

enterprises in our rural communities are important ways AARC can help promote more jobs, higher incomes, and fresh opportunities in rural America. In AARC's first 3 years in operation, the Center invested \$22.3 million in 54 projects in 28 states, matched by more than \$75 million from private partners—a 3 to 1 match.

It is my hope that conferees will realize the benefits of the AARC Corporation, and provide funding at the Senate-passed level of \$10 million.●

A MISSTEP BY THE UNITED STATES

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, the United States unfortunately has openly opposed a second term for United Nations Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali.

I have written about this hard-working, effective leader in a column that is sent to newspapers in Illinois, and I submit it here to call to the attention of my colleagues this policy that has not made us any friends.

The column follows:

A MISSTEP BY THE UNITED STATES

(By Senator Paul Simon)

Suppose a local Rotary Club had the community's most wealthy and powerful citizen, Sam Smith, as a member. Imagine that the Rotarians had a dues system that reflected the ability to pay, so that wealthy Sam Smith paid more in dues than any other Rotarian.

To complicate the story, Sam Smith is far back in the payment of his dues, so far back that the money he owes amounts to almost the total budget of the club for a year.

The president of the Rotary Club is up for reelection, and most of the members want him reelected, but Mr. Big, Sam Smith, says no.

How popular do you think Sam Smith would be with the other Rotarians? Would his influence rise or fall? And what will the other Rotarians do in their election of a president?

The story is true.

Only the "club" is called the United Nations. The wealthy deadbeat member is called Sam, Uncle Sam. Most of the UN members believe that Secretary General Boutros-Ghali is doing a good job, despite being hampered by approximately \$1.4 billion that the United States owes but has not paid.

But the United States has made clear that we want to veto his reelection as Secretary-General.

The other nations, already too often unimpressed by our uncertain leadership in foreign policy, are not pleased with what we are doing, believing it is dictated by domestic political considerations.

In 1978, President Jimmy Carter designated me as one of the delegates to a two-month session of the United Nations, and I have followed the UN and its work with more than casual interest.

My impression is that overall the United Nations performs a vital service and a good job, not perfect, and that Boutros-Ghali has been a hard-working, effective leader—hampered in part by the United States talking to a great game, but not paying our dues.

Egypt is the home of the Secretary-General, and as an Egyptian he is also an African. Africa sometimes is called "the dark continent." It is more accurately described as the ignored continent.

One little-known fact is the gradual spread of democracy in Africa, some of them fledgling democracies that deserve more encouragement from the United States and other nations.

African countries take pride in having Boutros-Ghali as the Secretary-General.

Our opposition to him is coupled with other realities that they see: President Clinton has never visited Africa. Secretary of State Warren Christopher has not visited any sub-Saharan country since he has been Secretary, compared to 24 visits to Syria.

Our inattention, coupled with our unfortunate open opposition to the reelection of the Secretary-General, has not made us any friends.

FOOD QUALITY PROTECTION ACT

● Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate gave final approval to the Food Quality Protection Act (H.R. 1627). This legislation will reform the scientifically outdated Delaney clause. I ask to have printed in the RECORD letters of support from commodity groups, the Food Chain Coalition, Farm Bureau, and environmental and consumer organizations as well as a letter from Senator KASSEBAUM and a statement from the American Crop Protection Association.

The letters follow:

JULY 24, 1996.

Hon. RICHARD LUGAR,

Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We are writing to urge you to support H.R. 1627 the "Food Quality Protection Act" when it is considered by the Committee. The effort to achieve food safety reform, which assures an abundant, affordable, and safe food and fiber supply has been difficult, and we applaud all those who worked to help reach an acceptable compromise.

It is important that farmers continue to have the greatest availability of crop production products which are safe, affordable and effective to ensure that they are able to meet the nation's demand for food and fiber. While we had concerns initially with some provisions in the bill, the diligent work by the Committee and assurances from EPA and USDA that the new higher standard of protection will be interpreted with common sense and reason have reassured us that this is meaningful change.

The Delaney Clause is outdated and could possibly cause the loss of many crop protection products which pose no significant health or safety risk. This legislation represents the best opportunity in a decade to modernize the Delaney Clause and strengthen federal food safety protection. We will continue to work with you to see that the new legislation accomplishes these goals and urge prompt Senate action.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

American Soybean Association, National Association of Wheat Growers, National Cotton Council of America, National Corn Growers Association, National Barley Growers Association.

FOOD CHAIN COALITION,

July 23, 1996.

Hon. RICHARD G. LUGAR,

Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, U.S. Senate, Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Last week, representatives of the Administration, industry and

the environmental community reached compromise agreement on H.R. 1627, "The Food Quality Protection Act," after several weeks of negotiations. This bill represents the best opportunity in a decade to modernize the Delaney Clause and strengthen our nation's food laws.

As Americans working to produce, process and market our nation's food supply, we urge the Senate to act promptly to pass this compromise agreement. We applaud the announcement by the Senate Agriculture Committee that it will markup the legislation on Wednesday, July 24.

