

□ 1615

Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be titled the "know when to say when" amendment. It puts a halt on corporate subsidies to the alcohol industry to boost its booze abroad. It simply carves away a very targeted portion of the Market Protection Programs, the multi-million-dollar hand-out to the alcohol industry to lure drinkers in foreign countries. Over the course of the last 3 years, the taxpayers has reached deep into their pockets and handed over \$24 million to the alcohol industry.

Let's just tell it like it is. The American taxpayers give subsidies to some companies that are making money hand over fist so that they can entice more people to drink. What we are doing here is financing a worldwide scam. We know what this kind of advertising is like. It is the most glamorous advertising in the world and hooks young people on the number one drug on this planet.

The wrongheadedness with which we subsidize alcohol exports and advertising by major alcohol corporations is compounded by the error of spending millions and millions of dollars to entice people to drink. It is a tragedy, and we should put an end to it.

Jim Beam last year got over \$2.5 million to push its whisky abroad. Other whisky giants like Hiram Walker and Brown-Forman profited under this program. Even companies like Miller, Coors, and Stroh Beer get money under this program.

If that were not enough of a corporate scandal, we add insult to injury by asking the American taxpayer to foot the bill for some of the world's largest foreign alcohol giants. We actually pay these foreign alcohol companies to advertise our wine, our bourbon and our whiskey overseas. Seagrams, a Canadian company, received over \$1 million from the United States taxpayers for wine promotion and nearly \$150,000 to advertise Four Roses Whiskey in Europe and the Far East. Three English companies, including Guinness, have received almost \$3 million to advertise United States-made bourbon and whiskey in Japan and Yugoslavia.

The Wine Institute itself spent \$40,000 of United States taxpayers' money to fly a group of Japanese wine stewards to California for a weeklong adventure that included trips to several wineries.

The fact is that we are going to hear a lot of yakking from people that come from wine country that tell us that this is just a program to help out the small vintners of America. That is a bunch of hogwash. If you look at where the numbers go, notwithstanding the fact we heard the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] talking about the fact that 89 of the vintners are small, that is, 89 of 100 vintners are the small vintners. They also get the small dollars.

If we look at it, Ernest and Julio, the two brothers that stood up to Caesar Chavez, they get 57 percent of all the

money that goes into this program. Fifty-seven percent to one company that only made \$1.5 billion more. Fetzer Vineyards, owned by Brown-Forman, makers of Jack Daniels, Southern Comfort, and Canadian Mist, millions more. Vintner International, another one of the largest companies in this country in the wine business, millions more.

Meanwhile, the small vintners, oh, yeah, there are a bunch of them, Geyser Park received \$999, Pine Ridge received \$162, Santa Cruz Winery, \$223, Santino Wines, \$4,167; and Saints Berry, \$3,892.

Ladies and gentlemen, let's break the back of those corporations that come in and try to jump on the back of the taxpayer in this hall and say to them that we are going to stand up to not only welfare mothers but we are going to stand up to this kind of corporate subsidy as well.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that this amendment, while broadly worded, is frankly a loaded gun pointed at the American wine industry.

Second, it would not save any money under the gentleman's amendment. We all are aware frankly that our domestic wineries are at a competitive disadvantage as they attempt to compete with European and South American wines due to the export subsidies and frankly the trade tariffs that are imposed on our wine exports abroad.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Fresno, CA [Mr. RADANOVICH], the first professional winemaker to serve in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in protest to this amendment that is being offered currently. I am a winemaker. I do not take MPP's. I never will take MPP's. But when my industry is singled out among 20 to 25 commodities that are participants in the MPP program, I must rise in protest.

Mr. Chairman, I am a member also of the Committee on the Budget and I do not believe that programs like this are going to survive 7 years of budget cuts that are necessary in order to get to zero. But I do agree that those decisions regarding the fate of MPP must be budget-driven and they must be decided within the Committee on Agriculture under the direction of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS], our chairman, not from someone who comes from a State where there is very little agriculture and no participation in the program. I rise in strong protest to this amendment and urge "no" vote on the Kennedy amendment.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me make two quick points. Even the gentleman from Massachusetts, the maker of the amendment, points out that 100 some odd wineries have been participating in the MPP. Of that

group, 89 are small wineries. These are mostly small, family owned operations. Second, the five largest wine recipients of the MPP purchase 90 percent of their grapes from independent grape growers. The gentleman's amendment would hurt those small grape growers which again are for the most part small, family owned businesses.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT].

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Chairman, I will be brief. What the Kennedy amendment does is single our independent grape growers across California. This penalizes farmers, farmers who grow grapes and sell them to the wineries in California and throughout this country. He is penalizing small, independent grape growers. If he has a beef with grape growers, do it a different way. This is not the way to do it.

There is \$607 million paid in excise tax. That is what the wine industry does. It is a \$9 billion industry in California. It is an important industry in California. It is about jobs, it is about American wine, and we should not single out this industry and discriminate against them. If we have got a beef with the grape growers, do it another way.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say, although I respect the gentleman from Massachusetts, I do not support his amendment because this amendment directly and unfairly targets my constituents in Sonoma and Martin counties. These are the people who produce the best wines in the world. If this amendment passes, their world-famous wine would no longer be able to compete in the world market.

The amendment would devastate the small wine producers in my district, who rely upon Federal export assistance to enter the global marketplace.

Unlike Europe and South America, United States wine producers receive no production subsidies what-so-ever! Furthermore, our competitors out-spend the U.S. in export subsidies by more than 6 to 1!

Mr. Chairman, small California wineries cannot compete in such a lop-sided marketplace without some assistance.

The Kennedy amendment takes this critical assistance away from small wine producers. And, in doing so, it takes away jobs; it takes away trade; and, it takes away fairness.

We should help export California wine, not California's jobs!

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Louisville, KY, our mutual birthplace [Mr. WARD].

Mr. WARD. Mr. Chairman, I stand in opposition to this amendment. This amendment singles out one industry for punishment. We all know we need to increase exports. We need to make our balance of trade come out better. I stand in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 30 seconds. (Mr. HANSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, in 1981 we had an interesting experience around here. We formed what was called the Presidential Commission on Drunk Driving under Ronald Reagan. We spent 1½ years working on that. We took a lot of time to do it. I was privileged to sit on that committee and we did an exhaustive study of what was going on in America.

After we did all this and found out how many were dying as a result of drunk driving, paraplegics, quadriplegics and people with very serious back injuries, we found that the No. 1 reason was the enticement they had to get people to drink. This is a harmless little amendment. It makes a lot of sense. All we are asking to do is take away the advertisement in this area. We are not in any way changing some of these other areas.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I point out that recent studies have indicated that moderate alcohol beverage consumption could actually be beneficial to personal health.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time evenly between my colleagues, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] and the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] will be recognized for 10 seconds, and the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] will be recognized for 10 seconds.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH].

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, this is the kind of amendment that drives us all to drink. It is discrimination aimed at Wisconsin where we produce the finest beers in the world and we want all people around the world to share in it.

Beer is a very noble product, and an honored part of American history. Many American fortunes have been made in the liquor industry. The liquor industry played an early role in the wealth of some of the most prominent American families, as the sponsor may recall.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, we are almost out of time.

When we work the doors here, JOSEPH, because you are a fourth-generation Irishman and I am a redheaded second-generation Irishman, and remembering that redheaded patriarch of your clan, and some friends in Scotland assure me they will not be toasting you in the champagne regions of France and the distilleries of beautiful Bonnie Scotland.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Just say no, big BOB. Just say no.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] which

would prohibit the use of funds in the bill to promote the sale or export of alcohol or alcoholic beverages.

This amendment is targeted at the Market Promotion Program [MPP].

MPP is a good program which is conducting important value-added marketing overseas. It works effectively, and MPP has been a crucial element of improving the export situation of our domestic wine industry, centered in California.

The California wine industry produces an award-winning, high-value product that can compete with the best of the world's wine industries—but we need MPP to help get that message out.

U.S. wine production represents approximately 6.5 percent of world production. However, despite aggressive export growth during the past 6 years, the industry has only a 3.0 percent market share of wine exports.

We need MPP to help us do better.

We need to remember that the European Union spends more on export promotion for wine than the United States spends in promoting all of our agricultural products.

The European Community wine industries are heavily subsidized—to the tune of \$1.5 billion, which includes \$90 million for export promotion.

Other countries then do even more. For example, the Italian Trade Commission is funded for an additional \$25 million.

When it comes to the wine industry, MPP is a program that helps small business.

In 1994, for example, 101 wineries participated in MPP and 89 were small wineries.

MPP promotes independent business.

The five largest wine recipients of MPP funds purchase over 90 percent of their grapes from independent grape growers.

In short, we will continue to battle for our fair share of foreign markets. But we need an export promotion program to allow us to achieve our competitive potential.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the Kennedy amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 19, 1995, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. DEUTSCH

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. DEUTSCH: Amendment No. 5: Page 71, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. 726. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to provide assistance to, or to pay the salaries of personnel who carry out a market promotion program pursuant to section 203 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5623) that provides assistance to, the U.S. Mink Export Development Council or any mink industry trade association.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 20, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida for 10 minutes, and, in opposition, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman if he would yield back 5 minutes.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield back 5 minutes before we begin.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back 5 minutes.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this is corporate welfare at its absolute worst; at its absolute worst. This is a program that spends about \$2 million a year on the U.S. Mink Export Development Council, a council that is managed by four people, an attorney and assistant and representatives of two companies. Those two companies get 98 percent of the funds of that \$2 million.

One of those companies happens to be a Canadian company. Actually, it is a subsidiary of a Canadian company whose gross revenues are 3.9 billion American dollars. What do they spend this money on every year? They spend it on fashion shows overseas and many times even work that is done to bring it back to the United States.

This is a copy of one of the fashion shows that does not even describe the minks or the mink stoles as America product.

Mr. Chairman, this is not an amendment against mink farmers; it is an amendment against the U.S. Mink Export Development Council program.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this amendment, and I again say through the efforts of this committee we have forced the Department to redo the way that it manages the market Promotion Program and it now targets the small, nonbranded groups.

We cannot pick apart this program and make it work. This program is good for America. Do not destroy this program. This program means jobs to the United States. To pass this amendment means jobs in other countries. Vote no and save American jobs.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. PETRI].

(Mr. PETRI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Deutsch amendment, because what it boils down to is a short-sighted attempt to exclude one particular industry from participation in this promotion program simply because animal rights activists do not like that industry.

The funding to promote U.S. mink exports to foreign markets is by law used only to promote the sale of U.S. produced mink and only U.S. mink ranchers can benefit from this program. The funding benefits only U.S. entities, just as every other MPP-funded program does. Ninety-five percent of U.S. produced mink are sold through two auction houses; one of them a rancher cooperative, that is rancher-owned, the other is substantially owned by hundreds of U.S. mink ranchers.

It is ridiculous to say that the mink ranchers who produce all those pelts do not benefit by the marketing work done by these two companies. I cannot honestly understand how less than \$2 million in marketing assistance to U.S. mink exporters can be truthfully characterized as "wasteful spending."

