

NOT VOTING—48

Barton	Gilcrest	Neal
Berman	Graham	Norwood
Blumenauer	Hooley	Paxon
Boswell	Hoyer	Pomeroy
Brady	Hyde	Radanovich
Cardin	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Chenoweth	Johnson, Sam	Roemer
Cox	Kaptur	Sawyer
Crane	Kennelly	Schiff
Davis (FL)	Kind (WI)	Skaggs
Diaz-Balart	Lampson	Stark
Dingell	Markey	Stokes
Dooley	Matsui	Sununu
Engel	McCarthy (MO)	Thurman
Eshoo	McDermott	Whitfield
Foglietta	Molinari	Young (AK)

□ 1055

Messrs. PACKARD, GEKAS, LEACH, CASTLE, LEWIS of California, HINOJOSA, SMITH of Michigan, BONO, BOEHNER, KANJORSKI, and Ms. SANCHEZ, changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. OWENS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on 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, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). 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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 193 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2160.

□ 1058

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) 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, with Mr. LINDER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, July 22, 1997, the bill had been read through page 27, line 23, and pending was the

amendment by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Pursuant to House Resolution 193, no further amendments to the bill or amendments thereto are in order except the amendments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD before July 22, 1997, the amendments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD numbered 21, 22, 23, and 35, one amendment by the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] regarding assistance to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and the amendment by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], pending when the Committee of the Whole rose on July 22.

Each amendment is considered read, debatable for 10 minutes, except as provided in section 2 of the resolution, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and opponent.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

After a motion that the Committee rise has been rejected on a day, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may entertain another such motion on that day only if offered by the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations or the majority leader or their designee.

After a motion that the Committee rise with the recommendation to strike out the enacting words of the bill has been rejected, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may not entertain another such motion during further consideration of the bill.

Pending is the amendment by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Pursuant to the resolution, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

□ 1100

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

Mr. Chairman, 2 years ago, when the majority party tried to cut the School Lunch Program, this Congress and the Nation finally rejected that. Last year, they tried to cut the WIC Program, the feeding program for women, children, and infants. The country rejected that. Now we are back with this bill, and this bill is \$30 million short of the amount that is apparently required in order to prevent 55,000 women and children from being knocked off the program.

At the same time, this Congress is being asked to approve a tax cut which will provide, on average, a \$27,000 tax cut to the richest 1 percent of people in this country. I think that is unconscionable. The bill itself is \$180 million below the President's budget for the WIC Program.

The amendment that I am offering today simply does not even restore the President's request. We simply try to restore \$27 million so that we assure that no person is knocked off the program in the coming fiscal year. Now how do we pay for it? We pay for it simply by eliminating \$36 million, which has been put in this bill above the President's budget to pay for subsidies for commissions for insurance agents who write crop insurance.

This is not aimed in any way at changing what farmers receive by way of crop insurance. This is not aimed in any way at affecting what farmers pay. It is simply aimed at the abuses in the commissions which were described by the General Accounting Office when they pointed out that they had discovered above-average commissions paid to agents by one large company. They discovered the Government was being charged for corporate aircraft and excessive automobile charges, we were being charged for country club memberships and various entertainment activities for agencies and employees such as skybox rentals at professional sporting events.

This amendment is, purely and simply, aimed at ending the rip-off of both farmers and taxpayers by some people who are involved in this program so that we can free up some money for starving and malnourished kids. It is as simple as that. I urge support of the amendment.

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

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in opposition to the OBEY amendment.

I would like to point out that we have worked long and hard to put together a bill that is reasonable and fair to all aspects of USDA, FDA, CFTC, and farm credit. I think we have before this House a bill that is balanced. It takes care of the needs of farmers and ranchers; research related to nutrition and ag production; housing, rural development, and nutrition of low-income people and the elderly; food, drug and medical device safety; and food for the needy overseas.

I appreciate the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] trying to do what he is trying to do. If my colleagues look at this bill, they will see that we both regard WIC as the highest priority item in it. WIC received the largest increase in this bill, at \$118.2 million over last year. This is on top of \$76 million that was recently provided in the supplemental. With this increase, WIC is funded at \$3.924 billion in fiscal year 1998. This amount fully supports the current participation level of 7.4 million.

My colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] says that if this amendment does not pass, 55,000, now they are going up about 5,000 a day from what I can gather after hearing the new statistics, 55,000 women, infants and children will be taken off the program.

I do not know where this information came from. We have two Statements of Administration Policy from the Executive Office of the President concerning this bill, and neither one says a word about people being forced off the program with the funding level included in this bill as it is now. We have heard these scare tactics before, let us not fall for them again.

Mr. Chairman, I have presented this House with a balanced bill. This is a bill of compromises. The amendment in full committee to increase crop insurance also provided an increase for the FDA food safety initiative and tobacco regulation enforcement activities. This is a bill that can and should be supported by every Member of this body. I support this bill and ask my colleagues also to support it, and I oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, could I inquire how much time each side has remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. Each side has 12½ minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HINCHEY].

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, we live in a country where our agricultural production is so bountiful that it exceeds that which our people can consume. We have excess agricultural production each and every year. At the same time, hundreds of thousands of people in our country go to bed hungry every night. Many of these people who are hungry are women who are carrying infants, pregnant women. Others are young mothers, their infants and children.

This is a brutal paradox. And the brutality of it is made worse by the bill before us, because the bill before us would deprive, it is estimated, 50,000 people, young mothers, pregnant women, young children, infants, from the ability to participate in the women, infants and children program, which provides basic nutrition for those folks.

The Obey amendment seeks to correct that brutal situation by restoring \$24 million to the women, infants and children program so that some of those pregnant women, some of those young mothers, some of those infants, and some of those children will get proper nutrition. This is a reasonable thing to do.

The opposition says that the Obey amendment is going to hurt farmers. The facts of the matter are quite the contrary. The Obey amendment will help farmers. It will help farmers by taking care of some of that excess agricultural production. Dairy, for example. We have excess dairy production all across the northeastern part of this country and elsewhere in the United States.

The Obey bill will make sure that some of that excess milk and other dairy products are consumed by people

who are hungry and need the nutrition. It is a sensible, reasonable thing to do. He takes the money, the \$24 million, from the commissions of people who sell crop insurance. And he talked a little bit earlier about some of the specific benefits, like skyboxes and airplane trips and things of that nature, that are enjoyed by these commissioners. And they will be, unfortunately, deprived of those amenities, but that money now will be used to make young mothers, pregnant women, young children whole, give them better nutrition, make them strong, make them healthy. It is a good amendment, and I hope that all Members of this House will support it.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] for yielding me the time.

Maybe it is time that we reviewed the facts in this issue rather than listen to the rhetoric. So let me just review the facts for one moment. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] offers to reduce the crop insurance program by \$23 million, adding it to a \$3.9 billion program for WIC. That is almost an insignificant addition, if we understand the immensity of the WIC program already.

However, if we take that same amount from the crop insurance program, we destroy the crop insurance program, we reduce it by 20 percent, it will not be available for agriculture. There will be nobody to deliver the crop insurance.

So while all of us are concerned with the WIC Program, as we should be, I note that this issue was never raised in committee. There were no negative votes on this question. Everybody seemed to have their arms thrown around the program offered by the chairman, until we reach the floor. Is this a hit-and-run on the committee system? I suggest it well may be.

Where should this whole thing be decided? We have added, as mentioned, \$118 million to WIC at the same time in committee. Where should this be decided? It should be decided where it has always been decided. The Secretary of Agriculture of the United States of America and crop insurers ought to sit down and negotiate this program. That is what is being done now. We should not take away the negotiation opportunity for farmers by passing this kind of legislation.

So, please, reject the Obey amendment and allow this to be done, as it is properly done, between the Secretary of Agriculture and crop insurers.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Ms. DEGETTE].

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, one of the measures of a strong and prosperous nation is its ability and willingness to take care of its neediest communities. I believe, we as a country,

have an obligation to address the problems of our most vulnerable citizens. We have a whole wealth of new research indicating importance of proper care for children, particularly at-risk children during their first few years of life.

The very least we can do for these young children is to make sure that they have access to proper nutrition during these formative years. WIC has been proven to be one of our most successful programs at reducing low birth weight, infant mortality, and child anemia. It is one of the most effective social programs that we have.

Why, then, would we fund WIC coming out of the committee \$30 million short of what we need to simply maintain the current caseload in 1998? This subtraction of the \$30 million will have a direct impact on children's health in this country. I think that the cost could be exacerbated, in fact, if the cost of food is higher in fiscal year 1998.

