



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1999

No. 28

## Senate

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Today's prayer will be offered by a guest Chaplain, the Reverend Dr. James E. Olson, Faith Evangelical Free Church, Fort Collins, CO. He is a guest of Senator WAYNE ALLARD.

### PRAYER

The guest chaplain, Reverend Dr. James E. Olson, Faith Evangelical Free Church, Fort Collins, CO, offered the following prayer:

Our God, You have been our hearts' true home in all generations. From everlasting to everlasting You alone are there and singularly sovereign. We are not. Our hearts are fragile and weakened by fears. Our lives, even in their prime, are weighted with labor and sorrow. We, therefore, turn to You for the strength beyond ourselves that is needed today.

Instill in the women and men of this Senate, whom You have entrusted with high responsibility, an intensity that keeps on caring. Grant them wisdom for sound judgment in the face of constant complexity. Prompt considerate words that they may relate to each other rightly this day, that they may encourage loved ones and staff at the close of the day, and that they may present to You a heart of wisdom on the last day.

Let Your favor be upon this Senate in doing what is right and do confirm for them the work of their hands "that we may lead a tranquil and quiet life in all godliness and dignity."—Timothy 2:2 NASB. In the strong Name of our Lord. Amen.

### RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The distinguished Senator from Colorado is recognized.

### THE GUEST CHAPLAIN

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I should like to personally welcome the guest Chaplain today, Dr. James Olson, who is from my home State of Colorado. I wish to also thank Dr. Lloyd Ogilvie for his graciousness in welcoming him here to the Senate.

My wife Joan and I are blessed that we have inspirational leaders both here in Washington and back in my home State of Colorado. Dr. Lloyd Ogilvie is somebody we really respect and value and look to for our spiritual leadership. Dr. James Olson is not only a spiritual leader for my wife and I in Colorado but of the family, and I just wish to state in a public manner how much we appreciate his leadership and how much as a family we appreciate what he does for us. He has not only personally served the Allard family, but he has personally served the community of Fort Collins, CO. He has taken an active part in that community as a religious leader, and in his sermons in the Faith Evangelical Free Church of Fort Collins he has been a leader of affairs before our country, and I think he has been a voice of reason for the congregation and one of balance. I have always appreciated his message on Sundays whenever we have attended his church, and I think that he has strengthened the spiritual community in Fort Collins, particularly the Christian community.

I just want to recognize in a public way all his leadership in Colorado, particularly his community. I think he typifies the leadership throughout this country of many of our community pastors and religious leaders. Sometimes I don't think we recognize them as we should. They are an important part of what goes on in this country; they are an important part of what America is all about.

So it is with a great deal of pleasure that I welcome Dr. James Olson to the Senate and let him know just how much we appreciate his prayer this

morning and wish both his wife Carol and him our very best. We are happy that they could take time out of their religious lives to come to Washington and be a part of the Senate today.

### SCHEDULE

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, this morning there will be a period of morning business until 11 a.m. Following morning business, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 4, the Soldiers', Sailors', Airmen's and Marines' Bill of Rights Act of 1999. At 12 noon, the Senate will recess until 2:15 p.m. to allow the weekly party luncheons to meet. Following the luncheons, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 4 with amendments expected to be offered and debated. Rollcall votes are possible throughout today's session, and Members will be notified of the voting schedule when it becomes available.

I thank my colleagues for their attention.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VOINOVICH). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

### MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 11 o'clock.

Under the previous order, the Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. SMITH, is recognized for up to 20 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. I thank the Chair.

### PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

that one of my staff, Mr. Jim Dohoney, be granted floor privileges during my remarks this morning.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire pertaining to the introduction of the legislation are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

#### IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FOOD QUALITY PROTECTION ACT

**MR. LOTT.** Mr. President, it is rare for both Houses of Congress to reach a unanimous agreement—fully bipartisan legislation. The Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA) was enacted in this manner in 1996. This new law eliminated the famed Delaney Clause for residues in raw and processed foods—replacing it with a scientific, rational standard of "reasonable certainty of no harm." Food and agricultural interest, as well as the pesticide industry, saw the passage of FQPA as an opportunity to assure that sound science is paramount in EPA's determinations on use of crop protection chemicals. It is worth saying it again—a scientific, rational, sound and reasonable standard.

Mr. President, sound science is what the authors intended and expected. This is what Congress wanted—sound science as the rule's foundation. Further, the new law provided an additional safety factor to protect infants and children, and new ways of assessing pesticide benefits and risks. This is something Congress fully supported. Despite a unanimous Congressional vote, implementing the law at the regulatory level has been a very difficult and unnecessarily complex process.