It is not a give away. It is a matching funds program which helps counter the massive subsidies that European countries give directly to their mink producers.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the questions we will answer when we vote on this amendment are these: Shall Congress discriminate against the MPP mink program just because it helps market U.S.-produced mink and not American seafood, paper products, grapes, walnuts, chocolate, cotton, raisins, feed grains, meats, wheat, rice, apples, wine or citrus from Florida and other States, even though the mink industry receives less marketing subsidy than any of these industries; and, shall Congress deny marketing assistance to the mink industry for the sole purpose of satisfying the extremists animal rights lobby?

Mr. Chairman, I must say that I think the rational answer to those questions, and the only real answer to those questions, is a resounding "no." I urge my colleagues to join me in voting a resounding "no" on the amendment.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, this is another one of those squirrely little issues where you have friends on both sides of the issues. But of all the subjects in all of the trade issues on the planet, why either party should be helping mink manufacturers, I do not know.

This would be a hard sell at any town hall meeting in America, and I would say if there was ever an industry that was on its own, it ought to be the mink industry.

Before we end up discussing vicuna coats and plain-cloth Republican coats or Democratic coats, I know my party has had an image problem for about 50 years as the party of the big guy, and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle get away with bloody murder, being the party of the little guy. I say let those little minks fight for themselves without Federal tax dollars.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO].

(Mr. CRAPO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Chairman, I stand in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, agriculture is a major Idaho industry. With 21,000 farmers and ranchers, its annual production totals nearly \$3 billion. This translates into billions of dollars in additional economic activity as well as an expanded tax base and tens of thousands of jobs.

This amendment arbitrarily excludes a small, yet very important part of this economy from participation in the MPP Program. Groups who do not believe that animals should be used for food, clothing or medical research are trying to prevent any MPP money from being used to retain and develop overseas markets for U.S.-produced mink.

MPP Program helps U.S. mink ranchers counter the efforts of massive production subsidies which go to foreign mink ranchers. In Idaho alone, the economic impact of the mink industry is \$7.3 million a year. MPP funding to promote mink exports is an investment with a 5,000 percent return. For about \$2 million, the MPP helps the U.S. mink industry achieve over \$100 million in export sales each year.

Additionally, the United States mink industry has successfully promoted the superior quality of United States mink to quality-conscious furriers and importers in Italy, Japan, Hong Kong, and elsewhere. Over 95 percent of the U.S. mink industry's total sales will be exported this year.

Contrary to the comments made that MPP funds go to big corporations, all of the branded mink participants in the MPP Program are classified as "small entities" by the SBA. The industry is made up of small, family owned mink ranches in 28 States. MPP marketing assistance has helped the mink producers survive 5 years of global over production caused by direct and indirect subsidization in China, Russia, and mostly in Scandinavian countries.

I urge my colleagues to reject this anti-jobs amendment.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to strongly oppose the Deutsch amendment. My colleagues need to understand what is going on here. Ninety-five percent of our market of mink, the mink ranchers in my district, is overseas. They have no Government program. They have no other money that comes to them, except for this MPP program. It is only \$1.9 million.

If we destroy this industry, what we are going to do is what we did with the wool and mohair industry; we are just

going to give that industry to the foreign countries, to the Danish, to the Norwegians, to the Finlanders.

Mr. Chairman, I can personally tell my colleagues that these mink ranchers are having a tough time. They are on the verge of going out of business anyway. They do not need us to single them out with this amendment and make the situation harder.

Mr. Chairman, this is not about MPP. What this is about are the animal rights folks, who do not like these people, trying to drive one more nail in their coffin.

I ask my colleagues to strongly oppose this amendment and maintain the mink industry in this country. These are good people, family farmers. We do not need to put them out of business.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS].

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. During the last few days, we have heard clearly what the plot to balance the budget is all about. The plot to balance the budget is merely to squeeze out money from Medicare and Medicaid and money for the cities.

The plot to balance the budget is not sincere at all, because we are refusing to take away taxpayer subsidies for tobacco. We will not take away taxpayer subsidies for alcohol. We will not take away taxpayers subsidies for mink coats. How are we going to balance the budget?

It would be only fair if you were to offer export promotion funds for everybody. I have a used clothing processing plant in Brooklyn, the largest in the world, and they export used clothing to all parts of the world. The underdeveloped world buys a lot of used clothes. They should have the export advertising subsidy also. They should get in on it also.

All products, such as automobiles, have a hard time in Japan. They should have the export promotion program also. We should be fair and have socialized marketing across the board; never balance the budget, cut Medicare and Medicaid.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], the cosponsor of the amendment.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I tried to avoid participating in the debate today, because we are all tired and we all feel strongly about these issues. But I have a hard time recognizing we have annual deficits at over \$200 billion a year, our national debt is close to \$4.8 trillion, and I am going back to my district and telling them we are slowing the growth of Medicare, we are slowing the growth of Medicaid. We are cutting housing programs, we are cutting education programs, but we are going to subsidize tobacco, alcohol, and mink export?

This, to me, is an obscenity. I join my colleague and thank the gentleman for offering this amendment.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such times as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as I stated, this is truly corporate welfare at its worst. I ask my colleagues to take a look at the specifics of this particular program, what it really does. It is almost beyond belief what this program does. It is almost a parody of government gone crazy in terms of corporate welfare.

We have about \$2 million a year, we give it to the U.S. Mink Export Development Council managed by 4 people, 2 of whom are representatives of companies. One is an attorney for the council and one an assistant.

Those people then all of a sudden, lo and behold, give 98 percent of the money that they get to the 2 companies represented on the board, at which point they then spend the money for fashion shows all over the world; Mainland China, Japan, Korea, Italy, and it is unclear what is going on.

One of the companies is a \$3.9 billion gross sales a year Canadian company. It is foreign corporate welfare. We are doing so well today in America that we can afford foreign corporate welfare.

It is not about mink farmers; it is about this particular program. If we cannot get rid of this, we are not going to get rid of anything.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Deutsch-Shays amendment.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER].

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from New Mexico, Mr. SKEEN, for yielding, and thank my colleagues in the House for their endurance during this entire consideration of the agriculture appropriation bill.

The amendment that we have before us has been explained very clearly by my colleagues that have proceeded me. There are two exchanges that handle U.S. furs for mink producers in America. It is the Seattle Fur Exchange, a co-op of ranchers out West. Here in the East, it is the New York market and 36 percent of it is owned by small mink farmers around the country.

But this program is about helping small farmers around our country. It is not about helping corporations. It is about helping our farmers compete in a world market where they have to compete with subsidized furs from all around the world. This program has helped open markets for U.S. producers. They have been through 5 years of almost all of them going out of business. They are actually starting to make some money, and pulling the plug on this program at this time, frankly, is not fair to them.

In the budget, agriculture is taking its hit. We are going to be putting up somewhere between \$17 and \$20 billion over the next 7 years to balance the budget. We are going to do our share. But this is not the way to do it.

But let me say to my colleagues that this amendment is more than about cutting money. Some who are interested in this amendment are interested in it only for one reason, because they want us to kneel down at the altar of political correctness of those radical animal rights people who do not want you to wear mink, they do not want to wear mink. They are bringing this to the floor of the House and it is unfair. Vote against this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and, pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 19, 1995, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 19, 1995, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order: The amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH].

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 64 OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY OF MASSACHUSETTS

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by a voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DEUTSCH

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by a voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been requested. Those in support of the

request for recorded vote will rise and be counted.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. A quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XXIII, the Chair will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for an electronic vote ordered on the pending question following this quorum call.

□ 1645

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago I had an amendment and enough people rose to ask for a recorded vote. You assured me that we had, and were going to have a recorded vote on my amendment. Are we having a recorded vote on my amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair announced at that point, the Chair began to count for a recorded vote. The Chair then remembered the planned order to postpone any request for a recorded vote until later on. It was a mistake on the part of the Chair not to immediately postpone the request for a recorded vote, without counting for a sufficient number to support a recorded vote. When proceedings later resumed, the request was not supported by a sufficient number.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Wait a second, could I have unanimous consent to have another attempt to have that vote, please?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote on the Kennedy amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Chair will vacate all proceedings since the resumption of unfinished business, to include those on the point of no quorum raised by the gentleman from Florida,

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RIGGS. Just to establish the sequence of the votes now, will we be voting first on the Kennedy amendment followed by the Deutsch amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will begin again, and it will be clear in just a minute.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 19, proceedings will now resume on

those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order:

The amendment by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH].

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in the series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY OF MASSACHUSETTS

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair tells Members this will be a firm 17-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 130, noes 268, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 552]

AYES—130

Archer	Hayworth	Rangel
Armey	Hoke	Reed
Bachus	Horn	Regula
Barcia	Hostettler	Rivers
Bartlett	Hunter	Rohrabacher
Bass	Inglis	Roukema
Beilenson	Jackson-Lee	Royce
Bereuter	Jacobs	Salmon
Blute	Kanjorski	Sanders
Borski	Kasich	Sanford
Brown (OH)	Kennedy (MA)	Scarborough
Brownback	Kennedy (RI)	Schiff
Canady	Kildee	Schroeder
Cardin	King	Schumer
Castle	LaFalce	Sensenbrenner
Chabot	Largent	Serrano
Christensen	Lewis (GA)	Shaw
Collins (IL)	Linder	Shays
Conyers	LoBiondo	Shuster
Coyne	Luther	Skaggs
Crapo	Markey	Smith (MI)
Davis	Martini	Smith (TX)
DeLay	McHale	Smith (WA)
Doyle	McInnis	Solomon
Duncan	McKeon	Souder
Ensign	McNulty	Stockman
Fields (LA)	Mfume	Tate
Fields (TX)	Minge	Tiahrt
Flake	Molinari	Torkildsen
Ford	Moran	Towns
Fowler	Morella	Velazquez
Fox	Myrick	Vento
Franks (CT)	Nadler	Visclosky
Franks (NJ)	Neumann	Waldholtz
Frelinghuysen	Oberstar	Wamp
Gibbons	Obey	Waters
Gilchrest	Olver	Waxman
Goodlatte	Orton	Weldon (FL)
Goss	Owens	Wolf
Graham	Pallone	Yates
Green	Payne (NJ)	Zeliff
Gutierrez	Porter	Zimmer
Hall (TX)	Poshard	
Hansen	Ramstad	

NOES—268

Ackerman	Barrett (WI)	Bliley
Allard	Barton	Boehlert
Andrews	Becerra	Boehner
Baesler	Bentsen	Bonilla
Baker (CA)	Berman	Bonior
Baldacci	Bevill	Bono
Ballenger	Bilbray	Boucher
Barr	Bilirakis	Brewster
Barrett (NE)	Bishop	Browder

