

we treating the farm sector of our economy fairly? I think in this regard it is important to first note that the appropriations subcommittee is constrained by the budget.

I happen to serve on the Committee on the Budget. I was very disappointed with the unfair treatment that America's farmers received from the Republican budget. I was constrained to vote against it, and I hope that as this appropriations bill moves to the Senate and comes back for consideration, that we can rectify some of its shortcomings. I would just like to point out a few.

First, and perhaps most importantly, we have failed to target the billions of dollars of agricultural assistance that is being spent in the U.S. Treasury. Instead, this money is going out the back-door, billions and billions these months; and it is going largely for the benefit of land ownership. It is not being targeted to assist those operating farmers who, indeed, are suffering from low prices.

Mr. Speaker, we are not targeting this money. We ought to be targeting the money. We ought to have programs that focus on the safety net concept, dealing with prices that farmers are receiving, not simply spending billions willy-nilly. We ought to have programs that recognize effective caps, but instead we have some that are receiving hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars and others scarcely enough to enable them to stay in their farming occupation.

A second problem is that the farm programs are largely administered by the Farm Service Agency. That agency, unfortunately, has many new programs thrust upon it, complicated changes in the programs it administers; and it has an inadequate staff. This is a dangerous recipe for disappointment, frustration and resignation ultimately by key employees. We ought to be providing the Farm Service Agency with the resources it needs, the staff that it needs to carry out its mission.

Third, the farm programs are also implemented, especially in the conservation area, by the Natural Resources and Conservation Service. The service itself is not adequately compensated. Furthermore, the conservation programs themselves are shortchanged.

Fourth, we have a dramatic limit on agricultural research, dramatically less than requested by the President.

Fifth, we have a dramatic limit on rural development, and, again, dramatically less than requested by the President.

Sixth, we have inadequate funding for the Packers and Stockyards Administration, or GIPSA. This is the agency in the Department of Agriculture that is charged with making sure that in the livestock sector we do not have unfair trade practices that undermine the farmer's ability to receive a fair price for the livestock that he or she is mar-

keting. It is absolutely necessary that if we are going to fulfill the mission of the Packers and Stockyards Act, that GIPSA be adequately financed. It is shortchanged.

Similarly, the Office of General Counsel within the Secretary's office is shortchanged. We cannot expect these agencies of the Federal Government to perform their mission if they do not have an adequate staff of attorneys and economists.

Finally, the promise of trade has been held out to America's farmers as really the hope that they have for improved prices. But trade cannot be the cornerstone of our agricultural policy. It has to be one part.

We have talked about trade with Cuba today. Unfortunately, trade with Cuba is an illusion. It is not in the agriculture appropriations bill, and I fear it will not be when it comes back.

To be sure, we need to do the very best we can in this appropriations bill, but we have got to do more.

MISSILE DEFENSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend we had one in a series of tests of our national missile defense program, which is currently under development, and supported both by the White House and by overwhelming support in both the House and the Senate. Unfortunately, this test was not a success, and there are those who are using this test to criticize the overall program and to say that technologically we are not prepared to move forward with missile defense.

I want to take a few moments to clarify what did happen and to clarify for the record what occurred in that test, and am offering to Members this week to have a full briefing, both classified and unclassified, on the details of the test that occurred this past weekend.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, the hit-to-kill technology that is fundamental to missile defense was not tested. It was not tested because we could not get the separation stage away from the main rocket.

Now, that is not new technology. That is not missile defense technology. In fact, Wernher von Braun and other scientists solved this problem 40 years ago. It is a technology necessary to launch every communications satellite into outer space. It is a technology utilized for every space mission that we get involved with. It is not a technology specific to missile defense. However, it failed. No one expected it to fail, just as when we launch communications satellites, we do not expect the separation technology to fail to allow that communications satellite to be put into an orbit.

Unfortunately, there are those who are misinformed; and there are those

who are informed but want to mischaracterize what occurred as to say that this test was an indication that we are not ready to move forward with missile defense. Nothing could be further from the truth.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I have come out and strongly criticized the corporation who was responsible for the separation stage technology and have put them on notice that if we do not solve this quality-control issue, there will be legislation to punitively punish them for other failures that may occur in the future.

But make no mistake about it, this test was not a failure of missile defense capability. We never got to that stage. The kill vehicle never had the opportunity to go after the target. It never had the opportunity to employ the sensors that are needed in missile defense to kill the incoming missile on its way into an American city.

We will do a full analysis and the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization and the Department of Defense will provide the full reports to us. But this week I will arrange, as the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services Subcommittee on Research and Development, for any colleague in this Chamber that wants, a full briefing on the test, exactly what occurred and why the test failed.

