There are fewer people like CARLOS and TONY today, and tomorrow and in the next session of Congress there will be two fewer, and we will all be lessened by that. CARLOS and TONY, I wish you well, and thank you for your service on behalf of California.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield to my good friend, the gentleman from California, Mr. DREIER.

FURTHER TRIBUTE TO CARLOS J. MOORHEAD AND ANTHONY C. BEILENSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], for taking the time for this special order. I would like to congratulate my California colleague, the dean of the entire delegation, because he has served here longer than any other Member and I think longer than any Californian has served in the Congress. I appreciate his taking out this time to talk about our colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer just a little glimmer of hope with the spirit that both TONY BEILENSON and CARLOS MOORHEAD have embodied with their service here, that being that our colleagues, Messrs. LAHOOD and SKAGGS have led an effort, of which I am proud to be a part, that will see us in the 105th Congress, God and the voters willing, a number of us will be here to participate in that, we will be holding a bipartisan retreat for the first time ever.

I think there has been recognition that the work that TONY BEILENSON and CARLOS MOORHEAD and a number of others who have chosen to retire have done over the years, that that spirit of bipartisanship, when it is possible, should continue.

Mr. Speaker, the point that I would make is that these two individuals have done so much to try and deal responsibly with legislation, not in any way compromising their principle, but, in fact, as our former minority leader Bob Michel used to enjoy saying, you should never compromise your principles, but you should always be prepared to compromise for principle. I think the Moorhead-Beilenson spirit is very important, and I am confident that while we will have two fewer Members here because of their absence, that the spirit will be carried forth into the 105th Congress. A number of us I know are working on that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from California, Mr. BROWN.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to comment on the point he just made. I appreciate the fact that there are persons like himself and Mr. SKAGGS and Mr. LAHOOD who are making an effort to see if we can improve in the next Congress.

We have been through some bitter fights. There is always, of course, a need for a sharp clash of ideas, but there is also the need for collegiality and cooperation when we do share common goals. What we do need to achieve and what you are seeking to achieve, I think, is that proper balance between the clash of ideas that is so necessary in a democracy and the desire to cooperate, which is necessary to implement those ideas when we finally reach agreement on them.

Mr. DREIER. Absolutely. That clash of ideas is going to continue, but the debate can take place. I remember we often point back to Speaker O'Neill and Ronald Reagan, who said that at 6 o'clock in the evening, when the workday comes to an end, and we know it does not come to an end at 6 o'clock at all times, but there are after-hour times when people should have the chance to get together and get to know each other so the tension level can in fact be reduced. I hope we will be able to successfully do that in the 105th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I should say I have had the privilege of serving, as I know my friend has, with these two great individuals. CARLOS MOORHEAD has served as dean of the California Congressional delegation on the Republican side for I believe longer than anyone. It was 1982 as I began my second term here that CARLOS became the dean of our delegation, and he has provided terrific leadership.

When it has come to California issues, CARLOS has constantly stood up to do everything possible to address the needs of our State. One of the least attractive, but most important areas, has been the one which my friend Mr. BROWN mentioned, that being the issue of intellectual property and job creation.

In California, as we have shifted from a defense and aerospace-based economy to an export-based economy with the proliferation of the high-tech-biotech industries and, of course, the entertainment industry, CARLOS MOORHEAD has been on the cutting edge, making sure that we have an opportunity to get our goods and services into other parts of the world.

When it has come to patent and trademark work, which is so important to that, CARLOS has led the charge, and we are hoping very much he is about going to be able in the waning days of the 104th Congress to continue his work on that with very important legislation.

I should say he has always been a great friend and traveling companion, and I have had the privilege of sharing the representation of the City of Pasadena during this decade of the 1990's with him. I know my friend Mr. BROWN has a particular interest in the Jet Propulsion Lab, which is technically in CARLOS MOORHEAD's district, but I am privileged to represent many of those who work at the Jet Propulsion Lab.

