

September 15, 1996 to implement the Conservation Reserve Program which was amended by the FAIR Act. Producers and landowners in many parts of the country are wondering what the parameters of the new program will be and this provision will spur the Department on to work out the new regulations in a timely fashion.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3900 which requires the USDA to publish its regulations governing the Conservation Reserve Program by September 1, 1996. Since its inception in 1985, the CRP has been a valuable tool for America's farmers. The CRP allows producers to protect fragile, highly erodible land from further deterioration by signing contracts to remove the land from production and place it under a managed conservation practice in exchange for fixed annual payments. While the CRP has achieved considerable reductions in wind erosion, it also provides excellent wildlife habitat for pheasants, quail, and other animals that inhabit the American plains.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that the regulations governing the future of the CRP have been repeatedly delayed by the USDA. Farmers need to know all of the details of the Federal agricultural policies that affect their ability to make commonsense farm management and production decisions. For weeks I have been hopeful that the USDA would issue its policy guidelines regarding the future of the CRP so that farmers could have full knowledge of the rules that will govern their program participation before they signed up for the 7-year farm program.

Unfortunately, in the more than 3 months that have passed since the new farm bill was enacted, USDA has provided only the barest of details. While the USDA has allowed CRP contract holders to extend their contracts for an additional year, farmers have no certainty regarding the long-term future of the CRP. With the world currently experiencing a grain supply shortage, many farmers worry that the CRP will be abandoned completely. At the same time, others worry that continuing to extend the CRP on a year-to-year basis discourages farmers from doing what they do best—feed a hungry and troubled world.

Mr. Speaker, farmers need long-term guidance from the USDA so they can make crucial production decisions. The new farm bill required that the USDA publish its CRP regulations within 90 days of passage—they are already 2 weeks past that deadline. With farmers already preparing to plant next year's wheat crop this fall, it is important that they know what the CRP rules will be both for next year and for the years to come.

The CRP debate has dragged on for long enough. America's farmers deserved an answer long before now. They should not have to wait any longer.

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

□ 1315

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3900

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

Sec. 1 Increased Planting Flexibility.—Section 118 of the Agricultural Market Transition Act (7 U.S.C. 7218) is amended by adding the following new paragraph to subsection (b)(2):

“(D) by a producer on contract acreage following a crop that fails due to conditions beyond the producer's control.”.

Sec. 2. Conforming Amendment.—Subsection 118(b)(2) is amended:

(a) in paragraph (B), by striking “or”; and  
(b) in clause (ii) of paragraph (C), by striking “vegetable.” and inserting “vegetable; or”.

Sec. 3. Conservation Reserve Program Regulations.—Not later than September 15, 1996, the Secretary shall issue regulations to implement the Conservation Reserve Program (16 U.S.C. 3831 et seq.), as amended by section 332 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (Pub. L. 104-127, April 4, 1996).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COMBEST

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TORKILDSEN). The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COMBEST:

On page 2 Line 7 strike “in” and insert “at the end of”.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I would just mention this is strictly technical. It is to further clarify in the amendment a misinterpretation that had been earlier made, and it is purely technical and clarifying in nature.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBEST].

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3900.

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

There was no objection.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 488.

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

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

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

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

[Ms. DELAURO addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. BURTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. SCHROEDER addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. RIGGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### STATUS REPORT ON THE CURRENT LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997 AND FOR THE 5-YEAR PERIOD FISCAL YEAR 1997 THRU FISCAL YEAR 2001

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

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, to facilitate application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, I am transmitting a status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 1997 and for the 5-year period fiscal year 1997 through fiscal year 2001.

The term “current level” refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature as of July 22, 1996.

The first table in the report compares the current level of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues with the aggregate levels set by House Concurrent Resolution 178, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1997. These levels are consistent with the recent revisions made pursuant to section 606(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as amended by the Contract with America Advancement Act—Public Law 204-121—which provides additional new budget authority

and outlays to pay for continuing disability reviews. This comparison is needed to implement section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for years after fiscal year 1997 because appropriations for those years have not yet been considered.

The second table compares the current levels of budget authority, outlays, and new entitlement authority of each direct spending committee with the section 602(a) allocations for discretionary action made under House Concurrent Resolution 178 for fiscal year 1997 and for fiscal years 1997 through 2001. Discretionary action refers to legislation enacted after adoption of the budget resolution. This comparison is needed to implement section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the section 602(a) discretionary action allocation of new budget authority or entitlement authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

The third table compares the current levels of discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 1996 with the revised section 602(b) suballocations of discretionary budget authority

and outlays among appropriations subcommittees. This comparison is also needed to implement section 302(f) of the Budget Act, because the point of order under that section also applies to measures that would breach the applicable section 602(b) suballocation. The revised section 602(b) suballocations were filed by the Appropriations Committee on July 12, 1996.

#### REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

#### STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 1997 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 178

#### REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF JULY 22, 1996

[On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1997	Fiscal year 1997–2001
Appropriate level (as set by H. Con. Res. 178):		
Budget authority .....	1,314,785	6,956,507
Outlays .....	1,311,171	6,898,627
Revenues .....	1,083,728	5,913,303
Current level:		
Budget authority .....	833,332	NA
Outlays .....	1,024,830	NA
Revenues .....	1,100,340	5,970,883
Current level over (+)/ under (–) appropriate level:		
Budget Authority .....	–481,453	NA
Outlays .....	–286,341	NA
Revenues .....	16,612	57,580

NA=Not applicable because annual appropriations act for fiscal years 1998 through 2001 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

#### BUDGET AUTHORITY

Enactment of measures providing any new budget authority for FY 1997 in excess of \$481,453,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 1997 budget authority to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 178.

#### OUTLAYS

Enactment of measures providing any new budget or entitlement authority that would increase FY 1997 outlays in excess of \$286,341,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 1997 outlays to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 178.

#### REVENUES

Enactment of any measure that would result in a revenue loss in excess of \$16,612,000,000 in FY 1997 (if not already included in the current level estimate) or in excess of \$57,580,000,000 for FY 1997 through 2001 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to be less than the recommended levels of revenue set by H. Con. Res. 178.

#### DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH SUBALLOCATIONS PURSUANT TO BUDGET ACT SECTION 602(b)

[In millions of dollars]

	Revised 602(b) suballocations (July 12, 1996)				Current level reflecting action completed (July 22, 1996)				Difference			
	General purpose		Violent crime		General purpose		Violent crime		General purpose		Violent crime	
	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O
Agriculture, Rural Development .....	12,802	13,349	0	0	0	3,853	0	0	12,802	9,496	0	0
Commerce, Justice, State .....	24,493	24,939	4,525	2,951	0	6,451	0	1,477	24,493	18,488	4,525	1,474
Defense .....	245,065	243,372	0	0	0	80,745	0	0	245,065	162,627	0	0
District of Columbia .....	718	718	0	0	0	0	0	0	718	718	0	0
Energy & Water Development .....	19,418	19,652	0	0	0	6,833	0	0	19,418	12,819	0	0
Foreign Operations .....	11,950	13,311	0	0	72	8,253	0	0	11,878	5,058	0	0
Interior .....	12,118	12,920	0	0	138	4,855	0	0	11,980	8,065	0	0
Labor, HHS & Education .....	65,625	69,602	61	38	1,858	40,615	0	20	63,767	28,987	61	18
Legislative Branch .....	2,188	2,179	0	0	0	214	0	0	2,188	1,965	0	0
Military Construction .....	10,033	10,430	0	0	0	7,204	0	0	10,033	3,226	0	0
Transportation .....	12,190	35,453	0	0	0	23,785	0	0	12,190	11,668	0	0
Treasury-Postal Service .....	11,016	10,971	97	84	0	2,381	0	9	11,016	8,590	97	75
VA-HUD-Independent Agencies .....	64,354	78,803	0	0	365	47,492	0	0	63,989	31,311	0	0
Reserve .....	722	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	722	0	0	0
Grand total .....	492,692	535,699	4,683	3,073	2,433	232,681	0	1,506	490,259	303,018	4,683	1,567

#### DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS PURSUANT TO BUDGET ACT SECTION 602(a) REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF JULY 22, 1996

[Fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

House committee	1997			1997–2001		
	BA	Outlays	NEA	BA	Outlays	NEA
Agriculture:						
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0	0	4,996
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0	0	–4,996
National Security:						
Allocation .....	–1,579	–1,579	0	–664	–664	0
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	1,579	1,579	0	664	664	0
Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs:						
Allocation .....	–128	–3,700	0	–711	–4,004	0
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	128	3,700	0	711	4,004	0
Economic and Educational Opportunities:						
Allocation .....	–912	–800	–152	–3,465	–3,153	7,669
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	912	800	152	3,465	3,153	–7,669
Commerce:						
Allocation .....	0	0	370	–14,540	–14,540	–41,710
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	–370	14,540	14,540	41,710
International Relations:						
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Government Reform and Oversight:						
Allocation .....	–1,078	–1,078	–289	–4,605	–4,605	–1,668
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	1,078	1,078	289	4,605	4,605	1,668
House Oversight:						
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0	0	0

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS PURSUANT TO BUDGET ACT SECTION 602(a) REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF JULY 22, 1996—Continued

[Fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

House committee	1997			1997–2001		
	BA	Outlays	NEA	BA	Outlays	NEA
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Resources:						
Allocation .....	–91	–90	–12	–1,401	–1,460	–59
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	91	90	12	1,401	1,460	59
Judiciary:						
Allocation .....	0	0	0	–357	–357	0
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	357	357	0
Transportation and Infrastructure:						
Allocation .....	2,280	0	0	125,989	521	2
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	–2,280	0	0	–125,989	–521	–2
Science:						
Allocation .....	0	0	0	–13	–13	0
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	13	13	0
Small Business:						
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Veterans' Affairs:						
Allocation .....	–90	–90	224	–919	–919	3,475
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	90	90	–224	919	919	–3,475
Ways and Means:						
Allocation .....	–8,973	–9,132	–2,057	–134,211	–134,618	–10,743
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	8,973	9,132	2,057	134,211	134,618	10,743
Unassigned:						
Allocation .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total authorized:						
Allocation .....	–10,571	–16,469	–1,916	–34,897	–168,812	–38,038
Current Level .....	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference .....	10,571	16,469	1,916	34,897	163,812	38,038

U.S. CONGRESS,  
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,  
Washington, DC, July 22, 1996.

Hon. JOHN KASICH,  
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, this letter and supporting detail provide an up-to-date tabulation of the on-budget current levels of new budget authority, estimated outlays, and estimated revenues for fiscal year 1997. These estimates are compared to the appropriate levels for those items contained in the 1997 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget (H. Con. Res. 178), and are current through July 18, 1996. A summary of this tabulation, my first for fiscal year 1997, follows:

[In millions of dollars]

	House current level	Budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 178)	Current level +/- resolution
Budget authority .....	833,322	1,314,785	–481,453
Outlays .....	1,024,830	1,311,171	–286,341
Revenues:			
1997 .....	1,110,340	1,083,728	+16,612
1997–2001 .....	5,970,883	5,913,303	+57,580

Sincerely,

JUNE E. O'NEILL,  
Director.

PARLIAMENTARIAN STATUS REPORT, 104TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION, HOUSE ON-BUDGET SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997—AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS JULY 18, 1996

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	outlays	revenues
Previously enacted			
Revenues .....			1,100,355
Permanent and other spending legislation .....	843,212	804,226	
Appropriation legislation .....		238,523	
Offsetting receipts .....	–199,772	–199,772	

PARLIAMENTARIAN STATUS REPORT, 104TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION, HOUSE ON-BUDGET SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997—AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS JULY 18, 1996—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	outlays	revenues
Previously enacted			
Total previously enacted .....	643,440	842,977	1,100,355
Enacted this session			
Taxpayer Bill of Rights 2 (H.R. 2337) .....			–15
Appropriated entitlements and mandatories			
Budget resolution baseline estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs not yet enacted .....	189,892	181,853	
Total current level <sup>1</sup> .....	833,332	1,024,830	1,100,340
Total budget resolution .....	1,314,785	1,311,171	1,083,728
Amount remaining:			
Under budget resolution .....	481,453	286,341	
Over budget resolution .....			–16,612

<sup>1</sup> In accordance with the Budget Enforcement Act, the total does not include \$34 million in outlays for funding of emergencies that have been designated as such by the President and the Congress.

## CAMPAIGN REFORM

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

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak today in the more dispassionate time of special orders, and one day following the vote on campaign finance reform, to talk about campaign finance reform and what the future is. I am not particularly interested in getting into a partisan dispute today.

I think that it was worthwhile defeating the bill yesterday which put more money into politics, it did not take money out, but that was yesterday. Let us talk about some of the very

real factors that are affecting campaign finance reform, and some of the difficulties in crafting a bill that deals not only with candidates but the overall issue of campaign finance reform.

First of all we had the Buckley versus Vallejo decision by the U.S. Supreme Court in the 1970's, which began a trail of decisions or started a line of decisions which effectively says that expenditure of money is the equivalent of speech; that as someone has the ability to say anything they want, if money enhances or permits them to say that, they can then expend that money.

So free speech and expenditure of money begin to be equated as the same. That is, I think, a disturbing trend, but that is a judicial decision.

So first of all we have that case, and what that then did effectively say, that we could not limit how much an individual could spend in their own campaign. If we have a billionaire, that billionaire can spend a billion dollars, if they want, of their own money for their own campaign. We can limit how much somebody can contribute to that person. We cannot limit how much that person can spend themselves.

The second major decision occurred only a couple of weeks ago, in which the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that political parties cannot be limited in how much they can spend for independent expenditures on behalf of their candidates. Let me give my colleagues an example: