

Deal	Istook	Nussle
DeFazio	Jackson (IL)	Oberstar
DeGette	Jackson-Lee	Obey
Delahunt	(TX)	Olver
DeLauro	Jefferson	Ortiz
DelLay	Jenkins	Owens
Dellums	John	Oxley
Deutsch	Johnson (CT)	Packard
Diaz-Balart	Johnson (WI)	Pallone
Dickey	Johnson, E. B.	Pappas
Dicks	Johnson, Sam	Parker
Dingell	Jones	Pascarell
Dixon	Kanjorski	Pastor
Doggett	Kaptur	Paxon
Dooley	Kasich	Payne
Doolittle	Kelly	Pease
Doyle	Kennedy (MA)	Pelosi
Dreier	Kennedy (RI)	Peterson (MN)
Duncan	Kennelly	Peterson (PA)
Dunn	Kildee	Petri
Edwards	Kilpatrick	Pickering
Ehlers	Kim	Pickett
Ehrlich	Kind (WI)	Pitts
Emerson	King (NY)	Pombo
Engel	Kingston	Pomeroy
English	Klecza	Porter
Ensign	Klink	Portman
Eshoo	Klug	Poshard
Etheridge	Knollenberg	Price (NC)
Evans	Kolbe	Pryce (OH)
Everett	Kucinich	Quinn
Ewing	LaFalce	Radanovich
Farr	LaHood	Rahall
Fattah	Lampson	Rogan
Fawell	Lantos	Rangel
Fazio	Largent	Redmond
Filner	Latham	Regula
Flake	LaTourette	Reyes
Foley	Lazio	Riggs
Forbes	Leach	Riley
Ford	Levin	Rivers
Fowler	Lewis (CA)	Rodriguez
Fox	Lewis (GA)	Roemer
Frank (MA)	Lewis (KY)	Rogan
Franks (NJ)	Linder	Rogers
Frelinghuysen	Lipinski	Rohrabacher
Frost	Livingston	Ros-Lehtinen
Furse	LoBiondo	Rothman
Galleghy	Lofgren	Roukema
Ganske	Lowey	Roybal-Allard
Gejdenson	Lucas	Rush
Gekas	Luther	Ryun
Gephardt	Maloney (CT)	Sabo
Gibbons	Maloney (NY)	Salmon
Gilchrest	Manton	Sanchez
Gillmor	Manzullo	Sanders
Gilman	Markey	Sandlin
Gonzalez	Martinez	Sawyer
Goode	Mascara	Saxton
Goodlatte	Matsui	Scarborough
Goodling	McCarthy (MO)	Schaefer, Dan
Gordon	McCarthy (NY)	Schaffer, Bob
Goss	McCollum	Schumer
Graham	McCrery	Scott
Granger	McDermott	Serrano
Green	McGovern	Sessions
Greenwood	McHale	Shadegg
Gutierrez	McHugh	Shaw
Gutknecht	McInnis	Shays
Hall (OH)	McIntosh	Sherman
Hall (TX)	McIntyre	Shimkus
Hamilton	McKeon	Shuster
Hansen	McKinney	Sisisky
Harman	McNulty	Skaggs
Hastert	Meehan	Skeen
Hastings (FL)	Meek	Skelton
Hastings (WA)	Menendez	Slaughter
Hayworth	Metcalf	Smith (MI)
Hefley	Mica	Smith (NJ)
Hefner	Millender-	Smith (OR)
Hegger	McDonald	Smith (TX)
Hill	Miller (CA)	Smith, Adam
Hilleary	Miller (FL)	Smith, Linda
Hilliard	Minge	Snowbarger
Hinchey	Mink	Snyder
Hinojosa	Moakley	Solomon
Hobson	Molinari	Souder
Hoekstra	Moran (KS)	Spence
Holden	Moran (VA)	Spratt
Hooley	Morella	Stabenow
Horn	Murtha	Stark
Hostettler	Myrick	Stearns
Houghton	Nadler	Stenholm
Hoyer	Neal	Stokes
Hulshof	Nethercutt	Strickland
Hunter	Neumann	Stump
Hutchinson	Ney	Stupak
Hyde	Northup	Sununu
Inglis	Norwood	Talent

Tanner	Traficant	Weldon (PA)
Tauscher	Turner	Weller
Tauzin	Upton	Wexler
Taylor (MS)	Velazquez	Weygand
Taylor (NC)	Vento	White
Thomas	Visclosky	Whitfield
Thompson	Walsh	Wicker
Thornberry	Wamp	Wise
Thune	Waters	Wolf
Thurman	Watkins	Woolsey
Tiahrt	Watt (NC)	Wynn
Tierney	Watts (OK)	Young (FL)
Torres	Waxman	
Towns	Weldon (FL)	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. Skeen).

The motion was agreed to.

□ 2202

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2160, with Mr. PEASE, Chairman pro tempore, in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole House rose on Thursday, July 17, 1997, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] had been disposed of and the bill had been read through page 13, line 24.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

None of the funds in the foregoing paragraph shall be available to carry out research related to the production, processing or marketing of tobacco or tobacco products.

NATIVE AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS ENDOWMENT FUND

For establishment of a Native American institutions endowment fund, as authorized by Public Law 103-382 (7 U.S.C. 301 note), \$4,600,000.

EXTENSION ACTIVITIES

Payments to States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, Micronesia, Northern Marianas, and American Samoa: For payments for cooperative extension work under the Smith-Lever Act, as amended, to be distributed under sections 3(b) and 3(c) of said Act, and under section 208(c) of Public Law 93-471, for retirement and employees' compensation costs for extension agents and for costs of penalty mail for cooperative extension agents and State extension directors, \$268,493,000; payments for extension work at the 1994 Institutions under the Smith-Lever Act (7 U.S.C. 343(b)(3)), \$2,000,000; payments for the nutrition and family education program for low-income areas under section 3(d) of the Act, \$58,695,000; payments for the pest management program under section 3(d) of the Act, \$10,783,000; payments for the farm safety program under section 3(d) of the Act, \$2,855,000; payments for the pesticide impact assessment program under section 3(d) of the Act, \$3,214,000; payments to upgrade 1890 land-grant college research, extension, and teaching facilities as authorized by section 1447 of Public Law 95-113, as amended (7 U.S.C. 3222b), \$7,549,000, to remain available until expended; payments for the rural development centers under section 3(d) of the Act, \$908,000; payments for a groundwater quality program under section 3(d) of the Act, \$9,061,000; payments for youth-at-risk programs under section 3(d) of the Act, \$9,554,000; payments for a food safety program under section 3(d) of the Act, \$2,365,000; payments for carrying out the provisions of the Renewable Resources Extension Act of 1978, \$3,192,000; payments for Indian reservation agents under section 3(d) of the Act, \$1,672,000; payments for sustainable agriculture programs under section 3(d) of the Act, \$3,309,000; payments for cooperative extension work by the colleges receiving the benefits of the second Morrill Act (7 U.S.C. 321-326, 328) and Tuskegee University, \$25,090,000; and for Federal administration and coordination including administration of

NOES—3
Paul Sanford Sensenbrenner

NOT VOTING—9
Ballenger McDade Schiff
Berman Mollohan Yates
Foglietta Royce Young (AK)

□ 2200

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to allow postal patrons to contribute to funding for breast cancer research through the voluntary purchase of certain specially issued United States postage stamps, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2003

Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2003.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2160, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2160), making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes.

the Smith-Lever Act, as amended, and the Act of September 29, 1977 (7 U.S.C. 341-349), as amended, and section 1361(c) of the Act of October 3, 1980 (7 U.S.C. 301 note), and to coordinate and provide program leadership for the extension work of the Department and the several States and insular possessions, \$6,370,000; in all, \$415,110,000: *Provided*, That funds hereby appropriated pursuant to section 3(c) of the Act of June 26, 1953, and section 506 of the Act of June 23, 1972, as amended, shall not be paid to any State, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, or the Virgin Islands, Micronesia, Northern Marianas, and American Samoa prior to availability of an equal sum from non-Federal sources for expenditure during the current fiscal year.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR
MARKETING AND REGULATORY PROGRAMS

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs to administer programs under the laws enacted by the Congress for the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, the Agricultural Marketing Service, and the Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, \$618,000.

ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION
SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, including those pursuant to the Act of February 28, 1947, as amended (21 U.S.C. 114b-c), necessary to prevent, control, and eradicate pests and plant and animal diseases; to carry out inspection, quarantine, and regulatory activities; to discharge the authorities of the Secretary of Agriculture under the Act of March 2, 1931 (46 Stat. 1468; 7 U.S.C. 426-426b); and to protect the environment, as authorized by law, \$424,244,000, of which \$4,443,000 shall be available for the control of outbreaks of insects, plant diseases, animal diseases and for control of pest animals and birds to the extent necessary to meet emergency conditions: *Provided*, That no funds shall be used to formulate or administer a brucellosis eradication program for the current fiscal year that does not require minimum matching by the States of at least 40 percent: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for field employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed \$40,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for the operation and maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed four, of which two shall be for replacement only: *Provided further*, That, in addition, in emergencies which threaten any segment of the agricultural production industry of this country, the Secretary may transfer from other appropriations or funds available to the agencies or corporations of the Department such sums as he may deem necessary, to be available only in such emergencies for the arrest and eradication of contagious or infectious disease or pests of animals, poultry, or plants, and for expenses in accordance with the Act of February 28, 1947, as amended, and section 102 of the Act of September 21, 1944, as amended, and any unexpended balances of funds transferred for such emergency purposes in the next preceding fiscal year shall be merged with such transferred amounts: *Provided further*, That appropriations hereunder shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2250) for the repair and alteration of leased buildings and improvements, but unless otherwise provided the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 percent of

the current replacement value of the building.