Brown (FL)	Hall (OH)	Norwood
Bryant (TN)	Hamilton	Nussle
Bryant (TX)	Hancock	Oxley
Bunn	Harman	Packard
Bunning	Hastert	Parker
Burr	Hastings (FL)	Pastor
Buyer	Hayes	Paxon
Callahan	Hefner	Payne (VA)
Calvert	Heineman	Pelosi
Camp	Herger	Peterson (FL)
Chambliss	Hilleary	Peterson (MN)
Chapman	Hinchey	Petri
Chenoweth	Hobson	Pickett
Chrysler	Hoekstra	Pombo
Clayton	Holden	Pomeroy
Clement	Hoyer	Portman
Clinger	Hutchinson	Pryce
Clyburn	Hyde	Radanovich
Coble	Istook	Rahall
Coburn	Jefferson	Richardson
Coleman	Johnson (CT)	Riggs
Collins (GA)	Johnson (SD)	Roberts
Combest	Johnson, E. B.	Roemer
Condit	Johnson, Sam	Rogers
Cooley	Johnston	Ros-Lehtinen
Costello	Jones	Rose
Cramer	Kaptur	Roth
Creameans	Kelly	Roybal-Allard
Cubin	Kennelly	Rush
Cunningham	Kim	Sabo
Danner	Kingston	Sawyer
de la Garza	Klecza	Saxton
Deal	Klink	Schaefer
DeFazio	Klug	Schmitt
DeLauro	Knollenberg	Shadegg
Dellums	Kolbe	Sisisky
Deutsch	LaHood	Skeen
Diaz-Balart	Latham	Skelton
Dickey	LaTourrette	Slaughter
Dicks	Laughlin	Smith (NJ)
Dingell	Lazio	Spence
Dixon	Leach	Spratt
Doggett	Levin	Stark
Dooley	Lewis (CA)	Stearns
Doolittle	Lewis (KY)	Stenholm
Dornan	Lightfoot	Studds
Dunn	Lincoln	Stump
Durbin	Lipinski	Talent
Edwards	Livingston	Tanner
Ehrlich	Lofgren	Tauzin
Emerson	Longley	Taylor (MS)
Engel	Lowe	Taylor (NC)
English	Lucas	Tejeda
Eshoo	Maloney	Thomas
Evans	Manton	Thompson
Everett	Manzullo	Thornberry
Ewing	Martinez	Thornton
Farr	Mascara	Thurman
Fattah	Matsui	Torres
Fawell	McCarthy	Traficant
Fazio	McCollum	Tucker
Filner	McCrery	Upton
Flanagan	McDade	Volkmer
Foley	McHugh	Vucanovich
Forbes	McIntosh	Walker
Frank (MA)	McKinney	Walsh
Frisa	Meek	Ward
Frost	Menendez	Watt (NC)
Funderburk	Meyers	Weller
Furse	Mica	White
Ganske	Miller (FL)	Whitfield
Gejdenson	Mineta	Wicker
Gekas	Mink	Williams
Gephardt	Mollohan	Wilson
Gillmor	Montgomery	Wise
Gilman	Moorhead	Woolsey
Gonzalez	Murtha	Wyden
Gordon	Myers	Wynn
Greenwood	Neal	Young (AK)
Gunderson	Nethercutt	
Gutknecht	Ney	

NOT VOTING—36

Abercrombie	Gallegly	Moakley
Baker (LA)	Geren	Ortiz
Bateman	Goodling	Quillen
Brown (CA)	Hastings (WA)	Quinn
Burton	Hefley	Reynolds
Clay	Hilliard	Seastrand
Collins (MI)	Houghton	Stokes
Cox	Lantos	Stupak
Crane	McDermott	Torricelli
Dreier	Meehan	Watts (OK)
Ehlers	Metcalf	Weldon (PA)
Foglietta	Miller (CA)	Young (FL)

□ 1707

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Moakley for, with Mr. Dreier against.

Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. BARR changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. CANADY of Florida, SMITH of Michigan, BARTLETT of Maryland, and GRAHAM changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DEUTSCH

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] for a recorded vote on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] has demanded a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 232, noes 160, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 553]

AYES—232

Ackerman	Engel	Kanjorski
Andrews	Ensign	Kasich
Archer	Eshoo	Kelly
Bachus	Evans	Kennedy (MA)
Bass	Farr	Kennedy (RI)
Becerra	Fattah	Kildee
Beilenson	Fawell	King
Berman	Fields (LA)	Klink
Bilbray	Filner	LaFalce
Billirakis	Flake	Largent
Blute	Foley	LaTourrette
Boehlert	Ford	Leach
Borski	Fowler	Levin
Brown (FL)	Fox	Lewis (GA)
Brown (OH)	Frank (MA)	Linder
Bryant (TX)	Franks (CT)	Lipinski
Burr	Franks (NJ)	LoBiondo
Buyer	Frelinghuysen	Lofgren
Canady	Frisa	Lowe
Cardin	Funderburk	Luther
Castle	Furse	Maloney
Chabot	Ganske	Manton
Christensen	Gejdenson	Manzullo
Clayton	Gibbons	Markey
Clement	Gilman	Martini
Clyburn	Gordon	Mascara
Coble	Goss	McCarthy
Coburn	Graham	McCollum
Coleman	Green	McDade
Collins (GA)	Greenwood	McHale
Collins (IL)	Gutierrez	McInnis
Conyers	Hall (OH)	McKinney
Costello	Harman	McNulty
Coyne	Hastings (FL)	Menendez
Creameans	Hayes	Meyers
Cubin	Hayworth	Mfume
Cunningham	Heineman	Mica
Danner	Hilleary	Miller (FL)
Davis	Hinchey	Mineta
DeFazio	Hobson	Minge
DeLauro	Hoke	Mink
Dellums	Horn	Molinari
Deutsch	Hostettler	Moran
Diaz-Balart	Hyde	Morella
Dixon	Inglis	Murtha
Doggett	Istook	Myrick
Dornan	Jackson-Lee	Nadler
Doyle	Jacobs	Neal
Duncan	Jefferson	Neumann
Dunn	Johnson (SD)	Ney
Durbin	Jones	Norwood

Olver	Sawyer	Torres	Dicks	Kim	Peterson (MN)	NOT VOTING—42
Pallone	Scarborough	Towns	Dingell	Kingston	Petri	Abercrombie
Payne (NJ)	Schiff	Trafficant	Dooley	Kleczka	Pickett	Baker (LA)
Pelosi	Schroeder	Upton	Doolittle	Klug	Pombo	Ballenger
Porter	Schumer	Velazquez	Edwards	Knollenberg	Pomeroy	Barton
Portman	Sensenbrenner	Vento	Ehrlich	Kolbe	Radanovich	Bateman
Poshard	Serrano	Visclosky	Emerson	LaHood	Rahall	Bentsen
Pryce	Shaw	Volkmer	English	Latham	Roberts	Brown (CA)
Ramstad	Shays	Waldholtz	Everett	Laughlin	Rogers	Burton
Rangel	Shuster	Wamp	Ewing	Lazio	Rose	Clay
Reed	Skaggs	Ward	Fazio	Lewis (CA)	Saxton	Collins (MI)
Regula	Slaughter	Waters	Fields (TX)	Lewis (KY)	Schaefer	Cox
Richardson	Smith (NJ)	Waxman	Flanagan	Lightfoot	Scott	Crane
Riggs	Smith (TX)	Weldon (FL)	Forbes	Lincoln	Sisisky	Dreier
Rivers	Smith (WA)	Weller	Frost	Livingston	Skeen	Ehlers
Roemer	Solomon	Wicker	Gekas	Longley	Skelton	
Rohrabacher	Souder	Williams	Gephardt	Lucas	Smith (MI)	
Ros-Lehtinen	Spence	Wilson	Gilchrest	Martinez	Stenholm	□ 1716
Roth	Spratt	Wolf	Gillmor	Matsui	Stump	The Clerk announced the following
Roukema	Stark	Woolsey	Gonzalez	McCrery	Talent	pairs:
Roybal-Allard	Stearns	Wyden	Goodlatte	McHugh	Tanner	On this vote:
Royce	Stockman	Wynn	Gunderson	McIntosh	Tauzin	Mr. Moakley for, with Mr. Barton against.
Rush	Studds	Yates	Gutknecht	McKeon	Tejeda	Mr. Stokes for, with Mr. Ehlers against.
Sabo	Tate	Zeliff	Hall (TX)	Meeke	Thomas	Mr. Dreier for, with Mr. Hastings against.
Salmon	Taylor (MS)	Zimmer	Hamilton	Mollohan	Thompson	Mr. Quinn for, with Mr. Dermott against.
Sanders	Taylor (NC)		Hancock	Montgomery	Thornberry	Mr. Shadegg for, with Mr. Watts against.
Sanford	Torkildsen		Hansen	Moorhead	Thornton	Messrs. JOHNSON of South Dakota,
	NOES—160		Hastert	Myers	Thurman	GORDON, HOKE, VOLKMER, GREEN-
Allard	Boehner	Chambliss	Hefner	Nethercutt	Tiaht	WOOD, SMITH of Texas, and
Armey	Bonilla	Chapman	Hegger	Nussle	Tucker	MANZULLO changed their votes from
Baesler	Bonior	Chenoweth	Hoekstra	Oberstar	Vucanovich	“no” to “aye.”
Baker (CA)	Bono	Chrysler	Holden	Obey	Walker	So the amendment was agreed to.
Baldacci	Boucher	Clinger	Hoyer	Orton	Walsh	The result of the vote was announced
Barcia	Brewster	Combust	Hunter	Oxley	Watt (NC)	as above recorded.
Barr	Browder	Condit	Hutchinson	Packard	White	Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, at this
Barrett (NE)	Brownback	Cooley	Johnson (CT)	Parker	Whitfield	point in the RECORD I insert a table
Barrett (WI)	Bryant (TN)	Crapo	Johnson, E. B.	Pastor	Wise	that shows a comparison of accounts in
Bartlett	Bunn	Cramer	Johnson, Sam	Paxon	Young (AK)	the bill.
Bereuter	Bunning	Crapo	Kaptur	Payne (VA)		
Bevill	Callahan	Deal	Kennelly	Peterson (FL)		
Bishop	Calvert	DeLay				
Bliley	Camp	Dickey				

**AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD & DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1976)**

