

House by voice vote on June 4. The Senate unanimously passed Senate Concurrent Resolution 63 on June 5. The Senate resolution is identical to the House resolution, as amended.

With this action today, we will officially send to Agriculture Secretary Dan Glickman our desire for him to immediately release the 45 million bushels of feed grains held in reserve. The release of this grain will not solve the current crisis for cattlefeeders, but it will help and possibly be enough to get some through an extremely severe drought and save their operations.

Farmers who own livestock are being severely hard hit with the drought conditions, when coupled with a low point in the cattle cycle, and record high grain prices.

The grain in this disaster reserve, nearly 45 million bushels, is worth an estimated \$200 million and would provide for all the cattle on feed in the affected States enough feed grain for over 2 weeks.

Passage of the resolution not only makes sense, it saves money. The Federal Government is currently spending \$10 million a year to store this grain.

The Government should not be paying huge storage fees and holding grain from the marketplace when the United States is experiencing record low grain supplies.

This is an important concurrent resolution and I thank the leadership for providing for its swift consideration.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 63, which is nearly identical to the legislation passed by this body last week, House Concurrent Resolution 181, introduced by my colleagues on the Agriculture Committee, Mr. BARRETT and Mr. EMERSON, and cosponsored by a number of other Members.

As was noted last week, the Clinton administration has been working on a similar effort to make Government-owned feed grain stocks available to hard-pressed livestock producers. Secretary Glickman transmitted to the President a request last week for the declaration of a state of emergency to allow the Department of Agriculture to dispose of the feed grain stocks under USDA's control.

There is no doubt that there is a need to alleviate the stress facing producers in many parts of this country due to the severe drought in the Southern Plains and flooding and excessive rainfall in the Northern Plains and eastern Corn Belt. These natural disasters come at a time when grain stocks are at their lowest levels in decades causing record market prices and cattle producers are receiving even less for their animals than during the Great Depression based on inflation-adjusted dollars.

The release of this grain would be in addition to the actions already taken by the Clinton administration to help alleviate the stress in the livestock sector. These actions include: Release of Conservation Reserve Program

acres for haying and grazing, extension of noninsured crop disaster assistance program coverage, extension of the Livestock Feed Program, the release of additional funds for emergency loans, advance purchases of beef for the school lunch program, and export credit guarantees for meat.

In my own State of Texas we are facing losses in the livestock and crop sectors in the billions of dollars. Sixty-two percent of our rangeland is rated as being in poor to very poor condition and dairy producers in Texas are facing a possible doubling of their normal feed costs due to the increases in the cost of feed and hay they must utilize to produce milk each day.

I would encourage my colleagues to support this resolution. The livestock sector in our country contributes billions of dollars to our economy and if we do not take actions to help stem the liquidation of herds now, we will pay the price later for rebuilding that infrastructure.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAZIO of New York). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 63

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF DISASTER RESERVE FOR ASSISTANCE TO LIVESTOCK PRODUCERS.

In light of the prolonged drought and other adverse weather conditions existing in certain areas of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture should promptly dispose of all commodities in the disaster reserve maintained under section 813 of the Agricultural Act of 1970 (7 U.S.C. 1427a) to relieve the distress of livestock producers whose ability to maintain livestock is adversely affected by disaster conditions, such as prolonged drought or flooding.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on Senate Concurrent Resolution 63.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on further consideration of H.R. 3603, and that I may include tabular and extra-neous material.

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

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 451 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3603.

□ 1105

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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3603) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, with Mr. LINDER, Chairman pro tempore, in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole House rose on Tuesday, June 11, 1996, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] had been disposed of and page 58, line 1 though page 68 line 22 was open for amendment at any point.

Are there further amendments to this portion of the bill?

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to enter into a brief colloquy with the gentlewoman from Ohio, if that would be possible.

Being a farmer-rancher by trade back in Oklahoma, I am particularly sensitive about the nature of the farm bill and appropriation bills or any other pieces of legislation that might have an impact on rural American production in agriculture. If I could, I would ask of the gentlewoman, it is my understanding that her provision in this appropriation bill does not impose any new requirements or provisions beyond those in the farm bill; is that correct?

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I would simply state to the gentleman that that is correct. The amount that was included in our bill was passed unanimously by our subcommittee. It was also passed in full committee and its intention is that the transition subsidy payments would require that farmers be engaged in the production of commodities or conserving purposes in order to receive assistance.

So the answer to the gentleman's question is yes.

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her reassurance that her language or provision does not impose any new requirement on producers beyond those in the farm bill.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding to me. As a farmer myself, I have some real concerns also with this provision in the appropriations bill and I would like to ask the gentlewoman, if a farmer maintains his land in agricultural use or conserving use, he will maintain his eligibility for production flexibility contract without any additional reporting or other requirement; is that correct?

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, that is correct. The Secretary of Agriculture will administer the program under the requirements of the production flexibility contracts as contained in the act.

Mr. LATHAM. So there will not be any additional reporting or other requirements?