In fiscal year 1998 the agency is authorized to collect fees to cover the total costs of providing technical assistance, goods, or services requested by States, other political subdivisions, domestic and international organizations, foreign governments, or individuals, provided that such fees are structured such that any entity's liability for such fees is reasonably based on the technical assistance, goods, or services provided to the entity by the agency, and such fees shall be credited to this account, to remain available until expended, without further appropriation, for providing such assistance, goods, or services.

Of the total amount available under this heading in fiscal year 1998, \$88,000,000 shall be derived from user fees deposited in the Agricultural Quarantine Inspection User Fee Account.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For plans, construction, repair, preventive maintenance, environmental support, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities, as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 2250, and acquisition of land as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 428a, \$3,200,000, to remain available until expended.

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE
MARKETING SERVICES

For necessary expenses to carry on services related to consumer protection, agricultural marketing and distribution, transportation, and regulatory programs, as authorized by law, and for administration and coordination of payments to States; including field employment pursuant to section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed \$90,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$45,592,000, including funds for the wholesale market development program for the design and development of wholesale and farmer market facilities for the major metropolitan areas of the country: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2250) for the alteration and repair of buildings and improvements, but the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 percent of the current replacement value of the building.

Fees may be collected for the cost of standardization activities, as established by regulation pursuant to law (31 U.S.C. 9701).

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Not to exceed \$59,521,000 (from fees collected) shall be obligated during the current fiscal year for administrative expenses: *Provided*, That if crop size is understated and/or other uncontrollable events occur, the agency may exceed this limitation by up to 10 percent with notification to the Appropriations Committees.

FUNDS FOR STRENGTHENING MARKETS, INCOME,
AND SUPPLY (SECTION 32)

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Funds available under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c) shall be used only for commodity program expenses as authorized therein, and other related operating expenses, except for: (1) transfers to the Department of Commerce as authorized by the Fish and Wildlife Act of August 8, 1956; (2) transfers otherwise provided in this Act; and (3) not more than \$10,690,000 for formulation and administration of marketing agreements and orders pursuant to the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and the Agricultural Act of 1961.

PAYMENTS TO STATES AND POSSESSIONS

For payments to departments of agriculture, bureaus and departments of markets, and similar agencies for marketing activities under section 204(b) of the Agricul-

tural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1623(b)), \$1,200,000.

GRAIN INSPECTION, PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS
ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the United States Grain Standards Act, as amended, for the administration of the Packers and Stockyards Act, for certifying procedures used to protect purchasers of farm products, and the standardization activities related to grain under the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, as amended, including field employment pursuant to section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed \$25,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$23,928,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2250) for the alteration and repair of buildings and improvements, but the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 percent of the current replacement value of the building.

INSPECTION AND WEIGHING SERVICES

LIMITATION ON INSPECTION AND WEIGHING
SERVICE EXPENSES

Not to exceed \$43,092,000 (from fees collected) shall be obligated during the current fiscal year for inspection and weighing services: *Provided*, That if grain export activities require additional supervision and oversight, or other uncontrollable factors occur, this limitation may be exceeded by up to 10 percent with notification to the Appropriations Committees.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FOOD
SAFETY

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety to administer the laws enacted by the Congress for the Food Safety and Inspection Service, \$446,000.

FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE

For necessary expenses to carry on services authorized by the Federal Meat Inspection Act, as amended, the Poultry Products Inspection Act, as amended, and the Egg Products Inspection Act, as amended, \$589,263,000, of which \$5,000,000 shall be available for obligation only after a final rule to implement the provisions of subsection (e) of section 5 of the Egg Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 1034(e)), as amended, is implemented, and in addition, \$1,000,000 may be credited to this account from fees collected for the cost of laboratory accreditation as authorized by section 1017 of Public Law 102-237: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for shell egg surveillance under section 5(d) of the Egg Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 1034(d)): *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for field employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed \$75,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2250) for the alteration and repair of buildings and improvements, but the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 percent of the current replacement value of the building.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FARM
AND FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICES

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services to administer the laws enacted by Congress for the Farm Service Agency, the Foreign Agricultural Service, the Risk Management Agency, and the Commodity Credit Corporation, \$572,000.

FARM SERVICE AGENCY
SALARIES AND EXPENSES
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for carrying out the administration and implementation of programs administered by the Farm Service Agency, \$702,203,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary is authorized to use the services, facilities, and authorities (but not the funds) of the Commodity Credit Corporation to make program payments for all programs administered by the Agency: *Provided further*, That other funds made available to the Agency for authorized activities may be advanced to and merged with this account: *Provided further*, That these funds shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed \$1,000,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

STATE MEDIATION GRANTS

For grants pursuant to section 502(b) of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1987, as amended (7 U.S.C. 5101-5106), \$2,000,000.

DAIRY INDEMNITY PROGRAM
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses involved in making indemnity payments to dairy farmers for milk or cows producing such milk and manufacturers of dairy products who have been directed to remove their milk or dairy products from commercial markets because it contained residues of chemicals registered and approved for use by the Federal Government, and in making indemnity payments for milk, or cows producing such milk, at a fair market value to any dairy farmer who is directed to remove his milk from commercial markets because of (1) the presence of products of nuclear radiation or fallout if such contamination is not due to the fault of the farmer, or (2) residues of chemicals or toxic substances not included under the first sentence of the Act of August 13, 1968, as amended (7 U.S.C. 450j), if such chemicals or toxic substances were not used in a manner contrary to applicable regulations or labeling instructions provided at the time of use and the contamination is not due to the fault of the farmer, \$350,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b): *Provided*, That none of the funds contained in this Act shall be used to make indemnity payments to any farmer whose milk was removed from commercial markets as a result of his willful failure to follow procedures prescribed by the Federal Government: *Provided further*, That this amount shall be transferred to the Commodity Credit Corporation: *Provided further*, That the Secretary is authorized to utilize the services, facilities, and authorities of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the purpose of making dairy indemnity disbursements.

AGRICULTURAL CREDIT INSURANCE FUND
PROGRAM ACCOUNT
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For gross obligations for the principal amount of direct and guaranteed loans as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1928-1929, to be available from funds in the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund, as follows: farm ownership loans, \$430,828,000 of which \$400,000,000 shall be for guaranteed loans; operating loans, \$2,341,701,000 of which \$1,700,000,000 shall be for unsubsidized guaranteed loans and \$191,701,000 shall be for subsidized guaranteed loans; Indian tribe land acquisition loans as authorized by 25 U.S.C. 488, \$500,000; for emergency insured loans, \$25,000,000 to meet the needs resulting from natural disasters; for boll weevil eradication program loans as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1989, \$34,653,000; and for credit sales of acquired property, \$19,432,000.

For the cost of direct and guaranteed loans, including the cost of modifying loans as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as follows: farm ownership loans, \$19,460,000 of which \$15,440,000 shall be for guaranteed loans; operating loans, \$67,255,000 of which \$19,210,000 shall be for unsubsidized guaranteed loans and \$18,480,000 shall be for subsidized guaranteed loans; Indian tribe land acquisition loans as authorized by 25 U.S.C. 488, \$66,000; for emergency insured loans, \$6,008,000 to meet the needs resulting from natural disasters; for boll weevil eradication program loans as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1989, \$500,000; and for credit sales of acquired property, \$2,530,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, \$218,446,000 of which \$208,446,000 shall be transferred to and merged with the "Farm Service Agency, Salaries and Expenses" account.

RISK MANAGEMENT AGENCY

For administrative and operating expenses, as authorized by the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 6933), \$65,000,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$700 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses, as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1506(i). In addition, for sales commissions of agents, as authorized by section 516 (7 U.S.C. 1516) \$188,571,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY:
On page 27, line 23, strike "\$188,571,000" and insert "\$152,571,000".

On page 48, line 11, strike "\$3,924,000,000" insert "(increased by \$23,700,000)".

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does any Member raise a point of order under clause 2(f) of rule XXI against provisions of the bill addressed by the amendment but not yet reached in the reading (to wit: page 48, line 6, through page 49, line 18)?

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, 2 years ago this Congress had a major fight because the majority wanted to cut school lunches. Last year the majority tried to cut the WIC program, which is a nutrition program for infants and young mothers. In this bill they are again falling some \$30 million short in the WIC Program of what would be required to maintain our existing case load.