	FY 1996 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
TITLE I - AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS					
Production, Processing, and Marketing					
Office of the Secretary	2,801,000	2,886,000	10,227,000	+7,426,000	+7,541,000
Executive Operations:					
Chief Economist		4,240,000	3,748,000	+3,748,000	-482,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Economics	540,000			-540,000	
World Agricultural Outlook Board	2,498,000			-2,498,000	
National Appeals Division		12,168,000	11,848,000	+11,848,000	-320,000
Office of Budget and Program Analysis	5,795,000	5,888,000	5,888,000	+104,000	
Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization		724,000			-724,000
Total, Executive Operations	8,833,000	23,028,000	21,483,000	+12,880,000	-1,536,000
Chief Financial Officer	580,000	4,982,000	4,133,000	+3,553,000	-819,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration	598,000	816,000	598,000		-20,000
Agriculture buildings and facilities (USDA)	135,183,000	135,774,000	135,774,000	+581,000	
Payments to GSA	(87,887,000)	(88,871,000)	(88,871,000)	(+2,014,000)	
Building operations and maintenance	(18,814,000)	(20,218,000)	(20,218,000)	(+1,802,000)	
Repairs, renovations, and construction	(28,822,000)	(25,587,000)	(25,587,000)	(-3,035,000)	
Advisory committees (USDA)	888,000	888,000	800,000	-128,000	-85,000
Hazardous waste management	18,700,000	18,700,000	18,700,000		
Departmental administration	28,187,000	87,347,000	27,888,000	+1,788,000	-88,381,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations	1,784,000	1,838,000	3,787,000	+2,033,000	+1,858,000
Office of Communications	8,188,000	8,880,000	8,188,000		-682,000
Office of the Inspector General	63,418,000	64,739,000	63,638,000	+221,000	-1,100,000
Office of the General Counsel	25,882,000	27,880,000	27,880,000	+1,888,000	
Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education and Economics	520,000	535,000	520,000		-15,000
Economic Research Service	53,936,000	54,886,000	53,131,000	-805,000	-1,534,000
National Agricultural Statistics Service	81,424,000	86,837,000	81,107,000	-317,000	-8,730,000
Agricultural Research Service	714,888,000	706,810,000	706,810,000	-8,078,000	-4,200,000
Human Nutrition Information Service	(10,818,000)				
Buildings and facilities	43,718,000	30,200,000	30,200,000	-13,518,000	
Total, Agricultural Research Service	756,407,000	740,010,000	736,810,000	-22,587,000	-4,200,000
Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Activities:					
Research and education activities	433,438,000	432,212,000	388,372,000	-44,088,000	-42,840,000
Native Americans Institutions Endowment Fund		(4,800,000)	(4,800,000)	(+4,800,000)	
Buildings and facilities	82,744,000			-82,744,000	
Extension Activities	438,744,000	437,582,000	413,257,000	-25,487,000	-24,285,000
Total, Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Activities	934,928,000	869,784,000	802,829,000	-132,287,000	-87,135,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs	805,000	825,000	805,000		-20,000
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service:					
Salaries and expenses	443,851,000	430,278,000	433,884,000	-8,987,000	+3,385,000
Special fund, user fees 1/	(88,880,000)	(100,254,000)	(100,254,000)	(+3,594,000)	
Buildings and facilities	8,973,000	12,541,000	12,541,000	+5,568,000	
Total, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	450,824,000	442,820,000	446,205,000	-4,419,000	+3,385,000
Agricultural Marketing Service:					
Marketing Services	58,581,000	50,807,000	48,882,000	-8,929,000	-3,945,000
New user fees	(4,452,000)	(3,887,000)	(3,887,000)	(-565,000)	
(Limitation on administrative expenses, from fees collected)	(57,054,000)	(58,481,000)	(58,481,000)	(+1,407,000)	
Funds for strengthening markets, income, and supply (transfer from section 32)	10,308,000	10,451,000	10,451,000	+142,000	
Payments to States and possessions	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,000,000	-200,000	-200,000
Total, Agricultural Marketing Service	68,100,000	62,258,000	58,113,000	-8,987,000	-4,145,000
Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration Inspection and Weighing Services (limitation on administrative expenses, from fees collected)	23,314,000	23,878,000	23,058,000	-258,000	-821,000
Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety	(42,784,000)	(42,784,000)	(42,784,000)		
Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety		580,000	450,000	+450,000	-130,000
Food Safety and Inspection Service	518,738,000	584,888,000	540,388,000	+23,627,000	-54,524,000
Lab accreditation fees 2/	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)		
Total, Production, Processing, and Marketing	3,178,784,000	3,254,178,000	3,062,186,000	-116,588,000	-181,882,000
Farm Assistance Program					
Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services	548,000	570,000	548,000		-21,000

**AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD & DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1978)—Continued**

	FY 1988 Enacted	FY 1988 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
Consolidated Farm Service Agency:					
Salaries and expenses.....		811,771,000	808,888,000	+ 808,888,000	- 8,883,000
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service,					
salaries and expenses.....	786,217,000			-786,217,000	
(Transfer from export loans).....	(888,000)	(888,000)	(888,000)		(-18,000)
(Transfer from P.L. 480).....	(1,038,000)	(748,000)	(748,000)	(-291,000)	
(Transfer from ACIF).....	(200,227,000)	(214,183,000)	(808,448,000)	(+ 8,218,000)	(- 8,717,000)
Total, salaries and expenses.....	(867,088,000)	(1,027,267,000)	(1,018,888,000)	(+ 28,589,000)	(- 11,818,000)
State mediation grants.....	3,000,000	3,000,000	2,000,000	-1,000,000	-1,000,000
Dairy indemnity program.....		100,000	100,000	+ 100,000	
Outreach for socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers.....	2,896,000	3,000,000		-2,896,000	-3,000,000
Total, Consolidated Farm Service Agency.....	781,212,000	817,871,000	807,888,000	+ 16,776,000	- 8,883,000
Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Farm ownership loans:					
Direct.....	(78,081,000)	(70,000,000)	(35,000,000)	(-43,081,000)	(-35,000,000)
Guaranteed.....	(540,874,000)	(540,867,000)	(580,000,000)	(+ 8,328,000)	(+ 8,313,000)
Subtotal.....	(618,955,000)	(610,867,000)	(615,000,000)	(- 83,755,000)	(- 25,887,000)
Operating loans:					
Direct.....	(800,000,000)	(842,880,000)	(400,000,000)	(-100,000,000)	(-142,880,000)
Guaranteed unsubsidized.....	(1,736,000,000)	(1,700,000,000)	(1,700,000,000)	(-36,000,000)	
Guaranteed subsidized.....	(230,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	
Subtotal.....	(2,466,000,000)	(2,442,880,000)	(2,300,000,000)	(-166,000,000)	(-142,880,000)
Soil and water loans:					
Direct.....		(2,888,000)			(-2,888,000)
Guaranteed.....		(1,422,000)			(-1,422,000)
Subtotal.....		(4,320,000)			(-4,320,000)
Indian tribe land acquisition loans.....	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(750,000)	(-250,000)	(-250,000)
Emergency disaster loans.....	(100,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(100,000,000)		
Credit sales of acquired property.....		(48,000,000)	(22,500,000)	(+ 22,500,000)	(-22,500,000)
Total, Loan authorizations.....	(3,184,756,000)	(3,203,867,000)	(3,008,250,000)	(-176,506,000)	(-195,617,000)
Loan subsidies:					
Farm ownership:					
Direct.....	10,883,000	18,373,000	8,187,000	-2,788,000	-8,186,000
Guaranteed.....	20,870,000	19,681,000	20,019,000	-861,000	+ 338,000
Subtotal.....	31,853,000	38,054,000	28,208,000	-3,847,000	-7,848,000
Farm operating:					
Direct.....	56,556,000	74,208,000	54,880,000	-1,875,000	-19,528,000
Guaranteed unsubsidized.....	8,380,000	18,380,000	18,380,000	+ 9,000,000	
Guaranteed subsidized.....	29,426,000	17,880,000	17,880,000	-11,485,000	
Subtotal.....	95,340,000	110,528,000	91,000,000	-4,340,000	-19,528,000
Soil and water loans:					
Direct.....		808,000			-808,000
Guaranteed.....		30,000			-30,000
Subtotal.....		838,000			-838,000
Indian tribe land acquisition.....	123,000	274,000	308,000	+ 83,000	-86,000
Emergency disaster.....	28,280,000	32,080,000	32,080,000	+ 5,780,000	
Credit sales of acquired property.....		8,228,000	4,113,000	+ 4,113,000	-4,113,000
Negative subsidies.....	-782,000	-298,000		+ 782,000	+ 298,000
Total, Loan subsidies.....	152,824,000	167,805,000	156,805,000	+ 2,781,000	-31,800,000
ACIF expenses:					
Salaries and expenses.....	228,736,000	214,862,000	208,835,000	-20,800,000	-5,717,000
Administrative expenses.....	14,031,000	12,808,000	12,808,000	-1,425,000	
Total, ACIF expenses.....	243,768,000	227,258,000	221,541,000	-22,226,000	-5,717,000
Total, Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund.....	388,580,000	414,783,000	377,148,000	-18,444,000	-37,817,000
(Loan authorization).....	(3,184,756,000)	(3,203,867,000)	(3,008,250,000)	(-178,506,000)	(-195,617,000)
Total, Farm Assistance Programs.....	1,188,361,000	1,233,204,000	1,186,863,000	-2,088,000	-47,521,000

**AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD & DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1976)—Continued**

	FY 1996 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
CORPORATIONS					
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation:					
Federal crop insurance corporation fund.....	218,107,000	1,263,708,000	1,263,708,000	+ 1,044,801,000
Commodity Credit Corporation:					
Reimbursement for net realized losses.....	18,900,000,000	10,400,000,000	10,400,000,000	-8,100,000,000
Hazardous waste (limitation on administrative expenses).....	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)
Borrowing authority (emergency).....	1,000,000,000	-1,000,000,000
Total, Corporations.....	18,718,107,000	11,663,708,000	11,663,708,000	-8,065,399,000
Total, title I, Agricultural Programs.....	21,086,242,000	18,181,080,000	18,811,867,000	-5,174,855,000	-226,903,000
(By transfer).....	(201,882,000)	(218,918,000)	(208,780,000)	(+ 7,828,000)	(+ 5,738,000)
(Loan authorization).....	(5,184,785,000)	(3,203,887,000)	(3,008,280,000)	(+ 178,808,000)	(+ 188,817,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(104,838,000)	(108,248,000)	(108,248,000)	(+ 1,407,000)
TITLE II - CONSERVATION PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment.....	677,000	666,000	677,000	-19,000
Natural Resource Conservation Service:					
Conservation operations.....	666,082,000	646,735,000	629,988,000	+ 73,924,000	-16,748,000
River basin surveys, investigations, and watershed planning.....	14,000,000	+ 14,000,000	+ 14,000,000
River basin surveys and investigations.....	12,970,000	11,210,000	-12,970,000	-11,210,000
Watershed planning.....	10,848,000	7,842,000	-10,848,000	-7,842,000
Watershed and flood prevention operations.....	70,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	+ 30,000,000
Resource conservation and development, Great Plains conservation program, forestry incentives program, and Colorado River Basin salinity control program.....	47,000,000	+ 47,000,000	+ 47,000,000
Resource conservation and development.....	32,845,000	28,800,000	-32,845,000	-28,800,000
Great Plains conservation program.....	18,172,000	11,000,000	-18,172,000	-11,000,000
Forestry incentives program.....	6,825,000	6,825,000	-6,825,000	-6,825,000
Colorado River Basin salinity control program.....	4,800,000	2,881,000	-4,800,000	-2,881,000
Wetlands reserve program.....	83,200,000	210,000,000	77,000,000	-16,200,000	-133,000,000
Total, Natural Resource Conservation Service.....	801,920,000	1,023,883,000	867,988,000	+ 88,068,000	-156,707,000
Consolidated Farm Service Agency:					
Agricultural conservation program.....	100,000,000	50,000,000	75,000,000	-25,000,000	+ 25,000,000
Water quality incentives program.....	(15,000,000)	(18,000,000)	(11,000,000)	(+ 4,000,000)	(+ 4,000,000)
Emergency conservation program.....	3,000,000	-3,000,000
Conservation reserve program.....	1,743,274,000	1,828,370,000	1,781,785,000	+ 38,511,000	-144,585,000
Total, Consolidated Farm Service Agency.....	1,843,274,000	1,978,370,000	1,856,785,000	+ 13,511,000	-122,585,000
Total, title II, Conservation Programs.....	2,645,871,000	3,003,758,000	2,725,448,000	+ 79,577,000	-278,311,000
TITLE III - RURAL ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Economic and Community Development.....	588,000	588,000	588,000	-18,000
Rural Housing and Community Development Service:					
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Low-income housing (sec. 502).....	(1,200,000,000)	(1,200,000,000)	(900,000,000)	(+ 300,000,000)	(+ 300,000,000)
Unsubsidized guaranteed.....	(1,000,000,000)	(1,300,000,000)	(1,800,000,000)	(+ 500,000,000)	(+ 200,000,000)
Housing repair (sec. 504).....	(36,000,000)	(36,000,000)	(36,000,000)
Farm labor (sec. 514).....	(18,915,000)	(18,482,000)	(18,000,000)	(+ 915,000)	(+ 1,482,000)
Rental housing (sec. 518).....	(220,000,000)	(220,000,000)	(180,000,000)	(+ 70,000,000)	(+ 70,000,000)
Site loans (sec. 524).....	(832,000)	(832,000)	(800,000)	(+ 32,000)	(+ 32,000)
Credit sales of acquired property.....	(78,000,000)	(38,000,000)	(+ 38,000,000)	(+ 40,000,000)
Total, Loan authorizations.....	(2,471,547,000)	(2,847,114,000)	(2,835,800,000)	(+ 184,063,000)	(+ 211,514,000)
Loan subsidies:					
Single family (sec. 502):					
Direct.....	227,520,000	251,880,000	188,910,000	+ 38,610,000	-62,970,000
Unsubsidized guaranteed.....	17,200,000	2,210,000	2,550,000	-14,650,000	+ 340,000
Housing repair (sec. 504).....	11,680,000	14,183,000	14,183,000	+ 2,503,000
Farm labor (sec. 514).....	7,911,000	8,482,000	8,628,000	+ 718,000	-853,000
Rental housing (sec. 518):					
Direct.....	115,500,000	92,973,000	82,038,000	+ 33,485,000	-10,838,000
Unsubsidized guaranteed.....	(1,000,000)	(+ 1,000,000)
Credit sales of acquired property.....	13,073,000	8,100,000	+ 8,100,000	-8,973,000
Total, Loan subsidies.....	378,821,000	383,811,000	302,417,000	-77,404,000	-81,384,000
RIF administrative expenses.....	386,818,000	386,211,000	380,211,000	+ 8,307,000	-5,000,000

**AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD & DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1976)—Continued**

	FY 1988 Enacted	FY 1988 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
Rental assistance:					
(Sec. 881).....	817,108,000	868,863,000	830,000,000	+ 12,862,000	-38,863,000
(Sec. 802(c)(9)(C)).....	5,900,000	5,900,000	5,900,000		
Total, Rental assistance.....	823,008,000	874,763,000	835,900,000	+ 12,862,000	-38,863,000
Total, Rural Housing Insurance Fund (Loan authorization).....	1,282,847,000	1,350,505,000	1,228,528,000	-84,119,000	-121,977,000
	(2,471,847,000)	(2,847,114,000)	(2,836,800,000)	(+ 184,083,000)	(-211,314,000)
Self-Help Housing Land Development Fund:					
Loan authorization.....	(803,000)	(803,000)	(803,000)		
Loan subsidy.....	11,000	31,000	31,000	+ 20,000	
Administrative expenses.....	14,000			-14,000	
Rural Community Facility Loans Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Direct 3/.....	(225,000,000)	(250,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(-25,000,000)	(-50,000,000)
Guaranteed 3/.....	(75,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(75,000,000)		(-25,000,000)
Total, Loan authorizations.....	(300,000,000)	(350,000,000)	(275,000,000)	(-25,000,000)	(-75,000,000)
Loan subsidies:					
Direct 3/.....	21,375,000	(43,800,000)	34,880,000	+ 13,505,000	+ 34,880,000
Guaranteed 3/.....	3,728,000	(4,740,000)	3,555,000	-173,000	+ 3,555,000
Total, Loan subsidies.....	25,103,000		38,435,000	+ 13,332,000	+ 38,435,000
Administrative expenses 3/.....		(11,247,000)	8,838,000	+ 8,838,000	+ 8,838,000
Very low-income housing repair grants.....	24,900,000	24,900,000	24,900,000		
Rural housing for domestic farm labor.....	10,900,000	10,900,000	10,000,000	-900,000	-900,000
Mutual and self-help housing.....	12,850,000	12,850,000	12,850,000		
Supervisory and technical assistance grants.....		2,500,000			-2,500,000
Rural community fire protection grants 3/.....	3,400,000	(3,400,000)	1,000,000	-2,400,000	+ 1,000,000
Compensation for construction defects.....	485,000	485,000	485,000		
Rural housing preservation grants.....	22,000,000	22,000,000	11,000,000	-11,000,000	-11,000,000
Rural housing performance partnerships program.....		80,802,000			-80,802,000
Subtotal, grants and payments.....	74,345,000	184,047,000	80,045,000	-14,300,000	-104,002,000
RHCDS expenses:					
Administrative expenses.....		53,850,000	53,315,000	+ 53,315,000	-335,000
(Transfer from RHIF).....	(389,818,000)	(382,074,000)	(377,074,000)	(-12,744,000)	(-5,000,000)
(Transfer from ACIF).....		(171,000)	(171,000)		
(Transfer from RCFLP).....		(11,114,000)	(8,731,000)	(+ 8,731,000)	(-2,383,000)
Total, RHCDS expenses.....	(389,818,000)	(447,009,000)	(438,281,000)	(+ 48,473,000)	(-7,718,000)
Total, Rural Housing and Community Development Service (Loan authorization).....	1,282,120,000	1,588,233,000	1,388,180,000	-2,930,000	-178,043,000
	(2,772,150,000)	(3,187,717,000)	(2,811,203,000)	(+ 138,083,000)	(-288,514,000)
Rural Business and Cooperative Development Service:					
Rural Business and Industry Loans Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Direct 3/.....		(50,000,000)			(-50,000,000)
Guaranteed 3/.....	(500,000,000)	(750,000,000)	(500,000,000)		(-250,000,000)
Total, loan authorizations.....	(500,000,000)	(800,000,000)	(500,000,000)		(-300,000,000)
Loan subsidies:					
Direct 3/.....		(3,506,000)			
Guaranteed 3/.....	4,750,000	(8,825,000)	8,437,000	+ 1,887,000	+ 8,437,000
Total, Loan subsidies.....	4,750,000		8,437,000	+ 1,887,000	+ 8,437,000
Administrative expenses 3/.....		(18,742,000)	14,888,000	+ 14,888,000	+ 14,888,000
Rural Development Loan Fund Program Account:					
(Loan authorization) 3/.....	(88,038,000)	(80,000,000)	(80,000,000)	(-28,038,000)	(-30,000,000)
Loan subsidy 3/.....	48,000,000	(53,885,000)	38,780,000	-10,210,000	+ 38,780,000
Administrative expenses 3/.....	1,478,000	(2,881,000)	1,782,000	+ 316,000	+ 1,782,000
Total, Rural Development Loan Fund (Loan authorization).....	47,478,000		37,582,000	-8,894,000	+ 37,582,000
	(88,038,000)	(80,000,000)	(80,000,000)	(-28,038,000)	(-30,000,000)
Rural Economic Development Loans Program Account:					
Direct loans (limitation on obligations).....	(12,885,000)	(14,081,000)	(12,885,000)		(-1,228,000)
Direct subsidy.....	3,077,000	4,085,000	3,729,000	+ 882,000	-358,000
Administrative expenses.....		884,000	584,000	+ 584,000	-280,000
Alternative Agricultural Research and Commercialization Revolving Fund.....					
Loan authorization.....	8,500,000	8,000,000	5,000,000	-1,500,000	-3,000,000
Loan subsidy.....		(25,000,000)			(-25,000,000)
Loan subsidy.....		7,138,000			-7,138,000
Administrative expenses.....		300,000			-800,000

**AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD & DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1976)—Continued**

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1995 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
Rural business enterprise grants 3/	47,500,000	(48,000,000)	46,000,000	-2,500,000	+46,000,000
Rural technology and cooperative development grants 3/	1,750,000	(3,800,000)	1,500,000	-250,000	+1,500,000
Local technical assistance and planning grants 3/	1,750,000	(2,500,000)		-1,750,000	
Rural business performance partnerships program		112,315,000			-112,315,000
RBCDS expenses:					
Salaries and expenses 3/	57,284,000	(8,589,000)	9,520,000	-47,774,000	+9,520,000
Salaries and expenses, FmHA	37,811,000			-37,811,000	
Rural business performance partnerships program		61,874,000			-61,874,000
(Transfer from RBILP)		(19,582,000)	(14,747,000)	(+14,747,000)	(-4,835,000)
(Transfer from RDLFP)	(1,478,000)	(2,846,000)	(1,784,000)	(+308,000)	(-1,164,000)
(Transfer from RETLP)		(684,000)	(684,000)	(+684,000)	(-280,000)
Self-Help HLDG (by transfer)	(14,000)			(-14,000)	
RBCDS (by transfer)		(92,119,000)			(-92,119,000)
Total, RBCDS expenses	(98,595,000)	(117,367,000)	(98,635,000)	(-98,280,000)	(-60,792,000)
Total, Rural Business and Cooperative Development Service	207,806,000	194,776,000	124,220,000	-83,686,000	-70,556,000
(By transfer)	(1,480,000)	(55,513,000)	(17,115,000)	(+15,825,000)	(-38,398,000)
(Loan authorization)	(588,038,000)	(915,000,000)	(590,000,000)	(-28,038,000)	(-355,000,000)
Rural Utilities Service:					
Loan authorizations:					
Water and waste disposal facility loans: Direct	(805,523,000)			(-805,523,000)	
Loan subsidies:					
Water and sewer: Direct	126,502,000			-126,502,000	
Rural Electrification and Telephone Loans Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Direct loans:					
Electric 5%	(100,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(90,000,000)	(-10,000,000)	(-10,000,000)
Telephone 5%	(75,000,000)	(75,000,000)	(70,000,000)	(-5,000,000)	(-5,000,000)
Subtotal	(175,000,000)	(175,000,000)	(160,000,000)	(-15,000,000)	(-15,000,000)
Treasury rate: Telephone	(297,000,000)	(300,000,000)	(300,000,000)	(+3,000,000)	
Muni-rate: Electric	(575,250,000)	(575,250,000)	(500,000,000)	(-75,250,000)	(-75,250,000)
FFB loans:					
Electric, regular	(300,000,000)	(400,000,000)	(300,000,000)		(-100,000,000)
Telephone	(120,000,000)	(120,000,000)	(120,000,000)		
Subtotal	(420,000,000)	(520,000,000)	(420,000,000)		(-100,000,000)
Total, Loan authorizations	(1,487,250,000)	(1,570,250,000)	(1,360,000,000)	(-87,250,000)	(-180,250,000)
Loan subsidies:					
Direct loans:					
Electric 5%	9,703,000	23,520,000	21,168,000	+11,465,000	-2,352,000
Telephone 5%	5,487,000	14,955,000	13,958,000	+8,461,000	-987,000
Subtotal	15,200,000	38,475,000	35,126,000	+19,926,000	-3,346,000
Treasury rate: Telephone	60,000	60,000	60,000		
Muni-rate, electric	46,020,000	62,300,000	54,180,000	+8,130,000	-8,150,000
FFB loans: Electric, regular	450,000	3,380,000	2,520,000	+2,070,000	-840,000
Negative subsidy		-1,715,000			+1,715,000
Total, Loan subsidies	61,730,000	102,480,000	91,856,000	+30,126,000	-10,624,000
RETLP administrative expenses	29,982,000	34,385,000	29,982,000		-4,403,000
Total, Rural Electrification and Telephone Loans Program Account	91,712,000	136,865,000	121,236,000	+30,126,000	-15,027,000
(Loan authorization)	(1,487,250,000)	(1,570,250,000)	(1,360,000,000)	(-87,250,000)	(-180,250,000)
Rural Telecommunications Partnership Loan Program Account:					
Loan authorization		(15,000,000)			(-15,000,000)
Loan subsidy		594,000			-594,000
Administrative expenses		1,110,000			-1,110,000
Total		1,704,000			-1,704,000
Rural Telephone Bank Program Account:					
Direct loans (limitation on obligations)	(175,000,000)		(175,000,000)		(+175,000,000)
Direct loan subsidy	770,000		770,000		+770,000
RTB salaries and expenses	8,784,000		3,541,000	-5,253,000	+3,541,000
Distance Learning and Medical Link Grants	7,500,000	15,000,000	7,500,000		-7,500,000
Rural water and waste disposal grants	500,000,000			-500,000,000	
Solid waste management grants	2,865,000			-2,865,000	
Rural utilities performance partnerships program		785,183,000	562,000,000	+562,000,000	-223,183,000
Solid waste management grants, rural water and waste disposal grants, and water and waste disposal facility loans (administrative expenses)			12,740,000	+12,740,000	+12,740,000

**AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD & DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1976)—Continued**

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1995 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
RUS salaries and expenses.....		19,827,000	19,211,000	+ 19,211,000	-418,000
Electric and telephone loans (by transfer).....	(29,982,000)	(34,385,000)	(39,982,000)		(-4,403,000)
Rural telephone bank (by transfer).....	(5,784,000)		(3,541,000)	(-5,253,000)	(+ 2,541,000)
Water and waste disposal loans (by transfer).....		(17,790,000)			(-17,790,000)
Rural Telecommunication Partnership Loan (by transfer).....		(1,110,000)			(-1,110,000)
Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund (by transfer).....		(318,000)	(318,000)	(+ 318,000)	
Rural partnership (by transfer).....			(12,823,000)	(+ 12,823,000)	(+ 12,823,000)
Subtotal.....	(38,776,000)	(73,230,000)	(66,575,000)	(+ 26,899,000)	(-7,655,000)
Total, Rural Utilities Service.....	738,273,000	958,378,000	727,800,000	-10,673,000	-230,778,000
(By transfer).....	(38,776,000)	(63,803,000)	(46,484,000)	(+ 7,998,000)	(-7,139,000)
(Loan authorization).....	(2,372,773,000)	(1,886,280,000)	(1,380,000,000)	(-982,773,000)	(-205,280,000)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(178,000,000)		(178,000,000)		(+ 178,000,000)
Total, title III, Rural Economic and Community Development Programs.....	2,336,889,000	2,721,974,000	2,841,578,000	-97,291,000	-480,389,000
(By transfer).....	(430,084,000)	(502,478,000)	(448,885,000)	(+ 19,471,000)	(-82,820,000)
(Loan authorization).....	(5,732,861,000)	(5,887,867,000)	(4,851,203,000)	(-881,758,000)	(-848,784,000)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(187,885,000)	(14,081,000)	(187,885,000)		(+ 173,774,000)
TITLE IV - DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services.....	540,000	583,000	440,000	-100,000	-113,000
Food and Consumer Service:					
Child nutrition programs.....	2,202,274,000	2,389,842,000	2,354,598,000	+ 152,292,000	-45,376,000
Transfer from section 32.....	5,248,077,000	5,520,482,000	5,597,858,000	+ 348,781,000	+ 77,386,000
Total, Child nutrition programs.....	7,451,351,000	7,920,434,000	7,952,424,000	+ 501,073,000	+ 31,860,000
Special milk program.....	18,088,000			-18,088,000	
Special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children (WIC).....	3,470,000,000	3,820,000,000	3,728,807,000	+ 259,807,000	-80,193,000
(By transfer).....			(4,000,000)	(+ 4,000,000)	(+ 4,000,000)
Commodity supplemental food program.....	84,500,000	86,000,000		-84,500,000	-86,000,000
Food stamp program:					
Expenses.....	25,187,710,000	26,119,887,000	25,954,828,000	+ 787,118,000	-185,059,000
Reserve.....	2,500,000,000	2,500,000,000		-2,500,000,000	-2,500,000,000
Nutrition assistance for Puerto Rico.....	1,130,528,000	1,143,000,000	1,143,000,000	+ 12,472,000	
Cattle tick eradication.....	12,472,000			-12,472,000	
Total, Food stamp program.....	29,830,710,000	29,782,887,000	27,097,828,000	-1,732,882,000	-2,886,059,000
Food donations programs for selected groups:					
Needy family program.....	33,154,000	78,639,000	85,000,000	+ 31,848,000	-13,839,000
Elderly feeding program.....	150,000,000	181,250,000	150,000,000		-1,250,000
Subtotal.....	183,154,000	229,889,000	215,000,000	+ 31,848,000	-14,889,000
Soup kitchens.....	40,000,000	40,000,000		-40,000,000	-40,000,000
Total, Food donations programs.....	223,154,000	269,889,000	215,000,000	-8,154,000	-54,889,000
The emergency food assistance program.....	40,000,000	40,000,000		-40,000,000	-40,000,000
Commodity purchases - TEFAP.....	25,000,000			-25,000,000	
Commodity assistance program.....			188,000,000	+ 188,000,000	+ 188,000,000
Total, The emergency food assistance program.....	65,000,000	40,000,000	188,000,000	+ 103,000,000	+ 128,000,000
Nutrition initiatives:					
Nutrition support.....		45,528,000			-45,528,000
Nutrition promotion.....		4,218,000			-4,218,000
Food program administration.....	108,485,000	141,380,000	108,323,000	+ 1,856,000	-33,037,000
Total, Food and Consumer Service.....	40,249,289,000	42,080,314,000	39,271,382,000	-977,887,000	-2,818,932,000
Total, title IV, Domestic Food Programs.....	40,249,809,000	42,080,867,000	39,271,822,000	-977,987,000	-2,818,045,000
TITLE V - FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS					
Foreign Agricultural Service, direct appropriation.....	108,880,000	120,201,000	114,547,000	+ 5,887,000	-5,854,000
(Transfer from Commodity Credit Corporation).....	(4,914,000)	(5,178,000)	(5,178,000)	(+ 262,000)	
(Transfer from export loans).....	(2,782,000)	(3,137,000)	(2,792,000)		(-345,000)
(Transfer from P.L. 480).....	(1,425,000)	(1,005,000)	(1,005,000)	(-420,000)	
Total, Program level.....	(118,011,000)	(129,519,000)	(123,520,000)	(+ 5,508,000)	(-5,889,000)
Scientific activities overseas (foreign currency program) (Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(1,082,000)			(-1,082,000)	

**AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD & DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1976)—Continued**

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1995 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
Public Law 480 Program Account:					
Title I - Credit sales:					
Program level.....	(320,342,000)	(177,867,000)	(316,342,000)	(-4,000,000)	(+138,385,000)
Direct loans.....	(291,342,000)	(161,840,000)	(291,342,000)	(+129,802,000)
Ocean freight differential.....	29,000,000	16,417,000	25,000,000	(-4,000,000)	(+6,563,000)
Title II - Commodities for disposition abroad:					
Program level.....	(821,100,000)	(795,703,000)	(821,100,000)	(+25,397,000)
Appropriation.....	821,100,000	795,703,000	821,100,000	(+25,397,000)
Title III - Commodity grants:					
Program level.....	(157,442,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(-107,442,000)
Appropriation.....	157,442,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	(-107,442,000)
Loan subsidies.....	236,182,000	131,633,000	236,182,000	(+104,328,000)
Debt restructuring.....	1,800,000	(-1,800,000)
Salaries and expenses:					
General Sales Manager.....	1,426,000	1,006,000	1,006,000	(-420,000)
CFSA.....	1,036,000	746,000	746,000	(-291,000)
Subtotal.....	2,461,000	1,750,000	1,750,000	(-711,000)
Total, Public Law 480:					
Program level.....	(1,298,884,000)	(1,023,890,000)	(1,187,442,000)	(-111,442,000)	(+163,782,000)
Appropriation.....	1,246,185,000	997,203,000	1,124,012,000	(-112,153,000)	(+136,808,000)
OCC Export Loans Program Account:					
Loan guarantees:					
Short-term export credit.....	(5,000,000,000)	(5,200,000,000)	(5,200,000,000)	(+200,000,000)
Intermediate export credit.....	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)
Emerging democracies export credit.....	(200,000,000)	(-200,000,000)
Loan subsidy.....	364,363,000	374,347,000	374,347,000	(-20,046,000)
Salaries and expenses (Export Loans):					
General Sales Manager.....	2,792,000	3,137,000	2,792,000	(-345,000)
ASCS.....	586,000	606,000	586,000	(-19,000)
Total, OCC Export Loans Program Account.....	397,774,000	376,082,000	377,726,000	(-20,046,000)	(-364,000)
Total, title V, Foreign assistance and related programs.....	1,732,819,000	1,466,466,000	1,626,267,000	(-126,532,000)	(+130,791,000)
(By transfer).....	(9,131,000)	(9,316,000)	(9,973,000)	(-158,000)	(-346,000)
TITLE VI - RELATED AGENCIES AND FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION					
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES					
Food and Drug Administration					
Salaries and expenses, direct appropriation.....	819,871,000	829,989,000	819,871,000	(-6,028,000)
Prescription drug user fee act.....	(79,423,000)	(84,723,000)	(84,723,000)	(+5,300,000)
Mammography clinics user fee.....	(6,500,000)	(13,000,000)	(13,000,000)	(+6,500,000)
New user fees.....	(36,740,000)	(-36,740,000)
Total, Program level.....	(905,894,000)	(954,452,000)	(917,654,000)	(+11,800,000)	(-47,788,000)
Buildings and facilities.....	18,150,000	8,360,000	18,350,000	(-2,800,000)	(+7,000,000)
Rental payments.....	46,294,000	46,294,000	46,294,000
Total, Food and Drug Administration.....	884,415,000	883,843,000	881,815,000	(-2,800,000)	(-2,028,000)
DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY					
Financial Management Service: Payments to the farm credit system financial assistance corporation.....					
	57,026,000	15,453,000	15,453,000	(-41,573,000)
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Commodity Futures Trading Commission.....	46,144,000	59,711,000	46,144,000	(-10,567,000)
Farm Credit Administration (limitation on administrative expenses).....	(40,420,000)	(39,900,000)	(-40,420,000)	(-39,900,000)
Total, title VI, Related Agencies and Food and Drug Administration.....	993,585,000	956,907,000	946,212,000	(-44,373,000)	(-12,986,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(40,420,000)	(39,900,000)	(-40,420,000)	(-39,900,000)
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority.....	69,084,195,000	66,421,983,000	62,722,934,000	(-6,341,261,000)	(-3,699,056,000)
(By transfer).....	(841,067,000)	(727,309,000)	(872,308,000)	(+31,241,000)	(-66,001,000)
(Loan authorization).....	(14,817,718,000)	(14,901,834,000)	(13,559,453,000)	(-1,056,263,000)	(-1,042,381,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(148,320,000)	(146,146,000)	(108,246,000)	(-40,073,000)	(-38,900,000)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(187,886,000)	(14,081,000)	(187,886,000)	(+173,774,000)

**AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD & DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1976)—Continued**

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1995 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
RECAPITULATION					
Title I - Agricultural programs.....	21,086,242,000	16,151,080,000	16,911,567,000	-6,174,655,000	-236,503,000
Title II - Conservation programs.....	2,845,871,000	3,003,798,000	2,785,446,000	+ 78,877,000	-276,311,000
Title III - Farmers Home and Rural development programs.....	2,336,866,000	2,721,874,000	2,241,576,000	-67,261,000	-480,308,000
Title IV - Domestic food programs.....	40,248,808,000	42,080,867,000	38,271,822,000	-677,987,000	-2,818,045,000
Title V - Foreign assistance and related programs.....	1,752,819,000	1,465,486,000	1,626,267,000	-126,532,000	+ 130,781,000
Title VI - Related agencies and Food and Drug Administration.....	660,585,000	668,607,000	646,212,000	-44,373,000	-12,395,000
Total, new budget (obligational) authority	69,084,185,000	68,421,883,000	66,722,834,000	-6,341,281,000	-3,698,089,000

1/ Such sums as available from ACl user fee account for FY 1995.

2/ In addition to appropriation.

3/ On 5/2/95 the Administration amended its FY 1995 request (H.Doc. 104-63). This table reflects the program levels as submitted in the original budget.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. speaker, on Thursday, July 20, I missed four rollcall votes and on Friday, July 21, I missed three rollcall votes during consideration of H.R. 1976, Agriculture appropriations for fiscal year 1996.

On rollcall vote Nos. 542, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, I would have voted "nay."

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1976, the Agriculture appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996, represents a serious effort to cut Federal spending on agriculture programs. I am pleased that this bill cuts funding from current levels by nine percent. But we can go even farther. This bill preserves a number of agricultural subsidies that I believe should be reviewed in light of our desire to move toward reducing our deficit. Although this bill preserves Federal subsidies for several agricultural programs which I believe should be cut or eliminated, I am encouraged by the assurances from Chairman Roberts of the Agriculture Committee that he will ensure votes on these subsidy programs during consideration of the farm bill later this year.

This bill recognizes the importance of child nutrition programs funded through the Department of Agriculture. I am pleased that the Republican leadership recognized the shortsightedness of their initial proposal to reduce funding for school lunch and breakfast programs. H.R. 1976 provides \$8 billion in funding for school lunch and breakfast programs, an increase of \$501 million over fiscal year 1995, and \$32 million more than the President's request.

This bill was also improved when an amendment offered by Representative HALL was accepted to remove the cap on the number of participants in the nutrition program for Women, Infants, and Children [WIC]. WIC is a cost-effective program which has significantly reduced rates of infant mortality, low birthweight, and anemia. If food cost inflation is lower than previous years, or if a State manages the program efficiently, the cap would have prohibited the state from enrolling additional eligible women, infants and children.

I do, however, remain concerned about the removal of the competitive bidding requirement included in this bill. If history serves as a guide, this will translate into higher costs for infant formula and fewer infants being served under the program.

Prior to enactment of the competitive bidding requirement in 1989, only half of State WIC programs used competitive bidding. The other half used industry-favored cost containment systems that saved 35 percent less than competitive bidding. For this reason, Congress passed the competitive bidding requirement in 1989 with bipartisan support and with support from the Bush White House.

Competitive bidding works. Competitive bidding saved the WIC program \$1.1 billion last year. Nearly 25 percent of women, infants and children served by WIC last year were served with savings from competitive bidding. In my home State of Rhode Island, the competitive bidding requirement has enabled the program to serve an additional 5,000 infants.

If we are searching for deep cuts across programs, surely it makes sense to support an incentive for states to utilize competitive bidding, given the documented costs savings that result. The Bush administration supported the

competitive bidding requirement in 1989 because it utilizes the free market to secure the lowest prices for infant formula, thereby making the most efficient use of the taxpayers' dollars and stretching WIC funds to serve more participants.

In States that do not use competitive bidding the losers will be vulnerable infants, pregnant women, and children. We should not sell out to large infant formula companies at the expense of infants, and I will urge my colleagues in the Senate to retain competitive bidding.

Finally, this legislation does not contain funding for the Coastal Institute at the University of Rhode Island. I am hopeful that through my continued effort and through the effort of the Senate, funding for this worthwhile project will be included in the conference report. The State of Rhode Island is enthusiastic about this project and voters have already approved a bond referendum for \$7 million. Bonding authority and other approved matching sources are at the \$12.56 level in support of this project. The Institute will focus on the major sources of estuarine pollution, including urban development, agriculture, and deep water activities. The Institute's mission has important implications for both these activities and for the world's fisheries. In addition, the Coastal Institute will contribute to the economic well-being of the region through the training and research that will be conducted.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 1976, the Agriculture appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996. I commend Mr. SKEEN, my colleague from New Mexico, for putting together a good bill which makes a firm contribution toward achieving our goal of a balanced budget by 2002. This bill funds important programs necessary to provide agricultural research, nutrition, conservation, health and safety, and farm sector stability.

I appreciate the hard work that Mr. SKEEN, and the other Committee members have put into allocating scarce resources among the many worthwhile projects covered by this bill. I look forward to working with the chairman in the future on programs important to the agricultural sector of our economy.

I offered an amendment to this bill that would have cut \$12 million from the Department's administrative accounts. This would have been less than 4 percent of the administrative funds. I was encouraged by the fact that 196 members of the House share my view that the Department's headquarter's bureaucracy should be further downsized at a time when farm programs are being cut dramatically. However, I accept the majority view that the Department's administrative downsizing is progressing at a sufficient pace.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Bunning amendment to eliminate funding for the Food and Drug Administration [FDA].

FDA plays an important role in the lives of every American. It is the last stage in translating life saving medical innovation to consumers. It examines the medications and feeds for farm livestock and household pets. It insures the safety of the foods we eat, and it regulates one-fourth of every dollar Americans spend. Yet, the FDA budget is only one-tenth of 1 percent of the industries it regulates. Its employees work in facilities that are out of date and in decrepit condition.

Currently the agency is located in over 48 leased and owned buildings at 20 different sites across Maryland and the District of Columbia. Many FDA facilities are in appalling condition. It has become increasingly difficult to attract the caliber of employees the FDA needs to perform its mission, especially with respect to drug and medical device product review.

Who will ensure that the food in American grocery stores is safe? Will the manufacturers and the distributors do a better job? Will the pharmaceutical companies protect the public against dangerous drugs and medical devices? Must we have another Thalidomide scare before we appreciate the good work of this agency?

Vote against the Bunning amendment and protect the health and safety of the American public.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my serious concern about the Committee Report accompanying H.R. 1976, the fiscal year 1996 Agriculture appropriations bill, which contains a provision that will seriously affect the availability of food on Indian reservations nationwide, and will dramatically increase hunger and hardship for some of America's most underserved population, our low-income Native Americans.

In the report, the Appropriations Committee directs the Secretary of Agriculture to begin the termination of the Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations, commonly known as the commodities program. Indians who benefit from the commodities program will be transferred to the Food Stamp Program.

This small non-controversial program has not been a target for cuts under any previous administration. The administration requested \$78.6 million for reservation commodities in fiscal year 1996. The Committee's bill provides for \$65 million for commodities, a difference of \$13.6 million (17 percent). Should this severe underfunding and eventual phaseout proceed, more than 110,000 Native Americans on reservations in 24 States will be virtually cut off from monthly food supplements. This misguided shuffling of programs would result in increased costs to the Federal Government and add to our ever-increasing deficit.

When Congress and the Nixon administration instituted the Food Stamp Program nationwide in 1974, one exception was made. Then, as now, the supply of commodity food items directly to Indian tribes for distribution among low-income tribal members made better economic sense than the State-administered Food Stamp Program. Indian reservations are some of the most remote and sparsely developed areas in this country. Currently, Indians can participate in either the commodities or food stamps programs but not both. The Food Stamp Program requires individuals to trade food coupons for food at grocery stores. In many reservation areas, there are not many stores. Travel to stores may take hours by car. In addition, the prices for foods at on-reservation stores are generally higher than in urban or suburban areas. Thus, food stamps buy less food at reservation stores than off-reservation stores.

In addition, while tribes operate the distribution of commodities, States operate the Food Stamp Program. Conversion to the Food Stamp Program will require Native Americans

to travel vast distances to the nearest State food stamp office. Other problems with the Food Stamp Program include a differing set of eligibility rules, and the likelihood that nonperishable foods, which make up the bulk of the commodities programs, will be less available under the Food Stamp Program because stores are less likely to stock them. Without a continued commodities program, food shortages will result and people will go hungry.

Finally, it appears that conversion to the Food Stamp Program will result in increased costs to the Federal Government. In fiscal year 1994, the average per month cost of food stamp benefits was \$69.01, compared to \$33.51 for commodities.

There are nine federally recognized tribes in South Dakota, whose members collectively make up one of the largest Native American populations in any State. At the same time, South Dakota has 3 of the 10 poorest counties in the Nation, all of which are within reservation boundaries. In fiscal year 1994, 11,600 low-income individuals living on or near reservations in my State were served through this program. This poorly thought out reshuffling of existing successful programs will severely impact the health and well-being of Native Americans in my State and across the country.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman. I want to inform the body that I am a farm owner and am involved in the Federal Farm Program, as I had been for many years before coming to Congress. I believe my involvement in and resulting knowledge of farm programs make me a more informed member of the Agriculture Committee. While I will vote present on this amendment to avoid any hint of conflict of interest, I am in opposition to the amendment to the Agriculture appropriations bill submitted by Representative LOWEY barring those with off-farm incomes of \$100,000 or greater from participating in Federal farm programs.

First of all, farm programs are a part of this country's food security policy, not our welfare programs. Means testing ag payments make as much sense as means testing those who invest in Government bonds. The Clinton administration has repeatedly stated the need for outside investment in rural America. Landowners who own but do not operate farms represent outside capital that agriculture needs to finance farming, conserve soil and water resources, and support the economy of rural America. Forty-three percent of all U.S. farmland is owned by someone who does not actually farm the land. In my Illinois district some 70 percent is owned by absentee landowners. This provides most family farmers with the opportunity to operate on a scale that is economically viable. Land prices prohibit farmers from purchasing all the land necessary to provide for a viable operation.

If landowners with off-farm incomes of \$100,000 or more are prohibited from participation in farm programs, land leases will move from share-rent leases to cash-rent. A share-rent lease simply means that both the tenant and landowner split costs and production, both assuming risks inherent to farming. Cash-rent leases represent a total shift of risk to the farmer. The tenant pays the landowner for the privilege of farming the land, then pays for all expenses and keeps all production.

