

State welfare program, administrative costs rose 72 percent. Wisconsin Governor Thompson himself said that for welfare reform to be successful, "It will cost more up front to transfer the welfare system than many expect."

For welfare reform to succeed, it also takes jobs. Wisconsin and Michigan learned this lesson the hard way. In Wisconsin, a trucking company praised by Governor Thompson and Presidential candidate Bob Dole for hiring welfare recipients, laid off 45 employees this week, including the welfare workers. It was a business slowdown they said.

In Michigan, only one-fifth of former general relief recipients have found jobs. The majority of beneficiaries have become even more destitute.

So it goes when social experiments go wrong. The Republican majority is prepared to push welfare families off the cliff in the hope that they'll learn to fly. And what happens if they fall? Nearly 9 million children, who make up the majority of AFDC recipients, will pay the price. Nine million children, and the majority of AFDC recipients will pay the price. And as a society, so will we.

This is not just theory—the Congressional Budget Office agrees. They recently issued a preliminary assessment of the Republican legislation. And like last year, they said it will not work. According to their study, most States will not even attempt to implement the legislation's work requirements, because putting people to work is too expensive. In fact, the report says States will fall \$13 billion short of the mark, and simply throw up their hands.

Nevertheless, the Republicans continue to defy the facts.

We have had, as I mentioned, church leaders, conservative columnists, those who have spoken and written about the various welfare reform programs with extraordinary credibility—the Congressional Budget Office taking the particular relevant facts—all reaching the same conclusion, that this is going to be an extraordinary disaster in its impact on poor children. Like last year, they said it will not work. Nevertheless, the majority continues to defy the facts.

They insist that this legislation is about putting people to work. Trust us, they say. That is not acceptable.

As Catholic Charities USA said in a recent letter: "The welfare proposal reflects ignorance and prejudice far more than the experience of this nation's poorest working and welfare families."

In the final analysis, that is what this legislation is about—ignorance and prejudice. The American people know that pulling the rug out from under struggling families is wrong. Denying health care for sick or disabled children is wrong. Keeping families trapped in poverty and violence is wrong. Condemning homeless children to cold grates is wrong.

Perhaps the greatest irony of all is now on display, as America hosts the

Olympic Games. We justifiably take pride in being the best in a variety of different events. We may well win a fist full of golds in Atlanta, but America is not winning any medals when it comes to caring for our children.

The United States has more children living in poverty and spends less of its wealth on children than 16 out of the 18 industrial countries in the world. The United States has a larger gap between rich and poor children than any other industrial nation in the world. Children in the United States are 1.6 times more likely to be poor than Canadian children, 2 times more likely to be poor than British children, and 3 times more likely to be poor than French or German children.

When it comes to our children, America should go for the gold.

Mr. President, not that just assigning resources, money, on this is necessarily the answer to all the problems. But it is a pretty good reflection of where the Nation's priorities are. When the bell tolls tomorrow afternoon on that measure that is going to cut back \$27 billion out of children's feeding programs, to move that payment from 88 cents to 65 cents, that is going to be a really clear indication about where the majority believes this Nation's priorities are—to use those savings for tax breaks for the wealthy individuals of this country. That is wrong. We should all take some time to think about what kind of country we want and about what we are doing to children, to ourselves and the Nation. Surely we can do better than this bad bill.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. I see our two floor managers. I appreciate their courtesy.

Mr. COCHRAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

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

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

CURRENT EFFORTS TO PROTECT SALMON HABITAT

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I rise to take note and compliment the Natural Resources Conservation Service's current efforts to encourage and provide technical assistance to private landowners who have salmon habitat on their property. In coordination with the Northwest Power Planning Council's plan for fish and wildlife protection, and other Federal agencies, the NRCS is working with conservation districts across Idaho, Oregon and Washington to assist local property owners on basin-wide and watershed specific plans to protect and restore habitat for dwindling runs for coho salmon, steelhead, sea-run cutthroat, and many chinook salmon runs.

These efforts have been widely popular in my home State, in particular in

the Clearwater and Lemhi Valleys where local landowners appreciate having the support to take the initiative to preserve this important cultural and economic resource. Conservation districts have proven to be a most effective method to successfully involve all important local stakeholders in a mutually acceptable way.

Mr. President, it is my intention to commit the Senate to exploring in future legislation the ways in which we might better foster this growing partnership. Would the chairman of the subcommittee agree that this is the sort of incentive approach that merits further consideration?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, the committee agrees that this is the sort of cooperative, incentive-based relationship that should be fostered in order to protect natural resources, as is the goal of the Natural Resources Conservation Service.

YELLOWSTAR THISTLE CONTROL

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. Mr. President, I rise to clarify this Congress' commitment to research that will develop controls for noxious weeds that are problems across this country. In particular, I would like to highlight research being done with the Agricultural Research Service to control yellowstar thistle.

Yellowstar thistle is a problem across the West. Over 5 million acres across the western United States are currently infested with this noxious weed. Scientists at the University of Idaho tell me that it costs an average of \$1 per acre in lost production and costs to control this weed. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure out that we're talking about \$5 million lost annually across the West.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I concur with the remarks of Senator KEMPTHORNE. In addition, I understand that, currently, it is nearly impossible to eradicate yellowstar thistle once it has infected the narrow, arid canyon lands of the West, and in particular, the canyons of the Clearwater, Snake and Salmon Rivers of my home State.

Mr. President, it is my understanding that the research to control this weed is reaching a critical stage, where practical biological controls should be available for public use within the next few years. Is it the intention of this bill to fund research with direct and immediate practical applications for the agricultural industry?

Mr. COCHRAN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KEMPTHORNE. I also noted that the committee specifically directed the ARS to continue funding the Albany, CA yellowstar thistle initiative. Is it the intention of the committee that the ARS continue current yellowstar thistle research contracts associated with that program, including the research efforts with the University of Idaho?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes, it is.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I would like to engage in a colloquy with

the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee to clarify the intent of language included in the committee report providing funding for ongoing research at the Plant Materials Center [PMC] in Golden Meadow, Louisiana, in collaboration with the Crowley Rice Research Station in Crowley, LA; ongoing research on nutria-resistant plant varieties; and funding to test application technologies for recently developed artificial seed for cord grass used to prevent coastal erosion. It is my understanding that it was the committee's intent, in the committee report, to continue the work at the Golden Meadow Plant Materials Center, in collaboration with the Crowley Rice Research Station, on smooth cord grass at the fiscal year 1996 level. In addition, work underway at Crowley on the development of nutria-resistant materials would also continue at the fiscal year 1996 level. Finally, it is also my understanding that the \$100,000 mentioned in the committee report to test application technologies for smooth cord grass seed would be in addition to the funding provided to maintain this ongoing work. Is that the chairman's understanding as well?

Mr. COCHRAN. I appreciate the questions of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, and I am happy to provide further clarification. The Senator is correct in his description of the committee's intent in its report accompanying the bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I appreciate this clarification.

ARS FUNDING FOR INTEGRATED LOW-INPUT CROP AND LIVESTOCK PRODUCTION SYSTEMS AT UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I am pleased that funding is provided through this bill for the ARS Integrated Farming Systems Program, to pursue long-term research on farming systems that integrate livestock and resource enhancing crop rotations—all aimed at answering farmers urgent questions of how to be profitable and farm in environmentally responsible ways. This new initiative, as requested by the President's fiscal year 1997 budget, recognizes expertise in the farming community by building research partnership teams with State researchers, extension agents, farmers, and nongovernmental organizations.

In this regard, Wisconsin has a nationally recognized program, the Wisconsin Integrated cropping systems trial, with long-term research trials and an excellent team of farmers, researchers, extension and nongovernmental groups collaborating to address questions that go right to the heart of the future of farming in the Midwest.

As specified in the committee report accompanying this bill, \$500,000 has been included in this bill to support research through the ARS/IFS Program into integrated low-input crop and livestock production systems, to be carried out at the Wisconsin-Madison Experiment Station. It is my intent and understanding that this funding is to sup-

port the Wisconsin Integrated cropping systems trial. I would ask the Senator from Mississippi, the chairman of the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, if he would concur with me on this matter.

Mr. COCHRAN. I would say to the Senator from Wisconsin that I agree with his comments regarding the ARS/IFS funds provided for the Wisconsin-Madison Experiment Station.

Mr. LEAHY. More than \$1 billion a year in Federal funds is saved by WIC infant formula cost containment allowing over 1.6 million more women, infants and children to receive WIC benefits than would otherwise have been the case. One of the most important factors in the success of the WIC cost containment is competition. Until recently there were four infant formula manufacturers in the United States. In January, one of the four, Wyeth Laboratories announced its withdrawal from the domestic market. Now, alarmingly, a move is beginning among States to alter their competitive bidding procedures in a way that restricts competition and makes it impossible for Carnation to compete. If this third small company, Carnation, can't compete, it ultimately could follow Wyeth out of the market. If that occurs, only the two largest manufacturers, Ross and Mead Johnson will remain, and the prospects for sustaining large savings will be bleak. Without a third company seeking to increase market share by winning WIC contracts, cost containment is not sustainable.

