CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

Hastings (WA)

Hansen

Hastert

Hayes Hayworth

Heineman

Hefley

Herger

Hilleary

Hobson

Hoke

Horn

Hoekstra

Hostettler

Houghton

Hutchinson

Johnson (CT)

Johnson, Sam

Kennedy (MA)

Hunter

Hyde

Inglis

Istook

Jones

Kaptur

Kasich

Kelly

Kim

King

Kolbe

LaHood

Largent

Latham

Lazio

Leach

LaTourette

Lewis (CA)

Lewis (KY)

Livingston LoBiondo

Longley

Maloney Manzullo

Martini

McCollum

McCrerv

McDade

McHugh

McInnis

McKeon

Metcalf

Meyers

Mica Miller (FL)

Molinari Montgomery Moorhead

Morella

Murtha

Myrick

Nethercutt

Neumann

McIntosh

Lowey

Lucas

Lightfoot

Linder

Laughlin

Kingston

Klug Knollenberg

Sensenbrenner Kaptur Moran Kennedy (MA) Murtha Serrano Kennedy (RI) Nadler Skaggs Kennelly Oberstan Skeen Obey Skelton Kildee Kleczka Olver Slaughter Klink Ortiz Spratt LaFalce Orton Stark Lantos Owens Stenholm Levin Pallone Studds Lewis (GA) Stupak Pastor Payne (NJ) Lincoln Tanner Taylor (MS) Lipinski Payne (VA) Lofgren Tejeda Peterson (FL) Lowey Thompson Peterson (MN) Luther Thornton Maloney Thurman Manton Pickett Torres Markey Pomeroy Towns Martinez Posharď Velazquez Mascara Rahall Vento Visclosky Matsui Rangel McCarthy Reed Volkmer Richardson McDermott Ward McHale Rivers Waters Roemer McNulty Watt (NC) Rovbal-Allard Meehan Waxman Meek Sabo Williams Menendez Sanders Wilson Miller (CA) Sawver Wise Woolsey Minge Schiff Mink Schroeder Wynn Moakley Schumer Yates Mollohan Scott

NOT VOTING-21

Hastings (WA) Bryant (TN) Riggs Bryant (TX) Jackson-Lee Chapman Collins (IL) (TX) McDade Rush Seastrand Dicks McKinney Weldon (PA) Engel Myers Neal Furse Harman

\Box 1249

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Riggs for, with Mrs. Collins of Illinois against.

Messrs. OWENS, SCHIFF, and KEN-NEDY of Massachusetts, and Ms. KAP-TUR changed their vote from "yea" to 'nay.

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. SEASTRAND, Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 31, due to pressing business, I was not able to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON). The question is on the reso-

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aves 244, noes 168, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 32]

AYES-244

Bartlett Allard Boehner Archer Barton Bonilla Bono Brewster Bass Armey Bateman Bachus Baesler Bereuter Brownback Baker (CA) Bilbray Bilirakis Bryant (TN) Baker (LA) Bunn Ballenger Bliley Bunning Blute Burr Barrett (NE) Boehlert Burton

Callahan Calvert Camp Campbell Canady Castle Chabot Chambliss Chenoweth Christensen Chrysler Clinger Coble Coburn Collins (GA) Combest Condit Cooley Cox Crane Crapo Cremeans Cubin Cunningham Davis Deal DeLay Diaz-Balart Dickey Doolittle Dornan Dreier Duncan Dunn Ehlers Ehrlich Emerson English Ensign Everett Ewing Fawell Fields (TX) Flanagan Foley Forbes Fowler Fox Franks (CT) Franks (NJ) Frelinghuysen Frisa Frost Funderburk Gallegly Ganske Gekas Geren Gilchrest Gillmor Gilman Goodlatte Goodling Graham Greenwood Gunderson Gutknecht Hall (TX) Hamilton Hancock

Abercrombie

Barrett (WI)

