

Fund—not used to pay for a special interest tax giveaway.

In addition, I would also like to raise my objection to the way that Speaker GINGRICH has conducted the debate on his massive changes to Medicare. As someone who believes in the Democratic process, I am outraged that the new majority only allowed for one day of public hearings on this assault on Medicare. As a former Petaluma City Council member, I remember that we talked longer and harder about sidewalk repairs than the House of Representatives has about an issue which affects the health of millions of Americans. This is unfair and undemocratic!

So, I am here to speak out for the people who have been shut out of the Democratic process by this new majority. These people should not be silenced, and they should not see their concerns ignored by a Congress bent on pursuing a partisan agenda.

We would all do better if we listened carefully to those we represent. As one man in my district said,

I worked hard all my life, raised ten kids and fought in two wars to live my life in peace. Living on only \$801 a month, I need all the help I can get.

To my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I would like you to remember these words. Think about this man, and the millions of seniors just like him all over America who do not deserve second rate medical care and who do not deserve to have their pockets picked for a special interest tax giveaway. I call on my colleagues to reject this bill, take the tax giveaways off the table, and get on with the bipartisan job of restoring Medicare's solvency by eliminating rampant waste and fraud. Stand up for seniors by voting down this bill.

PURPA REPEAL

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 1995

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, today, I am pleased to join my friend and colleague from Florida, Mr. STEARNS, in the introduction of important and long-overdue legislation to begin to reform the way in which electric utilities in this country are regulated. This bill would repeal section 210 of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 or PURPA.

Section 210 of PURPA is unusual legislation. It requires utilities to buy power from certain privileged nonutility generators of electricity at a price that is set by the State, with guidance from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. This price is supposed to be no higher than a utility avoided cost, the cost which the utility would have paid to generate the electricity itself or to buy the power from other sources. Unfortunately, in most cases, this avoided-cost calculation has turned out to be higher than the market price for electricity and consumers are paying billions of dollars for high-cost power which is not needed. In New York alone, it has been estimated that PURPA has resulted in billions of excess power costs. This harms business, costs jobs, and penalizes residential users who must pay electric bills which are higher than they need be. While this measure will not affect existing above-market contracts, it will eliminate the

possibility that the problem will be made worse in the future.

The drafters of PURPA never anticipated the changes which are now sweeping through the electric industry. In large part, these changes were initiated by the passage of the Energy Policy Act of 1992, which opened up the Nation's transmission system and greatly expanded the firms who could compete to supply power. PURPA today stands pat as an outdated moment to a different era in our national energy policy. Simply put, PURPA's time has come and gone.

The restructuring of the electric industry is accelerating both at the State and Federal levels. Mr. Schaefer, chairman of the Energy and Power Subcommittee, has indicated that he intends to hold several hearings on this important issue and I applaud him for his foresight. Further change in the regulation of utilities, including the introduction of greater competition, is inevitable.

Repeal of section 210 of PURPA is an important step in this process of allowing competition to play a greater role in the electric industry. Repeal will also lower future electricity prices to our constituents.

I urge speedy consideration of this legislation.

A SALUTE TO PASTOR JASON COOPER

HON. THOMAS M. FOGLIETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 1995

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute Pastor Jason Jerome Cooper on the occasion of his retirement from the Berean Presbyterian Church U.S.A. and to congratulate him on his many years of service to the north Philadelphia community.

Pastor Cooper, educated at Lincoln University, Lincoln University Theological Seminary, New York Theological Seminary, Philadelphia School of Family Therapy, and Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary, began his tenure with the Presbyterian Church over 32 years ago. He has proudly served on many committees within the church including the member of Stewardship, Promotion and Evangelism Committee and as a member of Presbytery's Coordination Committee. Pastor Cooper is an outstanding leader who should be commended for his numerous contributions to the spiritual health of the north Philadelphia community.

Pastor Cooper has also played a vital role in many programs in the Philadelphia community as the interfaith chaplain in the Philadelphia prisons, North Central "Seasoned Citizens" Program, and the Citizens' Model Cities Program. In addition, he served as a member of the board of directors at the Wharton Center, a community center established to promote intergroup harmony, guidance, and education in the artistic and cultural community. As an educator, Pastor Cooper served as president and vice president on the Temple Community Mental Health Administrative Cabinet which was designed to educate the community about comprehensive health programs.

I wish to join today with the Berean Presbyterian Church, Pastor Cooper's family and friends in recognizing him for his many years of service with the Presbyterian Church and

the north Philadelphia community. I wish him health, happiness, and prosperity in his retirement years. It is well deserved.

REMARKS ON H.R. 2491

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 1995

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, the House leadership recently removed from the budget reconciliation legislation a provision to auction the Southeastern Power Administration [SEPA]. I applaud this action as the measure would have increased SEPA customer power rates and established a poor precedent for other Federal power marketing administrations [PMA's].

SEPA ratepayers would be adversely affected by a sale as had been proposed in the original resources package. Simply put, that type of auction sale of SEPA would have almost certainly meant rate increases to consumers, and the larger the sale price, the larger the rate increase. If the facilities were sold to a private power company, the CBO estimates that consumer-owned electric utilities could pay as much as \$75 million more for PMA power; costs that would have been passed on to electric consumers.

Though I am not from the SEPA region, I am concerned about the precedent at PMA sale would create for other regions of the country. Millions of customers throughout the Nation are served by PMA's. As a Representative from Riverside, I am worried that the electric customers in southern California who receive their power from the Western Area Power Administration [WAPA] would see their electric payments increase if Western were sold. Costs for water delivered by the metropolitan water district would almost certainly go up, since power from Hoover Dam and Parker Dam is used to pump that water.

The reconciliation package does include language that will institute a study of SEPA, WAPA, and Southwestern Power Administration [SWPA] to evaluate possible sale structures and the effects of such sales. I support this language, and suspect it will bear out that WAPA is not a good candidate for auction and that any sale of WAPA should take into account a number of factors which would not be addressed in an auction sale.

While I do support the defederalization of PMA's, I believe there is a better solution than the one proposed by the Resources Committee—a solution that is fair to those entities that made substantial investments in the projects and facilities that comprise WAPA and the other regions' PMA's while at the same time, protects the customers who receive PMA power. I am in the process of reviewing a number of proposals that achieve these goals. I look forward to seeing that these views are fairly represented in the study called for in the reconciliation package.