I commend Representative LOWEY for trying to reduce Federal spending. The problem is, this amendment will not save money. Shifts in

rental agreements will prevent this from happening. Ms. LOWEY's amendment will not reduce spending, but it will hurt family farmers.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman. I strongly support the Agriculture Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1996. Not only does this bill provide much needed funding for farm programs, it provides vital funding for research in the field of nutritional health.

The Children's Nutritional Research Center [CNRC] at Baylor College of Medicine is located in the heart of the Texas Medical Center in Houston. This center is currently our Nation's only Federal facility dedicated to investigating the food needs of pregnant and nursing women and of children through their adolescence.

Since its inception in November 1978, the Children's Nutritional Research Center has focused on critical questions relating to women and nutrition. These include determining how the diet of a pregnant woman affects her health and the health of her child and how a mother's nutrition affects by lactation and the nutrient contents of her milk. The center also has researched the relationship between nutrition and the physical and mental development of children.

In addition, CNRC has conducted amazing research which has identified the genes contributing to nutrient intake and determined the factors that regulate these genes. This research will lead to valuable discoveries in the field of genetics.

This year, CNRC will fully activate the two remaining units of its research program, the Metabolic Research Unit and the Greenhouse. The Metabolic Research Unit will serve as the central laboratory for detailed nutrition studies in the center. The 12 apartments, 2 nurseries, metabolic kitchen, and four recreational areas in the unit will allow family participation in CNRC's research activities. Studies will examine the nutrients associated with growth and development and the role of diet in birth weight.

The Greenhouse will prepare plant foods to study the digestion of carbon, nitrogen, iron, and calcium in foods eaten by pregnant and nursing women and their children. Recently, CNRC scientists uncovered a major research breakthrough by using labeled foods to accurately determine essential and nonessential nutrients. The Greenhouse will further study this phenomenon and is unique among the Department of Agriculture's nutrition research centers.

I am pleased that the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee has agreed to maintain funding for the Children's Nutrition Research Center. Under the Guidance of Baylor College of Medicine, one of the premier academic health science centers in the Nation, I am certain CNRC will continue to lead the way in the field of nutritional research.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution No. 188 and the order of the House of July 20, 1995, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CRAPO) having assumed the chair, Mr. KLUG, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1976) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and

Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 188 he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 313, nays 78, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 554]

YEAS—313

Allard	Cramer	Hall (OH)
Andrews	Crapo	Hall (TX)
Archer	Creameans	Hamilton
Armey	Cubin	Hansen
Bachus	Cunningham	Hastert
Baesler	Danner	Hastings (FL)
Baker (CA)	Davis	Hayes
Barcia	de la Garza	Hayworth
Barr	Deal	Hefner
Barrett (NE)	DeFazio	Heineman
Barrett (WI)	DeLauro	Herger
Bartlett	DeLay	Hilleary
Bass	Diaz-Balart	Hinchey
Bereuter	Dickey	Hobson
Bevill	Dooley	Hoekstra
Bilbray	Doolittle	Hoke
Bilirakis	Dornan	Holden
Bishop	Doyle	Horn
Bliley	Dunn	Hostettler
Boehlert	Durbin	Hoyer
Boehner	Edwards	Hunter
Bonilla	Ehrlich	Hutchinson
Bonior	Emerson	Hyde
Bono	Engel	Inglis
Borski	English	Istook
Boucher	Evans	Jackson-Lee
Brewster	Everett	Jefferson
Browder	Ewing	Johnson (CT)
Brown (FL)	Farr	Johnson, E. B.
Brownback	Fawell	Johnson, Sam
Bryant (TN)	Fazio	Jones
Bryant (TX)	Fields (TX)	Kanjorski
Bunn	Flake	Kaptur
Bunning	Flanagan	Kasich
Burr	Foley	Kelly
Buyer	Forbes	Kennedy (RI)
Callahan	Ford	Kildee
Calvert	Fowler	Kim
Camp	Franks (CT)	King
Canady	Frelinghuysen	Kingston
Castle	Frisa	Klink
Chabot	Frost	Klug
Chambliss	Funderburk	Knollenberg
Chapman	Furse	Kolbe
Chenoweth	Ganske	LaHood
Christensen	Gejdenson	Largent
Chrysler	Gekas	Latham
Clayton	Gilchrest	LaTourette
Clement	Gillmor	Laughlin
Clinger	Gilman	Lazio
Clyburn	Gonzalez	Leach
Coble	Goodlatte	Levin
Coburn	Gordon	Lewis (CA)
Coleman	Goss	Lewis (GA)
Collins (GA)	Graham	Lewis (KY)
Combest	Green	Lightfoot
Condit	Greenwood	Lincoln
Cooley	Gunderson	Linder
Costello	Gutknecht	Lipinski

Livingston	Paxon	Solomon
LoBiondo	Payne (VA)	Souder
Longley	Pelosi	Spence
Lowey	Peterson (FL)	Spratt
Lucas	Peterson (MN)	Stenholm
Luther	Pombo	Stockman
Manton	Pomeroy	Talent
Manzullo	Porter	Tanner
Martini	Portman	Tate
Mascara	Poshard	Tauzin
Matsui	Pryce	Tejeda
McCarthy	Radanovich	Thomas
McCollum	Rahall	Thompson
McCrary	Ramstad	Thornberry
McDade	Reed	Thornton
McHale	Regula	Thurman
McHugh	Richardson	Tiahrt
McInnis	Riggs	Torres
McIntosh	Rivers	Towns
McKeon	Roberts	Trafficant
McKinney	Roemer	Tucker
McNulty	Rogers	Upton
Meek	Ros-Lehtinen	Visclosky
Meyers	Rose	Vucanovich
Mica	Roth	Waldholtz
Miller (FL)	Roukema	Walker
Minge	Sabo	Walsh
Mink	Sanford	Wamp
Molinari	Sawyer	Ward
Mollohan	Saxton	Watt (NC)
Montgomery	Schaefer	Weldon (FL)
Morella	Schiff	Weller
Murtha	Scott	White
Myers	Serrano	Whitfield
Myrick	Shadegg	Wicker
Nethercutt	Shaw	Wilson
Neumann	Shays	Wise
Ney	Shuster	Wolf
Norwood	Sisisky	Woolsey
Nussle	Skaggs	Wyden
Orton	Skeen	Wynn
Oxley	Skelton	Young (AK)
Packard	Smith (MI)	Zeliff
Pallone	Smith (NJ)	Zimmer
Parker	Smith (TX)	
Pastor	Smith (WA)	

NAYS—78

Ackerman	Gibbons	Pickett
Baldacci	Gutierrez	Rangel
Becerra	Hancock	Rohrabacher
Beilenson	Harman	Roybal-Allard
Berman	Jacobs	Royce
Blute	Johnson (SD)	Rush
Brown (OH)	Kennedy (MA)	Salmon
Cardin	Kennelly	Sanders
Collins (IL)	Klecza	Scarborough
Conyers	LaFalce	Schroeder
Coyne	Lofgren	Schumer
Dellums	Maloney	Sensenbrenner
Deutsch	Markey	Slaughter
Dicks	Martinez	Stark
Dingell	Menendez	Stearns
Dixon	Mfume	Studds
Doggett	Mineta	Stump
Duncan	Moran	Taylor (MS)
Ensinger	Nadler	Torkildsen
Eshoo	Neal	Velazquez
Fattah	Oberstar	Vento
Fields (LA)	Obey	Volkmer
Filner	Olver	Waters
Frank (MA)	Owens	Waxman
Franks (NJ)	Payne (NJ)	Williams
Gephardt	Petri	Yates

NOT VOTING—43

Abercrombie	Fox	Moorhead
Baker (LA)	Gallegly	Ortiz
Ballenger	Geren	Quillen
Barton	Goodling	Quinn
Bateman	Hastings (WA)	Reynolds
Bentsen	Hefley	Seastrand
Brown (CA)	Hilliard	Stokes
Burton	Houghton	Stupak
Clay	Johnston	Taylor (NC)
Collins (MI)	Lantos	Torricelli
Cox	McDermott	Watts (OK)
Crane	Meehan	Weldon (PA)
Dreier	Metcalf	Young (FL)
Ehlers	Miller (CA)	
Foglietta	Moakley	

□ 1734

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Watts of Oklahoma for, with Mr. McDermott against.

Mr. Dreir for, with Mr. Moakley against.
Mr. Ballenger for, with Mr. Stokes against.
So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1944. An act making emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance, for anti-terrorism initiatives, for assistance in the recovery from the tragedy that occurred at Oklahoma City, and making rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 1976, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CRAPO). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE A PRIVILEGED REPORT ON VETERANS AFFAIRS, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1996

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on a bill making appropriations for VA, HUD and independent agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All points of order are reserved on the bill.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. FAZIO of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], the distinguished majority leader, to explain the schedule for next week.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, by now it is obvious to most of the Members that we did not make our 3 o'clock departure today. Mr. Speaker, before I give the details of next week's legislative schedule, let me first outline what we need to ac-

complish next week in order to protect the August recess for Members. I recognize that we have all worked very hard for many long hours during this appropriations process, and I think by and large that we have made good progress.

We have worked these long hours for many reasons, not the least of which is our strong commitment to preserve the right of every Member to offer amendments to these important pieces of legislation. I want to thank each and every Member for their patience and diligent efforts to keep the House on schedule.

That being said, to protect the August departed tour date, next week we need to complete the Transportation appropriations bill, as well as the Commerce, Justice, State, and the VA-HUD appropriations bills.

I realize that working all night every night is unhealthy and is not overly productive. With that in mind, I will outline a schedule I feel is more reasonable and fair to Members.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday the House will meet at 10:30 a.m. for the morning hour and 12 o'clock for legislative business. Members should be advised that there will be no recorded votes before 5 o'clock on Monday. During the time when no recorded votes are expected, we plan to consider the rule and amendments to H.R. 70, the Alaskan oil export bill. If any recorded votes are ordered on H.R. 70, they will be postponed. We then plan to return to the Transportation appropriations bill. We will rise no later than 10 o'clock p.m. on Monday night, hopefully, after completing consideration of the Transportation bill.

On Tuesday, and the balance of the week, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business. On Tuesday, we plan to consider H.R. 1943, the San Diego Coastal Corrections Act. We will then return to the appropriations bill, hopefully taking up the Commerce, State, Justice bill. We plan to rise on Tuesday by no later than 8 o'clock. Members will take note that the House will meet in joint session with the Senate at 11 a.m. on Wednesday to receive the President of Korea. We hope to rise no later than 10 p.m. on Wednesday night.

On Thursday, we hope to finish no later than midnight, unless a few extra hours of work would allow us to complete our scheduled business and get Members home to their districts and their families at an earlier time.

Members should realize that when we finish the schedule I have outlined, we will go home. But if we have not, the House will work on Friday and through the weekend to finish the business I mentioned earlier.

Again, I would like to thank the Members for their help and patience thus far during this difficult process, and I would simply close by saying that no one is looking more forward to the August break and to a good fishing hole than I am. And I thank the gentleman for yielding.