

other oils, including toxic petroleum oil. Specifically, H.R. 436 requires Federal agencies charged with regulation of the transportation, storage, discharge, release, emission, or disposal of oil to establish a separate class for animal fats and vegetable oils and to consider the differences in characteristics of these edible oils and other types of oils.

While an agency may consider the characteristics of animal fats and vegetable oil and determine that for a particular regulation no differentiation is required, the agency may only do that where there are no differences in the characteristics that are relevant to that regulation. For example, in the case of regulations dealing with oil spill response, common sense dictates that the non-toxic, biodegradable, and nonpersistent characteristics of animal fats and vegetable oils be recognized and reflected in the oil spill response regulations. It seems clear to everybody except Federal regulators that the Oil Pollution Act was designed to reduce the risk of, improve the response to, and minimize the impact of catastrophic oil spills like the one in Prince William Sound, Alaska—not to regulate edible agricultural products.

In fact, vegetable oils have been used to help clean up beaches fowled with petroleum, and vegetable oils are also being explored as substitute lubricants for machinery in environmentally sensitive areas. This not only demonstrates the significant difference between vegetable oils and petroleum oils, it highlights the fact that animal fats and vegetable oils do not pose the same risk to human health and the environment, and should not be treated the same way.

The financial responsibility relief provided in H.R. 436, as amended, applies only to exclusive shippers of animal fats and vegetable oils, and it brings industry insurance and bonding requirements back into line with the value of the product. Like the rest of H.R. 436, nothing in this section exempts edible oils from all regulatory requirements. The net effect will be to place transporters of edible oils on par with other shipments of nontoxic products, and it will allow U.S. agricultural oils to be more competitive in world markets.

Although the House has already acted three times on this issue in the 104th Congress, H.R. 436 should be adopted as a stand-alone measure because similar language was adopted twice in the House and once in the Senate during the 103rd Congress, only to see the underlying bills die at the end of 1994. I know of no objection to the substance of H.R. 436 from any Member of this body, or from the administration. H.R. 436 passed on voice votes in both the Commerce and Agriculture Committees, and in the House on October 10. In fact, judging from the bipartisan mix of co-sponsors, H.R. 436 enjoys broad support and is absolutely non-controversial.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all of the Members—from both sides of the aisle—who have worked hard to see H.R. 436 enacted, for their input and cooperation on this issue. It is time to finally solve this problem.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support H.R. 436.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 436, the Edible Oil Regulatory Reform Act, as amended by the Senate. The legislation passed the House, as part of the Corrections Day Calendar, on October 10, 1995. The Senate passed the bill with minor amendments on November 2, 1995.

The bill embodies the overwhelming sentiment that Congress can and should interject common sense into various Federal regulations.

H.R. 436, requires that Federal regulations differentiate between animal fats and vegetable oils on the one hand, and petroleum products on the other. It does not exempt animal fats and vegetable oils from any regulatory requirement. The bill simply requires Federal regulators to consider the different physical, biological, and chemical properties of these oils as opposed to petroleum based oils.

The Transportation and Infrastructure Committee has already passed language very similar to H.R. 436 in two separate contexts: section 413 of H.R. 1361, the Coast Guard Authorization Act for fiscal year 1996, and section 506 of H.R. 961, the Clean Water Amendments of 1995. Both bills subsequently passed the House of Representatives by wide margins.

Over the last several years, the Committee has gathered testimony and other data indicating that the need for this legislation stems primarily from the current or proposed regulations under the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 and the Clean Water Act—statutes which are under the jurisdiction of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

When Congress passed the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, in the wake of the *Exxon Valdez* oil spill, the focus was on crude oil and other petroleum products, not on animal fats or vegetable oils. Although the definition of oil under both the Oil Pollution Act and the Clean Water Act can be read to include these products, regulating them under standards developed for petroleum oils make no sense. This is a prime example of the kind of regulation run amok that has given rise to the corrections calendar.

This is a common sense reform. It does not say that animal fat and vegetable oil should be exempt from regulation. It merely requires Federal agencies to take a second look at these substances and regulate them according to their relative threat to the environment.

We believe substances that are biodegradable, nonpersistent in the environment, and are essentially components of human and wildlife diets should not be treated the same as crude oil. It's that simple. In addition, these products are shipped in much smaller quantities than petroleum based products and they have a safety record that is the envy of the marine industry. Only 4 tenths of 1 percent of the spills from 1986–1992 were from animal fats or vegetable oils.

I would also add a note of thanks to the bill's primary sponsors, Representative EWING and Representative DANNER, and other supporters, for their efforts. Because it was drafted in a generic, agency-wide manner, H.R. 436 was initially referred to the Commerce and Agriculture Committees. All of us know, however, that the primary purpose of the bill is to address problems under the Oil Pollution Act and the Clean Water Act, which are under the jurisdiction of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. Therefore, I also want to thank the leadership of both Committees for their cooperation in getting this important legislation to the House floor, through the other body, and—I hope—on its way to the President.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 436, and the Senate amendments thereto.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT ON H.R. 2126

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

(Mr. METCALF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 seconds, and to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of rule 28, clause 1(c), I am announcing that tomorrow I will offer a motion to instruct the House conferees on the bill, H.R. 2126, to insist on sections 8102 and 8111 of the House-passed bill.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. METCALF moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two houses on the bill H.R. 2126 be instructed to insist on sections numbered 8102 and 8111 of H.R. 2126 as passed by the House restricting the deployment of United States Armed Forces in the former Yugoslavia.

□ 1900

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNN of Oregon). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

IN MEMORY OF YITZHAK RABIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply saddened by the tragic assassination of Israel's Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin. I offer my sympathies to the Rabin family, to the Israeli people, and to all who mourn the loss of this great man.

Yitzhak Rabin was an Israeli patriot and courageous leader whose life will