Ackerman

Andrews

Baldacci

Barcia

Becerra

Bentsen

Berman

Bevill

Bishop

Bonio

Borski

Boucher

Browder Brown (CA)

Cardin

Clayton

Clement

Clyburn

Coleman

Collins (MI)

Clay

Brown (OH)

Beilenson

NOES-168

Conyers Costello Foglietta Coyne Ford Frank (MA) Cramer Danner Geidenson de la Garza Gibbons DeFazio Gonzalez Gordon DeLauro Dellums Green Deutsch Gutierrez Dingell Hall (OH) Dixon Doggett Hefner Dooley Hilliard Doyle Hinchey Durbin Holden Edwards Hoyer Jackson (IL) Engel Eshoo Jacobs Evans Jefferson Farr Fattah Johnson (SD) Johnson, E.B. Johnston Fazio Fields (LA) Kanjorski Kennedy (RI) Filner

Norwood Nussle Oxley Packard Parker Paxon Peterson (MN) Pombo Porter Portman Quillen Quinn Ramstad Regula Roberts Rogers Rohrabacher Ros-Lehtinen Roukema Royce Salmon Sanford Saxton Scarborough Schaefer Schiff Schumer Seastrand Shadegg Shaw Shays Shuster Sisisky Smith (MI) Smith (NJ) Smith (TX) Smith (WA) Solomon Souder Spence Stearns Stump Talent Tate Tauzin Taylor (NC) Thomas Thornberry Tiahrt Torricelli Traficant Unton Vucanovich Waldholtz Walker Walsh Wamp Watts (OK) Weldon (FL) Weldon (PA) Weller White Whitfield Wicker Williams Wolf Young (AK) Young (FL) Zeliff

Flake Hastings (FL)

Kennelly Skeen Skelton Oberstan Kildee Obey Kleczka Olver Slaughter Klink Ortiz Spratt Stark LaFalce Orton Lantos Owens Stenholm Levin Pallone Stockman Lewis (GA) Pastor Studds Lincoln Payne (NJ) Stupak Lipinski Payne (VA) Tanner Pelosi Taylor (MS) Lofgren Peterson (FL) Luther Tejeda Petri Thompson Manton Pickett Thornton Thurman Torkildsen Martinez Pomerov Mascara Poshard Matsui Rahall Torres McCarthy Rangel Towns Velazquez McDermott Reed McHale Richardson Vento Visclosky McNulty Rivers Meehan Volkmer Roemer Meek Roybal-Allard Ward Menendez Saho Waters Miller (CA) Sanders Watt (NC) Sawyer Waxman Schroeder Mink Wise Moakley Scott Woolsey Sensenbrenner Mollohan Wynn Moran Serrano Yates Nadler Skaggs Zimmer

NOT VOTING—19

Brown (FL) Harman Riggs Rose Jackson-Lee Bryant (TX) Chapman Collins (IL) (TX) McKinney Roth Rush Dicks Myers Stokes Furse Gephardt Neal Wilson Radanovich

□ 1306

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Riggs for, with Mrs. Collins of Illinois against.

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION MEMBER AS COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON) laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, DC, February 28, 1996.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH, Speaker of the House,

The Capitol, Washington DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby resign from the House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

Sincerely.

GENE TAYLOR, Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Agriculture:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, Washington, DC, February 28, 1996. Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,

Speaker of the House of Representatives, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I would like to inform you that I am resigning from my committee assignment on the House Agriculture Committee.

Thank you very much. Sincerely,

CYNTHIA MCKINNEY,

NITHIA MCKINNEY,

Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO SUNDRY STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 367) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 367

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and they are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

To the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Tom Sawyer of Ohio, Gene Taylor of Mississippi;

To the Committee on Science, Harold Volkmer of Missouri, to rank directly below Mr. Brown of California; Bart Gordon of Tennessee, to rank directly below Mr. Hall of Texas:

To the Committee on International Relations, Charlie Rose of North Carolina, Pat Danner of Missouri;

To the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, Cynthia McKinney of Georgia.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENT TO OFFER ON TOMORROW A MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFERES ON H.R. 956, COMMONSENSE PRODUCT LIABILITY AND LEGAL REFORM ACT OF 1995

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to rule XXVIII, I hereby announce my intention to offer a motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 956 tomorrow.

truct conferees on H.R. 956 tomorrow. The form of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Conyers moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 956 be instructed to insist upon the provisions contained in section 107 of the House bill.