Ms. KAPTUR. No. The farmers have to go into the local farm service agencies anyway to sign these contracts, and that is the procedure that will be used in this.

I think maybe it is important also just to place on the record, so Members understand what is going on here, there was somewhat of an omission in the original bill when it passed the House originally in that the conference report stated that farmers were really not required to plant a crop to qualify for a farm payment. The intention of this is not to reward investors but to reward farmers and ranchers who are actually doing the work of agriculture in this country.

We also recognized the need for conservation and conserving uses, and we do make exceptions in the bill for weather. We cannot control drought or flooding or serious weather situations. So we are not after changing the requirements when they go into the farm service agency. We are just wanting to make sure these transition payments are going to farmers who are actually doing the work.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman, and I assume conserving use means if land were to lay fallow, as is often used for resting land and things like that.

Ms. KAPTUR. It has to have a crop cover. In other words, there is a lot of land out there that needs to replenish itself with additional moisture and so forth. We have severe problems in many parts of our country, we understand those needs, but we want the land ultimately to be used for livestock. We want it to be used for cash crops, vegetable crops, whatever. We just do not want to reward investors.

We have gotten some letters from the gentleman's part of the country, for example, from tenant farmers who have had their contracts cut off for this next fiscal year because the investors who own the land can actually make more money by getting the payments from USDA than if, in fact, they had raised a herd or grown a crop. We want to pre-

vent any abuse like that and really reward the people who are doing the work. That is the purpose of the language.

I think both gentlemen, being respected ranchers and farmers in their own States, understand those who may try to cash in on a program like this, and I know that is not his intention in any way.

Mr. LATHAM. And I appreciate the gentlewoman's response. She is aware that like a corn farmer in Ohio would get about \$30 an acre and they probably would not even cover the property taxes, and farmers are farmers because they want to produce. I really do not know if the economics bear out the gentleman's concern here because I do not think anyone is going to let their land sit without production, but I appreciate the gentlewoman's response.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there further amendments to this portion of the bill which are not limitation amendments?

If not, the Clerk will read the last paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 733. Funds appropriated to the Department of Agriculture may be used for incidental expenses such as transportation, uniforms, lodging, and subsistence for volunteers serving under the authority of 7 U.S.C. 2272, when such volunteers are engaged in the work of the U.S. Department of Agriculture; and for promotional items of nominal value relating to the U.S. Department of Agriculture Volunteer Programs.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DEFAZIO

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DEFAZIO: At the end of the bill (page 69, after line 5), insert the following new section:

SEC. . (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for predator control efforts under the Animal Damage Control Program in the western region of the United States, except when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that the control efforts protect human health or safety or endangered or threatened species.

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION IN FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided by this Act for salaries and expenses with respect to the Animal Damage Control Program under the heading "ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE" is hereby reduced by \$13,400,000.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 30 minutes and that the time be equally divided.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] seek time in opposition?

Mr. SKEEN. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I do.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO] and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] will each be recognized for 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

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

This is a simple amendment before the House. It is to eliminate an anachronistic, expensive, ineffective subsidy to a selected few livestock producers in the western United States. It does not prevent, and I want people to listen up, because there is some misinformation out there, it does not prevent the animal damage control from acting in cases that would affect human health or safety. That would be rabid animals or animals that are encroaching upon human habitation, problem animals or rogue animals.

It does not eliminate controls that would deal with the safety of endangered or threatened species. It does not prevent any private individual, any private livestock producer or any other private individual, any county, or any State from expending their own funds under Federal law to control predators and other problem creatures. It does not prevent control of birds, insects for crop damage or safety at airports.

What it does is eliminate \$13.4 million from the budget that is now spent on an indiscriminate and ineffective predator control program, a subsidy provided by Federal taxpayers to some, a few, private livestock producers in the western United States.

□ 1115

If the issue were the real problems affecting the livestock industry in this country, the money would be better spent. The statistics for 1995, national statistics gathered by the Agriculture Department, 3 percent of the livestock losses in the United States were due to predators, 11 percent due to weather, 17 percent due to calving problems, 27 percent due to respiratory problems, and 25 percent due to digestive problems.

Mr. Chairman, if we want to subsidize this industry, we would be better put to spend the Federal dollars solving the digestive problems of livestock or the respiratory problems, the calving problems, or solving the weather problem. But that would involve a government program, which of course we would not want to have.

So, what we are suggesting here is we need to eliminate the subsidy, cut back this ineffective and indiscriminate problem, and to restore some natural order to the ecosystem of the Western United States.

Mr. Chairman, in many cases when they go in and attempt to control coyotes, there are more now than when this program started in 1931. It actually increases the birth rate of the coyotes and spreads them over a larger area. So inadvertently, this program over time has wrought devastation in

terms of killing a whole lot of nontarget species, and even target species, but it has not been effective as a predator control 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 in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. This amendment would have a far more devastating effect than I believe the gentleman intends it to have.

