduced into Hawaii. I support the work ADC is doing on this issue and, again, would like to stress that my amendment does not reduce funds for this purpose.

This amendment focuses on the West for several reasons. First, 97 percent of ADC's livestock protection budget is spent in the

West. Second, the objectionable and excessive mass-killing of coyotes and other predators takes place mostly in the Western States. Third, that region serves a livestock industry that is over-subsidized to the detriment of wildlife and other public land uses, such as outdoor recreation, including hunting and fishing. Fishing is harmed because the run-off from intense livestock grazing near streams reduces fish populations available for commercial and sport fishing. And, of course, subsidized coyote control may induce ranchers to increase their herds beyond environmentally sustainable levels. Fourth and finally, this ADC subsidy is unfair to the majority of livestock producers around the country, who do not benefit from this subsidy, even though their tax dollars help pay for it. This represents an unfair competitive disadvantage.

Let me take a moment to talk about the ADC program and what it does. Each year, ADC kills more than a hundred thousand coyotes, mountain lions, bears, and other predators. Thousands more are accidentally killed. In fact, between 1990 and 1994, ADC killed 7.8 million critters. A number of techniques are used, including leghold steel jaw traps—the method chosen for this ill-fated bobcat in the photo next to me, who died a slow painful death, aerial gunning, field hunting with dogs, snares, denning—which means gassing the mother and pups in their dens, and M-44s—a baited device that ejects cyanide poison into the animal's mouth. One frequent ADC technique is the preventative shooting of coyotes from aircraft to kill as many coyotes as possible before livestock is moved to a new range area, even though they haven't actually harmed any livestock. This practice is comparable to a dentist pulling out all of a patient's teeth as a way to prevent cavities.

In fact, we often see that the amount of wildlife killed by ADC bears little relation to the actual damage inflicted. In 1990, for example, ADC personnel in New Mexico spent more than 80 staff days killing 55 animals—including 22 non-target animals such as kit fox, deer, porcupines and badgers—in response to a single lamb killed by a coyote—a loss of only \$83. This is not a wise use of taxdollars.

I would also point out that the ADC's predator control program is of very questionable effectiveness. Between 1983 and 1993, Federal appropriations to ADC increased 71 percent and the number of coyotes killed increased 30 percent—but the number of livestock losses to predators did not decline.

In addition, other factors such as weather, medical problems, poisoning and theft account for the majority of losses of both sheep, 60 percent, and cattle, 97 percent—not predators. Less than 3 percent of all cattle losses nationwide are the result of predation. Our money would be better spent on animal research on how to reduce these losses than on killing coyotes.

The finances of the program are equally questionable. The private ranching interests that benefit from this program contribute only 14 percent of the costs of the program, despite the fact that the Department of Agriculture is authorized to collect fees for ADC services. In every Western State in fiscal year 1995, ADC spent more money controlling predators than the value of the livestock allegedly lost to predators by ADC beneficiaries.

To add insult to injury, this program uses tax dollars to benefit some very wealthy ranch-

ers who can more easily afford ADC's predator control services than the American taxpayers. I bring to your attention the front page story of the New York Post from March which highlights how ABC News correspondent Sam Donaldson, who makes \$3 million annually, benefits from ADC. Sam's sheep ranch received 412 visits from ADC officers between 1991-1996, during which time they killed 74 coyotes and 3 bobcats. This is not an appropriate use of your constituents' tax dollars.

For years, official ADC policy has required ADC employees to try nonlethal methods of predator control before resorting to killing animals. Congress in fiscal year 1994 and fiscal year 1995 also directed that "non-lethal methods of control should be the practice of choice" for ADC personnel. Nonetheless, a 1995 GAO report found that ADC personnel still "used lethal methods in essentially all instances to control livestock predators." In essence, ADC is completely ignoring established congressional guidance, as well as their own internal directives.

Many cost effective, nonlethal control methods exist, such as the use of guard dogs and shepherds, confinement of sheep during the vulnerable lambing period, pasture rotation, removal of carcasses that attract predators, fencing and electronic guards, to name a few. The State of Kansas, which has spent less than \$75,000 a year on its predator control program for the past 27 years, relies heavily on nonlethal techniques. In fact, Kansas has 20 times fewer reported predator problems than the State of Oklahoma, a State of comparable size and agriculture production which spends \$1.3 million on predator control. We could learn a lesson or two from Kansas on this issue.