CARLOS is a Californian, a native of Glendale, a graduate of Hoover High School in Glendale, one who loves our State and one who has chosen to retire to California when he leaves. He and Val will be sorely missed, and I will miss the very levelheaded advice he has given this very enthusiastic guy on more than a couple of occasions.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of sitting with TONY BEILENSON up in the Committee on Rules. TONY has been an independent voice in the Committee on Rules, and independence is not something that is always sought in the Committee on Rules, but TONY has offered it. He has been extraordinarily thoughtful when it has come to fairness and deliberation, and I have appreciated the advice that he has provided me and the friendship that he has offered. He and Delores have also been terrific people to travel with and to go from Los Angeles to Dulles with on more than a couple of occasions.

TONY is a native of New York, but has been in California for a long period of time, as my friend said, and served there for many years.

□ 2200

He will be missed. And I should say that I hope that our colleagues will take advantage of a chance to add remarks into the RECORD as they see fit, and I am happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. BROWN of California. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman reminds me of an almost forgotten anecdote about when TONY was first appointed to the Committee on Rules. I was consulted then as a senior member of the delegation by the leadership, and asked my views as to what TONY's position might be, the implication being, will he follow the leadership? And I remember saying probably not, but he will do the right thing when he is on the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DREIER. That is a terrific story.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks for the RECORD on this special order that the gentleman from California, Mr. BROWN, and I have held here.

ASSISTED SUICIDE FUNDING RESTRICTION ACT OF 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HALL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Assisted Suicide Funding Restriction Act of 1996. It is a bill that will safeguard our Nation against the use of Federal tax dollars to subsidize or promote the practice of assisted suicide.

Now, this bill is the product of a bipartisan effort—we have over 100 signatures, and no one has turned me down as a cosponsor, we just have not had the time to get around to every office—

with supporters from both sides of the aisle, and overwhelming support from the public.

This legislation is needed, Mr. Speaker, in light of recent court actions. Assisted suicide, or ''aiding, abetting or encouraging the suicide of another,'' is a criminal offense in 40 States. Yet two Federal appeals courts, the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals and the 2d Circuit Court of Appeals, have ruled assisted suicide is a constitutional right. One State has already chosen to actually legalize assisted suicide, and while that law has not taken effect in that State yet, the 9th Circuit Court could reinstate it any day, and that State's Medicaid director has publicly stated that Medicaid, which is a Federal program funded by Federal tax dollars, will pay for assisted suicide.

Unless the Supreme Court disagrees with these opinions, physician-assisted suicide could become a legal and a routine practice throughout our country. Taxpayers could be funding assisted suicides, no matter how strong their conscientious objections were and how much they objected to the practice itself.

Polling shows us that a majority of Americans, 83 percent, oppose assisted suicide. This legislation will preempt the use of taxpayer dollars by preventing programs such ad Medicaid, Medicare, Indian health care, the military health care system, the Federal employees benefits plans and other Federal programs from paying for assisted suicide, euthanasia or mercy killing of an individual.

This bill does not affect the patient's right to reject or to discontinue medical treatment. It respects the wishes of the patient and it respects the sanctity of the doctor-patient relationship. It does not affect recognized modes of pain relief. Doctors will be able to continue to administer pain medication in any dose necessary to control pain. This bill permits full funding of this type of relief and any other type of medically recognized comfort or pain care that does not assist in the killing of patients.

The sum, Mr. Speaker, this legislation has the modest goal of keeping the Federal Government out of the business of euthanasia and out of the business of using taxpayer money for assisted suicide. I urge my colleagues to give their support to this bill, the Assisted Suicide Funding Restriction Act of 1996.

FLORIDA'S WINTER FRUIT AND VEGETABLE FARMERS FACE GRAVE SITUATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, this morning in Lake Worth, FL, the Subcommittee on Risk Management and Specialty Crops held an important field hearing regarding Florida's winter fruit and vegetable industry. I commend our colleagues, the gentleman from Florida, MARK FOLEY, and the gentleman from Illinois, TOM EWING, for making this effort.