What happens in this bill is that the committee is attempting to bring the carryover funds down to around 3 percent or less. That creates a problem because this program needs a certain amount of carryover funds in order to pay the reimbursements that come in after the end of the fiscal year.

OMB and USDA both estimate that without this amendment that I am offering tonight that we run the risk of seeing 55,000 women, children, and infants bounced out of the WIC Program. Basically what we do is to restore that funding and pay for it by reducing the increase in this bill, which the committee provided above the administration request for commissions for crop insurance.

Before anybody has a heart attack and says, oh, do not hurt our farmers,

I want to make quite clear, this amendment will in no way hurt farmers. The GAO reported that under the crop insurance program we had a number of fiscal failures. The General Accounting Office said that they found in the crop insurance program expenses for above average commissions paid to agents by one large company, corporate aircraft and excessive automobile charges, country club memberships and various entertainment activities for agents and employees such as skybox rentals at professional sporting events. The GAO went on to indicate that the problem could best be addressed by reducing the commission that is provided to insurance agents under the program.

Now, we have some scare tactics being followed by some people who would like to see this amendment not passed. Members are being told, for instance, in a letter circulated by the American Association of Crop Insurers that this is going to hurt farmers. That is absolutely not true. There are four separate assertions in this letter which are dead wrong.

First of all, they say that the cuts that I am proposing will occur in addition to the Meehan amendment. That is in fact wrong. If my amendment is passed, the Meehan amendment cannot even be offered on the House floor.

Second, they say that a 10.5-percent commission is insufficient and would cause cancellation of policies. We are not talking about a 10-percent commission. We are talking about limiting these commissions to 24.5 percent rather than the 28 percent in the bill.

Third, they claim that the Obey amendment is an attack on farmers. That is absolute nonsense. What is an attack on farmers is the ridiculous farm policy that we have had under both Democratic and Republican administrations for the past 12 years which have driven prices down and driven many farmers off the farm. This proposal or this assertion that this cut in insurance rates or insurance commissions will hurt farmers is, as Mo Udall used to say, straight gumwah, absolute gumwah. All this does is to say that we want farmers and taxpayers to get the best possible deal for the money. This proposal does absolutely nothing to change the crop insurance program. It does absolutely nothing to raise the cost of this program for farmers. What it does do is to stop the rip-off that this program has had to endure from some of the people who have been trying to sell this insurance to farmers, and so it is a simple choice. If you want to continue to support the kind of rip-offs that some of these agents had provided, then you vote against the amendment.

If you want to, on the other hand, ensure that we do not knock 55,000 to 60,000 women and infants and children off the WIC Program, then vote for the amendment. That is the sound thing to do.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. Mr. Chairman, this bill is a fair and balanced bill. It takes care of the needs of farmers and ranchers, research related to agriculture, nutrition and food safety, rural development and housing for low-income people, the safety of our food, drugs, and medical devices, and the stoppage of gunwah. We have worked very hard to present the House with a well-balanced bill. The bill includes \$3.924 billion for WIC, an increase of \$118 million above last year, so no one is taking anybody off of WIC. I ask to defeat this amendment.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Obey amendment. As I recall what happened in the committee, when we were working through this issue, it was quite well discussed in the committee; the administration had asked for \$154 million for the actual sales commissions. This is money, \$154 million, that goes to agents who are brokering crop insurance in our country and their commissions.

□ 2215

It is \$154 million. It is not an insignificant amount of money. And, in fact, at that level we estimated every sales agent would receive a 24.5 percent commission. Now, that is a pretty healthy commission, even at 24.5 percent.

What happened once the bill came out of the subcommittee and moved to the full committee, at that point in the manager's amendment the proposal was to increase the sales commissions to \$188 million, which would raise the amount of commission back to the level of about 27 percent. So we are really talking about whether somebody who is selling insurance out there is making a 27-percent commission or if they are making a 24.5-percent commission.

And if the GAO study had not been so clear on abuses in the program, I think that people who hold my opinion on this would not feel so strongly. We really do not believe, and we have taken the advice of the Department of Agriculture on this, we do not believe this is going to in any way diminish the amount of crop insurance available to farmers but, in fact, will put in the kind of regimen that we need in that program to make sure we counter abuses.

Mr. Chairman, I do not really know why the proponents of the higher level of commission were able to prevail at the full committee level, but it seems to me we are being responsible in this amendment. We are trying to cut back on the abuses that the GAO identified.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman talked about a 27.5-percent

commission, and I think in all due fairness to the insurance agents, the average commission for Federal crop insurance is about 10 percent to the agent. The other money goes to cover the administrative costs of running this program through the private sector.

Now, if we do not pay those costs and all of that falls back on the Government, we will spend a lot more than that in beefing up our personnel at all the farm service agencies to handle this thing. We should be fair with the insurance agent. They are not getting 24.5 percent, they are not getting 27.5 percent. The average is about 10 percent.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, if I might reclaim my time, I think the GAO was very clear in the analysis that they did on an objective basis, and there are serious questions about who is making money.

I think the taxpayers of our country would be pretty upset if they knew that they were paying for commissions to the private sector. That is not quite the way they think it is supposed to work. They do not understand a lot of the details about what crop insurance is all about, but the point is that it is not a program that has a terrific reputation and, therefore, we were trying to be fair.

We did meet the requirements of the Department of Agriculture. They asked for \$154 million. We passed that at the subcommittee level. When it went to the full committee, all of a sudden some of the powers that be, the ones that like making those bigger commissions, made their weight felt.

I think the gentleman from Wisconsin has a responsible amendment. He represents a very agricultural State, as do I. We have seen abuses in this program, and this is a way of sending a very strong message that we are not going to overly reward those who are performing this service.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will continue to yield, she mentioned two things: No. 1 that they are getting this large commission, which is not the case; and, No. 2, the public does not think that people who sell Federal crop insurance earn a commission? That is what I understood the gentlewoman to say. I would think that they would not do it for nothing.

Ms. KAPTUR. Reclaiming my time, I think the gentleman understands my point that the taxpayers, if they really understood this, would be outraged that they are paying commissions to private sector insurance agents to sell this insurance.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment by the gentleman from Wisconsin. It is understandable that he would attempt to move money to the WIC Program, but I want to point out to my colleagues why this is irresponsible to do it at this point and at this time.

As has been mentioned, the WIC Program is already a \$3.9 billion program. It has been increased this year \$118 million, and this is an attempt to put \$23 million, a dribble compared to the total, by decimating the crop insurance program in this country. The \$23 million transfer amounts to a 20-percent reduction in crop insurance.

Now, if we want to debate the question of crop insurance and should those insurers receive 24.5 percent or 27 percent, or 34 percent which they received last year, down to 28 percent, the bill funds it at 27 percent, why do we not follow what is going on right now?

The Department of Agriculture, as we speak, is negotiating with the crop insurers to determine at what level crop insurance will be funded. Now, if we eliminate the opportunity for crop insurance insurers to negotiate with the Department of Agriculture by passing this bill, we have already ended the negotiation. Now, that is foolishness. That is irresponsible.

We are trusting the Secretary of Agriculture and the crop insurers to enter into a negotiation, which has always been the case. They will determine at what level crop insurers will be paid for. I am sure the Secretary of Agriculture will protect the taxpayers, as he has in the past, when they have negotiated.

I add again, in the past crop insurers have received 34 percent. We are now down, if the gentleman's amendment is passed, down to 24 percent. That is to cover 54 agricultural programs in America. I suggest there will not be crop insurance available for 54 commodities across the United States.

And for someone to say this does not hurt farmers is preposterous. For someone to say this does not change crop insurance is preposterous. Of course it affects farmers, because it eliminates crop insurance. If we do not want to eliminate crop insurance, defeat this amendment and allow the Secretary to negotiate properly.

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

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I would just take a second to point out that we are taking the Secretary's advice in the original mark of the committee, which was at \$154 million, and we agree that there should be negotiations. In fact, the proposal was the administration's Department of Agriculture's request. So I do not think we need to add to it.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, that was the Secretary's offer. That was before the negotiation ever started. The negotiation has not been completed or culminated. The Secretary makes an offer, the crop insurers make an offer. That is the way negotiations are supposed to be conducted.

So again I say to my colleagues, this hurts farmers across the country. Defeat this amendment.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Let me just say, Mr. Chairman, that this does not reduce crop insurance but it reduces crop insurance commissions. Let us be clear about that.

I rise in strong support of the Obey amendment to increase funding for the Women, Infants, and Children Program, a program which provides nutrition assistance to pregnant women and to young children. Last year the congressional majority went after the school lunch program; earlier this year it was the milk and cereal for women and infants.

If my colleagues recall, it was not long ago this year that the Congress debated the merits of the WIC Program during the disaster relief bill. Threats of reduction in the program. It was wrong then and it is wrong now.