So, let me reiterate. My amendment would save American taxpayers \$11.3 million. It does this by reducing funds for the killing of predators to protect private livestock operators in the Western United States. My amendment still leaves more than \$16 million for other ADC activities and does not touch funding for the protection of human health and safety or endangered species. It does not impact moneys to clear birds from airport runways, to remove beavers or groundhogs that cause flooding, to control mountain lions that attack joggers or to prevent the spread of rabies by raccoons. My amendment does not impact any ADC activities in the Eastern United States at all.

While we struggle to scrape together moneys to continue the many important programs critical to the American people, the subcommittee has chosen to increase the fiscal year 1998 funding for the ADC subsidy by \$1 million over the fiscal year 1997 appropriation and \$4.25 million more than the President's budget. In fact, this program is consistently funded at an average of almost \$3 million per year more than the administration requests for it. I would argue that our constituents wouldn't view this program as a priority use of their tax dollars.

Let me close by saying that I am a Westerner. I hail from a district that includes rural areas and livestock ranches. Not everyone in my district would be happy to lose their ADC subsidy. But if we're going to be serious about balancing the budget and cutting the fat out of Government spending, then we're going to have to be critical of the subsidies in our own backyards. We can't just cut the pork in our neighbor's district.

I'd like to end my statement by quoting from a letter written to the Governor of New Mexico from a Ph.D. rangeland scientist who just happens to be a senior fellow at the Cato Institute. The Cato Institute, as you know, is a well-respected, fiscally conservative, free market think tank. Karl Hess from Cato writes:

ADC subsidies effectively shoulder what should be part of the costs of operating a business . . . ADC is a gross intervention in the market place. The wonderful feature of America is the freedom of opportunity each of us has to make it on our own merits and to do so in the arena of the free market. I am, as you might surmise, a fan of the free markets, just as I am a great believer in individual freedom. I am certain you are too. Let's make sure that ranchers can defend themselves against predators, but let's not ask taxpayers to pay the bill. It's only fair.

I couldn't have said it better myself. Please join me in reducing the animal damage control subsidy for private livestock owners in the West. Send the signal to ADC that they need to clean up their act. And give the American taxpayers a break.

Vote "yes" on the Furse amendment.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

#### HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1997

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I was necessarily absent during rollcall vote 307. If present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall No. 307.

#### INTRODUCING A HOUSE RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE CRISIS IN CAMBODIA

#### HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 24, 1997

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today House Resolution 185 which addresses the current crisis in Cambodia and calls for definitive action to put that country back on the road to peace, democracy, and stability.

As you know, the Cambodian people suffered terribly through two decades of political conflicts, civil war, foreign invasion, protracted violence, and the horrific genocide perpetrated by the Khmer Rouge. The nightmare finally ended with the 1991 Paris peace accords which, through a massive and historic international effort, brought peace to Cambodia. The peace accords set the stage for a process of political accommodation, national reconciliation, and the founding of a nation based on democratic principles.

The successful national elections held in Cambodia in 1993 under U.N. supervision—in which over 90 percent of the eligible voters participated—demonstrated the firm commitment of the Cambodian people to democracy. Regrettably, earlier this month, a military coup by Second Prime Minister Hun Sen forcefully wrested democracy from the Cambodian people. This must not stand.

Since the signing of the peace accords and the completion of the 1993 elections, Cambodia has made considerable progress toward

establishing a bright future based on economic freedom and democratic principles. This included the creation of a national constitution that guarantees fundamental human rights and liberties. With significant investment from the international donor community, including many millions of dollars in assistance from the United States, Cambodia appeared to be heading in the right direction toward democracy, peace, and freedom. The Association of Southeast Asian Nations [ASEAN] recognized this progress and recently extended membership privileges to Cambodia.

On July 5, 1997, Cambodia's bright future was shattered when Second Prime Minister Hun Sen deposed First Prime Minister Ranariddh in a violent military coup. Reportedly, over 40 opposition politicians have died or have been executed in the custody of Hun Sen's forces, some after having been tortured. Hundreds of others have been detained without cause due to their political affiliations and thousands have fled the country.

It is regrettable that we find ourselves on familiar ground once again—trying to restore peace and stability in Cambodia. The military coup d'etat orchestrated by Hun Sen marks an unfortunate return to the past—a past of fear and violence. The reports of executions, arrests, and other human rights abuses are cause for tremendous concern. Cambodia's once bright future is now clouded by the shadow of tyranny that darkens the countryside.