There is virtually unanimous agreement that an overhaul of the outdated Delaney clause for pesticide residues is long overdue. With the very limited number of legislative days remaining this year, the need for action to accomplish that objective is now more urgent than ever.

EPA recently proposed disallowing the use of five pesticides on a number of crops under the Delaney Clause, even though the agency has repeatedly stated its belief that those pesticides pose no significant health risk to consumers. By April 1997, EPA is due to determine whether to disallow up to 40 additional uses; without corrective action, farmers could lose the use of a number of safe and effective crop protection tools that keep the American food supply abundant and affordable.

The compromise version of "The Food Quality Protection Act" has received bipartisan praise from both the House and Senate, including Senate Agriculture Chairman Lugar, as well as from EPA Administrator Carol Browner and Vice President Albert Gore. Key Republican and Democratic leaders have stated that it is their goal to see this legislation passed and signed into law by the President this year. We urge its prompt adoption by the Committee.

Sincerely,

Agricultural Council of California; Agri Bank; Agri-Mark, Inc.; Agway, Inc.; American Bankers Association; American Crystal Sugar Company; American Farm Bureau Federation; American Meat Institute; American Feed Industry Association; Apricot Producers of California; Atlantic Dairy Cooperative; Biscuit & Cracker Manufacturers Association; Blue Diamond Growers; California Tomato Growers Association, Inc.; Californian Pear Growers; Chemical Specialties Manufacturers Association; Chocolate Manufacturers Association; Gold Kist, Inc.; Grocery Manufacturers of America; GROWMARK; Harvest States; Independent Bakers Association; International Apple Institute; Kansas Grain and Feed Association; Kraft Foods, Incorporated; Land O'Lakes; Michigan Agribusiness Association; Milk Marketing Inc; National Agricultural Aviation Association; National Cattlemen's Beef Association; National Confectioners Association; National Council of Farmer Cooperatives; National Farmers Union; National Food Processors Association; National Grain and Feed Association; National Grain Trade Council; National Grange; National Grape Co-operative Association, Inc.; National Pasta Association; Nebraska Cooperative Council; North American Export Grain Association; Oklahoma Grain and Feed Association; Produce Marketing Association; Pro-Fac Cooperative; SF Services, Inc.; Snack Food Association; South Dakota Association of Cooperatives; Southern States Cooperative; Tortilla Industry Association; USA Rice Federation; United Fresh Fruit

and Vegetable Association; Upstate Milk Cooperatives, Inc.; Utah Council of Farmer Cooperatives; Wisconsin Agri-Service Association.

July 23, 1996.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Last week, the House Commerce Committee reported by a vote of 45-0 compromise language on H.R. 1627, "The Food Quality Protection Act." We congratulate Chairman Bliley, Chairman Bilirakis, Mr. Dingell, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Waxman and many other members of the House who have worked to resolve the "Delaney paradox" and the problems it presents for farmers and consumers.

Although the agreement contains provisions we do not support, it does address many issues which are of critical importance to agriculture:

Safety Standard: The bill replaces the antiquated, "zero tolerance" Delaney standard with a health-based "safe" standard for food pesticide residues. "Safe" is defined as "reasonable certainty of no harm" which is interpreted as a one in a million additional lifetime risk. This is a standard which is essentially the same as the "negligible risk" standard in the original bill. This key provision removes the threat of unjustified cancellation of more than 50 safe crop protection products which are now jeopardized by the Delaney Clause.

Benefits Consideration: Tolerances could be exceeded to avoid a significant disruption in domestic production of an adequate, wholesome and economical food supply or if the pesticide protects consumers from a greater health risk. Benefits consideration is broadened from current law in that it is extended from raw agricultural products to include processed food. However, benefits consideration is limited under the agreement to 10 times a negligible risk for one year or more than two times a negligible risk over a lifetime. Although Farm Bureau does not support this new limitation, we are pleased that the bill preserves benefits consideration and extends it to processed food.

National Uniformity: The bill establishes national uniformity for food pesticide residues. States could not adopt tolerances which are more stringent than those set by EPA, except with respect to tolerances established through benefits consideration. In those circumstances, states would be required to petition EPA and establish that there was an imminent dietary risk to the public.

Minor Use Pesticides: It is our understanding that the FIFRA provisions of H.R. 1627 which have been reported by the House Agriculture Committee will be attached to the Commerce Committee provisions. Included are new incentives and streamlined procedures for so-called "minor crop" chemicals—crop protection products whose relatively small market does not justify the high cost of registration. This provision is essential to fruit, vegetable and horticultural growers in virtually every state.

Miscellaneous Provisions: Although we support the above provisions, Farm Bureau has some concerns with certain provisions of the Committee agreement. These include provisions relating to estrogenic effects of agricultural chemicals, infants and children, civil penalties for food adulteration and a "right to know" provision for consumers.