In the past, States typically have awarded their WIC contract to the company whose net wholesale price—the wholesale price minus the rebate per can the company offers to pay the state WIC Program—is the lowest. But recently, a few states instead awarded their contracts to the company that offered the highest rebate per can, regardless of the company's wholesale price.

There is one circumstance where a State may have a legitimate case for awarding a WIC contract on the basis of the highest rebate rather than on the basis of the lowest net wholesale price. This occurs in States where retailers charge about the same price for all formula brands and take a much larger mark-up for Carnation products than for those of the other companies.

This problem can be readily addressed by directing States to award contracts on the basis of the lowest net wholesale price—as most States currently do—rather than on the basis of the biggest rebate, except where the State has reliable data showing that retail prices for different formula brands are similar in the State. In any State where this is the case, the State would retain full flexibility as to the basis on which to award its contract.

In 1990, the GAO wrote:

Because only three firms are responsible for almost all domestic infant formula production, coordination of pricing and marketing strategies between the manufacturers is

always a potential danger. Competitive bidding will successfully yield high rebates only to the extent that infant formula manufacturers act independently. Consequently, efforts to assure competition in the infant formula industry will be an important element in State efforts to maximize cost-containment savings. (GAO, Infant Formula: Cost Containment and Competition in the WIC Program, September 1990.)

This remedy of awarding contracts on a lowest net wholesale price would help avert the loss of hundreds of millions of dollars in cost containment savings and thereby prevent hundreds of thousands of women and children from being dropped from the program. Nearly one of every four WIC participants is served with cost containment savings—and would have to be removed from the program if cost containment collapses.

The Senate, unlike the House, has managed to correct this problem in the Agriculture appropriations bill. Therefore, in conference, it is imperative that the Senate language on WIC cost containment prevail.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I rise today to highlight a provision in the agriculture appropriations bill that I think makes an important improvement to the WIC Program. I want to highlight the importance of this provision with hope that we can maintain it in the conference committee.

The WIC infant formula cost containment program saves more than \$1 billion a year in Federal funds and allows over 1.6 million more women, infants, and children to be served through WIC each month than would otherwise be the case. Nearly one of every four WIC participants is served with cost containment savings and would have to be removed from the program if cost containment collapsed.

There is a danger now developing that threatens to undermine WIC cost containment and we need Federal action to counteract this development. In the past, States typically awarded their WIC contract to the company whose net wholesale price is the lowest. The net wholesale price represents the wholesale price of the product minus the rebate per can the manufacturer will pay the State WIC program. Recently, though, States have begun to award their WIC contracts to the company that offered the highest rebate per can, regardless of the company's wholesale price. A provision contained in this bill requires that States award contracts on the basis of the lowest net wholesale price—as most States currently do—rather than on the basis of the biggest rebate. An exception would exist if the State has reliable data showing that it makes no difference in the cost outcome whether the contract is awarded on the basis of rebate or net wholesale price.

Let me take a few moments to describe to my colleagues the flaws of the rebate methodology. This methodology is faulty for two reasons:

First, it discriminates against a company that charges low wholesale prices.

An industry heavyweight can sell the product for, say \$2.50 per can and then give the State a rebate of \$2.00 per can of formula. Under that scenario, the net wholesale price to the program is 50 cents per can of infant formula. A smaller company, on the other hand, may not be able to demand as high a retail price and they may charge only \$1.95 per can of formula. At a \$1.95 retail, the smaller company can't begin to compete on the basis of rebate, they'd be losing money on every can of formula. What the company could do is offer a rebate of \$1.50, setting the net wholesale price at 45 cents per can. Ultimately the smaller company will save the WIC Program a lot of money. But they will never have the opportunity to do so if the only thing the State looks to is the rebate amount.

The second problem with this contract methodology is apparent in the scenario I've just described. Not only does the highest rebate methodology discriminate against small companies, it could cost the WIC Program up to \$1 billion a year.

Approaching WIC infant formula contracts on the basis of who offers the highest rebate just doesn't make sense. We know from experience that a truly competitive bidding process will save the WIC program more than \$1 billion a year.

I'll close by thanking Senator COCHRAN and Senator HATFIELD for including this cost containment measure in the Agriculture Appropriations bill we're now discussing, and I urge my colleagues serving on the conference committee to support this provision in the conference bill.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 4972 THROUGH 4974, EN BLOC

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, there are a few amendments which I am going to send to the desk and ask that they be considered en bloc and approved en bloc. All have been cleared.

The first is an amendment making technical corrections to the bill by Senator COCHRAN. The second is an amendment by Senator STEVENS dealing with appropriated funds for rural water and waste systems, the third is an amendment for Senator MURKOWSKI concerning seafood inspection requirements, and the fourth is an amendment by Senator JEFFORDS dealing with the FSIS/APHIS accounts or the National Farm Animal Identification Pilot Program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that those amendments be considered en bloc and agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN] proposes amendments numbered 4972 through 4974, en bloc.

The amendments (Nos. 4972 through 4974) en bloc, are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 4972

(Purpose: To make technical corrections to the bill)

On page 81, after line 8, add the following:

"This Act may be cited as the 'Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1997'."

AMENDMENT NO. 4973

(Purpose: To appropriate funds for rural water and waste systems as authorized by Sec. 757 of Public Law 104-127)

On page 47, line 17, before the period add the following: "Provided further, That of the total amount appropriated, not to exceed \$10,000,000 shall be for water and waste disposal systems pursuant to section 757 of Public Law 104-127".

AMENDMENT NO. 4974

On page 24, line 16, before the ":", insert the following: "Provided further, That not to exceed \$1,500,000 of this appropriation shall be made available to establish a joint FSIS/APHIS National Farm Animal Identification Pilot Program for dairy cows".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I am constrained on behalf of a Member on our side to object to the Murkowski amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard on the Murkowski amendment.

Mr. BUMPERS. The remainder are cleared on this side.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments numbered 4972, 4973, and 4974 en bloc.

The amendments (Nos. 4972 through 4974) were agreed to en bloc.

Mr. COCHRAN. I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BUMPERS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BUMPERS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

AMENDMENT NO. 4975

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of myself and Mr. KOHL, which I think has been cleared on the other side, dealing with the Wetland Reserve Program which would allow additional wetland reserve acreage to be added to the program as long as non-Federal funds were used. I ask that it be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS] for himself and Mr. KOHL, proposes amendment numbered 4975.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 71, strike all after line 22 through page 72, line 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 721. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act, or made available through the Commodity Credit Corporation, shall be used to enroll in

excess of 130,000 acres in the fiscal year 1997 wetlands reserve program, as authorized by 16 U.S.C. 3837: *Provided*, That additional acreage may be enrolled in the program to the extent that non-federal funds available to the Secretary are used to fully compensate for the cost of additional enrollments: *Provided further*, That the condition on enrollments provided in section 1237(b)(2)(B) of the Food Security Act of 1985, as amended (16 U.S.C. 3837(b)(2)(B)), shall be deemed met upon the enrollment of 43,333 acres through the use of temporary easements: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall not enroll acres in the wetlands reserve program through the use of new permanent easements in fiscal year 1998 until the Secretary has enrolled at least 31,667 acres in the program through the use of temporary easements".

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 4975) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4976

(Purpose: To increase funding for certain agriculture research activities, with an offset.)

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of Senator KOHL dealing with special research grants which I think has been cleared on the other side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS], for Mr. KOHL, proposes an amendment numbered 4976.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 12, line 25, strike "\$46,018,000" and insert "\$46,330,000".

On page 14, line 10, strike "\$418,308,000" and insert "\$418,620,000".

On page 21, line 4, strike "\$47,829,000" and insert "\$47,517,000".

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I am pleased that the managers of the bill are willing to accept my amendment to correct a problem that has arisen with regard to special research grants section of the Agriculture appropriations bill.

Specifically, when the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee requested information from USDA/CSREES regarding special research grant projects, the Babcock Institute for International Dairy Research and Development at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, was mistakenly listed as one of the several projects slated for completion at the end of fiscal year 1996. Unfortunately, that information was not accurate. However, this error was not noticed until after the committee had acted on the bill, and funding for the Babcock Institute was omitted from the Committee Report entirely.

Therefore, my amendment will simply restore funding for the Babcock Institute in the CSREES special grant

section of the bill. The funding provided is \$312,000, the same as provided in fiscal year 1996.