In fact, only a few months after the law was passed, the entire FQPA implementation process broke down. Members of Congress voiced their concern. The problems were so great and concerns from America's agriculture industry so substantial that Vice President GORE sent a Memorandum to both the Department of Agriculture and the Environmental Protection Agency on April 8, 1998. This memorandum laid out the White House's plan for getting FQPA's implementation back on track.

The White House's plan for FQPA implementation contained four basic principles. It included sound science in protecting public health, regulatory transparency, reasonable transition for agriculture, and consultation with the public and other agencies. The Vice President's approach was supported by America's agriculture community. Everyone's hopes were high.

Mr. President, today, almost a year after the White House got directly involved in FQPA's implementation process, it is still off track. It is becoming clear to me that Congress may again have to revisit FQPA.

Mr. President, Congress wanted a law to eliminate the scientifically inadequate and outdated Delaney Clause. What Congress and the Nation got was

much worse. In fact, the EPA has failed to provide scientifically sound guidance to the regulated community. The EPA approach follows a path toward great economic harm for both agricultural producers and urban users of these products—an EPA approach which is without scientific foundation.

Farmers, the food industry, pest control interests, and many others are understandably concerned. Americans want and deserve a fair, workable implementation of this bipartisan law. Americans want and deserve rules that are based on real information and sound science. Americans want and deserve rules that follow the Vice President's memo. Americans want and deserve rules which fit FQPA's requirements.

In order for these rules to be achieved EPA must:

Allow development of the best scientific methodology and data;

Base its decisions on actual pesticide uses rather than model assumptions; and

Operate in an open, transparent manner to establish uniform, scientific and practical policies.

Mr. President, this is simple and straightforward, and makes scientific common sense. This request is consistent with the intent of the unanimously passed law. This request is also consistent with the Vice President's memo of nearly a year ago.

The requirements of the law are achievable. I have confidence that EPA can do this right—EPA just needs to take the time, invest the effort with the proper focus.

EPA must recognize the problems that will be created if FQPA is improperly implemented. It is estimated that the economic impact for agricultural producers is tremendous. For just one class of chemicals being analyzed by EPA, estimates have shown a 55% yield loss in my state for corn if these products were eliminated. For cotton in Mississippi, the yield loss has been estimated at 8 percent. Crops across the United States would also be negatively impacted.

However, Mr. President, FQPA is not just about farming. Poor implementation of FQPA could also have consequences in the public health area. FQPA's passage was not just about reassessing old products, it was more about getting new, safer crop protection products on the market. FQPA's passage was bipartisan & unanimous because Congress also wanted new products and a rational scientific process. One such new product intended for use on cotton is currently under review by EPA. This new cotton insecticide, PIRATE, is extremely important to Mississippi cotton producers and we need full registration of this product before the growing season this year.

Mr. President, EPA must implement FQPA properly. EPA should not make any final decisions on important pesticide products until they have completely developed a clear and trans-

parent process for implementing the law and have evaluated the impacts of product loss. With that done—FQPA will meet the expectations of Congress.

#### NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE

**MR. GRAMS.** Mr. President, I wish that I could say that Congress and the President of the United States are doing everything possible to protect the American people and preserve the values that we hold dear. But that is not the case.

At this time, the United States is defenseless against a ballistic missile attack. Clearly, that is an unacceptable state of affairs. Recent events demand the United States move forward and deploy, as soon as technologically possible, an effective National Missile Defense (NMD) system which can defend U.S. territory against any limited ballistic missile attack, whether from an accidental, unauthorized, or deliberate launch.

It is my sincere hope that President Clinton's recent decision to request \$6.6 billion over 6 years for missile defense research in his budget reflects a new commitment to deploy the most extensive, effective national missile defense system in the shortest amount of time. I am pleased the President finally understands the need for a missile defense system and hope he will continue that commitment. Any President sworn to protect our Nation must support the deployment of a system that would protect Americans from annihilation.

We know that the threat of a missile attack is growing stronger as more emerging powers, such as North Korea and Iran are developing long-range ballistic missiles that could reach the United States. As recent events have shown, we cannot rely on the intelligence estimates this administration has been using as a security blanket. Remember, our intelligence community projected that Iran could not field its medium-range ballistic missile (the 800-940 mile range Shahab-3) until 2003, but Iran flight-tested this system 6 months ago. We were also surprised by North Korea's test firing of a two-stage missile over Japan last August. It is simply not reasonable to assume that the United States will get 3 years' advance warning, thus allowing 3 years to deploy a limited defense under the Clinton administration's "3+3 deployment readiness program."

As the congressionally mandated bipartisan Rumsfeld commission noted, Iran has acquired and is seeking advanced missile components that can be combined to produce ballistic missiles with sufficient range to strike all the way to St. Paul, Minnesota. As the Senator from Minnesota, I must say that I take that threat to heart. In addition, North Korea is close to testing a new missile that will have sufficient range to strike the continental United States. When that occurs, the threat to