These reductions in the WIC Program, I might add, were met with an outcry across the country and, in fact, in a number of places we already saw people who were being thrown off of the program, women and children who were being let go from the program. But I will say that Congress rightly responded by providing the dollars that WIC needed to continue helping to provide nutritious food to women who are expecting children, to infants, and to young children.

Fact is, is that our experience with the WIC Program shows that it is a wise investment. Each dollar invested in WIC saves more than \$3 in other Government spending on programs such as Medicaid. It is a wise investment in the health and development of our youngest children, and each day we learn more and more about the critical elements of early childhood development. So supporting WIC helps kids get off on the right foot.

For years we have been steadily progressing toward the goal of providing nutrition assistance to 7.5 million people through the WIC Program. At the very least, we need to hold the line and continue helping 7.4 million women and children as WIC now does.

The funding level in this bill threatens to backtrack on WIC, help fewer people who depend on it. It includes unrealistic assumptions that could end up costing our kids plenty. It is important to note that WIC is funded at \$180 million below what the President's request is.

The Obey amendment will address the danger that women and children who need help will be left without healthy food. The Obey amendment will add \$23.7 million, enough to provide WIC benefits for 45,000 people, and the amendment prevents knocking off the 55,000 people off of the WIC program.

The Obey amendment offsets this amount by reducing the \$36 million in excessive payments to crop insurance agents contained in the bill. One more time: It is crop insurance commissions and not crop insurance. The Secretary

of Agriculture said the insurance agents do not need this extra money.

The GAO has revealed that the taxpayer money is used for outrageous, unreasonable expenses, such as sky boxes at athletic events, country club membership fees, and corporate aircraft. This does not hurt farmers.

The choice before us is to fund efforts to provide healthy food to pregnant women, to young children; or to pay insurance agents to buy sky boxes and to join country clubs. I urge my colleagues, really, to make the choice that is right; to deal with our values and priorities in this country. Let us help those who need the funds, women, infants, and children, and I urge my colleagues to support the Obey amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. DELAURO. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that we are not even asking that we meet the administration's request for funding level for WIC. This bill funds WIC at \$184 million below the President's request. We are adding only a tiny portion back. That is hardly excessive.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am not quite sure where to start here, because I think everyone should be informed, I guess, in their statements. And the fact of the matter is, on the WIC Program the administration says we need about a 2½ percent carryover. The bill, with the current funding, has over 3 percent carryover funds. There is more than enough money in the WIC Program to take care of any needs, any emergencies at all.

I think the real debate here is what we are doing to farmers. And I can tell my colleagues, as a farmer myself, that the idea of tying the hands of farmers trying to protect their risk, and agriculture is probably the most volatile business one can be in. A farmer takes more risk than any other business on a year-to-year basis, and they are at the mercy of Mother Nature for hail, wind, rain. We flooded out at home this year.

But the idea of taking away this tool from farmers, insurance, and under the farm bill last year, Mr. Chairman, we made a commitment to farmers out there. We said that they would have the freedom to make choices themselves but they would have with that freedom the responsibility to take care of the risks they have in agriculture. We assured them that there would be insurance available for them; that there would be revenue insurance plans, new innovative plans out there.

Farmers are in the middle of a transition today, of going from the old 60 years of Government control, which has caused the demise of the small family farmer, now to the opportunity to finally make decisions for themselves, to insure their own risk, to cre-

ate opportunities, to keep their family farms together.

□ 2230

This gutting amendment to crop insurance cuts at the heart of opportunity for farmers and anyone involved in agriculture today.

We are not asking for much. We are asking for the opportunity to work inside the system. And a reduction like that, a 6, almost 7 percent reduction in the current bill from what insurance was last year, is harmful enough, let alone to take it down to a level where we are going to have insurance companies no longer offering crop insurance to real farmers out there.

I am surprised that people who are from farm States would be offering this type of amendment, which is going to decimate the insurance business, going to hurt farmers out there, take away the opportunities to protect their own risk.

Apparently, what we want to do is go back to a system where the Government comes in and helps out with disaster payments. And if we want to look at the trend in agriculture in farm bills, 10 years ago we were spending about \$26 billion a year directly to farmers. This year it is about \$5 billion. We are at 20 percent where we were 10 years ago support for agriculture and for farmers. And I think it is really a low blow to anyone who cares about agriculture.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Agriculture, for 7 of the last 11 years, has taken the biggest hit on reductions. I would like to convince my colleagues over on the left that we have now stopped and are phasing out subsidies for agriculture. I helped write the risk management language in the farm bill. They now have to pay for this insurance. No more disaster relief for agriculture.

If we cannot phase in this kind of risk management insurance for farmers, we are going to be very hard-pressed. As we phase out the subsidy programs and do not pay the farmers that direct payment anymore, now we are simply saying farmers have to dig into their own pocket to start covering their risk, no more disaster insurance, no more subsidy payments. I think it is very important that we not cut way down on the phasing in of this risk management and insurance.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, let me say in closing, anyone who likes to eat, who likes to eat food, good quality food, at a reasonable price, produced by family farms who care about agriculture should oppose this amendment, understanding there is way more money than necessary in the WIC program already, but you are cutting the heart out of the family farmers when you do this, and anyone who votes for this amendment is cutting out the family

farmer; and let them all remember that.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

For those of my colleagues who are prolife, as I am, I urge them to vote yes on the Obey amendment. This is one of the most positive prolife votes my colleagues will be called upon to cast. This program, we all know, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] knows, and the gentleman votes for WIC, this program helps pregnant women and nursing women and their children, their children both born and unborn.

If one is truly prolife, it is not enough to be only anti-abortion. Prolife is a very positive position and not just a negative position. I am anti-abortion, but I am prolife. And there is a fundamental distinction in that.

Many of my colleagues were elected to this Congress on a prolife platform. They campaigned on a prolife platform. They asked the National Right to Life for their endorsement. They asked their own State Right to Life for endorsement. They ran on a prolife platform, and many of them got elected because they ran on that prolife platform.

I do not think any of them ran on a crop insurance commission platform. Now this is a chance for them to stand on that prolife platform. This is an essential vote for prolife. Be positive. Be for life. Vote for this amendment. My colleagues talk about food, feeding people. Pregnant women are hungry. Remember those words uttered about 2,000 years ago: "I was hungry, and you gave me to eat." Prolife, vote for this amendment.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I am prolife, and I certainly agree with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] that one of the strongest things one can do as a Member of the Congress who is prolife is to support people who are hungry. And that is why I am going to vote against the WIC bureaucrat increase and vote for the farmers.

The farmers are the ones who produce foods, not Washington bureaucrats. It appears that our well-intended friends on the other side of the aisle are once again feeding bureaucrats, and this time they are taking the food away from the families by hitting the farmers right between the eyes on it.

Mr. Speaker, the agriculture bill is always kind of a convoluted maze of price supports, import-export quotas, allotments, all kinds of different jargon that is unique to the ag committees and ag laws. But the results of it are spectacular. Two percent of the American population feeds 100 percent of the population plus millions of people throughout the world.

Americans, on an average, pay 11 cents on a dollar earned for food. That is less than what they pay for recre-

ation, on an average. That is why we have so many of these farm programs. Some of them are very hard to explain. But the results, when you are paying 11 cents on the dollar for food and 2 percent of the population is feeding 100 percent, it works.

In this bill of \$49 billion, \$37 billion goes to food and nutrition programs. Just in May, 2 months ago, we increased WIC \$76 million. And I quote from the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO], my friend, May 1, 1997, "the \$76 million figure is based on numbers submitted from the States to the U.S. Department of Agriculture in early April of this year. These numbers are, in fact, only a few weeks old."

We increased in response to that \$76 million. Now we have increased it again a mere 2 months later \$118 million. Now, it is always nice to say, hey, we have got starving women. But according to the numbers of our colleagues on the left, that \$76 million increase was full funded. Now we are going another 118. According to our figures, USDA figures, this is full participation of WIC at 7.4 million people.

Mr. Speaker, it is also important to note that WIC, as we speak, has a \$200 million carry-over. That is a surplus in the WIC fund. We are not talking about children versus commission agents. We are talking about farmers versus bureaucrats. I know there are a lot of people who like bureaucrats and a lot of people who want to see government grow. But as for me, I am going to go with the farmers. Because it is the farmers who grow the food, it is the farmers who feed the children, it is the farmers who feed the families, it is the farmers who feed the babies. It is not Washington bureaucrats. The only thing that this thing does is take money away from farmers and give it to the bureaucrats. I urge my colleagues to vote against the amendment.

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

Mr. KINGSTON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I think that what happens is we are taking the taxpayers' money and giving the sales commissions to the insurance agents. That is who is getting the money.

Mr. KINGSTON. Reclaiming my time, it would be great if we were privately funding the whole bill. But, unfortunately, the taxpayers are paying all \$49 billion of this bill; \$37 billion of it is going into food and nutrition programs for children, but that is not enough.

What appears to be happening is that some folks want to take more away from the farmers and give more to Washington bureaucrats. The farmers are the ones feeding the families.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield further, I agree with the gentleman. We had a freedom to farm bill and we said to the farmers of America, compete in the global marketplace. Why do we not say the same to the insurance agents?

