

While many think of California as large cities and recreational parks, one in 10 jobs are directly related to agriculture. Farmers face the whims of mother nature and uncertainties of the marketplace and ever increasing government regulations. Bob Vice has been a strong advocate of the industry and has spent much of his time away from his family to devote his efforts to the industry that he loves. I am proud to know him as a distinguished agricultural leader, a devoted constituent and a friend. I wish him the best in his future endeavors.

Bob Vice began his service to the agricultural industry when approached to attend a meeting of the California Farm Bureau Federation's Young Farmers and Ranchers Committee. This offer to attend this meeting was made so far in advance that he gave little thought to the time commitment involved. But it was to the agricultural industry's benefit that he chose to do so.

After attending the meeting, Bob Vice became very active in the San Diego County Farm Bureau's young Farm and Ranchers Program and worked on many programs at the county level. His involvement led him to a position on the County Farm Bureau board of directors.

His enthusiasm for work on behalf of the agricultural industry and Farm Bureau was acknowledged by his progression to president of the San Diego County Farm Bureau and thus a delegate to the California Farm Bureau Federation. In 1987, he was honored as the San Diego County Farmer of the Year.

In December 1981, Bob Vice was elected as the first vice president of the California Farm Bureau Federation at their annual meeting in Palm Springs. As an officer and board member of the State organization, he participated in many committee assignments and directed the policy review procedures at the annual meetings.

In 1985-86, he participated as the agricultural point person to deal with the Immigration Reform and Control Act provisions in the national legislation. He continues to be a national spokesperson for agricultural labor issues and has been called upon to testify before Congress numerous times.

In 1989, after serving 7½ years as first vice president, Vice assumed the role of president of the California Farm Bureau Federation and was re-elected four times to that two year position. He served on the American Farm Bureau Federal [AFBF] board of directors from 1989-92. He was reelected to the AFBF board in 1994 and continues to serve in that capacity. He was also named to the six member executive committee of that organization. He has served on many committees including chairman of the AFBF International Trade Advisory Committee. He has participated in agricultural trade delegations to Europe, Israel, Latin America, the Pacific Rim, South Africa and Australia.

Bob Vice has not only been active within Farm Bureau but as a leader for all of agriculture. Shortly after assuming the presidency, he became the chairman of an agricultural coalition to successfully fight the ill-conceived "Big Green" initiative. His efforts further elevated him as a leader on the national agriculture scene.

Bob Vice has been a visionary on behalf of the agriculture industry by his long range out-

look on issues affecting the industry. He is especially aware of the need to balance the use of water between competing interests within California and was one of the original participants on the California Bay Delta Oversight Committee established by Governor Pete Wilson. He was a major participant in the effort to pass Proposition 204, the water bond issue in 1996.

His willingness to participate in issues affecting agriculture has propelled the California Farm Bureau to new heights in political awareness and has made the organization a well respected force in Sacramento and Washington, DC. This respect is not only acknowledged by elected officials but also by his peers throughout the industry.

He was appointed to the 22d Agricultural District Fair Board (Del Mar) in 1984 by Governor George Deukmejian and has been re-appointed twice by Gov. Pete Wilson. He is a member of the Advisory Council on Small Business and Agriculture of the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco.

In addition to his many agricultural activities, Bob Vice and his wife Carilyn are very active in their church and community. He continues to farm avocados in Fallbrook, San Diego County.

MORE ON THE IRS AND THE TAX CODE

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to talk about the IRS, our Tax Code, where we go from here, and some of the abuses. In my Somerset congressional church in Somerset, MI, a member gave me his dun notice from the IRS and I would like to share it with my colleagues and, Mr. Speaker, with the American people.

It says, "According to our records, you owe \$49 on your income tax. Please pay the full amount, et cetera, by this date. If you have not paid, mail your check or money order. Tax withheld, zero; estimated tax payments, \$6,347; total payments or credits, \$7,379.83; total tax on return, \$7,380." That is all complicated.

Here is the line that makes the difference. "Your underpaid tax, 17 cents. You owe a penalty of \$49.35."

The postage stamp to send out this dun notice is more than the 17 cents that IRS said he owed on his taxes. I think it is another example of why we have to reform the IRS and get rid of it as we know it.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following:

REQUEST FOR TAX PAYMENT

According to our records, you owe \$49.35 on your income tax. Please pay the full amount by Sep. 15, 1997. If you've already paid your tax in full or arranged for an installment agreement, please disregard this notice.

If you haven't paid, mail your check or money order and tear-off stub from the last page of this notice. Make your check payable to Internal Revenue Service and write your Social Security number on it. If you can't pay in full, please call us to discuss payment.

Tax Statement

Payments and credits:	
Tax withheld	\$0.00
Estimated tax payments	6,347.83
Other credits00
Other payments	1,032.00
Total payments and credits ...	7,379.83

Tax:	
Total tax on return	7,380.00
Less:	
Total payments and credits	7,379.83
Underpaid tax17
Penalty	20.64
Interest	28.54
Amount you owe	49.35

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SCOTT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SAXTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FORD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. FORD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SMITH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

□ 1700

BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN INTEGRITY ACT OF 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CALAHAN). Under a previous order of the

House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to come today to talk about a very important subject, and that is campaign finance reform. I think a legitimate question at this point can be, where are we and where are we going in the House and Senate on campaign finance reform?