The importance of the research conducted by the Babcock Institute has never been more important than it is today. The domestic market for many U.S. dairy products will grow less rapidly in the future as the population ages and consumption patterns change. Further, the dairy provisions of the 1996 farm bill also signal the need for dairy farmers to look more toward international markets for their livelihoods. International markets for dairy products are changing in ways that create opportunities for U.S. dairy farmers, as well as dairy exporters. But along with these developments come many research questions, related to how foreign competitors operate, and the risks associated with export markets. Through its research on many of these topics, the Babcock Institute will continue to play an important role for the U.S. dairy industry as it seeks to turn its attention more toward international markets.

Again, I thank the managers for their support of this amendment, and look forward to working with them to retain funding for this valuable program in conference.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 4976) was agreed to.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if I could speak very briefly about a particular provision in the legislation which is a matter of some concern. I do not intend to take time this evening nor do I intend to delay consideration, but I would like to bring to the attention one of the provisions that has been included here that I think the Members should have at least some awareness of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

MEDGUIDE REGULATIONS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I want to draw attention to provisions in the appropriation bill that deal with a matter of priority for the FDA, and that is on the proposed Medguide regulations which would establish goals for industries to meet on the issues of prescription drugs. I just want to speak for a few moments on this issue this evening, then indicate to the managers some alternatives that we are thinking about and want to talk over with the managers again tomorrow.

This appropriation bill contains an unwarranted provision that will undermine the Food and Drug Administration's efforts to prevent adverse reactions that cost the American economy an estimated \$100 billion a year in direct and indirect costs. That cost is as much as, if not more, than the country spends on prescription drugs in the first place.

The provision would forbid the FDA from going forward with a proposed

regulation, called the Medguide regulation, to ensure that patients get adequate information when they buy a prescription.

The FDA's efforts to ensure that the American consumer gets good information when they buy prescription drugs have been under attack by a consortium of pharmacists and other businesses who claim they are already doing an effective job of getting information to consumers without Government regulation.

The facts are to the contrary. For example, in 1992, FDA required a boxed warning—the most serious kind of warning—on labeling for Seldane and Hismanal, two of the most popular antihistamines for allergies. When taken in association with certain antibiotics and antifungals, there have been deaths and serious cardiovascular events.

These same warnings also appeared in the FDA-approved consumer advertising and magazines such as *People*, *Time*, and *Newsweek*. These warnings about taking these drugs in combination did not appear on the information sheets that pharmacists gave to consumers—information that was written after these warnings went into effect. In fact, consumers were given better information in magazine ads than they were given by the pharmacists who dispensed their prescriptions.

Even today, after concerted efforts to educate physicians and pharmacists about the dangers of prescribing Seldane with certain antibiotics, 2.5 percent are coprescriptions written in conjunction with one of those antibiotics, erythromycin. As a result, tens of thousands of patients are presently at risk.

FDA's concerns are not speculative. A 29-year-old woman taking Seldane died because she was not warned about the risk of taking it with an antifungal. If she had been warned of this possibility of a fatal interaction she might be alive today.

Leaving out critical warnings is unacceptable. In these types of life-and-death cases, FDA oversight is clearly warranted. The health and the lives of too many patients is at stake.

FDA has rightfully decided that consumers deserve more protection than the status quo. The Medguide regulation is intended to correct this gross deficiency in our consumer protection laws.

Today, we go into a supermarket to buy a loaf of bread, a carton of milk, or a box of cereal, and we know there is complete nutritional information on the package. When we buy an over-the-counter drug like aspirin or Tylenol in the same grocery store, FDA regulations require the drugs to have complete information so that those who take the pills understand what they are doing, how to take it, the side effects to watch out for, what foods or drugs it interacts with.

But, if we buy a prescription drug in the pharmacy or one of these same gro-

cery stores, there is no guarantee that we will get the same kind of information when the prescription is filled. Current laws require more information about breakfast cereals than dangerous prescription drugs.

The costs of this lack of information are high. Mr. President, 30 to 50 percent of adult patients do not use their medications properly, and lack of information is one of the primary reasons. In children, noncompliance exceeds 50 percent. In the elderly, who rely most heavily on medication, non-compliance is often higher.

If patients do not take medication properly, they are poorly served by their health care system. The public health is put at risk if unsecured infections are transmitted and resistant infections develop.

The cost of misuse of prescription drugs and adverse reactions to drugs is estimated at \$20 billion a year in the elderly alone. Industry's own estimates place the indirect costs at five times higher—\$100 billion a year when lost productivity and reduced quality of life are included.

To avoid further tragedies and lower costs, the proposed Medguide regulations would establish concrete goals for industries to meet. By the year 2000, FDA seeks to ensure that at least 75 percent of patients with new prescriptions would obtain adequate, useful, easily understood written information. By the year 2006, 95 percent of patients with new prescriptions would receive this information. That is a goal by the year 2000, that 75 percent would receive adequate information; and 95 percent by the year 2006. It does not seem to me to be enormously prohibitive.

Working with drug companies, pharmacists, physicians and consumers, FDA plans to establish nonbinding guidelines on such information. These guidelines will help pharmacies ensure that the written information they give out is adequate.

If the goals set out in the proposed regulation are not met, FDA would either institute a mandatory program or seek public comment on what steps to take next.

This approach is reasonable. It gives the private sector the opportunity to achieve compliance without regulatory requirements over the next 4 years. Yet industry still objects. It claims that neither the Medguide regulation, nor any binding requirements are necessary. Clearly, if the industry meets the health goals by the year 2000, no binding requirements would be imposed. These goals were established in a bipartisan fashion during the Bush Administration. They should be honored by Congress today. The guidelines that have been established were established under the Republican administration with the support of the industry at that particular time.

The industry has already failed to deliver on its promise of voluntary action. In 1982, a regulation mandating that information be given to patients

when they buy new prescriptions was withdrawn, because the private sector promised it can do better without regulations.

This whole proposal that is out there builds on a long history of relationship between the agency and the industries which are affected, and an agreement had been worked out. Now there is an attempt to circumvent that agreement to the disadvantage of consumers.

FDA then monitored the industry's efforts of 1982, and found that few patients were getting information, and much of the information was not adequate, and that failure led to the rule-making that the industry is now trying to avoid.

The provision in the appropriation bill states that if the private sector develops a plan within 120 days of enactment, FDA's rulemaking is suspended. We understand that now. The provision in the appropriation bill states if the private sector develops a plan within 120 days of enactment, FDA's rulemaking is suspended. However, the Secretary of HHS and the commissioner cannot review the voluntary program to determine if it is, in fact, adequate. The only action that HHS or FDA is allowed to take is to order the plan to see if it meets the goals set by the industry. So this is an industry plan. They could develop it within 120 days. The FDA is prohibited from protecting consumers. The only ability FDA has is eventually auditing the industry program to find out if there has been compliance with the industry program.

Mr. President, this is on an issue of such vital importance to the consumers. We have a solid record in our committee on adverse drug reactions and on what the industry has been willing to do, what they have not done, and what we have reviewed in our committee and is a part of the FDA reform program, which the leader indicated they are going to call up. But we have just heard about this proposal in the last several hours. The bill further hamstring FDA by precluding activities such as guidelines that might assist the private sector.

This provision is an abdication of Congress' responsibility to protect the public health. Instead of responsible action by the FDA, an industry with an unsatisfactory track record is permitted to regulate itself without any FDA oversight of their program. That is inadequate.

Mr. President, tomorrow, I will have an amendment to address that particular issue. I will consult with the floor managers to find out about whether they share the sense or concern which I have spoken to this afternoon and if they have a way to try to address it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition?

Mr. BRYAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 4977

(Purpose: To limit funding for the market access program)

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. BRYAN], for himself, Mr. KERRY, and Mr. GREGG, proposes an amendment numbered 4977.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. . FUNDING LIMITATIONS FOR MARKET ACCESS PROGRAM.

None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to carry out the market access program pursuant to section 203 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5623) if the aggregate amount of funds and value of commodities under the program exceeds \$70,000,000.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, this amendment is regarding the Market Access Program. The Market Access Program, or MAP, was created to encourage the development, maintenance, and expansion of exports of U.S. agricultural products. MAP is the successor to the Market Promotion Program [MPP], which in turn was the successor to the Targeted Export Assistance Program [TEA], established in 1986. TEA was originally created to "counter or offset the adverse effect of subsidies, import quotas, or other unfair trade practices of foreign competitors on U.S. agriculture exports." Since 1986, over \$1.43 billion has been spent for TEA, MPP and now MAP.

MAP is operated through about 64 organizations that either run market promotion programs themselves or pass the funds along to companies to spend on their own market promotion efforts. In fiscal year 1994, about 43 percent of all program activities involved generic promotions while 57 percent involved branded promotions.