ORDER OF AMENDMENTS ON H.R. 2854, AGRICULTURAL MARKET TRANSITION ACT

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment, which is in order to be the fourth amendment to the farm bill, H.R. 2854, be in order instead after the Solomon-Dooley amendment.

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

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] and I have discussed this at length. I think the gentleman has made a very reasonable request.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURAL MARKET TRANSITION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 366 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2854.

□ 1310

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2854) to modify the operation of certain agricultural programs, with Mr. YOUNG of Florida in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] each will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS].

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

Mr. Chairman, at long last the House of Representatives will now consider a farm bill, and in this regard I would like to make some commentary as to the reasons why we on the Republican side adopted the policy approach that we have.

In that regard I think, unfortunately, during most of the debate in this regard to this year's farm bill, much of the rhetoric has ignored several basic facts. There are dramatic changes taking place that involve U.S. agriculture. Farmers are competing for increased demand in a growing global market-place.

The Congress is serious, finally, about a balanced budget. The political climate will not permit any rubberstamped acceptance of status quo policies in agriculture or anywhere else. Farmers and ranchers know, boy do they know, the current farm program is outdated and in need of reform.

So the question is, what kind of policy takes these givens into account and makes sense? After conducting 19 hearings, traveling over 60,000 miles, and listening to over 10,000 farmers and ranchers, agribusiness men and women, and many others involved in agriculture, this is what farm country told us: One, they are sick and tired of regulatory overkill and demand regulatory

reform; two, they strongly support a balanced budget. They know a balanced budget will save agriculture and farmers and ranchers \$15 billion in lower production costs. They also requested a consistent and aggressive export program, and they want more flexibility and ability to respond to market signals and to make their own financial decisions.

So taking all of these points into account, we have proposed an innovative approach to farm program policy. It has received the most debate of any farm program proposal in modern history. It was originally called freedom to farm, and is now before us as the Agricultural Market Transition Act.

Let me explain the policy rationale. The original New Deal farm programs over 60 years ago were based on principles of supply management. If you control supply, you raise prices. Over the last 20 years, the principal justification for the programs has been that farmers received Federal assistance in return for setting aside a portion of their wherewithal, that is, their acreage.

□ 1315

That assistance was largely in the form of something we called deficiency payments to compensate farmers for prices below a Government-set target price for their production. Today, unfortunately, that system has collapsed as an effective way to deliver assistance to farmers.

Worldwide agricultural competition takes our markets when we reduce production. The more we set aside, the more our competitors overseas simply increase their production by more than we set aside. They steal our market share. In short, the supply management rationale not only fails under close scrutiny by the many critics of ag policy, it has enabled our competitors to increase their production and we lose the market share.

As I have indicated, the Freedom to Farm Act, Agriculture Market Transition Act, was born of an effort to create a new farm policy from an entirely new perspective. Acknowledging that budget cuts were inevitable, that we must meet our budget responsibilities, freedom to farm set up new goals and new criteria for farm policy.

No. 1, get the Government out of farmers' fields. No longer do you put the seed in the ground to protect your acreage base to receive a Government subsidy. Return to farmers the ability to produce for the markets, not the Government programs. And to provide a predictable and guaranteed phasing down of Federal financial assistance.

By removing Government controls on land use, freedom to farm effectively eliminates the No. 1 complaint of farmers about the programs: bureaucratic redtape, paperwork, all of the regulations and the Government interference. Endless waits at the county ASCS office or the SCS office will end. Hassles over field sizes, whether the right crop