I think we need to look carefully at funding this program at levels that we have funded it in the past. I am sympathetic with the concerns of small farmers, but the money that this amendment is taking it from comes from insurance premiums. A GAO study in fact showed that the money that these insurance agents are taking from this program is being used for things like skyboxes. And frankly, if you weigh children's nutrition and healthful food and infant formula against skyboxes, I think the choice is pretty clear.

This is not an intention to hurt farmers. And in fact, I think that we should support our farmers of this country, and I think the farmers of this country would support and do support programs that benefit young children.

And so, for those reasons, I think this is a great amendment. I thank the gentleman for raising it.

□ 1115

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. THUNE].

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out because I was down here on the debate on the supplemental disaster bill and I was one who voted for \$76 billion additional spending on the WIC Program. As was noted earlier today, we have a \$118 million increase in WIC over last year's level in this appropriation bill.

What I would like to speak about for just a minute because I was listening with great interest a couple of nights ago to the debate on crop insurance, I found somewhat humorous, if not tragic, the constant reference to skyboxes. I can tell my colleagues about the typical crop insurance agent in my State of South Dakota. Their business is on Main Street. They are mom and pop operations whose main line of business is probably another field of insurance, but they are also involved in crop insurance because somebody has to do it. They are not cutting a fat hog. They are making a living, having a tough

time of it, because they are dealing with a program which is fraught with redtape and bureaucracy.

As I have listened to the crop insurance agents explain to me how difficult it is to be in this business, one of the things that repeatedly comes up is how much bureaucracy and redtape there is. I think as I look the our State of South Dakota, we have 77,000 square miles. Agriculture is our No. 1 industry. We do not have a professional sports team in South Dakota, so our guys are not going to skyboxes. But we have a lot of small crop insurance agents who make this program work. As a matter of fact, 90 percent of the farmers, the producers in South Dakota, are in the crop insurance program and 75 percent at the buyup level.

That is precisely what we wanted to do by changing Government policy in this country, to encourage our producers to protect themselves against future loss so that we do not down the road have to come in with taxpayer dollars in the form of disaster assistance.

Let me tell Members what I think are the alternatives if we do not have a workable crop insurance program. The first one is it will go back to the Federal Government. We will have a delivery system where the Federal Government is once again in the business of crop insurance. I think that is a lot less preferable than having people in the private sector who are delivering this program in a way that makes sense and is efficient and saves the taxpayers dollars.

The second alternative is to have no program at all. Where does that leave us? That leaves us exactly where we were before, and that is year in and year out as a disaster strikes we will be coming back to the Congress and asking for disaster assistance to go to producers in the States that are in the business of agriculture.

I think we have an efficient system that is delivering the product, that is working, and it is to our advantage to have a program that works for the producers, for the people who are trying to make a living, in the business of selling crop insurance, and if we do not have that sort of a system in place, those are the alternatives that we are left with.

I would like to say, because I heard the other night the discussion on skyboxes, it might please the gentleman from Wisconsin to know that I am a Green Bay Packers fan and have been since I was about 5 years old. I have never been to a Green Bay Packers game, but I hope that someday in the future I will. I can assure the gentleman that if and when that happens that I probably will not be in a skybox. I would be happy to sit in general admission, which is where the crop insurance agents in my State of South Dakota, who are small businesses, mom and pop operations, will be sitting with me.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE].

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I am very interested in all this discussion about small farmers. I am probably one of the few small farmers in this body. I have a small farm. I sure do not get whole lots of Federal subsidies or insurance agents. I never heard of this commission. But I do know about women's health. I do know what it means when a woman who is pregnant gets good nutrition. I do know what it means when a small child gets good nutrition. All these subsidies for farmers, come on. Farmers are in business. We do not subsidize farmers, or we should not. We certainly should not subsidize insurance agents, at the cost of health care and nutrition. We know that every dollar we put into health care and nutrition for pregnant women is a dollar that pays back time and time again.

What does America stand for? Does it not stand for our children? Let us support the Obey amendment because the Obey amendment is sensible. It is common sense. It is common sense to invest in prevention. All this talk about skyboxes, gee, I never as a small farmer have ever seen one of these commissioners. I buy insurance because I think that is the American way. We buy things for small business. We do it ourselves. We do not take money and food out of the mouths of pregnant women and children so that we in business can get a little subsidy.

As a farmer, I say let us support WIC. I say let us support the Obey amendment. Let us say finally that this is not a country that subsidizes everybody who wants to be in business. This is a country that stands for something. One of the things we stand for is healthy children, healthy mothers. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] for presenting this amendment. I say we should all support it.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

Mr. STENHOLM. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, let me first say that if there is a greater supporter of the WIC Program in this body than CHARLIE STENHOLM, I do not know who it might be. I am a great supporter of WIC. It does wonderful things for people that need wonderful things done for them.

This bill, as presented to us, increases by \$118 million the amount of dollars in the WIC Program. If it will take more, I will be glad to join with my colleagues in supporting more. But let me remind all of us, we are dealing with tight budgets. That means we have got to scrutinize all programs, including the good ones, if we are going to do our job.

In regard to crop insurance, I am a great supporter of crop insurance. We have some terrific problems, and time will not permit me to talk about some of the frustrations I have with the crop insurance program today. But this is

not the time and the place to revise and reform the crop insurance program. That belongs in the authorizing committee, and we are going to do that.

Let me remind everyone in regard to agents, right now we are ratcheting down the reimbursement rate for crop insurance agents from 31 percent to 29 percent. We are scheduled to go to 28 percent in 1997. This bill takes it to 27 percent 1 year earlier. Therefore, all of the rhetoric about where this is going and how it is going to do, let me say to my colleagues, this is not the place to make arbitrary judgments regarding the crop insurance plan for some alleged wrongdoing. Stick with the committee bill, defeat the Obey amendment. We are all going to be supportive of WIC. We all are going to be supportive of crop insurance reform, but let the authorizing committee do its work, which I will publicly admit we have not done as yet, and that is a black mark on us, not the appropriators.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, let me try to place this debate and discussion in some context. The fact of the matter is that in the last session of the Congress, the Republican majority did not appropriate enough money for the WIC Program, Women, Infants and Children Program. They were forced, and in fact we helped to force them, to increase those dollars at the end of the process so that women, infants, and children would not be thrown off of the program. In fact, in several States that process has started. But the Democrats forced that debate in order for there to be an increase in funding in the WIC Program, what my colleague from Wisconsin is trying to do, because once again the Republican majority is short-changing the WIC program and we will find ourselves in the same position where we will look at approximately 55,000 people, women, infants and children, who will not be able to avail themselves of the program. My colleague from Wisconsin is trying to avoid that situation and in fact restore money so that we will not have to take women, infants and children off of this program. This program, we find, is a cost-effective one. It saves us dollars in other programs. It is a wise investment. What the Obey amendment is suggesting is that what we take the money from is the increase in the insurance rates to those who offer crop insurance to farmers. This does not decrease the amount of dollars to farm subsidies.

I understand the problem of small farmers, or I try to do that. The fact of the matter is that the insurance agents are the ones who are benefiting from this effort. I trust the fact that we are trying to bring down the number, but we are talking today about 24 percent of premium. This is a hefty amount of premium. This should not go to the insurance agents but to women, infants and children.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BONILLA].

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I stand in opposition to the Obey amendment. As working families in every corner of the country go to the grocery store today, they will find about 10,000 items to choose from. In many cases, the overwhelming majority of the cases, they will find good prices for good food products that people can buy in this country. People take that for granted, not understanding how important our agriculture industry is to this country. To amend this bill and to hurt farmers eventually will hurt consumers as they try to buy food in the grocery store.

I know in this day and age we have become a victim to a great degree of our materialistic success and as we go to buy food in stores many Americans think somehow it just comes from the back storeroom or from a truck that came down the road, but that all started out on a farm in some State in this country. To do this to our farmers is a sad commentary on what we are arguing about here today.

The WIC Program is something that we all support. We on our subcommittee in a bipartisan way have supported increased funds for the WIC Program because it is important. But to demagog this issue in the way that it is being demagogued this morning is a real tragedy. I hope Members will look in their hearts and look for the truth in what we are debating about here today and support the position that we have taken on the subcommittee to fully fund crop insurance and fully fund the WIC Program.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA].