The General Accounting Office [GAO] has pointed out that the entire Federal Government spends about \$3.5 billion annually on export promotion. While agricultural products account for only 10 percent of total U.S. exports, the Department of Agriculture spends about \$2.2 billion, or 63 percent of the total. The Department of Commerce spends \$236 million annually on trade promotion.

While the stated goal of MAP is to benefit U.S. farmers, the program has benefited foreign companies. In fiscal years 1986-1993, \$92 million on MPP funds went to foreign-based firms. This amount represented nearly 20 percent

of the total funds allocated for brand-name promotions during the 8-year period. In fiscal year 1995, 49 foreign-based firms received MPP funds; in fiscal year 1994 over 110 foreign firms received MPP funds from the U.S. Treasury. I found this to be unfathomable, and I offered an amendment to remedy this to the 1996 farm bill. My amendment passed, and I am pleased to say that MAP money can no longer be given to foreign corporations.

Still, many problems exist with the MAP program:

First, wasted dollars: There is still no proof that MAP funds are not simply replacing funds that would have been spent anyway on advertising. USDA does not have any good data on this phenomenon. Commercial firms still have the opportunity to substitute MAP funds for promotional activities they would have otherwise undertaken with their own funds.

Second, graduation: Current regulations require MAP assistance to cease after 5 years. However, the 5-year clock started running in 1994. This means that some companies will have been in the program for 13 years at the end of 1999. Thirteen years is enough time to overcome barriers and develop markets. Already, 136 firms have participated in this program for 6 to 8 years and have received the bulk of the brand-name funds.

Third, efficiency: GAO states that taxpayers do not have reasonable assurance that the considerable public funds expended on export promotion are being effectively used to emphasize sectors and programs with the highest potential returns. MAP supporters use examples of increased exports to defend this program. However, even if a brand-name promotion effort results in identifiable increases in exports, unless the Foreign Agriculture Service [FAS] can convincingly demonstrate that the promotion effort would not have been undertaken without MAP assistance, those increases in exports cannot be attributed to the program.

Since 1986 there have been over 100 participants in the program, and yet the Foreign Agriculture Service has completed only 12 program evaluations. Only 9 of 26 participants who have received over \$10 million have been evaluated.

Fourth, U.S. content: MAP regulations issued in August 1991 do not restrict program participation to products that have 100 percent U.S. content. Regulations permit full funding for products that have at least 50 percent U.S. content by weight.

There is no dependable data on percent of U.S. content. The Foreign Agriculture Service relies on statements made in MAP applications about U.S. content and not-for-profit organizations rely on unverified statements regarding U.S. content from their branded participants. In 1993, the Foreign Agriculture Service began to review the support for the certifications made

regarding U.S. content during their audits of participants. Their work is limited to the not-for-profit organizations and they do not, as a rule, audit the commercial entities performing brand-name promotions.

Who should get these funds? Although new guidelines say small firms should have priority—one third of fiscal year 1994 funds went to large companies. For that reason, large corporations such as Sunkist, Sun-Maid, Welch's, and Pillsbury still receive large sums of money. In 1992, the average amount awarded to the top 50 firms was \$1 million. Eight of those firms had sales over \$1 billion.

There were 17 MAP participants receiving more than \$1 million for fiscal years 1993-95:

Sunkist, \$11.1 million.
Ernest & Julio Gallo, \$9.1 million.
Sunsweet, \$4.6 million.
Blue Diamond, \$4.5 million.
American Legend, \$2.9 million.
North Am. Fur Producers, \$2.3 million.
Dole, \$2.1 million.
Tyson Foods, \$1.9 million.
M&M Mars, \$1.8 million.
21st Century Genetics, \$1.5 million.
Welch Foods, \$1.4 million.
Pillsbury, \$1.3 million.
Campbell Soup, \$1.2 million.
Hansa-Pacific, \$1.1 million.
Hershey, \$1.1 million.
Canandaigua Wine, \$1.1 million.
Seagram, \$1.0 million.

Private, for-profit companies are the ones who benefit from this program. Taxpayers should not pay for advertising particular products. These companies should take over the costs themselves. MAP, like MPP and TEA before it, is a convenient source of free cash for wealthy businesses, such as McDonald's, to help pay for their overseas advertising budgets.

While the Federal Government does have a legitimate role in promoting exports to foreign countries, we should use our considerable Federal expertise to assist companies in cutting red tape in foreign countries and providing them with technical assistance. We should not do it by granting scarce taxpayer dollars to private, for-profit companies for activities they would otherwise conduct on their own.

Mr. President, the amendment I offer today is nearly identical to the position the Senate took on the Federal Agricultural Improvement and Reform Act, or farm bill, of 1996. The Senate voted 59 to 37 in February to accept the Bryan amendment on the MPP program. That amendment restricted use of MPP program moneys to small businesses, as certified by the Small Business Administration, and Capper-Volstead cooperatives. Because the amendment eliminated foreign companies from the program, the funding level for MPP was capped at \$70 million.

In the House-Senate conference on the farm bill, my language prohibiting foreign companies from participation in MPP was retained, but the level of

funding was raised to \$90 million. So while the conferees were attempting to reform the MPP program by removing foreign companies, they also enacted a 29-percent increase in funding. My amendment would return the MAP program to the originally approved Senate funding level of \$70 million. This represents no real cut to the program as foreign companies may no longer participate. This frees up funds for domestic businesses.

Mr. President, reiterating, I am renewing an effort that I had been involved in—as Members will be familiar with—for some years. It is a program that was originally known as the Targeted Export Assistance Program. A little later iteration referred to it as the Market Promotion Program, and it has now evolved into the Market Access Program.

The historical genesis, as well as the ostensible premise for its continuation, is an effort to encourage the development, maintenance, and expansion of exports of U.S. agricultural products abroad, originally designed to counter or offset the adverse effects of subsidies, import quotas, and other unfair trade practices.

Since 1986, TEA, MPP, and now MAP, has resulted in the expenditure of \$1.5 billion. This program is operated through about 64 different organizations, as I know the distinguished Presiding Officer and the chairman of the committee are both very familiar with. In fiscal year 1994, about 43 percent of all program activities involved generic promotions, while 57 percent involved branded promotions. By that, Mr. President, we mean specific products of company A, B, C, or D.

We will talk later about some of the companies who have received very generous amounts of taxpayer dollars to support a program which, in the view of this Senator, amounts to a corporate entitlement program that could not have been justified even in the most affluent circumstances at the Federal level. Now, while we are trying to downsize, streamline, cut expenditures, and reach targeted goals for balancing our budget by 2002 or 2003, this is precisely the kind of program that is still a legacy of the past and, in my judgment, one I cannot support on its merits.

I think it might be helpful to note that the Federal Government spends about \$3.5 million annually on export promotion activities. Agricultural products represent about 10 percent of the total U.S. exports. Yet, of that \$3.5 billion spent at the Federal level, about \$2.2 billion, or 63 percent of the total amount, is spent on agricultural export promotion. The Department of Commerce, for example, spends about \$236 million annually on trade promotion.

Now, earlier this year, Mr. President, one of the objections that this Senator and others raised was that a substantial amount of the funding on this program went not to American companies,

but went to foreign companies. So joining with the distinguished occupant of the chair, and other colleagues on both sides of the political aisle, we were able to get an amendment through that, as it ultimately worked its way through the legislative process, dealt with one issue which, in my judgment, was inconceivable, unfathomable, in that we would continue to provide money to foreign companies with taxpayer dollars. I am happy to report that, in the legislation that passed, we have now eliminated moneys that previously went to foreign-based firms. So, prospectively, that can no longer occur, and the money that we are talking about here this afternoon will no longer be given to foreign corporations. But the fundamental objections to the programs remain.

First, the General Accounting Office, which has evaluated this program, has determined that these are wasted dollars. There is no evidence to support the proposition that money which ostensibly is given to companies to augment or increase their promotional activities has simply not been used to replace existing dollars already in these major corporations' advertising accounts. So rather than a McDonald's spending \$500 million a year, if they get \$4 million or \$5 million, they reduce the amount of their own budget allocation to \$496 million—the point being that there is no extra dollar outlay spent on the promotion and advertising of these products. That is to even accept the proposition that you can target or trace a correlation between the amount of money that is spent on advertising dollars and the kind of products that these companies are able to market overseas.

So that is the first objection raised, and that is as valid today as it was when the General Accounting Office did its evaluation some 5 years ago that there is no assurance of companies simply not trading their own corporate dollars and replacing them with dollars that the American taxpayers pay.