But, again, I would repeat, it was not a failure of missile defense, any more than a rocket trying to launch a satellite into space and failing would cause us to stop all future communication satellite launches. It is simply a problem that we need to get corrected, and we will get corrected.

As Jack Gantzler, our Deputy Secretary of Defense, and General Kadish, our three-star general in charge of missile defense, stated in Congressional hearings 2 and 3 weeks ago, they are totally confident in our technology; and we will move forward. But there are those who want to distort the facts. The Union of Unconcerned Scientists is one of them. Those members of the Flat Earth Society that would like to mischaracterize what occurred are not going to be allowed to get away with that, and I would encourage our colleagues to make sure they avail themselves of all the factual information surrounding that test.

NUCLEAR ENERGY CRISIS LOOMING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, we all know what happens when we are too reliant on foreign sources for oil; and, as a result, in my district in southern Ohio and across this country, consumers are paying outrageous prices for a gallon of gasoline.

But there is another energy crisis looming that many of us seem not to be aware of. I think it is important for

Members of this House and for citizens of this country to be aware of the fact that 23 percent of our Nation's electricity is generated by the use of nuclear power plants, and almost all of that fuel comes from a domestic source.

Unfortunately, in July of 1998, the United States Enrichment Corporation, which is the public corporation that was responsible for operating the two existing uranium enrichment facilities in this country, that corporation was privatized. Since privatization, disasters have occurred.

The mining industry is on the verge of collapse. The conversion industry, there is only one conversion plant in this country, and that is in Metropolis, Illinois. It is on the verge of collapse. And just 2 weeks ago the United States Enrichment Corporation, the privatized corporation, announced that they were closing one of our two enrichment facilities, the one in my district in Piketon, Ohio; and within a year some 1,800 to 2,000 workers will lose their jobs.

How did this disaster happen? Why are we on the verge of having to depend upon foreign sources for perhaps 20 percent of our Nation's electricity?

I have in my hand a waiver letter that was written by the chairman of the Public Board, Mr. William Rainer; and in this letter he is addressing the CEO of the Public Board, who is now the CEO of the private corporation.

Mr. Rainer says to Mr. Timbers in this letter: "As employees of a wholly owned government corporation, you may not participate personally or substantially in any particular matter that would have a direct and predictable effect on your financial interests or those of others, such as spouse."

2145

However, Mr. Rainer granted Mr. Timbers this waiver, giving him permission to advise the board on whether or not USEC should be privatized, how it should be privatized, and the selection of the individuals to serve on the new privatized board. What is the result? Mr. Timbers went from making \$350,000 as a government employee and after the company was privatized, Mr. Timbers made \$2.48 million.

Mr. Speaker, if that is not substantive, I do not know what is. This is a sham and a farce, and this administration and this Congress have an obligation to look into these matters. If someone who worked for the government made \$350,000, and then was given the privilege of making decisions which had the benefit of enabling him to enrich himself and then a year-and-a-half later ends up with a salary of \$2.48 million, then there is no sense in us having any prohibition on these kinds of government employees being involved in matters that could enrich themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking this House, I am asking this administration to come to their senses and to understand

that we are facing a looming crisis in this country. If this rogue corporation continues without any prohibition, we find ourselves perhaps facing the demise of the enrichment industry in this country and becoming completely dependent on foreign sources for the essential fuel that is necessary to power our nuclear plants which provide some 23 percent of all of the electricity in this country.

Mr. Speaker, this is a serious matter. I am appreciative of the time I have had to share this with my colleagues and with the country. I will include for the RECORD at this time the letter I referred to earlier in my remarks.

USEC,

Bethesda, MD, September 26, 1995.

Mr. WILLIAM H. TIMBERS, Jr.,
President and Chief Executive Officer, United States Enrichment Corporation, Bethesda, MD.

DEAR MR. TIMBERS: Under 18 U.S.C. §208(a), USEC employees, as employees of a wholly owned Government corporation, may not participate personally and substantially in any particular matter that would have a direct and predictable effect on their financial interests or those of certain others, such as their spouses. Nevertheless, as Chairman of the Corporation's Board of Directors, under 18 U.S.C. §208(b)(1) I may waive the prohibition of 18 U.S.C. §208(a) where I determine that the employee's financial interest in the matter "is not so substantial as to be deemed likely to affect the integrity of the services which the Government may expect" from the employee.

On September 25, 1995, you provided me with a request for a waiver under section 208(b)(1) to allow you to participate in matters directed toward implementation of the "Plan for the Privatization of the United States Enrichment Corporation" (Plan), presented to the President of the United States on June 30, 1995, and effectuation of the Corporation's privatization. Your request stated that such matters would include, but not be limited to, providing advice and recommendations to the Corporation's Board of Directors on the following matters: the method that USEC should utilize in privatizing, e.g., an IPO or an M&A transaction, the timing of a privatization transaction, and whether any such transaction would meet the requirements of section 1502(a) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended; the selection of a M&A buyer and the negotiation of a M&A transaction if a buyer is selected; and the selection of individuals to be appointed to serve on the board of the privatized corporation.

You presently are the President and Chief Executive Officer of USEC. In your position, you are required to implement resolutions adopted and approved by the Board of Directors and to act on directions provided thereby, to abide by the terms of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and of other laws, as each relates to the Corporation, and to carry out your duties as provided by the Corporation's By-laws. One of the primary responsibilities of the Corporation is to effectuate privatization through implementation of the Plan. In your position as President and CEO, you are responsible for overseeing day-to-day implementation, and ensuring the successful realization, of this project. In carrying out your privatization-related duties, including those matters detailed in your waiver request as outlined above, your financial interests in both your current Federal employment and your future employment will be affected. They will be af-

fected by virtue of the privatization of USEC resulting in the termination of your current Federal employment. Moreover, matters relating to privatization also likely will affect your interests in future employment by structuring the possibilities for your employment with the private successor to USEC. In turn, the financial interests of the privatized entity may be imputed to you under the statute if you have an arrangement regarding future employment therewith. These effects on your current and future employment interests give you a disqualifying financial interest in privatization-related matters undertaken by the Corporation.

Under the terms of section 208(b)(1), disqualifying financial interest may be waived if the "interest is not so substantial as to be deemed likely to affect the integrity of the services which the Government may expect" from the employee. In this instance, the particular matter of privatization of the Corporation is not a project proposed by you or another employee of the Corporation. It is a goal that was placed with the Corporation by Congress. Therefore, working to realize that goal is incumbent upon every employee of the Corporation, although each will be personally affected by the outcome. Without such effort by USEC employees, privatization could not be realized. Given the effect that privatization will have on the financial interests of each of the officers of the Corporation, not just your own, it is not feasible to delegate your participation in privatization-related matters to a subordinate officer qualified to perform such tasks. However, the openness of the privatization process to the scrutiny of the USEC Board of Directors, the U.S. Treasury as the sole shareholder of the Corporation, and officials of the other Federal agencies will provide additional assurance as to the integrity of the services provided by each USEC employee participating in the privatization process.

Given these factors, and the scope of this waiver as delineated herein, I do not find your disqualifying financial interests to be so substantial as to be deemed likely to affect the integrity of your services to the Government.

Pursuant to the foregoing analysis, I hereby grant a waiver of 18 U.S.C. §208(a) with regard to your participation in matters that would affect your financial interests, and those imputed to you, as previously described in this memorandum. Those financial interests, in light of the requirements imposed upon the Corporation by the Act and the Plan, are not so substantial as to be deemed likely to affect the integrity of your services in these matters.

The scope of this waiver extends to those matters, within your scope of authority and responsibility as President and Chief Executive Officer of USEC, directed toward implementation of the Plan and effectuation of the privatization. This waiver, however, does not extend to; (i) matters involving the determination of the terms and conditions of the counterpart position in the privatized corporation to that which you currently hold; or (ii) matters involving the determination of whether the person holding such position should be selected as a candidate for the board of directors of the privatized corporation.

As the Corporation's privatization efforts proceed, financial interests that conflict with your required duties, that were not anticipated at the time this waiver was issued, could arise. If at any time you have questions regarding the scope of this waiver, you

should seek guidance from the General Counsel. The USEC General Counsel, on my behalf, has consulted with the Office of Government Ethics on this waiver and will provide them a copy of it.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. RAINER,
Chairman, Board of Directors.

SALUTE TO JOHNS HOPKINS HOSPITAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TANCREDO). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Johns Hopkins Hospital located in my district in Baltimore, Maryland for its recently announced number one ranking among the Nation's hospitals.

Treating nearly 600,000 patients per year, Johns Hopkins Medicine has been recognized for more than a century as a leading center for patient care, medical research, and teaching. The institution, which includes a hospital and health system and the School of Medicine, is noted for its excellent faculty and staff covering every aspect of medicine, its two world class medical campuses, and multiple outreach programs for regional, national and international patient activities.

The flagship of this institution, Johns Hopkins Hospital, is a 1,025-bed facility and encompasses renowned centers such as the Brady Urological Institute, the Wilmer Eye Institute, the Johns Hopkins Comprehensive Cancer Center, and the Johns Hopkins Children's Center.

For the 10th straight year, the hospital has placed first on the annual U.S. News and World Report magazine hospital ranking. The rankings are based on three factors: reputation, mortality, and aspects of treatment such as technology and nursing care. Among 17 medical specialties evaluated, Hopkins ranked in the top 10 in 16 of them, including number one in ear, nose, throat, gynecological services, urology, and eye care. Further, 41 Johns Hopkins Hospital doctors were recognized in an American Health Magazine survey as among the best in the United States, more than any other medical center in the Nation.