Although I was not able to be there myself, I want to share the feedback that my staff who were there got, because it definitely matches the information from the recent meetings we have been having in my own southwest Florida district, and that information is not good.

The situation on the ground in Florida for these farmers is grave. Bankruptcy, in fact, looms for many, many of whom have been in farming families, growing winter vegetables and fruits in Florida, for literally generations. Planted acreage numbers are declining and they are declining rapidly. In some places we understand the contraction of the industry this year has been as much as 30 percent. That is a giant impact and it is a negative one.

We have also heard from local bankers in my district who, despite longstanding relationships with the farming community, today just simply have to say ''no'' to new loans because the risks are too high for them.

In the long term there are legislative steps this Congress can take, such as country-of-origin labeling laws, we know about and have been working on to assist our growers' in the transition to what we call a post-NAFTA trade system. In fact, the House has already taken action to relieve some farmers of unnecessary burdens by modernizing pesticide regulation, by voting for commonsense regulatory reform and doing things like that.

But the farmers face more immediate problems, a situation that I think now clearly calls for decisive action by the executive branch within the existing authority that it has to provide immediate assistance for our farmers.

Prior to the passage of NAFTA, I well recall the Clinton White House made a lot of promises to the Florida delegation and to the fruit and vegetable industry in our area, and today the Florida growers need the administration to take action to halt the potentially unfair Mexican trading practices we are seeing; to get full enforcement of NAFTA and its side agreements; to utilize existing mechanisms, notably section 316 of NAFTA, to consult with their Mexican counterparts; and to simply give growers a chance to compete on a level playing field. They think they can win competitively, and so do I, if they have a level playing field.

So we are looking to the administration for help. We only hope the White House will honor the pledge they made to these hard-working Americans and give them a chance to prove that they can do the job in a fair field.

Mr. MILLER OF Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSS. I yield to my friend and colleague from the west coast of Florida, DAN MILLER, who knows this problem as well as I do and is working just as hard to bring a satisfactory conclusion.

Mr. MILLER OF Florida. Mr. Speaker, both of our districts have a very significant amount of winter tomato raised in our area. We have two crops a year in our area. We have one in November and one in May. The Florida tomato farmers are really hurting. They really are.

Last season the imports of Mexican tomatoes went up 44 percent. The production of Florida tomatoes went down 23 percent. Another set of numbers is that in 1991, 5 years ago, there were 230 growers of tomatoes in Florida. Today there are only 80 growers in Florida. They are going out of business. And these are families that have been around a hundred years. Third and fourth generation. One hundred years in Florida is a long time. That may not be very long in Massachusetts, but it is in Florida.

So they are really hurting, and the question is, is the administration doing everything they should be doing.

When NAFTA was voted on, at the very end it was the Florida delegation who held out to make sure that agriculture was taken care of properly under NAFTA. Because Florida agriculture competes directly with Mexican agriculture. Michigan tomatoes do not compete with Mexican tomatoes. Mexican tomatoes only grow in the winter, and that is when we grow our tomatoes.

And it is not always a fair trade that is going on. There is a difference between free trade and fair trade. We want to have both. To make it fair, we need a level playing field. It is not always a level playing field, and we think the administration can and should do more, and they promised to do everything they could back when we talked about NAFTA in the fall of 1993.

I am really delighted that the gentleman from Illinois, Congressman EWING, was able to have the hearing down in Florida today, and so they are trying to get to the bottom of what can be done. There are certain limits to what we can do, but the gentleman is right, the administration has some ability, and I think the Department of Commerce is getting ready to come out with a ruling soon and maybe will tell us what is available for us.

One of the things that make it a fair trade issue, and one of the things I have been working on, is the situation of methyl bromide. The administration should be more cooperative. The President spoke out in California about the issue and he said, yes, I will help on that issue, but then, when he gets back to Washington, he turns it over to the EPA and they say, no, we are not going to do anything.

A University of Florida study showed the impact of methyl bromide to be a 43 percent reduction in production of