The second is a graduation problem. There is no graduation formula. How long does one remain as part of the program? Current regulations, enacted in response to criticisms made by this Senator and others about the merits of the program, ultimately caused the reevaluation of the regulation so that this MAP assistance will cease after 5 years. However, those who continue to benefit from this financial allocation provided at taxpayer expense target it to 5 years to run prospectively from the date of the enactment of the regulation, so you can still stay on this program up until 1999.

Now, for some companies, that would mean being a part of this program for 13 years. That is an incredibly long period of time. If you find any merit to this program—and I must say I am one who finds none—how do you justify keeping a particular company as part of this program for up to 13 years? Already, 136 firms have participated in

the program for 6 to 8 years and have received the bulk of the brand-name funds.

The third objection is a question of efficiency. GAO states that taxpayers do not have any reasonable assurances that the rather considerable public funds expended on export promotion are being effectively used to emphasize sectors and programs with the highest potential returns. It is frequently said in the course of debate—and I am sure will be again in the context of this amendment—where supporters of this program cite increased exports as an example of why this program is so needed, why it is so beneficial, why it does so much good. But there is no analytical correlation between those increases in exports and moneys being expended from the program. That is to say, would those increases have occurred notwithstanding the allocations made under the MAP program? Since 1986, there have been over 100 participants in the program, and yet the Foreign Agricultural Service has completed only 12 program evaluations. Only 9 of 26 participants who have received more than \$10 million have been evaluated.

Finally, Mr. President, on the question of U.S. content, MAP regulations issued in August 1991 do not restrict program participation to products that have 100 percent U.S. content. Regulations permit full funding for products that have no more than 50 percent of U.S. content by weight.

There is no dependable data on the percent of U.S. content. The Foreign Agricultural Service relies on statements made in MAP applications about U.S. content to ascertain the amount of U.S. content without doing an independent analysis. So these are self-certified statements without any type of independent verification whatsoever.

The question is: Who should get these funds? Although new guidelines say some small firms should have priority, one-third of fiscal year 1994 funds went to large companies. It is for that reason that some of the largest corporations in America—among them Sunkist, Sun Maid, Welch's, and Pillsbury—still receive large sums of money. In 1992, the average amount awarded to the top 50 firms was \$1 million. Eight of those firms have sales over \$1 billion.

I am sure most Americans would ponder, with a company that has a sales volume of \$1 billion, should the American taxpayer be subsidizing the advertising account of a firm of that size? I must say again that I do not believe that should justify defending those appropriations.

But to give you some more current data, there were 17 MAP participants receiving more than \$1 million for the past 2 fiscal years, fiscal year 1993 to fiscal year 1995: Sunkist, \$11.1 million; Ernest & Julio Gallo, \$9.1 million; Sunsweet, \$4.6 billion; Blue Diamond, \$4.5 million; American Legend, \$2.9 million; North America Fur Producers,

\$2.3 million; Dole, \$2.1 million; Tyson Foods, \$1.9 million; M&M Mars, \$1.8 million; 21st Century Genetics, \$1.5 million; Welch Foods, \$1.4 million; Pillsbury, \$1.3 million; Campbell Soup, \$1.2 million; Hansa-Pacific, \$1.1 million; Hershey, \$1.1 million; Seagram, \$1 million.

Mr. President, those are some of the great household names of America. These are companies that have been exceedingly successful, and all of us as Americans quite curiously share in their success. We are delighted when American firms prosper and do well. But why should they do well at the expense of the taxpayer who is being asked to pay his and her hard-earned dollars to supplement the advertising accounts of some of the largest companies in America?

I believe that the Federal Government has a legitimate role in promoting exports to foreign countries, but we should certainly use our considerable expertise to assist companies in cutting red tape in foreign countries and providing them with technical assistance. We should not do it by granting scarce taxpayer dollars to private companies, either, for-profit companies, or activities that they would otherwise conduct on their own.

So, Mr. President, that brings me to the point of what our amendment that I offer this afternoon would do. It is identical virtually to the position that the Senate took on the Federal Agricultural Improvement and Reform Act, commonly referred to as the farm bill of 1996. The Senate voted by 59 to 37 in February to accept the Bryan amendment on the MPP program, and that amendment restricted use of MPP moneys to small businesses certified by the Small Business Administration and Capper-Volstead cooperatives. Because the amendment eliminated foreign companies from the program, the funding level for MPP was capped at \$70 million. That is to say, based upon the recent experience of the Market Promotion Program, out of an appropriation of \$110 million it was projected that \$40 million was being allocated to foreign companies. So if you flatten out the program and keep it at its present level, \$70 million would continue to fund the program other than for foreign company participation.

I make it clear that I think none of my colleagues are misled about this. My preference would be to zero out this program for all of the reasons that I have outlined. And I daresay I think the distinguished occupant of the chair shares the view of the Senator from Nevada. But yielding to pragmatic imperatives, it is clear that this body is not yet prepared to go that far.

So what this amendment would do would be to cap the current level at \$70 million. The current appropriations bill provides for \$90 million. So when you factor out that none of this money can go to foreign companies, in effect, this program would be increased by 29 percent—a 29-percent increase.

The amendment that I have offered would return this program to the originally approved Senate funding level of \$70 million. That, I believe, is a reasonable compromise, and I believe that my colleagues having voted once before by 59 to 37 to cap the program at that level and to carry out the intent of the farm bill of 1996, we ought to hold the appropriations to the level authorized in that bill.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my friend from Nevada, Senator BRYAN, in another attempt to save American taxpayers from funding U.S. corporate advertising in other countries. The Market Promotion Program is one of the most blatant examples of corporate welfare in the budget—the American taxpayers have footed a bill of more than \$1 billion to pay for corporate advertising since its inception. And Senator BRYAN and I have been as tenacious as it is possible to be in trying to eliminate this program.

This is a subsidy program which has been roundly criticized by research institutes across the political and economic spectrum—the National Taxpayers' Union, the Progressive Policy Institute, Citizens Against Government Waste, and Cato Institute.

Taxpayers in Massachusetts would be shocked if they knew that the Federal Government is collecting taxes from them and using their hard-earned money to embellish the advertising budgets of corporate America.

I have taken to the floor time and time again to speak about wasteful spending in the budget. And I have been an outspoken critic of this Market Promotion Program. Our colleagues have heard me discuss how we have paid the Gallo Bros. to peddle their wine to the French; how we helped advertise Japanese-made underwear in Tokyo; how we promoted fashion shows of mink coats and fur stoles; how we have subsidized M&M's and Chicken McNuggets.

We have tried to reform the MPP program over the past few years. Last year, we prohibited the mink industry from receiving Federal subsidies to promote fashion shows abroad. That was a step in the right direction. And, Mr. President, I am very pleased the distinguished chairman of the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, Senator COCHRAN, has agreed to exclude mink subsidies in this year's bill. In addition, Mr. President, last year, in the Department of Agriculture appropriations bill, the Senate voted to curb the Market Promotion Program—we passed the Bryan-Bumpers-Kerry amendment to limit the program to small businesses and agricultural co-ops. This was a good start to curb corporate welfare, but the provision was dropped in conference. So, the program continues despite the Senate's vote.

Accordingly, my friend from Nevada, Senator BRYAN, and I are making the effort once again to halt this unnecessary flow of funds from the Treasury.

We must not force American taxpayers to keep subsidizing multimillion-dollar corporations. When my friends and neighbors in Massachusetts measure this program against the extraordinary reductions we are facing in programs that really matter to working Americans, they ask me how Congress can continue to justify this type of corporate welfare. There is no good answer to that question. This program is unjustifiable in the current budget environment.

Mr. President, I am grateful Senator BRYAN is willing to lead the charge. Together, we will continue to fight this waste of taxpayer money until this program is eliminated. We fought the wool and mohair subsidy, and that is now gone. We fought the mink subsidy, and that is now gone. Ultimately, we will win this battle, too, because the Senate will recognize that it is a monumental waste of money. I yield the floor.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, this Market Promotion Program has been one that has attracted an awful lot of attention and some controversy over the last several years. Senators have heard the arguments for it and against it, and why it is important for us to continue to support those who are trying to market their commodities and food products in overseas markets, particularly when they are confronted with trade practices that are developed by our competitors, or even those countries in which we are trying to export our products that operate against our interests.

Under the rules of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, we have tried to reduce barriers to trade, make the playing field fair, and have as a principle for our international trade that if we are going to make available our market here in the United States, we are going to insist that other countries do the same. But from time to time, even though this is the general understanding and the general basis for these international agreements, we run into specific problems—structural difficulties, bureaucratic redtape, call it what you will. It is all an effort to prefer one of our competitors over our exporters in these markets, or to keep us out of the markets altogether.

These funds have been very helpful, I am told at our hearings with the Foreign Agriculture Service, in breaking down barriers to trade, to overcoming these efforts to keep our suppliers and our exporters out of international markets.