The amendment would not only prohibit predator control efforts in the western region of the United States, but because of the 50-percent funding reduction to the program, it would also negatively impact work related to protecting the health and safety of the people of this country.

The total funding for the program is \$26.8 million nationwide. Approximately 30 percent of this funding or about \$8 million, is spent on predator control to protect livestock across the country. Less than \$8 million is spent in the western region. Reducing the program by \$13.4 million will mean significant reductions to work conducted at airports to prevent wildlife-aircraft strikes; disease control work such as rabies in south Texas; brown tree snake management; and blackbird control.

This reduction would also impact the cooperative agreements for ADC activities USDA has with all 50 States. States contribute over \$22 million of State funds for ADC related work.

I do not think the gentleman from Oregon's intention is to impact the assistance provided to the Eugene Airport to reduce the threat of bird strikes to aircraft or the cooperative agreement ADC has with private timber companies to reduce black bear damage to timber resources in his own State, which is what this amendment would do if it passed.

I strongly urge all Members to vote no on this amendment. This amendment has a far more devastating impact on ADC activities across the country. It is not limited to the predator control activities in the western region alone.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I was a county commissioner when we were in tough budget times, and despite the Federal share, we eliminated the Animal Damage Control Program in a county as large as the State of Connecticut with an extensive livestock industry, and we heard that there was going to be cataclysm, all of these deaths were going to occur of the livestock.

Mr. Chairman, know what happened? Nothing. Nothing. There were no additional deaths in the livestock, the sheep, or the cattle industry, in a county the size of Connecticut, when we did away with this program with its indiscriminate killing of predators. In fact,

it reduced other pest species such as rodents and things which the coyotes primarily prey upon.

The gentleman talked about human health and safety. There is a line item in the ADC budget for human health and safety. If that line item at \$3,197,040 is inadequate, then I would certainly join with the gentleman in a unanimous-consent request to shift some of the funds into that line item. But it has its own line item. This is only the livestock line item that is affected here.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO] a couple of questions. I heard his opening statement. Am I to understand that only 3 percent of the animal damage is predator and so 97 percent is nonpredator-related, and that we are, in fact, doing a government subsidy for just this 3 percent?

It seems to me we might be able to put that money to better use in doing some other research. The gentleman pointed out that it is animal disease that is generally what kills the creatures.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, yes, the Department of Agriculture's own statistics for 1995 show that 97 percent of the mortality was due to causes other than predation, the largest being respiratory problems, 27 percent; second largest, digestive; third largest, calving problems.

Perhaps if we applied more money to research in these areas there would be greater gains. But we have had this animal predator control program since 1931, and we have today more coyotes in the United States than when they started the program but they are more dispersed, and there are other problems that have been a consequence, particularly inadvertent kills of nontarget species.

Mr. Chairman, I had a constituent whose dog was killed, and when she ran to rescue the dog who had gotten into one of those M44 explosive devices, she also had a cyanide poisoning.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, could I ask a couple of other questions? Would the gentleman's amendment affect bird damage for small fruits or berries or that sort of thing? Would it have an effect on that?

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, no, I do not touch the \$3,463,460 for crop control.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO]. It seems to be that at a time when we are cutting back very much on agricultural support and our farmers are in deep need, that this may be one of those places where we could perhaps save and put it into other areas where our farmers are certainly being strapped financially.

Mr. Chairman, I know there are huge cuts in this agricultural bill, and maybe this would be a place we could save some money for farmers across the country; not just a small subsidy for some western farmers.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LINDER). The Committee will rise informally.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONILLA) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House and Senate of the following titles:

HOUSE

March 7, 1996:

H.R. 2196. An act to amend the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 with respect to inventions made under cooperative research and development agreements, and for other purposes.

March 12, 1996:

H.R. 927. An act to seek international sanctions against the Castro government in Cuba, to plan for support of a transition government leading to a democratically elected government in Cuba, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3021. An act to guarantee the continuing full investment of Social Security and other Federal funds in obligations of the United States.

March 15, 1996:

H.J. Res. 163. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes.

March 16, 1996:

H.R. 2778. An act to provide that members of the Armed Forces performing services for the peacekeeping efforts in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, and Macedonia shall be entitled to tax benefits in the same manner as if such services were performed in a combat zone, and for other purposes.

March 22, 1996:

H.J. Res. 165. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes.

March 26, 1996:

H.R. 2036. An act to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to make certain adjustments in the land disposal program to provide needed flexibility, and for other purposes.

March 29, 1996:

H.J. Res. 170. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3136. An act to provide for enactment for the Senior Citizens' Right to work Act of 1996, the Line Item Veto Act, and the Small Business Growth and Fairness Act of 1996, and to provide for a permanent increase in the public debt limit.

April 1, 1996:

H.J. Res. 78. Joint resolution to grant the consent of the Congress to certain additional powers conferred upon the Bi-State Development Agency by the States of Missouri and Illinois.

H.R. 1266. An act to provide for the exchange of lands within Admiralty Island National Monument, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1787. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to repeal the saccharin notice requirement.