

or informed of the decision to bypass the Buy American Act. I spoke with a small business owner yesterday who would have gladly bid on the order for the berets if she had only been given the opportunity. What is more, she could have made the berets for almost \$3 less than it is costing you and me and every taxpayer to import them from Communist China.

Also, I heard from retired Lieutenant Colonel William Luther. Colonel Luther wrote:

Those who can act on this matter need to wake up and understand that what they are about to let happen will cost the Army and our country far more than money can ever buy.

Mr. Speaker, these are just a few of the letters that I have received on this issue, but these letters represent the feelings and sentiment of thousands who are sickened by this original decision and by the bogus resolution that the Rangers were forced to agree to. I am still greatly perplexed and extremely disappointed that this decision and the series of bad decisions that followed were allowed to stand. I hope that it is not too late for this Congress to intervene on behalf of the Rangers, small business owners and U.S. manufacturing companies before it is too late.

I along with many of my colleagues will not let this matter simply drop. We will continue to encourage the committees of jurisdiction to hold hearings so the American people can know the truth once and for all.

Mr. Speaker, I close by saying, God bless our men and women in uniform, and God bless America.

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 Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

REGARDING THE BUDGET FOR DEFENSE

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, it is quite familiar to me to stand here and address the subject of military budgets. For many years, under administrations of both parties, I have pointed out where we believe the House as a body and America as a Nation were failing to set appropriate priorities in the de-

fense budget. Often, indeed far too often, I and other Members noted that we were trying to do too much with too little. In fact, last year I asked the Budget Committee to add \$12 billion for the Department of Defense.

That is why I was glad to see both candidates for President advocate increases in the defense budget. It was good news. That is the right step, regardless of one's party. If we can keep our promises to the troops and maintain an effective defense, I do not care if the money comes from Democrats, Republicans or Martians.

That is why I have to say I am disappointed with the result. President Bush's defense budget for 2002 provides about \$325 billion for national security activities, nearly \$311 billion of that for the Department of Defense. That is a whole lot of money, to be sure. But then you have to take out the retiree health care provisions that the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR), the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) and I initiated and which were passed into law last year; and then you have to adjust for inflation. When you do that, guess what? The actual increase in the defense budget is \$100 million from what President Clinton proposed. \$100 million.

If any of us won that much in a lottery, we would be rich. But in the Department of Defense, what does \$100 million do? \$100 million is a pay increase for every soldier of \$1.85 per pay period. Or it is one-forty-fifth of an aircraft carrier. Or it fixes the gymnasium at West Point. Or it runs the ballistic missile defense program for 6 days. Or it is 1½ F-15 fighters. You pick whichever you like, because for that money you get only one. A \$100 million increase in the defense budget is not really too much to write home about. When the President during his campaign said that help is on the way, he must have meant spiritual help, because \$1.85 does not help anybody very much.

But let us be fair. President Bush wants to increase pay by more than \$1.85. On February 12, he told soldiers at Fort Stewart that he would increase pay by \$400 million and add in other benefits for a total of \$5.7 billion. And there is \$100 million to pay for that.

□ 1445

Well, let us not forget the budget included a \$2.6 billion increase in research and development. Not a bad idea, as such. But add that to the pay increase of \$5.7 billion, and that is \$8.3 billion; and you have to get that out of a \$100 million stone.

I am just a country lawyer, but it seems to me if you increase spending by \$8.3 billion, but have only \$100 million more to do it, you have to cut something else to make the numbers work out. We do not know what is going to get cut yet. The department has not finished the first of a series of defense reviews. But what do the choices look like?

You could cut procurement, if you can find a way to keep planes designed in the 1960s and built in the 1970s in the air safely; and if you are willing to let the Navy slide below 300 ships; and if you are ready to stop the Army's acquisition of armored vehicles for its current dismounted infantry. I am not willing to do any of these things, and I hope the Pentagon is not either.

How about operations and maintenance costs? Well, if you are willing to train even less, and let your ammunition shortages grow, and cut flying hours more, and stop repairing the U.S.S. Cole, and live with the health care shortfalls, then you could cut operations and maintenance. I do not want to be the one to tell the troops that they are not going to get help to get them off food stamps, and I hope none of my colleagues would either.

Then you could cut military construction. You could, if you were ready to give up on repairing dilapidated military housing, and stop adding protection against terrorist strikes. You get the idea. There just are not any easy choices when you have only \$100 million to pay a \$8.3 billion bill.

That is before our tax cut. That is before increasing the budget for missile defense.

It seems to me that part of the solution would be to enact a supplemental spending bill that recognizes just how hard our troops have been working. It would at least help close the gap. But that, too, has been ruled off the table for now.

Mr. Speaker, I will admit, I was one of those who believed that whoever won the Presidency, the military would begin to get the relief it needs; and I know some of my Republican friends believed the same. I am sorry to say that it looks as if we were given false hope.

JUMP-STARTING VALUE-ADDED INITIATIVES FOR AGRICULTURE PRODUCERS

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

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Speaker, this week, March 18 through March 24, is National Agriculture Week. Agriculture is the number one industry in my State and last week I introduced, along with the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON), two pieces of legislation that I believe will be very important in ag country.

The past few years have brought widespread disasters and record low prices to the agriculture economy. These harsh conditions have prompted some farmers to call for a debate on current farm policy and others to demand a better safety net for producers. While a safety net is important to producers, especially in lean years, America's farmers and ranchers do not want

to be dependent on the Federal Government for their livelihood. Consequently, the Federal Government must develop a long-term, market-oriented approach to Federal farm policy that will provide producers with the tools to help themselves, while at the same time bringing much-needed economic development to rural communities.