(Mrs. ROUKEMA asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I want to address my concerns very briefly to the colleagues who have fiscal concerns. There is no better way to put it than to say we should not be penny wise and pound foolish on this subject. This is not profligate Government spending we are debating here. The WIC Program is a program that works and in the longer term actually saves Federal money. For every \$1 used in the prenatal segment of the WIC Program, Medicaid saves untold amounts of money and gives healthy productive lives to all these children. WIC works, to put it very bluntly. It is not an area where we should be penny wise and pound foolish.

I guess I have got to say, Mr. Chairman, and speaking now as a Republican fiscal conservative, in this the wealthiest Nation in the world, we should not see children going to bed hungry.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Obey amendment to increase funding for the WIC Program by over \$24 million by implementing offsetting cuts in funding for crop insurance sales commission.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a natural follow-on to the farsighted decision made by

this Congress in May to fully fund the WIC Program in the disaster supplemental.

Today, we are reducing for crop insurance sales commissions to provide food and health security for our children. Mr. Chairman, in the constant struggle to make sure that we set our priorities straight, this amendment is another step in the right direction.

For those of my colleagues who have fiscal concerns—don't be penny-wise and pound-foolish.

This is not profligate Government spending we are debating here. The WIC Program is a program that works, and in the longer term, actually saves Federal money. For every \$1 used in the prenatal segment of the WIC Program, Medicaid saves untold moneys and gives healthy productive lives to these children and cannot be measured in dollars and cents.

WIC works. It reduces the instances of infant mortality, low birthweight, malnutrition, and the myriad other problems of impoverished children. The WIC Program also provides valuable health care counseling for expectant mothers for both mothers and children.

In recent months Time and Newsweek magazines have written feature articles on the importance of the years from birth to age 3. These articles validate longstanding research based on up-to-date studies of prenatal and early childhood development. WIC funding is a big part of the future development of these infants. Let's not be penny-wise and pound-foolish.

This \$24 million for the WIC Program is good investment. A wise investment, at that.

Mr. Chairman, this is the wealthiest Nation in the world and yet, children still go to bed hungry.

WIC must remain fully funded and should be off limits. Only then will we preserve food for hungry babies.

Mr. Chairman, we can take advantage of an opportunity today.

We can meet the challenge of fiscal responsibility in two ways: First, through budget neutrality, that is finding offsets as we appropriate funds to different programs, and second, by making wise investments.

This is a wise investment.

With this amendment, we have the opportunity to enhance WIC funding and thereby protect low-income women and children and—incidentally—the taxpayer.

I urge support of this amendment.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE].

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I certainly count myself among those in this body that fully support the WIC Program. I think that it ought to be funded so that it can operate and provide services and food to all that meet eligibility requirements. That, I do not think, is what is at issue here this morning. We are talking about a zero sum game. We are trying to increase the funding of one program at the expense of another. Of course it sounds more attractive to say we are going to feed infants and pregnant women at the expense of providing insurance agents with commissions. But I submit that is not really the issue. The issue is what type of a crop disaster program do we wish to have. Do we wish to have

one that is based on an insurance principle or do we want ad hoc disaster payments? In the past we have paid out billions of dollars in some years in ad hoc disaster payments to farmers for crop losses. With an insurance-based program, the farmers are purchasing insurance. In order to make that program effective we have to have agents selling the insurance, and this program is essential to maintain that commission program and those agents.

□ 1130

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LATHAM].

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I spoke the other evening on this subject, and there is a lot been made about the WIC program and caring for women, infants and children. There is plenty of money already in the bill for that, more than what is needed as far as the carryover. But I think one thing that is being very much forgotten here is the women, infants and children of farm families that they are going to destroy by taking away an opportunity for them to protect the risks that they have out there.

Mr. Chairman, when we look at the hope and dream of a small family farm which is made up, by the way, of women, infants and children, they would rather have them apparently go on the welfare rolls than they would to survive in their businesses. All we are asking for is the opportunity for these people, these small farm families, to protect their risk so that they do not have to get on a Government program, so that we do not have to have disaster bills which cost us billions of dollars every year.

If my colleagues want to think about women, infants and children, why do they not think about those on family farms?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remaining time.