We have seen the Senate try to address this issue. They brought up the McCain-Feingold bill. They came to a stalemate in the Senate, neither side winning, but simply could not get the 60 votes necessary to move that issue forward.

I believe that the issue now turns back to the House to see what are we going to do, what are we going to do for the American public. I believe we have a tremendous opportunity now to address the issue seriously, through our policy conference, through our committees, and to make some constructive suggestions and legislative enactments in regard to this important issue.

We also have the opportunity to create some momentum, which this issue seriously needs. So I believe that we have that opportunity, and I would urge my colleagues in the House to get behind the effort to reform our campaign finance laws.

One thing I hear all the time is we first have to enforce the laws. I agree 100 percent, the first obligation that we have is to enforce our current campaign laws, and I am grateful for the hearings that Senator THOMPSON is conducting on the Senate side and Congressman BURTON is handling on this side, that are bringing out some serious abuses, some violations of the law, and we have to continue digging in that area.

But the American public fully understands what the real problem is. It does not take a rocket scientist to figure out that the problem is soft money. That is what has led to the abuses of the last campaign, and that is what needs to be addressed during this legislative cycle in regard to the reform that we need to do.

So we have presented the Bipartisan Campaign Integrity Act of 1997 that I have introduced as H.R. 2183, that Congressman TOM ALLEN from Maine, my Democrat counterpart, has cosponsored along with me, along with 650 cosponsors to this legislation, both Republicans and Democrats, both conservatives and liberals.

Why can we all agree upon this? Because we narrowed it down to what is important. What we have to present now is what are the important elements of reform in this bill. It includes, first of all, a ban on soft money to the national political parties.

What is soft money? It is the millions of dollars generally in contribution that come from the corporations and the labor unions to our national political parties.

I believe the debate boils down to this: Are we going to have our national political parties controlled by the multinational corporations that give the huge chunks of money, or are we going to be responsive to the grassroots of the American population? That is how simple this issue is, and that is how the American public sees it.

I believe conservatives need to unite behind this bill, the Bipartisan Campaign Integrity Act, because it builds confidence in the grassroots. It tells them that we are going to be serious about being responsive to them and reforming our system and banning soft money, returning control of our parties, of our Congress, to those people that have built this Nation. That is what it is all about.

In addition, it increases disclosure. We need to simply give the American people information on the campaigns, who is spending what. So it provides for electronic disclosure for the candidates, quicker information for them.

In regards to issue advocacy groups, it is simply disclosure. It does not get into the constitutional questions of some other billings, but simply provides the disclosure of information as to who is spending what on the campaigns to influence those. So that is the essence of the Bipartisan Campaign Integrity Act, and I believe it is very, very important.

Where did all of this start? It started with the Republican President, President Teddy Roosevelt, who in 1905 addressed the Congress of the United States and said that all contributions by corporations to any political committee or for any political purpose should be forbidden by law.

It started with a Republican President, who started campaign finance reform. Later, the prohibition on union contributions, labor union contributions to the political candidates, was enacted.

So that is the basis upon our legislation today that bans unions and corporations from giving directly to the political candidates. But yet we have this loophole where they can give in multimillion-dollar chunks to the political parties that influences those elections they cannot give directly to. That is why it is a loophole of soft money that we should address.

Now there is a proposal that is out there that says we just need to deregulate it all, we need to let anybody contribute whatever they want to, and that is the best approach to campaign finance reform.

First of all, I believe that this would take us back to the dark ages. People remember the day when a candidate could receive anything he wanted and lean however much he wants to get money. And, sure, the American public will need it, but it is bad for the system. It would be inappropriate to raise the limits.

The proposal says we even take the limits off of political action committees. Can you imagine the labor union

political action committees that could give anything they want, that they could give \$1 million to a candidate? I think that is bad for the system. So the proposals that say we need to take the limits off is not where the American public is today.

We need true reform. We need to have the bipartisan proposal that bans soft money, the greatest abuse, that increases disclosures, empowers individuals and restricts the influence of the special interest groups. That is what our bill does.

I am grateful for the gentleman from California, Chairman THOMAS, who has indicated that he will provide hearings on this legislation, as well as others. I hope that he will schedule those immediately, so that we can move forward with this important legislation before we go home in November.

That is where we are. I ask my colleagues to support the Bipartisan Campaign Integrity Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. SMITH of Washington, addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Ms. BROWN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. BROWN of Florida addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

FAST TRACK TREATY AUTHORIZATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to take this five minutes to begin what I hope will be a constructive and important debate on the subject of fast track, a debate which I think will certainly rank with among the most important debates that this Congress will undertake this year or next year, whenever we finally do actually take this debate and cast a vote on fast track.

I recognize in beginning this discussion tonight, and this will only be the beginning of a long discussion I think we need to have, that there are many Members in this body who have come to the Congress of the United States since the Congress last voted on any kind of substantive trade issue, an issue where the fast track was the essence of the debate. It also ranks as one of the most unusual, some would say arcane, but certainly one of the most complex pieces of legislation that