Mr. KINGSTON. Reclaiming my time, I know there are a lot of people who do not like the private sector, and I know the private sector is anathema to many Members on my colleague's side. But the fact is the private sector is delivering the insurance program cheaper than some of his friends over at USDA. It is saving taxpayer dollars. It is shrinking the size of Government. And it is more efficiently penetrating the marketplace so we do not have to have these disaster relief bills that are a big government expenditure year after year.

I think, finally, the USDA has moved in a very smart, efficient, common-sense direction. But now again, Mr. Speaker, people want to take money away from the farmers and give it to the bureaucrats. Their amendment is bureaucrat and it is anti-food and anti-farmers. I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the requisite number of words.

I would like to get a little more direct in the conversation and try to have a little less demagoguery back and forth on either side here. Frankly, this is no way the type of bill it can be construed to be, the farmers versus the bureaucrats. We are talking about commissions here.

Farmers, as far as I know, do not make insurance commissions. But we are talking about a WIC program that is generally perceived to be probably one of the most successful programs we have had in the social programs of this country. We are talking about a program that deals with low birth weights, deals with infant mortality, deals with child anemia, saves money in Medicaid in the future, and reduces the number of infants that need costly medical care in the future.

Basically, what we are trying to do, as I think the Members on that side of the aisle well know, is make sure that we forward fund enough so that there is not a lapse going from one year to the next year and that we do not leave some 45 to 55 thousand women, infants, and children without the kind of nutritional work and without the kind of food that they need to be sustained in this successful program. And we are pitting that against, I guess you would say, the insurance people, the ones that are earning that commission, not against the farmers.

Certainly, nobody has the intention of harming the farmers here. And few people in my district or many other districts, I would suggest, are going to believe that this is a thing against farmers and bureaucrats. It is commissions being earned by insurance people, and it is people that are women, children, and infants receiving nutrition that they need to make sure that they do not fall between the cracks as we go from one year to another.

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

Mr. TIERNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TIERNEY] for yielding.

I simply want to say that I find a couple of the last statements bordering on jokes. Just because one repeats a mistake 50 times does not make it a fact. And the fact is that this does not do anything to cut crop insurance. It cuts crop insurance commissions.

Now when they passed a freedom to farm act, I would say to our friends on the other side of the aisle, they did not pass a freedom to milk the farmers act. And neither did they pass a bill that allowed salesmen to milk the taxpayers.

What we are trying to do is to simply meet our primary responsibility to farmers to see to it that programs which we have on the books for their assistance are defensible so that demagogos do not rip them up. And the fact is that when insurance agents are going around charging skyboxes at baseball and football stadiums to the taxpayer, that discredits the entire program. And that kind of nonsense has to stop, and that is what we are attempting to do.

It so happens to be that the USDA and the OMB, the Office of Management and Budget, and the Agriculture Department both agree with the Obey amendment because they know that in the long run nothing protects farmers more than protecting the integrity of programs that are supposed to serve farmers. When we have insurance agents ripping this program off, it does not do diddly for farmers, despite the propaganda mantra that is being repeated this evening, and it certainly does not do diddly for the taxpayers.

If my colleagues are on the side of farmers and not on the side of women and infants and children who need WIC funding, they support this amendment; they do not listen to the propaganda of the insurance agents who are ripping off the country in this case.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I obviously associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], and I close by saying that we have to take a chance, Mr. Chairman. I do not want to take a chance that 45 to 55 thousand women, infants, and children are going to be at risk at the end of this year. I will take the chance that some insurance agency does not make all of the commission that they might otherwise be entitled to under this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2245

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 40 minutes and that the time be equally divided.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman when he says let us not demagog this. Let us be perfectly up front of what is happening. We did away with subsidies for farmers in the freedom to farm bill last year. Risk management is a new type of insurance. It is insurance that not only is sunshine insurance on the weather, but it is also insurance on what happens to those crop prices in the new revolution of world trade where other countries can affect now the price as much as production in this country.

So we are moving into a new area of insurance called risk management insurance. The amount of money that we call commissions is a subsidy to farmers, because if that commission is not paid by taxpayers in this transition to this new type of insurance program, then it is going to be paid by the farmers. That money is going to be charged to somebody.

Right now the Secretary of Agriculture is negotiating to the best of his ability to get those commissions as low as possible. So I would suggest with great respect for the people that made this amendment's feeling of need for the WIC Program is that it is not a good policy judgment to take it out of a new risk management program as we try to move farmers into their decisionmaking of deciding how much of what crop to plant instead of Government doing it, as we put the burden on farmers for the risk of disaster and the risk of their success in farming, as we take away the deficiency programs that taxpayers have paid to farmers for the last 50 years.

So in an effort to make this transition, I think it is very important that we move farmers into reaching into their own pocket, which they are doing with this insurance program, and satisfying their risk management needs. But it is a new area. Let us not cut down or cut back on the transition to this new era where agriculture and farmers and ranchers are moving into the private sector and the real marketplace.

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Obey amendment. I would like to address it from two basic areas. One is the credibility and the importance of the WIC Program. The second will be about the difference between our argument over here about insurance commissions versus the good will and the kind of product that we get out of the WIC Program.

Members will hear me on this floor talk many times about early childhood development. Let me give my colleagues some statistics about what early childhood development really means to us as taxpayers on both sides of the aisle.

It is estimated by national non-partisan groups that we as taxpayers pay approximately \$800,000 per child where we have to pay for nutrition pro-

grams, remedial education, sometimes incarceration and all kinds of other social programs later on in life. We pay that. Instead of investing merely 10 percent of that money early on, we can prevent those kinds of problems. In the age group 0 to 6, which is where the WIC Program really focuses its effort, if we put our money into that area, we will save taxpayers on both sides of the aisle a great deal of money.

In my State of Rhode Island just recently, a pregnant woman on the WIC Program gave birth to a daughter, Mindy, but after only 27 weeks of pregnancy. When Mindy was born, she was merely 1 pound 5 ounces, with her head barely the size of a small peach. But thanks to special formula and the follow-up visits because of the WIC Program we have put into place, nutritionists helped Mindy and her mother, and now after a year and a half she is as active as any toddler that we would know.

Mindy's mom could never have afforded her continual visits and the nutrition she received as a result of WIC. The assistance WIC has given to her is exactly how we can save taxpayers money later on. Medical research has found that WIC reduces infant mortality, improves diet and has been linked to improving development among children. For every dollar that we put into the WIC Program, we save \$3.50 later on in Medicaid and other costs.

The validity and the importance of WIC is undeniable. So the real question is why would we take \$23.7 million out of the crop insurance fund for this? Let me tell my colleagues, if they were on this side and arguing this, they would say any program that has overhead and commission of 27 percent should be looked at and changed. They would say privatization is the cure to that. And if any company was operating on an overhead and a commission of 27 percent, they should be looked into as a part of the Government. We are saying, quite frankly, that overhead and commission is far too much. To knock it down to 24.5 percent is barely reasonable, to knock it down even more than that is more than reasonable for the taxpayers. What we are saying is do not hurt the farmers, but do not hurt the women, infants and children. Realize that there should be a reduction in this overhead and this commission and it should go to helping women, infants and children.

If Members are for insurance rates and are for paying that outrageous fee for overhead and commission, do not vote for the Obey amendment. But if Members truly are concerned about saving taxpayers money and helping women, infants and children, vote for the Obey amendment.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to express my support for the Obey amendment to the Agriculture appropriations bill. This amendment, as my colleagues have

heard, is going to add \$23.7 million for the special supplemental food program for women, infants and children. Under that amendment, \$23.7 million would be taken from funding for crop insurance sales commissions. The Committee on Appropriations raised the funding for crop insurance sales commissions above the level that was approved by the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations. The Department of Agriculture has indicated that the level approved by the subcommittee is sufficient for the crop insurance sales commissions. The offset appears to be appropriate and reasonable.

The Committee on Appropriations funding level for WIC is \$30 million short of what is needed to maintain the current caseload in fiscal year 1998, and it would result in a reduction in participation of 55,000 to 60,000 women, infants and children next year.

Mr. Chairman, WIC is an effective prevention program that saves on future health care costs. WIC provides food, education, and child care to poor women, infants and children. It is estimated that 1 in 5 children in our country is living in poverty and 5 million children under the age of 12 go to bed hungry each month. No child in our country should go to bed hungry. Only well-nourished children reach their potential and become productive contributing members of society.

Fortunately, Mr. Chairman, the pain and violence of hunger can be reduced by appropriating additional money to the WIC Program. This increase would provide supplemental food and nutrition education for at least 45,000 women, infants and children per month in the coming fiscal year. Without this additional money, these eligible participants will be part of the growing childhood hunger epidemic that plagues us.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a yes vote on the amendment.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I had an amendment that I was going to offer, but I am going to withdraw that amendment and rise in support of the Obey amendment. The one difference in my amendment and his amendment is he is asking for \$23 million and I was asking for \$184 million for the 1998 fiscal year. Actually I was asking to bring WIC up to the request that the President had asked for. Again, another difference is rather than take it from the crop insurance, I had asked for a cut across the board which would represent 37 percent of all discretionary accounts in that program.