Mr. Chairman, a propaganda sheet has been circulated by lobbyists who are lobbying against my amendment, claiming that this is an amendment that attacks farmers. That is certainly not true. I represent farmers, I have fought for them all my life; in my view farmers are not hurt by this amendment, they are hurt by two things. They are hurt by the misguided farm policies of the Reagan, Bush, and Clinton administrations that we suffered through for the last three administrations, and they are also being hurt by the failure of the Committee on Agriculture to reform the crop insurance program so that we do not get ripped off by some of the agents involved in this program. Most of the agents involved are perfectly rational, responsible and fair-minded people, but the fact is that nonetheless the program is

being ripped off. If we separate fact from fiction, the fact is that nothing in this amendment changes crop insurance for farmers, nothing in my amendment changes what farmers will pay for crop insurance. What we are trying to do is to stop the rip-offs on the commissions that some of the insurance agents are getting.

Now the lobby sheet that is being circulated says that 10 percent commission is not enough. We are not cutting this to 10 percent. We are trying to cut the commission from 28 percent to 24½ percent, which is the amount USDA and the Office of Management and Budget both say is sufficient to run the program. We are not cutting it to 10 percent. And the reason we are doing that, as I said earlier, is because we have a General Accounting Office report which indicates that some of the commissions being charged included charges for corporate aircraft, excessive automobile charges, country club memberships, rental of things such as skyboxes, and they suggest that the best way to tighten up this program is to do exactly what we are doing in this amendment.

I know we passed a freedom to farm program last year. I did not vote for it because I thought it was a lousy bill. But the fact is, freedom to farm is not freedom to milk farmers. It is also not freedom to milk taxpayers as some of these commissions are doing.

The fact is my amendment is supported by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, it is supported by the Office of Management and Budget, it is an attempt to end the rip-offs of this program, and that is in the benefit of farmers. It is an attempt to use the money we save to help starving infants and to help malnourished mothers who are about to give birth to children who we want to be healthy. That is what it does.

Stick with the kids. Do not listen to this propaganda sheet being pedaled by some of the agents. I urge support for the amendment.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT].

(Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, three of the six counties in our district are in Appalachia where WIC is a very important program. I am a strong supporter of WIC, and if I believed for 1 minute that this bill short-changed the WIC Program, I would be supporting the Obey amendment.

I think the facts indicate otherwise. The WIC Program is completely funded in this program. We need to vote "no" on this amendment.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Let me close and let me state the facts, the facts, once again. This bill does not force anyone to be taken off the program. I do not know where they are getting this information, but we

have two statements of administration policy from the Executive Office of the President concerning this bill, and neither one says they are worried about people being forced off the program with the funding level included in the bill. We have heard these scare tactics once again raised, but, Mr. Chairman, they are not true, we have given our colleagues the facts, and I oppose this amendment.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to thank and support my colleague, Mr. OBEY, for introducing such an important amendment today. The current bill provides just enough money to maintain current participation levels, but it is based on the assumption that the number of women and children in need and the cost of food will remain absolutely constant. A similar miscalculated assumption brought all of us to the floor 2 months ago to vote on increased funding for WIC in the middle of the 1997 fiscal year.

The WIC funding level does not provide enough funding to ensure that no women, child or infant will be cut from this critical program. The cost of infant formula, for example, depends in part on the contract the State WIC program secure with formula manufacturers. This is not a fixed price. Furthermore, the prices for which the manufacturers have offered to sell formula to State WIC programs have been steadily increasing. If this trend continues, which many expect that it will, then this appropriations bill will fall far short of ensuring that current participation levels are maintained.

The Office of Management and Budget and the U.S. Department of Agriculture project that the funding level the committee has provided would result in the loss of 55,000 to 60,000 women, infants, and children next year alone. In my State of California, 1,225,800 low income and nutritional at risk pregnant women, infants, and children benefit from WIC. It is not fair to suddenly strip many of these women, infants, and children of this vital program in the middle of the 1998 fiscal year simply because we have lacked the foresight now to make accurate predictions of the needs of WIC recipients.

The WIC program is one of the most cost-effective and successful programs in the country. The Government saves \$3.50 for each dollar spent on WIC for pregnant women in expenditures for Medicaid, SSI for disabled children, and other programs. More importantly, research has demonstrated how effectively WIC reduces low-birthweight babies, infant mortality, and child anemia.