There is no question that this is an area of economic activity that has benefited American business, agriculture, and industry. We have seen a growing amount of jobs created in our own economy here at home because of access to overseas markets for our products. There is a direct correlation between the amount of exporting we do and the amount of benefit we get economically here in terms of jobs, pay for workers, and renewed and invigorated business activity.

It has been consistently shown on the basis of experience that we have had using these funds that as we provide assistance to exporters and suppliers in international markets, we do better; we sell more; we are more successful. I hope the Senate will not be persuaded to further reduce the ability of the Foreign Agriculture Service to go to bat for our exporters, to try to help where help is needed, and use these funds in a targeted way, in a way that is designed to help us sell more of what we produce in these emerging markets around the world.

I know that we are not going to resolve this issue tonight, and we have a lot of information that will be available to Senators, but almost all the Senators who are going to vote—and I presume we are going to go to a record vote on this unless the Senator decides to withdraw his amendment on the basis of my overwhelmingly persuasive remarks in opposition to his amendment. I presume we are going to vote on this amendment tomorrow.

Mr. BRYAN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I will be happy to yield to my friend from Nevada.

Mr. BRYAN. I always find my friend from Mississippi extraordinarily articulate. Without any derogation intended, he has not persuaded this Senator. At this particular point, it would be my intent to ask for a rollcall vote at the appropriate time. And I can assure the Senator I do not intend to prolong the debate tonight, but when he finishes, I might just make a very brief comment.

Mr. COCHRAN. I thank the Senator. I know he is committed on this issue. He raises it from time to time. I do appreciate the fact we do not have all the charts and other things that he has brought to the floor in the past to persuade Senators on the correctness of his position, but he is certainly correct in pointing out that this issue was debated fully, extensively in the discussion of the farm bill earlier this year. The farm bill did have provisions relating to the program, and so Senators are familiar with it, and they are familiar with the arguments for and against.

I am not going to belabor the issue again. I hope Senators will reject the amendment and support the committee's funding level for this program. It is, I would say, consistent with the authorization contained in the conference report of the farm bill.

I rest my case, and I am happy for the Senate to work its will on this subject. I hope they will support the decision that we made in the committee.

Mr. BRYAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BRYAN. I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas be added as a cosponsor of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BRYAN. If I may very briefly respond to my friend from Mississippi,

and then I will yield to my friend from Arkansas, it seems to me that we talk a lot about sacrifice—the need for us to notch up the proverbial belt and slim down, streamline Government, all of these sorts of things, and we ask most segments in our society to do more with less.

I must say, with all due respect to my friend from Mississippi, it seems to me that those who are part of this corporate entitlement program that has been culturally ingrained as part of this Federal budget process, we never ask them. I do not think it is asking too much of our friends, the McDonald's hamburger people, Pillsbury, the Welch's, Sunkist, Sun Maid, Seagrams, all these other marvelous corporations to say, look, this is a program we thought we could afford at one time but this is 1996 and you folks have followed our debate on balancing the budget. Both parties, both the Congress and the White House have agreed that a balanced budget ought to be our goal, that ought to be a national priority. There are benefits that inure to our society, to our economy, and we cannot do that if we continue the old ways, as comfortable as they may have become.

So I conclude with the observation that the \$70 million is \$70 million more than I would like to spend, but this appropriations bill sets a funding level of \$90 million, so it does represent a 29 percent increase over the \$70 million that would be available under the parameters of the farm bill because we have deleted the money for foreign companies. It seems to me that a spirit of sacrifice and fairness would say, look, those who are the giants of corporate America, they ought to be asked to trim their sails and to cut their spending a bit by enabling us to wean ourselves gradually from this program.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter that I received as chairman of the subcommittee from the Coalition of U.S. Exporters in support of the Market Access Program.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COALITION TO PROMOTE U.S.
AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS,
Washington, DC, July 9, 1996.

Hon. THAD COCHRAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural
Development, and Related Agencies, U.S.
Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As Congress considers the FY 1997 agriculture appropriations bill, we want to emphasize again the need to maintain funding for USDA's export programs, including the Market Access Program and FAS Cooperator Program, as authorized under the new Farm Bill.

Such action is critical to the success of the new Farm Bill, which gradually eliminates direct income assistance to producers, while providing increased planting flexibility. Within this framework, the long term viability of American agriculture is even more dependent on ensuring access to foreign markets and maintaining and expanding U.S. agricultural exports.

It is also vital to our nation's economic well-being. For example, U.S. agricultural exports this year are now projected to reach a record \$60 billion. This is expected to result in a record agriculture trade surplus of approximately \$30 billion, generate as much as \$100 billion in related economic activity, and provide jobs for over one million Americans.

The Market Access Program, along with the FAS Cooperator Program, are among the few programs specifically allowed under the Uruguay Round Agreement and not subject to any reduction or discipline. When other countries are increasingly pursuing such policies to help their agriculture industries maintain and expand their share of the world market, now is not the time for the U.S. to continue to unilaterally reduce or eliminate such programs.

Under the new Farm Bill, the Market Access Program already has been reduced from \$110 million to just \$90 million annually. The new Farm Bill also makes permanent the reforms included in the FY 1996 agriculture appropriations bill, including limiting any direct cost-share assistance to small businesses, farmer cooperatives and trade associations.

Clearly, the Market Access Program and other USDA export programs remain an essential element of our nation's overall agriculture and trade policy. They are key to helping boost U.S. agricultural exports, strengthening farm income, promoting economic growth and creating needed jobs throughout our entire economy. Accordingly, we urge your strong support to ensure such programs continue to be fully funded and aggressively implemented.

Sincerely,

Coalition to Promote U.S. Agricultural Exports.

COALITION TO PROMOTE U.S. AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS

COALITION MEMBERSHIP 1996

Ag Processing, Inc.
Alaska Seafood Marketing Institute.
American Farm Bureau Federation.
American Forest & Paper Association.
American Hardwood Export Council.
American Meat Institute.
American Plywood Association.
American Seed Trade Association.
American Sheep Industry Association.
American Soybean Association.
Blue Diamond Growers.
California Canning Peach Association.
California Kiwifruit Commission.
California Pistachio Commission.
California Prune Board.
California Table Grape Commission.
California Tomato Board.
California Walnut Commission.
Cherry Marketing Institute, Inc.
Chocolate Manufacturers Association.
Diamond Walnut Growers.
Eastern Agricultural and Food Export Council Corp.
Farmland Industries.
Florida Citrus Mutual.
Florida Citrus Packers.
Florida Department of Citrus.
Ginseng Board of Wisconsin.
Hop Growers of America.
International American Supermarkets Corp.
International Apple Institute.
International Dairy Foods Association.
Kentucky Distillers Association.
Mid-America International Agri-Trade Council.
National Dry Bean Council.
National Grape Cooperative Association, Inc.
National Association of State Departments of Agriculture.
National Cattlemen's Beef Association.

National Confectioners Association.
National Corn Growers Association.
National Council of Farmers Cooperatives.
National Cotton Council.
National Milk Producers Federation.
National Peanut Council of America.
National Poultry Producers Council.
National Potato Council.
National Renderers Association.
National Sunflower Association.
National Wine Coalition.
NORPAC Foods, Inc.
Northwest Horticultural Council.
Produce Marketing Association.
Protein Grain Products International.
Sioux Honey Association.
Southern Forest Products Association.
Southern U.S. Trade Association.
Sun-Diamond Growers of California.
Sun Maid Raisin Growers of California.
Sunkist Growers.
Sunsweet Prune Growers.
The Catfish Institute.
The Popcorn Institute.
Tree Fruit Reserve.
Tree Top, Inc.
Tri Valley Growers.
United Egg Association.
United Egg Producers.
United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association.

USA Dry Pea & Lentil Council.
USA Poultry & Egg Export Council.
USA Rice Federation.
U.S. Feed Grains Council.
U.S. Livestock Genetics Exports, Inc.
U.S. Meat Export Federation.
U.S. Wheat Associates.
Vodka Producers of America.
Washington Apple Commission.
Western Pistachio Association.
Western U.S. Agricultural Trade Association.
Wine Institute.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, first, let me say that my good friend, the distinguished manager of the bill and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations, and I very seldom disagree, and we have worked on a number of bills when I was chairman of this subcommittee and now the last 2 years he has been chairman of the subcommittee, and I think we have worked together well and produced really good bills for the Senate's consideration. This is one of those rare occasions when we disagree.

I feel very strongly, and have for many years, that the Market Promotion Program, recently renamed the Market Access Program, is just short of outrageous. When I first got involved in it, the General Accounting Office had just done a study. We were putting millions of dollars in a program to encourage McDonald's to sell Big Macs in Moscow. In addition, we were spending money to encourage one of the big companies in my own State, Tyson Foods, a company I am more than happy to champion on most occasions, to advertise their products overseas. Further, Gallo wine was a big recipient. The liquor industry was getting millions to export liquor.

I said last year, where is the Christian Coalition when we need them? But we finally, through the determined efforts of the Senator from Nevada, last year were able to change the people who were eligible to put a little bit of sense in it. We made a substantial con-

tribution to common sense last year on the Senate floor, but unfortunately the conferee committee was not satisfied until they worked in a loophole big enough to drive a Fortune 500 company through.

Having said that, let me say if I had a chance to eliminate the whole program as it currently operates at this moment, if I had the power to do it, I would be more than happy to do it. But at least because of the efforts of the Senator from Nevada, we have been able to make it a little more palatable.

But think about this, Mr. President. We have capped the Export Enhancement Program now for 1997 at \$100 million. But when you take the Export Enhancement Program, Public Law 480, which has been on the books for decades—and there are three titles in that program, I, II, and III, all designed and calculated to enhance agricultural exports—everybody is for agricultural exports. The USDA also has the GSM Program as an export tool. There are the COAP and SOAP Programs. If it were not for agricultural exports, the trade deficit in this country would be really staggering. I am not sure what the correlation is in the amounts between how much oil we import from around the world compared to how many agricultural products we export, but I think the two are very similar. That will give you some idea how staggering the deficit would be if we did not do a lot of agricultural exporting.

But when I think of the programs that run into hundreds of millions of dollars to export agriculture products and then here is this questionable—well, it is not insignificant. It is \$90 million. Where I come from, that is considered sizable. Last year, we were able to cut that program from \$90 million to \$70 million, and this year, lo and behold, it is back to \$90 million. So while we have been able to get the Gallo Bros. and McDonald's and people like that out of the program, at least directly, and allow cooperatives such as my own Riceland Foods, and their farmer-members, to benefit from the program, we should certainly not in the days of budget constraints that we are experiencing now be raising that program by about 25 percent.

So, Mr. President, I will not belabor it. I see the Senator from Nebraska here. He, apparently, wants to offer an amendment. I do not want to delay his opportunity to do that. But I say I am more than happy to cosponsor the amendment of the Senator from Nevada, which does not eliminate the program but simply puts the funding level from \$90 million back to \$70 million, where we put it last year.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KERREY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

AMENDMENT NO. 4978

(Purpose: To increase funding for the Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration and the Food Safety and Inspection Service, with an offset)

Mr. KERREY. I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the pending amendments are set aside.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. KERREY] proposes an amendment numbered 4978.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 18, line 12, strike "\$432,103,000" and insert "\$421,078,000".

On page 20, line 10, strike "\$98,000,000" and insert "\$86,975,000".

On page 23, line 8, strike "\$22,728,000" and insert "\$24,228,000".

On page 24, line 11, strike "\$557,697,000" and insert "\$566,222,000".

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I have brought this problem to the attention of both the chairman, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, as well as the ranking member, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas. This amendment would increase funding for the Food Safety and Inspection Service as well as for the Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, the first by \$8.5 million, the second by \$1.5 million. The increases are offset by a reduction in funding available for the Agriculture Quarantine Inspection Program. This is a user fee account within the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

I understand there have been some problems. I understand the committee has asked the Department of Agriculture, under the FSIS, the Food Safety Inspection Service, to give the Congress an evaluation of its computer programs. I understand this has just occurred today. But we are now moving, the Department is moving from an old carcass-by-carcass system of evaluating product—which in many cases did not improve the safety of the meat coming out to the consumer because the inspection system was not able to apply good science to determine whether or not there were pathogens on the animals—we are moving from that old system to a new system called HACCP. HACCP is, to my mind, a vastly preferable system. But it will be very difficult in my judgment to do that if we underfund FSIS in the process.

Let me say parenthetically, I believe across the board in those areas where Republicans and Democrats agree the Government function is important—and there are still some disagreements between Republicans and Democrats, or sometimes, as we have just heard, inside, even, each party; sometimes it does not break along party lines, with the Market Promotion Program as an example, the Sugar Program and so

forth—but in many cases we have reached agreement: The FAA should be funded. FSIS is important to fund. That increases the quality of our product and the confidence of the consumer. It makes our economy more productive and, as a consequence, is a very important function of the Government.

Very often we find ourselves in those areas as a result of an unwillingness to fund the program because we will not allocate money from other places. I will make the point again, typically it is not this kind of temporary reallocation, which is all this is, internal to USDA. Very often it is a problem of not being willing to either say we are going to raise taxes to pay for it, which very few people at this point want to do, or we are going to get it out of the growth of entitlements, or we are not going to build the F-18C, or some other thing, some other major program like that.

If we do not fund FSIS this year and next year and the year after, as the appropriations accounts get smaller, I believe we are going to pay a big price for it. So I understand there may be some language that can be worked out in this particular reallocation out of concern for the very specific program I would like to fund, the field automation and information management project. I have a great deal of respect for the chairman and ranking member's concerns for that particular effort.

The second thing that is being funded in here is a bit easier and a lot more straightforward. That is just a \$1.5 additional million for the Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration. A lot of us have expressed concern this year as the price of beef has gone down. Once again the concern is, is the market working? That is to say, has the concentration in the beef and the concentration of the pork industry reached a point where we no longer have competition, where we no longer have price discovery, where we no longer have a market that is working to the advantage of either the consumer or for the American economy?

That question is a difficult one to answer. Last year there was an advisory committee that was put together. A couple of months ago they made their recommendations to us. The dominant recommendation, at least the recommendation at the top of the list, was we should just do more of what the Packer and Stockyards Act says the USDA should do. Even if we are able to get an additional \$1.5 million, I must say a \$24 or \$25 million budget against the Packer and Stockyards budget, against a \$120-billion industry, is not likely, even by some sort of common-sense evaluation, to provide this agency with enough money to get the job done.

For all Members who have issued press releases expressing enthusiasm about this Commission's report, this

panel report, this amendment would provide for: An industry structure performance surveillance of \$550,000—it was in the concentration recommendations; \$480,000 for a packer market competition study—that, again, was in the recommendation that was made; and a quarter of a million dollars for an electronic filing system, also in the Commission's recommendation.

It is impossible for us to be able to go from saying "we are concerned about whether or not the market is working" to a point where, particularly for the smaller packers as well as the great number of feedlot operators and growers out there who say "the market is not working," unless we fund this particular agency.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 4979

(Purpose: To provide funds for risk management, with an offset)

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to lay that amendment aside and move immediately to the consideration of second amendment I have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. KERREY] proposes an amendment numbered 4979.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 25, line 16, strike "\$795,000,000" and insert "\$725,000,000".

On page 29, between lines 7 and 8, insert the following:

RISK MANAGEMENT

For administrative and operating expenses, as authorized by section 226A of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6933), \$70,000,000, except that not to exceed \$700 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses, as authorized by section 506(i) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1506(i)).

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, this amendment establishes a separate appropriation for salaries and expenses for the Risk Management Agency inside the Farm Service Agency's account. I wish the administration of the Department of Agriculture had sent up a separation. I think it is clear to most of us who look at the new farm program that increasingly it is going to be the farmers managing their own risks that will determine how well they do in a market that is increasingly volatile. The risk management program, the combination of Government and, increasingly, private sector insurance, is going to determine whether or not a producer, a farmer, or small business person out there operating in the marketplace, is going to be successful. This

establishes this risk management agency and sets up a separate account for it so we make sure the U.S. Department of Agriculture does allocate a sufficient amount of resources to do so. I pull \$70 million out of the FSA to do that. I believe it is much more likely, as a consequence of doing this, that the risk management program is going to be executed in the fashion that both Republicans and Democrats desire. Again, as we look at this new age of farmers on their own establishing what the risk is and purchasing coverage for that risk, it is much more likely, if this agency is funded separately, that the market, the consumer out there, will determine what the nature of that product is going to be and that the agency itself will, as a consequence, be sufficiently funded.

Mr. President, Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 4980

(Purpose: To provide the Secretary of Agriculture temporary authority for the use of voluntary separation incentives to assist in reducing employment levels, and for other purposes)

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to lay this pending amendment aside and I ask immediate consideration of a third amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. KERREY] proposes an amendment numbered 4980.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, this third amendment is one of those sort of good Government amendments. I have spoken with the authorizing committee about this. They raise some concerns that I will attempt to address in a moment. This gives the U.S. Department of Agriculture the authority to conduct a voluntary buyout in order to meet its downsizing needs. No question, under this appropriations bill, the Department of Agriculture, particularly in FSA, is going to have to downsize and, equally important, Mr. President, no question, that is a desirable thing to do, given the substantial reduction in work that is likely to be required under the new farm program.