Most significant to me, however, is Hopkins' commitment to Baltimore and the worldwide community. This institution has a sense of obligation and social responsibility that finds its foundation in instructions by its founder and benefactor. Over a century ago, the Baltimore merchant Johns Hopkins wrote to his trustees, and I quote, "The indigent of this city and its environs, without regard to sex, age or color, shall be received into this hospital."

In recent years, Hopkins has followed this commitment with the incorporation of the historic East Baltimore Community Action Coalition, better known as HEBAC. It is a coalition formed among Baltimore City, the

State of Maryland, Hopkins and the neighborhood to improve housing, attract new business, and offer social services to the 47,500 residents of East Baltimore, 43 percent of whom live in poverty. HEBAC was part of the city's successful bid to become a Federal empowerment zone and secure \$34 million from the Federal Government for physical rehabilitation of the neighborhood.

After more than a year of working closely with the East Baltimore community to identify their health concerns, Johns Hopkins also committed \$4.5 million over a period of 5 years to establish an Urban Health Institute to tackle the vexing health problems that plague the community. The Institute brings together a wide range of Hopkins health experts, community leaders, business leaders, clergy and State and local agencies to forge a partnership that will first identify the most pressing health issues and then develop the best methods, including research, education and community outreach to address these problems.

Health priorities identified by the community that the institute is expected to address include substance abuse, violence, sexually transmitted diseases, HIV/AIDS, cardiovascular disease, pulmonary disease, environmental health, the elderly, and family maternal and child health services.

In my stead as a Member of this body, my focus is to create a livable community in my district of Baltimore as well as throughout the Nation. I believe that all Americans, regardless of race, ethnicity and social economic status, deserve livable communities where they feel safe, where their children can obtain a quality education, and where they have access to quality health care. All must share equitably in this American dream.

Johns Hopkins is truly making an effort to ensure that Baltimoreans and persons around the world are able to realize this dream by providing the kind of patient care that will allow them to live fruitful and productive lives. The hospital's commitment to medical excellence and to serving this community are deserving of recognition; and today, I salute Johns Hopkins Hospital for these efforts.

Congratulations to Johns Hopkins for being named the number one among hospitals and certainly a premier servant to our Nation's patients.

COURAGE OVER CAUTION—WE MUST HAVE PEACE IN THE MID- DLE EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in less than 48 hours, one of the most historic and, I believe, one of the most important meetings will take place just a few miles away from the Capitol of the United States of America, and that is the gathering of Presi-

dent Clinton, Prime Minister Barak and President Arafat on deliberating on peace in the Mideast.

Let me salute all three of these gentlemen and particularly let me applaud the leadership of President William Jefferson Clinton. Many might offer to say that there is nothing else that he could do. Why should he not hold this summit? It is a win-win situation for him in the short time that he has to lead this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, peace is never easy. I think it is important to realize the leap of faith that is being taken by all three of these heads of nations. Camp David will be a very serious place; and, for many Americans, I believe it is important to focus our attention, our hearts and our minds on an effort to bring about peace to a region that has had 52 years of bloody conflicts. For more than half a century, there has been no peace in the Middle East.

I want to applaud the Prime Minister of Israel who realizes that he is on very dangerous ground. Already, three of the six of his coalition members have broken away and resigned because of its efforts to seek peace. Many have said he is fragilely kept in government, that no one will support him, and that there is no guarantee that he will remain as prime minister or head of government of the country of Israel. But I salute him for his words that he comes here with a profound sense of responsibility and, as well, to acknowledge that he has a mandate from the voters, the citizens of Israel to do all that he can to establish peace, not for those of us who live and those of us who are adults responsible for ourselves, but for the children and for those yet not born.

He is willing to consider giving 90 percent of the West Bank to the Palestinians; he is willing to consider some answer to the problem of Jerusalem running some part thereof. The details are not all present, but he is willing to discuss the status of Jerusalem. He is willing as well to allow a small number of Palestinians, so it has been reported, to return to what is today Israel. Yes, we must answer the question of the Palestinians who continuously view parts of Jerusalem or Jerusalem as having a religious significance to them. Jerusalem has a religious significance to all of us of many faiths from around this world. We must find a way to solve the problem with a respect for all and dignity for all and peace for the world.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is important that once this peace agreement comes to fruition, that we look at an international peacekeeping contingent, as has been suggested by the Palestinians. Yes, as Secretary Albright has already stated, this is an effort of high stakes. It is an effort that hopefully will avoid the tragedy of death of a young Palestinian mother and child experiencing the wrong turn at the wrong time, and they met their death during some bloody conflict just a few days ago. Apologies were offered by the Government of Israel, but how many more will