Stakeholders in American agriculture recognize that while short-term financial assistance is helpful, long-term planning and creative and innovative opportunities are necessary in order to stem the loss of small, family-owned farms and preserve small-town economies.

Encouraging agricultural producers to launch value-added enterprises will do just that by enabling farmers and ranchers to reach up the marketing chain and capture profits generated from processing their raw commodities.

While producers have great interest in pooling together to add value to their raw products, two primary barriers stand in their way: first, producers often do not have the technical expertise to launch extremely complex business ventures, like value-added enterprises. Producers are experts, but they are experts in their own fields. Farmers are often outside their arena when it comes to putting together complex processing plants.

Second, producers are currently cash strapped. Even if enough capital could be accumulated to initiate development of producer-owned, value-added processing, many of the consolidated players in the market could squeeze producer-owned entities out before they become profitable. Therefore, something needs to be done to level the playing field for these producers.

That is why, together with the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) and the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON), I have introduced two bills to help jump-start value-added initiatives for those producers who need more help to overcome the barriers they face.

The Value-Added Agriculture Development Act would grant \$50 million to create agricultural innovation centers for 3 years on a demonstration basis. The ag innovation centers would provide desperately needed technical expertise, engineering, business, research and legal services to assist producers in forming producer-owned value-added endeavors.

The companion bill, the Value-Added Agriculture Investment Tax Credit Act, would create a tax credit program for farmers who invest in producer-owned value-added endeavors. This program would provide an incentive to invest in value-added production by assisting cash-strapped producers.

Specifically, the bill would make available a 50 percent tax credit for farmers who invest in a producer-owned value-added enterprise. Producers can apply the tax credit over 20 subsequent years or transfer the tax credit to allow for the cyclical nature of farm incomes.

For example, sugar beet growers in the Yellowstone Valley in Montana have the potential to purchase the Great Western sugar refinery. This legislation could provide much-needed tax relief for the grower, turning a "maybe" purchase into a "possible" purchase.

With our tax credit bill, each grower would claim as much as a \$30,000 tax credit for his \$60,000 investment towards the purchase of this plant. That may be enough assistance for the producers to remain in a business so important to Montana's economy.

I have always said that government does not create jobs, people do. Something government can do, however, is create an environment that gives incentives to entrepreneurs and enables businesses to flourish. That is what this package of legislation does: it provides American family farmers with the tools and incentives they desperately need to transform themselves from price-takers to price-makers. Because of this, the legislation has been endorsed by the Montana Farmers Union, Montana Wool Growers, Montana Farm Bureau, Safflower Growers Associations, R-CALF, Montana Stock Growers, Mountain States Beet Growers Association of Montana, and Montana Grain Growers.

Agriculture is Montana's number one industry, and what is good for agriculture is good for Montana. By developing value-added industries, we can bring some economic development to Montana and other rural States. That is good for our pocketbooks, our communities, and our way of life.

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

(Mr. LUTHER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT 107TH CONGRESS

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, enclosed, please find a copy of the Rules of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct of the U.S. House of Representatives for the 107th Congress. The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct adopted these rules pursuant to House Rule XI, clause 2(a)(1) on March 14, 2001. We are submitting these rules to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for publication in compliance with House Rule XI, clause 2(a)(2).

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

Adopted March 14, 2001

FOREWORD

The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is unique in the House of Representatives. Consistent with the duty to carry out its advisory and enforcement responsibilities in an impartial manner, the Committee is

the only standing committee of the House of Representatives the membership of which is divided evenly by party. These rules are intended to provide a fair procedural framework for the conduct of the Committee's activities and to help insure that the Committee serves well the people of the United States, the House of Representatives, and the Members, officers, and employees of the House of Representatives.

PART I—GENERAL COMMITTEE RULES

Rule 1. General Provisions

(a) So far as applicable, these rules and the Rules of the House of Representatives shall be the rules of the Committee and any subcommittee. The Committee adopts these rules under the authority of clause 2(a)(1) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, 107th Congress.

(b) The rules of the Committee may be modified, amended, or repealed by a vote of a majority of the Committee.

(c) When the interests of justice so require, the Committee, by a majority vote of its members, may adopt any special procedures, not inconsistent with these rules, deemed necessary to resolve a particular matter before it. Copies of such special procedures shall be furnished to all parties in the matter.

Rule 2. Definitions

(a) "Committee" means the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

(b) "Complaint" means a written allegation of improper conduct against a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives filed with the Committee with the intent to initiate an inquiry.

(c) "Inquiry" means an investigation by an investigative subcommittee into allegations against a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives.

(d) "Investigative Subcommittee" means a subcommittee designated pursuant to Rule 8 to conduct an inquiry to determine if a Statement of Alleged Violation should be issued.

(e) "Statement of Alleged Violation" means a formal charging document filed by an investigative subcommittee with the Committee containing specific allegations against a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives of a violation of the Code of Official Conduct, or of a law, rule, regulation, or other standard of conduct applicable to the performance of official duties or the discharge of official responsibilities.

(f) "Adjudicatory Subcommittee" means a subcommittee of the Committee comprised of those Committee members not on the investigative subcommittee, that holds an adjudicatory hearing and determines whether the counts in a Statement of Alleged Violation are proved by clear and convincing evidence.

(g) "Sanction Hearing" means a Committee hearing to determine what sanction, if any, to adopt or to recommend to the House of Representatives.

(h) "Respondent" means a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives who is the subject of a complaint filed with the Committee or who is the subject of an inquiry or a Statement of Alleged Violation.

(i) "Office of Advice and Education" refers to the Office established by section 803(i) of the Ethics Reform Act of 1989. The Office handles inquiries; prepares written opinions in response to specific requests; develops general guidance; and organizes seminars, workshops, and briefings for the benefit of the House of Representatives.