The choice between whether we ask for the crop insurance or ask for WIC, that is a hard issue obviously. But in the final analysis, it is really not a hard issue if we are going to raise children. If the difference is between hav-

ing kids to eat, having kids to be healthy, that is no question at all. My preference is that we do not take it from the crop insurance, because I personally know the crop insurance is needed.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. CLAYTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I will vote for that amendment if she puts it in, but let us not take it out of crop insurance that farmers are going to suffer from.

Mrs. CLAYTON. The gentleman will vote for \$184 million for WIC?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. If the gentlewoman takes it out as a pro rata reduction across the board. But do not take it out of crop insurance that is so important in the transition of the Freedom to Farm bill.

Mrs. CLAYTON. The gentleman has concurrence on his side that he will vote for the \$185 million?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I will vote for it.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Did the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] hear the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] say that he would be willing to move from \$23 million to \$184 million that I had offered? I was just wondering and that seemed like a bargain to me, but I do not know if he has concurrence on his side of the aisle.

Mr. OBEY. If the gentlewoman will yield, with all due respect, I think we have the proper amendment before us. The gentleman is suggesting that he would add what?

Mrs. CLAYTON. That he would raise it from \$23 million to \$184 million.

Mr. OBEY. Where does the money come from?

Mrs. CLAYTON. My amendment would have it coming from across the board.

Mr. OBEY. I understand the gentlewoman's would, but where is he suggesting?

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, where is the gentleman from Michigan suggesting?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Pro rata across the board like she is suggesting.

Mr. OBEY. I do not think that is the proper way to do business.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, the point is that trying to raise the level of children to be healthy indeed is not a hard decision.

I think the preferable way would be across the board. That is what my amendment would do. But if we are not going to raise it \$23 million, I can ill expect that we are going to raise it \$184 million, what the President asked for.

We have a bill before Congress called Hunger Has a Cure. It simply means that those of us who care about children and care about starving people or care about their health, we feel it ought to be raised to an issue. I personally have a preference that it should come across the board. But if I am not going to get that opportunity, I am

going to withdraw that amendment. If the Obey amendment goes down, maybe I will offer it, but if it does not go down, we will indeed be supportive of it.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think there has been a healthy debate here. I certainly have not agreed with all of the theories put out, particularly on the other side, but I think there are some points that need to be made.

No. 1, the Federal crop insurance program costs are being reduced. It is a fact that if we expect USDA to carry this program all on their own without the private sector, the Government would cost 147 percent more than the private sector. So it is not a good investment for us to be cutting a program that is cost effective.

There has been a lot of talk over here about skyboxes. But let me tell my colleagues that the Federal Crop Insurance Program makes a contract with the insurers and at a set rate reimburses them. If an insurance company or anyone else chooses to have a skybox, that is something else and it is not charged to the Federal Government. They enter into a contract, the Federal Government, with the crop insurance agency.

Let me also say that farmers will suffer because of the Obey amendment. Under this amendment, service will be cut, farmers will have to wait longer for an adjuster to come, they will wait longer to get a claim settled, and the range of products which are offered to America's farmers will very likely change.

□ 2300

So it does have a detrimental effect. Finally, all the criticism about the Federal crop insurance program and how it operates and all the talk about WIC. Well, while WIC is a fine program, I am sure, there are many who claim that there is waste and fraud in the WIC Program, and I believe that is substantiated by GAO, and yet we hear nothing about that as if there were no problems in that. There are problems in probably every Federal program, so throwing more money at it is certainly not the answer.

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

Mr. EWING. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I am on the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, and the gentleman is on the Specialty Commodities Committee. Now on these programs, to make sure, is WIC fully funded?

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding.

Mr. KINGSTON. According to our calculations it is funded at 7.4 million participants and that it is fully funded.

Now does WIC have any leftover money, or are they scraping the bottom right now?

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, I think they had \$200 million, was it left in their account?

Mr. KINGSTON. They have a \$200 million carryover, and so the discussion of saying that there are children starving and because of this we have got to give the benefit of the doubt is totally specious, totally emotional, total demagoguery. The children are not starving. The only thing we are going to do here is increase the bureaucracy on the backs of the American farmer. That is what we are talking about.

Mr. EWING. Did we not just increase WIC funding a couple months ago?

Mr. KINGSTON. We increased it in May by \$76 million. We increase it in this bill \$118 million.

Mr. EWING. That is almost \$200 million.

Mr. KINGSTON. Exactly. And 2 months ago we were told the \$76 million increase would bring us up to the full participation level, and we did not have a dialog or a debate about this in committee. It was everybody was happy.

Mr. EWING. In the appropriation process, has the gentleman found that just large expenditures and new money make a program better?

Mr. KINGSTON. No; I have not.

That is a very good point because there seems to be something here that WIC is good, pay more money into it. It can be good at adequately funded levels right now, and I am not sure why people are trying to run away from that. It is possible that the program is good as is. I think, and the gentleman has already suggested, we should try to increase the efficiency of it. I think that there is some waste in it. Twenty-five percent of the money goes to administration. I think we could do a better job and feed more children from that, and less bureaucrats. But to add money to a program that has a \$200 million carryover, a \$200 million surplus, if the gentleman will, and a program that is already completely fully funded is ridiculous, and to take it away from American farmers is even worse.

Mr. EWING. Reclaiming the balance of my time, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Georgia, I appreciate the hard work he has done on this bill, and I think we should defeat this amendment.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my very strong support for the Obey amendment. We all experienced the debate that we had to restore the \$76 million just a few months ago when there was reported to be a shortfall that would severely impact on all of our districts, and so here again we are now confronted by a committee deliberation, which, as I understand it, will be shortfaling again a full funding as recommended by the Department of Agriculture, some \$30 million short. The Obey amendment will provide \$23.7 million of this shortfall.

The issue is we have to base our funding upon reliable statistics from either

OMB or the Department of Agriculture. It makes no sense for us to discuss what the estimated number of participants will be in this program. We have to trust the estimates provided us by the Department, and by their statistics and their analysis there will be some 50,000 individuals left out if this additional money were not provided.

So I support that. It seems to me that if we could support this program with a sense that if there are eligible people that meet the criteria that we have set by our legislation, then they ought not to be left without support under the program. It should be as simple as that. If my colleagues do not like the eligibility standards or because they think too many people are being allowed in, then change the standards. But as long as we have the standards there that say 185 percent of poverty, they qualify; if they have children younger than 1 year of age and so forth, if they meet these qualifications, it seems to me it is perfectly right that the Government appropriate the moneys necessary to meet this obligation. I consider this an obligation.

The program has provided tremendous benefits to all of us, not only the children and the mothers involved, but because with the early support and the early nutritional information and the foods that are supplied, we have been able to cut down the costs of Medicaid and other health benefits which they might have an entitlement to receive. So it is a very, very cost-benefit, cost-efficient program.

So it seems to me that it is very logical that if my colleagues support the women, infants children program, that they would do everything they can to fully fund it to make sure that every child that is eligible, every expectant mother who is eligible would have the necessary program support.

Now we have heard tonight about this \$200 million, moneys that have not been called for. I had the opportunity to attend a WIC conference in San Francisco not too long ago, and there was a discussion there as to why this additional moneys seem to have a carryover at the end of the year. The reason is simple. All of us run our offices. We incur obligations, we pay bills, we send our vouchers to the finance office here for payment. But the payments are not forthcoming. It may take a month, it may take 2 months to have our bills paid. But that does not mean because we have these funds on reserve in our committee account that they are not obligated. That \$200 million is obligated.

The people who I talked to from the WIC Program tell me these are unpaid vouchers that have been submitted but have not been paid to that. This is not extra money that we can use to balance the budget or reduce the deficit. These are moneys that have been committed to the program up to the end of the fiscal year. They have been vouchers submitted to the Government but not paid. Let us not steal from this

money just because it seems to be a carryover balance. These are moneys that are committed.

If we are going to budget for the next fiscal year, let us be real, let us count the number of families, number of women and children that we believe are going to be eligible, estimate what the costs are going to be; costs are rising, the price of the commodities is going up; and let us appropriate sufficient amounts of money so that we do not have to come here in the spring next year and worry about a supplemental allocation. It seems to me that that is the least we can do to support this program which so many people say is so beneficial to our families.

We all run on a family first kind of agenda. This is truly a family first amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am delighted that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] answered the very important question about any suggestions of a \$200 million slush fund for the WIC Program. It is very obvious accounting principles that those are attributable to unpaid invoices that have to be paid.

But, Mr. Chairman, I think the real question to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle is whether or not they will opt for luxury skyboxes or whether or not they will opt to feed women, infants and children. I think it is appalling that even though we are \$184 million short, we cannot find enough humanity to allow a mere \$23 million increase.