This forcible change to the duly-elected Government in Cambodia is illegal and unacceptable. This brutality violates not only Cambodia's own constitution but also all internationally respected norms of behavior. More tragically, Hun Sen's actions violate the mandate of the Cambodian people, as expressed in the 1993 elections.

We must not look the other way while violence and tyranny rule in Cambodia. The United States Government and the international community have made a significant investment in bringing peace to Cambodia and providing the Cambodian people with the opportunity to determine their own future through free and fair elections. We must remain committed to this ideal.

The United States must condemn—in the strongest terms possible—the undemocratic and forcible change in government and the use of violence to resolve political matters by all sides in Cambodia. So far, the administration has taken a cautious approach in addressing this crisis, failing to acknowledge that Hun Sen's actions constitute a military coup.

We must not renege on our role as a guarantor of the Paris peace accords and wait on the sidelines while the situation in Cambodia sorts itself out. The United States Government should demonstrate leadership to reverse the coup and restore democracy in Cambodia. We should work with the U.N. Security Council and the ASEAN member states to consider all options to return democracy, stability, and the rule of law to Cambodia.

The administration's decision to suspend assistance for 1 month is only a first step. This resolution calls for a continued suspension of direct assistance to the Cambodian regime until the violence ends and a democratically elected government is reconstituted. The legislation also encourages the international donor community to suspend aid as part of a multilateral effort to encourage respect for democratic processes and principles.

The United States Government should use its influence to ensure that Cambodian authorities hold free and fair national elections as scheduled in 1998. We also must assist Cambodia in depoliticizing its military and making the judicial system independent.

In addition, this resolution calls upon the Cambodian authorities to stop all political violence; restore all civil and political freedoms to the Cambodian people; investigate all extralegal actions that have taken place since fighting was renewed in July 1997; and, bring to justice those who are responsible for the human rights abuses that have occurred.

The Cambodian people have suffered enough. Let's work to get Cambodia back on the road to democracy. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution (H.R. 185).

H. RES. 185

Whereas during the 1970s and 1980s Cambodia was wracked by political conflict, civil war, foreign invasion, protracted violence, and a genocide perpetrated by the Khmer Rouge from 1975 to 1979;

Whereas the Paris Agreement on a Comprehensive Political Settlement of the Cambodia Conflict led to the end of 2 decades of civil war and genocide in Cambodia, demonstrated the commitment of the Cambodian people to democracy and stability, and established a national constitution guaranteeing fundamental human rights;

Whereas the 1991 Paris Peace Accords set the stage for a process of political accommodation, national reconciliation, and the founding of a state based on democratic principles;

Whereas the international donor community contributed more than \$3,000,000,000 in an effort to secure peace, democracy, and stability in Cambodia following the Paris Peace Accords and currently provides over 40 percent of the budget of the Cambodian Government;

Whereas the Cambodian people clearly demonstrated their support for democracy when over 93 percent of eligible Cambodian voters participated in United Nations sponsored elections in 1993;

Whereas since the 1993 elections, Cambodia has made significant progress, as evidenced by the decision last month of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations to extend membership to Cambodia;

Whereas notwithstanding the notable societal and economic progress since the elections of 1993, concern has increasingly been raised regarding the fragile state of democracy in Cambodia, in particular the quality of the judicial system, which has been described in a United Nations report as thoroughly corrupt; unsolved attacks in 1995 on officials of the Buddhist Liberal Democratic Party; and the unsolved murders of journalists and political activists;

Whereas tensions within the Cambodian Government has erupted into violence in recent months;

Whereas on March 30, 1997, 19 Cambodians were killed and more than 100 were wounded in a grenade attack on a peaceful political demonstration in Phnom Penh;

Whereas in June 1997 fighting erupted in Phnom Penh between military and paramilitary forces loyal to First Prime Minister Prince Norodom Ranariddh and Second Prime Minister Hun Sen;

Whereas on July 5, 1997, Second Prime Minister Hun Sen deposed the First Prime Minister in a violent military coup d'etat;

Whereas at least several dozen opposition politicians have died in the custody of Hun Sen's forces, some after being tortured, and hundreds of others have been detained due to their political affiliation;