So it is not that I am objecting to that downsizing. I am merely, with this amendment, trying to provide the Department with the authority to do buyouts which very often can save them substantial money and save the taxpayers substantial money in the process.

I note there has been considerable attention to giving buyout authority to

other agencies in the Federal Government, Treasury in particular. I am well aware of the work others have done in this area. As indicated, I have had discussions with the authorizing committee—that is to say, the Committee on Governmental Affairs—in gaining acceptance for my amendment.

Thus, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to amend my amendment before it comes to a vote tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the third amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KERREY. I yield the floor.

FAIR ACT CREDIT TITLE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I rise to inquire of my friend, Senator LUGAR of Indiana, about a provision in the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act [FAIR Act] which became law on April 4, 1996. Specifically, I am concerned with the way the U.S. Department of Agriculture has interpreted section 663, the section of the credit title that provides a transition period for elimination of the Lease-back/Buyback program.

The statutory language says that only those borrowers who have submitted complete applications to acquire inventory property prior to the date of enactment will be considered for this form of loan servicing. The language is clear that applications must have been fully submitted on or before April 4, 1996, but a difficulty has arisen with regard to whether or not the property—on which the application is being made—must actually be in Federal inventory prior to the date of enactment. The statute is not clear on this point. The Department has interpreted the clause, "Applications to acquire inventory property," to mean the property must already be in Federal inventory. This is called a "post-acquisition" application—"acquisition" referring to when the Government takes ownership of the property.

I am concerned that this "brightline" has stranded a number of "pre-acquisition" applicants in the pipeline. These borrowers have submitted complete applications for lease-back/buyback servicing within the valid timeframe, but for a variety of reasons, the Government has not yet acquired their property.

I certainly do understand the desire of the Department to expeditiously resolve as many debt servicing cases as possible, and I am supportive of the FAIR Act's marked advances in streamlining the farm loan programs and returning Government to its proper role as a "lender of last resort." I do believe, however, that we should grandfather those applications that were submitted prior to the change in law.

I would ask my friend from Indiana whether he agrees with me that USDA's interpretation is incorrect?

Mr. LUGAR. Senator SIMPSON raises a valid issue regarding the interpretation of section 663 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996. Although I disagree with your statement that the statute is not clear on this point, I agree that USDA has incorrectly interpreted this section.

Section 663 clearly states that a complete application to acquire inventory property must have been submitted prior to the date of enactment of the FAIR Act. The issue is whether the property in question has already come into the Government's possession. Until that time, the property should not be deemed inventory property.

If a borrower had submitted an application that the Secretary would have deemed complete except that the steps necessary for the Government to acquire the property had not been fulfilled, those borrowers' applications should be considered complete so that once the property does enter the Government's inventory, the lease back-buyback agreement can be executed.

Mr. SIMPSON. Then you agree that borrowers who had completed applications for inventory property that had not yet been acquired by the Government should be grandfathered?

Mr. LUGAR. Yes.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank my fine friend for his assistance in this matter.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 4981 AND 4982, EN BLOC

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be considered en bloc and agreed to en bloc:

The first is offered for the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER], dealing with electronic warehouse receipts.

The second is offered for the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE], dealing with research facilities in Oklahoma of the Agriculture Research Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COVERDELL). Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN] proposes amendments numbered 4981 and 4982, en bloc.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 4981

(Purpose: To improve the issuance of warehouse receipts)

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. . WAREHOUSE RECEIPTS.

(a) ELECTRONIC WAREHOUSE RECEIPTS.—Section 17(c) of the United States Warehouse Act (7 U.S.C. 259(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking "cotton" and inserting "any agricultural product";

(2) by striking "the cotton" each place it appears and inserting "the agricultural product"; and

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “in cotton” and inserting “in the agricultural product”; and

(B) in the last sentence of subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking “electronic cotton” and inserting “electronic”; and

(ii) by striking “cotton stored in a cotton warehouse” and inserting “any agricultural product stored in a warehouse”.

(b) WRITTEN RECEIPTS.—Section 18(c) of the United States Warehouse Act (7 U.S.C. 260(c)) is amended by striking “consecutive”.

AMENDMENT NO. 4982

On page 11, line 22, add the following proviso after the word “law”: “: *Provided further*, That all rights and title of the United States in the property known as the National Agricultural Water Quality Laboratory of the USDA, consisting of approximately 9.161 acres in the city of Durant, Oklahoma, including facilities and fixed equipment, shall be conveyed to Southeastern Oklahoma State University.”

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, those amendments have been cleared on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are agreed to.

The amendments (Nos. 4981 and 4982) were agreed to, en bloc.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BUMPERS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, it appears that Senators who were prepared to offer their amendments have come to the floor and offered and discussed the amendments that they have to this bill. We understand there are other amendments that Senators would like to offer to this bill.

I have a list, which I am prepared to read just for the information of all Senators. It is obvious we are not going to be able to complete action on this bill tonight. We do have amendments that votes have been ordered on that will occur tomorrow, and during the wrap-up tonight, an agreement will be proposed for an order in which those amendments will be taken up and voted on tomorrow.

Let me suggest, if Senators can still this evening come to the floor to offer their amendments, we are prepared to be here for that purpose.

We have this list:

Senator BURNS, an amendment on barley; Senator BROWN, an amendment on water rights; Senator SANTORUM, who has eight amendments on peanuts; Senator MIKULSKI, an amendment on the Food and Drug Administration; Senator LEAHY on milk orders; Senator CRAIG on GAO study on agriculture workers; Senator LUGAR on double cropping; Senator KERREY, which he has now offered, three amendments; Senator MURKOWSKI on seafood inspection; Senator KERREY, another amend-

ment, which he has offered; Senator KENNEDY on Food and Drug Administration; Senator THURMOND on agriculture research; Senator FRAHM on section 515 rental housing program; Senator SIMPSON on wetland easements.

We know of no other amendments. We hope those will be the only amendments, and maybe if Senators will let us know about suggested changes, we may be able to work out accepting some of these amendments tonight or when we reconvene on this bill tomorrow.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I think Senator PELL has a small amendment that he wants to offer that we probably should add to that list.

Mr. COCHRAN. OK.

Mr. President, we understand that it will be unlikely that we can get an agreement tonight to limit the amendments to those that I have just read. We had hoped to be able to get that agreement. We understand, if we propounded that request, there would be an objection. So we will not propound a unanimous-consent request, but we hope that will be all the amendments we will have to this bill, and we will take them up when Senators come to the floor to offer them. If they don't come to offer them tonight, we will be here tomorrow.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, to direct a question to the distinguished chairman and floor manager, as I understand it, we are going to have a whole slew of votes in the morning on the welfare bill, as many as 20. I was wondering if the chairman will be willing to make a unanimous-consent request that immediately following final passage of the welfare reform bill tomorrow that we proceed immediately, while the Senators are still here on the floor, to a vote on the Gregg amendment and the McCain amendment.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, that will be in the proposed request which the majority leader will propound. That is an excellent idea. We are going to try to include that in the request of the majority leader as we wind up business tonight.

I am told now the amendment of the Senator from Alaska, Senator MURKOWSKI, which we had tried to clear earlier, has now been cleared for adoption.

AMENDMENT NO. 4983

(Purpose: To reconcile seafood inspection requirements for agricultural commodity programs with those in use for general public consumers)

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, with that understanding, I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of the Senator from Alaska, [Mr. MURKOWSKI], on the subject of seafood inspection and ask that it be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN], for Mr. MURKOWSKI, proposes an amendment numbered 4983.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . Hereafter, notwithstanding any other provision of law, any domestic fish or fish product produced in compliance with food safety standards or procedures accepted by the Food and Drug Administration as satisfying the requirements of the “Procedures for the Safe and Sanitary Processing and Importing of Fish and Fish Products” (published by the Food and Drug Administration as a final regulation in the Federal Register of December 18, 1995), shall be deemed to have met any inspection requirements of the Department of Agriculture or other Federal agency for any Federal commodity purchase program, including the program authorized under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c) except that the Department of Agriculture or other Federal agency may utilize lot inspection to establish a reasonable degree of certainty that fish or fish products purchased under a Federal commodity purchase program, including the program authorized under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c), meet Federal product specifications.

Mr. BUMPERS. There is no objection on this side, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 4983) was agreed to.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUMPERS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I also understand that Senator HATCH is going to propose an amendment on the subject of generic drugs. We will add that to our list.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business Friday, July 19, the Federal debt stood at \$5,169,596,709,354.27.

On a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes \$19,482.39 as his or her share of that debt.

MID YEAR REPORT—1996

The mailing and filing date of the 1996 Mid Year Report required by the Federal Election Campaign Act, as amended, is Wednesday, July 31, 1996. All Principal Campaign Committees