I join the honorable gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] in supporting the \$184 million increase. Recognizing that the amendment on the floor is the amendment by the ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], I support the \$23 million because I want to ensure that we get some relief for the 55,000 women who would not be covered but for this amendment.

It just, if my colleagues will, causes me great consternation that the Republicans cannot see the logic in this particular amendment. No one is talking about crop insurance per se as much as they are talking about the commissions attributable to such.

Let me give my colleagues just a few statistics. One, it is interesting that this country, one of the most developed and sophisticated countries in the world, has a high infant mortality rate. We can go to any place in this Nation, urban centers, rural communities, and find a high infant mortality rate. In fact, we will go to various WIC centers around the Nation and find that at the certification process some 43 percent of the women who come in that are pregnant have three or more nutrition risk factors. That means that women who come into the WIC centers to secure the kind of nutritious treatment that they should get in order to ensure that

they have a long-term pregnancy, they go to full term, that they do not have premature birth, those women, if they were not in the program, would suffer through three nutrition risks, and that means they would be subject to the very tragic potential of infant mortality, sometimes a premature birth, low birth rate in their babies.

It seems to be without any sort of real thinking that one would have to dwell on whether I choose luxury skyboxes or whether I choose the program that feeds women, infants and children.

Interestingly enough, if we just take the statistics in my own community in Harris County, we will find that there are at least 12,000 women who are on the WIC Program during the month. There are more that need to be on the program. Five thousand breast-feeding women receive WIC services per month. There are more that need to be on the program. Nine thousand postpartum women receive WIC services per month. More need to be on the program. Twenty-nine thousand infants benefited from WIC services per month. More need to be on the program. And 51,000 preschool children benefited by the WIC Program. More need to be on the program.

This \$23 million, a mere drop in the bucket, will help 55,000 women across this Nation, women, infants and children to be served as they should be served. The question is what are the services? Well, it is what we take for granted. How many of us in this Congress take for granted eggs, peanut butter, cheese, juices, beans? And how many of us take for granted that those that we know, our family members and friends, have a ready access to infant formula? Do my colleagues realize there are Americans in this country, there are people living in this Nation, that do not have access to eggs and peanut butter, cheese, juices, infant formula? It seems incredulous, but it seems incredulous to me again that we can stand on this floor and talk about skyboxes and talk about golfing trips and various other substitutes while \$23 million that would help the children, would help the women and would help the infants.

Again it is interesting. As my colleagues stood on the floor, I am delighted that this is a combination of those of us who have come together who believe in the quality of life. I heard my colleague mentioning his pro-life posture. He rises. I happen to believe in another aspect of choice. I rise. It would seem that if we can come together around this very important issue, I do not see why this is not a bipartisan amendment, I do not see why there are not more voices rising and saying that we can support a \$23 million addition that will help children, will help women, and will help our infants and decrease infant mortality in this Nation.

I support the Obey amendment.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Obey amendment because it increases funding for the WIC Program by \$23.7 million.

I have been told that we measure the humaneness of a society by how well it treats its young, how well it treats its old, and how well it treats those who cannot take care of themselves, and so when we increase funding for this program, we are looking out for those who have the most difficulty in looking out for themselves. And even the \$23.7 million is still less than the \$30 million that is really needed.

Now I have heard those argue that we really do not need the additional money because there may be some shortfall that can be overcome by surpluses. The reality is that when we look at those projections, we are taking a gamble. I do not want to gamble with the lives of 45 to 50,000 women and children who could, in fact, benefit for certain.

□ 2315

There has been a great deal of talk about family values, about the development of people. Yet, when there is an opportunity to put our monies where the conversations are, we find that providing insurance protection, providing commissions is more important than providing milk and butter and eggs and cheese.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the little bit of money we are talking about right now for WIC, in my area in Chicago and Cook County there are well over 100,000 women and children who benefit from this program. As a matter of fact, many of the large urban centers throughout the country could have solved the 45,000 to 50,000 alone, by themselves; when we really go into the crevices and cracks of our society, we find those who are untouchable and unreachable.

I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] for giving this House an opportunity to demonstrate its humaneness. I urge support for the Obey amendment.

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I will try to be brief. I think it is safe to say I have a long history in support of the women and children program, that program and others of that nature, in my other life, in another place.

I also would like to take the Members for a little walk, if I could, about some of the things I think we ought to be thinking about. I wonder if we have forgotten that in many places of the world, in the modern world, that nearly all of disposable income is spent for the food and fiber we subsist on. In this Nation we enjoy like 14 percent or 15 percent of our disposable income being used for that purpose.

I have no quarrel with the WIC program. I support it. But I do suggest to

the Members that to take it from this area is wrong. The spin on that is not something that we would anticipate. We do not want to do this. Yes, a bill was passed before I got here, the Family Farm Act. I would have supported it if I had been here. I think the time had come. But for that to work we have to have the opportunity for them to have some coverage, some insurance to stay in business.

I come from a farm community. That is what I do. I have been known to have had a lot of dirt under my fingernails, as some of the other Members. But I can tell the Members, why, I know of nobody, I never been invited to any sky box, and I do not know anybody who has. I do not think that is the issue. I think that horse has been ridden to death this evening.

I think it is OK to try to increase the WIC program, but not from this source. I would guess in this great House of Representatives here, that if we really care about those things that have been talked about, that we can bring our minds together and do something to enhance that. I say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], I do not think this is the place to get it.

I regret to have to go against the gentleman on this, but I must do that, because I feel that at least I come from the sense that we have to work together if we are going to produce the food and fiber that this country needs, and not be dependent on it from somewhere else. So I oppose it, and I hope that we can find some other source to address this problem.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I will yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman, we are hearing limits on debates on this matter and other matters. I was wondering if the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations could shed some light on this.

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

Mr. MEEHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, Mr. Chairman. Let me simply say that as the gentleman knows, trying to figure out what is happening at any point in this House on any subject, the way it is being run these days, is extremely difficult, to say the least.

Let me simply say that for the last 2 days this House has been at a procedural impasse because the majority party in the Committee on Rules arrogantly disregarded the rights of minority managers of the bills. It arbitrarily denied the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] the right to offer a major amendment on the foreign operations bill, a bill which she is supposed to manage on this side of the aisle. It did the same thing to the gentlewoman

from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] several weeks ago on a previous bill. It did the same thing to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] on the Interior appropriations bill.

The majority party determined to bring the agriculture bill to the floor without a rule. The procedural protest which this side has been engaging in on the other problems is apparently now being responded to by attempts to go to the Committee on Rules and draft what we understand is going to be a draconian rule which will allow virtually a meaningless 5 minutes of debate on serious amendments, which will apparently eliminate the right to strike items in this bill, which goes to the heart of the congressional prerogative to protect the power of the purse.

I would simply say that if that is indeed the case, then it makes the debate which we are having on this amendment at this point tonight useless, because it apparently is simply a time-filler until the majority party responds in exactly the wrong way to our concerns.

Mr. Chairman, this is exactly opposite the actions which would be taken by a party that wanted to promote bipartisanship, that wanted to promote collegiality. And in my view, if they do intend to proceed down that road, it will certainly lead to more acrimonious days on the floor of the House.

It apparently is not enough that they are cannibalizing themselves in their own caucus. Apparently the legislative process itself is to be cannibalized. I would simply urge the majority party, if they are planning to do that, that they think about it overnight, because that would be a most destructive way to proceed. It would not be a fair outcome. It would be a total misreading of their responsibilities, given the already acrimonious feelings in this House. I would hope that in their own interests, as well as the interests of this House, they would reconsider their apparent plans.

Mr. MEEHAN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, what is of concern to me is not only the discussion that we have had tonight that would basically be a discussion that would be wasted, but I have an amendment that is a fundamentally important amendment to the future of this country regarding tobacco use in America and protecting America's children from tobacco.

What I am hearing is we are going to have a rule that is going to limit debate on that amendment to a mere 5 minutes per side, which I find an absolute outrage. At 11:25 in the evening, I am getting word that a bill that fundamentally affects the ability of this country to regulate tobacco use among children is going to be limited to 5 minutes, an absolute outrage. If that is what is going on at the Committee on Rules right now, I would suggest that the Members of the majority party get their act together.

Because if we have a 5-minute debate on a rule that would limit debate on

amendments that affect tobacco use specifically, an amendment that I have that would allow the FDA to enforce rules and regulations that are on the books all over this country, if we are going to limit debate after waiting all day for this amendment to be offered, then I think the majority party better think and act very, very cautiously. Because I as one Member would be outraged if we get a rule and this Congress is asked to pass that rule tomorrow and limit debate on fundamentally important issues of tobacco use.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to join my colleagues in strongly protesting the proposed rule, and I have not seen the rule as yet, but I would hope that this misguided rule is just a rumor, and not reality.

I have an amendment with the gentlewoman from Colorado [Ms. DEGETTE] and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] and the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], and many other Members join us in support of this amendment, that would also deal with the tobacco subsidy and would try to bring some consistency to this policy, to make sure that our health policy is consistent with our subsidy policy. It just does not make any sense at all.