At this time, no one can determine with certainty the long-term, cumulative impact of these changes on specific commodities and on the availability of crop protectants necessary for farmers to produce the wide variety of safe, affordable and abundant agricultural commodities that the public demands. While we support many of the reforms in this package, we also recognize that there will be

unanticipated problems stemming from regulatory and business implementation of this legislation. On balance, however, we believe that this legislation represents an improvement over current law and we support moving the legislation to the Senate.

RICHARD W. NEWPHER,
Executive Director, Washington Office.

JULY 18, 1996.

Hon. THOMAS J. BLILEY, Jr.
Chairman, Committee on Commerce, Rayburn House Office Building, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The following environmental, education, public health, and consumer advocacy organizations would like to offer our support for the compromise substitute amendment for H.R. 1627, "The Food Quality Protection Act of 1995" that goes a long way towards better protecting the health of consumers from toxic pesticides on their food.

The compromise addresses the deadlock between the industry who oppose the Delaney clause and the organizations that support better protection for children and the public health, by establishing a comprehensive federal program to make pesticide levels in food and the environment safe for infants and children. The bill establishes a health-based standard and a strict timetable for pesticide tolerance setting that adheres tightly to the recommendations of the 1993 National Academy of Sciences Committee on Pesticides in the Diets of Infants and Children.

Although we are pleased with the extent to which the bill was changed to better protect public health, we have reservations with the sections that will allow benefits consideration for cancer-causing pesticides and pre-emption of states rights to set more protective tolerances than federal limits for pesticides. We are hopeful that these provisions will be revised upon further consideration of this legislation.

Our support for this bill is contingent upon the understanding that the bill will not be changed in any way that would allow for a weakening of public health protections.

Again we would like to extend our thanks and appreciation to the members of Congress and their staff who played a part in producing this bill.

Sincerely,
American Preventative Medical Association; Center for Science in the Public Interest; Citizen Action; Environmental Working Group; National Audubon Society; National Wildlife Federation; National Parent Teacher Association; Natural Resources Defense Council; Physicians for Social Responsibility; Public Voice; World Wildlife Fund.

AMERICAN CROP PROTECTION ASSOCIATION
PRAISES COMPREHENSIVE FOOD SAFETY ACT

WASHINGTON, DC, July 24, 1996.—The American Crop Protection Association voiced its support of the "Food Quality Protection Act of 1996," a bi-partisan bill to reform the nation's food safety laws that Tuesday was passed by the House of Representatives 417-0.

Jay J. Vroom, ACPA president, said, "The action is an overwhelming affirmation of the value and benefits of modern agricultural technology to the consumer, our children and the American farmer. With our allies and friends across food and agriculture, the crop protection industry is proud to have helped lead the way for modern, science-based food safety reform."

The Senate is expected shortly to follow the House's lead and vote to replace the 1958

Delaney clause with a single safety standard for pesticide residues on both raw and processed foods. Under the legislation, which was more than 10 years in the making, pesticides will be deemed safe when they are approved by the Environmental Protection Agency as meeting a new, health-based safety standard, defined as a "reasonable certainty of no harm."

The bill mandates implementation by the EPA of the 1993 recommendations of the National Academy of Sciences for providing additional safeguards for infants and children. "The Academy's recommendations have been at the heart of ACPA's fight for food safety reform," said Vroom. "This is particularly gratifying victory for us because it assures that modern, sound science will undergird our food safety laws and that farmers will continue to have the tools to produce the most abundant and affordable supplies of food and fiber in the world."

Regarding industry's relationship with the EPA, Vroom said, "We want to continue the productive working dialogue we have established with the Agency during the course of negotiations for this legislation. For example, one of our hopes is to successfully conclude work underway by EPA, ACPA and other registrant groups to provide additional user fee resources to the Agency for enhancing new product application decision making."●

WELFARE REFORM

● Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, 2 days ago I voted against the so called welfare reform bill which passed the Senate. I wish to explain my reasons for that vote.

The time has come to change the Nation's welfare system. We should enact much-needed, workable reforms, such as requiring all able-bodied recipients to work, turning welfare offices into employment offices, providing adequate child care and requiring strong child support enforcement. While the bill just passed by the Senate achieves some of these goals, it does so in a way that I believe will ultimately end up doing more harm than good. And the damage will be done not only to innocent children but to State and local governments and to taxpayers, who may end up bearing even more of the burden than they currently do.

Last fall, I voted for welfare reform legislation in the expectation that we could develop a better bill. A good bill would encourage adults to work without threatening the well-being of children or unduly burdening the States that need welfare assistance most. It would enable flexible planning at the State and local levels, without dismantling the social safety net.

Unfortunately, the highly political environment in which we find ourselves has not permitted the development of such a bill. The forces of reaction in our country have persuaded many that the main cause of our problems is welfare cheats and the current election campaign has spawned a competition between politicians to prove their machismo by getting tough.

The conference report that emerged on HR4 last fall was a worse bill than what the Senate had previously passed.