And to think that we are going to limit this debate on this very important issue to 15 minutes a side, and we hear about this at 11:25 at night when we have been waiting all day and all night to debate this issue, this just does not make any sense at all.

I would appeal to my colleagues, our distinguished chairman on the other side of the aisle, to protest this rule, because limiting this important discussion to either 5 minutes a side on the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN] or 15 minutes a side on our amendment just does not make any sense at all.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, I would also add to the words of my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York, to point out that our tobacco policy in this country is inconsistent. Last year we spent nearly \$200 million to prevent tobacco use, and we spent \$80 million on tobacco crop insurance subsidies. That is why the Lowey-DeGette-Hansen-Meehan amendment enjoys broad bipartisan support on both sides of the aisle. That is why it would be a real crime if we limited the debate on this issue to just a few minutes per side.

There are many voices on both sides of the aisle that have a lot to say about the tobacco policy in this country, about a policy that is killing millions of Americans and causing millions of young people to begin smoking every year. That is why I would hope that

this rule would not be limited, and I would also join my colleagues in urging the Committee on Rules to rethink any such proposed rule.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MEEHAN. What is really concerning about this, Mr. Chairman, is if we look at the fact that 44 attorneys general from all across America have spent months and months negotiating on this issue of tobacco and FDA regulations, when we look at the fact that there have been literally millions of pages of newspapers all across America debating the issue of tobacco in America and what we are going to do about it, to think that we are going to limit, in the people's House, we are going to limit the debate on this major, fundamentally important issue to 5 minutes here or 15 minutes here is an outrage. America is waiting for a discussion about how we are going to protect the next generation of Americans from the leading preventable cause of death in America.

We are saying that we do not want to debate this, we are going to limit debate, because it is 11:30 at night and some Members may be tired. It makes us wonder how the tobacco companies really work and when they are working and where they are working.

We ought to have a substantive discussion, it seems to me, about tobacco in this country, and it seems that the majority has been running away from this discussion. Let us have this discussion and have a rule, maintain the rule, and let us get up and debate this. I just want to say that I, too, am outraged that they, the majority party, could even contemplate such a ridiculous move.

Mrs. LOWEY. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, consistent with the arguments of my colleague, it just does not make sense at all to know that we are spending \$200 million to prevent our youngsters from using tobacco, and yet we are going to limit our debate to make our policy on crop insurance consistent with our health policy to 15 minutes a side.

And we are not talking about the billions of dollars that are being spent in Medicaid and Medicare. Many of my colleagues have a lot to say on this issue. Tobacco is on the minds of thousands and thousands of our constituents.

I would ask my colleagues, and I know I am joined by colleagues on both sides of the aisle, to reconsider any rule that would limit the discussion to 10 minutes on either side, or even 15 minutes on either side. This is an important issue and we should give it fair time.

□ 2330

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot believe what I am hearing, honestly. We worked in a

bipartisan way on this agriculture bill. We brought it to the floor without a rule so that we could have unlimited debate on these issues. And what we find when we come to the floor is everybody wants to talk about everything but agriculture.

And the fact is, when we brought this bill up last week, the dilatory tactics that were undertaken by the minority precluded any substantive debate on agriculture. It was all about, we got one after another after another, motion to rise, motion to rise, motion to rise.

We could have been debating the gentleman from Massachusetts's amendment. We could have been debating the gentlewoman from Ohio's amendment and the gentlewoman from New York's and the gentleman from Wisconsin's, but we could not get a vote. We could not have any debate because of the dilatory tactics.

Now we come in today. We are prepared to debate the agriculture bill again, and we have a series of suspension votes, which normally means that we just voice vote them because everyone basically agrees to them. We are forced to vote on every single issue, rollcall votes that tie everybody up in knots, that preclude us from doing our committee work, that preclude us from having a substantive debate on agriculture. And now we propose, if we cannot have a substantive debate, we will have to limit the rule so that we can get back to the issues at hand and the minority complains.

You reap what you sow on the agriculture bill and every other bill. If we cannot work in a bipartisan way, then we have to have a rule.

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I will not yield to the gentleman. He has had all night.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful that the Appropriations Committee has reported continued funding for the Agricultural Development in the American Pacific [ADAP] project and the Tropical and Subtropical Agricultural Research Programs, both conducted by the Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service within the USDA.

With committee provisions reporting ADAP funding at \$564,000, as in previous years, the American Government demonstrates its continuing commitment to provide funds and grants to its communities in the Asia-Pacific region. These include not only Guam, but also Hawaii, the Northern Marianas Islands, American Samoa, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Freely Associated States.

ADAP funds a number of activities for the Asia-Pacific communities. These include financing research of regional agricultural problems common to members of the five land-grant institutions in the American-affiliated Pacific, strengthening market information systems, producing instructional materials development and distribution, and providing scholarships for land-grant faculty and staff.

I commend the committee's continued support for ADAP, however, I am disappointed with the decreased funding it has reported for

the Tropical and Subtropical Agricultural Research Programs. Not only does this program impact Guam, it also affects Hawaii, Florida, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. For the people of Guam, the Tropical and Subtropical Research Programs fund numerous activities. These include financing research contributing to the establishment of energy and labor efficient irrigation and fertigator systems, watermelon disease control, modeling crop production systems, market surveys, and the biological control of pests in order to increase productivity.

Although I have stressed the benefits Guam receives from these programs, I also point to the implications the Tropical and Subtropical Research Programs have on the neighboring regions. Knowledge and expertise culled from these studies not only improve Guam's local agricultural industry, they are disseminated throughout Micronesia, Asia, and Africa.

American tropical and subtropical regions face agricultural needs unique to other areas. Continued support for the Tropical and Subtropical Research Programs are necessary steps to improving not only the livelihood of the people of Guam, but also other tropical regions of the world.

I will continue to actively support funding for ADAP and the Tropical and Subtropical Agricultural Research Programs. These programs are fundamental vehicles for improving standards of living not only on Guam, but also other tropical regions of the United States.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PEASE) having assumed the chair, Mr. LINDER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2160) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

A DOUBLE STANDARD

(Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk recently in Washington about the influence of foreign money on Members of Congress and on the administration. The most recent media reports indicate that there may have been complicity between the government of the People's Republic of China and Mr. John Huang to influence our elections and certain Federal officials of our Government.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues may have missed a recent report in The Hill newspaper which reported that as

much as \$86 million was spent by foreign governments to lobby and conduct public relations with both private and public officials of our Government. It is ironic, Mr. Speaker, that it is perfectly legal for foreign governments to spend over \$86 million to lobby the Congress and the White House, but no one ever questions the ethical aspects of the process.

So while we are pointing fingers at China for alleged misconduct to lobby and influence our policymakers, there appears to be a standard that is confusing to me and I am sure to the American people. I call it a double standard.

[From The Hill, June 25, 1997]

FOREIGN STATES SPENT \$86 M TO LOBBY U.S.

(By Robert Schlesinger)

Foreign governments, led by Japan, reported spending in excess of \$86 million on activities including lobbying and public relations in the United States during the first six months of 1996, according to filings made to the Department of Justice under the Foreign Agents Registration Act (FARA).

Overall, foreign interests, working through more than 330 separate registered entities, reported \$430,867,734 in activities reportable under the FARA in the first half of last year, according to an analysis by The Hill of the attorney general's report to Congress on FARA filings.

Individuals or groups must register as foreign agents if they perform certain activities, ranging from lobbying to trade promotion, on behalf of a foreign entity, such as a government or corporation.

"The U.S. is definitely uniquely open and user friendly to official foreign lobbyists from all over the world," said Alan Tonelson of the U.S. Business and Industrial Council Educational Foundation (USBICEF). "This situation is not even close to being reciprocated anywhere."

The government of Japan, mostly through entities like the Japan External Trade Organization (JETRO), reported spending at least \$17,840,878—more than twice as much as any other government.

JETRO reported \$14,117,208 during the first six months of 1996. Their activities are typically along the lines of "research in matters concerning foreign trade between Japan and the U.S.," as a filing for JETRO states.

Other countries spent their resources on lobbying or "monitoring and analysis" of issues of interest to them. Mexico, the sixth-largest spending government at \$3,576,368, paid Burson-Marsteller \$563,000 for public relations on the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), which will be up for expansion in the near future. Mexico, which has been wracked recently by charges of corruption and narcotics problems, also spent a great deal of money on broader PR efforts to burnish its suffering image.

Burson, which made slightly over \$1.2 million over all from foreign entities, ranked only 11th in line in the 13 law/lobby/PR firms to gross more than \$1 million from foreign clients.

Most of the other top-spending governments devoted at least some of their expenditures to tourism-related activities. For example, the Bahamas and the Cayman Islands, the second and third largest spending governments at roughly \$8 million each, spent virtually all of their money promoting tourism, as did Ireland, the number four country.

New York City-based advertising agency DDB Needham Worldwide pulled in more than \$18 million, most of it from the National Federation of Coffee Growers of Colombia, which paid them \$13,965,723.68.