On behalf of the State of California, which operates the largest WIC program in the country, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in voting "yes" on the Obey amendment. I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 195, noes 230, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 308]

AYES—195

Abercrombie	Gephardt	Obey
Ackerman	Gibbons	Olver
Allen	Gilman	Ortiz
Andrews	Green	Owens
Baldacci	Gutierrez	Pallone
Barrett (WI)	Hall (OH)	Pappas
Bass	Harman	Pascrell
Becerra	Hastings (FL)	Pastor
Bentsen	Hefner	Payne
Bereuter	Hilliard	Pelosi
Berman	Hinchee	Porter
Bilirakis	Horn	Poshard
Blagojevich	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Blumenauer	Jackson (IL)	Quinn
Boehlert	Jackson-Lee	Rahall
Bonior	(TX)	Ramstad
Borski	Johnson (CT)	Rangel
Boucher	Johnson (WI)	Reyes
Brown (CA)	Johnson, E. B.	Riggs
Brown (FL)	Kanjorski	Rivers
Brown (OH)	Kelly	Rodriguez
Campbell	Kennedy (MA)	Roemer
Capps	Kennedy (RI)	Ros-Lehtinen
Cardin	Kennelly	Rothman
Carson	Kildee	Roukema
Castle	Kilpatrick	Roybal-Allard
Chabot	Kind (WI)	Rush
Clay	Kleczka	Sabo
Clayton	Klink	Salmon
Clement	Kucinich	Sanchez
Conyers	LaFalce	Sanders
Costello	Lampson	Sawyer
Coyne	Lantos	Saxton
Cummings	Levin	Schumer
Davis (FL)	Lewis (GA)	Scott
Davis (IL)	Lipinski	Serrano
Davis (VA)	LoBiondo	Shays
DeFazio	Lofgren	Sherman
DeGette	Lowe	Skaggs
Delahunt	Luther	Slaughter
DeLauro	Maloney (CT)	Smith, Adam
Dellums	Maloney (NY)	Stokes
Deutsch	Manton	Strickland
Diaz-Balart	Markey	Stupak
Dicks	Martinez	Sununu
Dixon	Mascara	Tauscher
Doggett	Matsui	Thurman
Dooley	McCarthy (MO)	Tierney
Doyle	McCarthy (NY)	Torres
Ehlers	McDermott	Towns
Engel	McGovern	Trafficant
Ensign	McHale	Velazquez
Eshoo	McKinney	Vento
Evans	McNulty	Visclosky
Fattah	Meehan	Waters
Fawell	Meek	Watt (NC)
Filner	Menendez	Waxman
Flake	Millender-	Weldon (PA)
Foglietta	McDonald	Wexler
Forbes	Miller (CA)	Weygand
Fox	Mink	Wise
Frank (MA)	Moakley	Woolsey
Franks (NJ)	Moran (VA)	Wynn
Frelinghuysen	Morella	Yates
Furse	Nadler	Young (FL)
Gejdenson	Oberstar	
	NOES—230	
Aderholt	Bunning	Cubin
Archer	Burr	Cunningham
Armey	Burton	Danner
Bachus	Buyer	Deal
Baesler	Callahan	DeLay
Baker	Calvert	Dickey
Ballenger	Camp	Doolittle
Barcia	Canady	Dreier
Barr	Cannon	Duncan
Barrett (NE)	Dunn	Dunn
Bartlett	Chambliss	Edwards
Bateman	Chenoweth	Ehrlich
Berry	Christensen	Emerson
Bilbray	Clyburn	English
Bishop	Coble	Etheridge
Bliley	Coburn	Everett
Blunt	Collins	Ewing
Boehner	Combest	Farr
Bonilla	Condit	Fazio
Bono	Cook	Foley
Boswell	Cooksey	Ford
Boyd	Cox	Fowler
Brady	Cramer	Frost
Bryant	Crane	Gallegly
	Crapo	

Ganske	Leach	Ryun
Gekas	Lewis (CA)	Sandlin
Gilchrest	Lewis (KY)	Sanford
Gillmor	Linder	Scarborough
Gonzalez	Livingston	Schaefer, Dan
Goode	Lucas	Schaffer, Bob
Goodlatte	Manzullo	Sensenbrenner
Goodling	McCollum	Sessions
Gordon	McCrery	Shadegg
Goss	McDade	Shaw
Graham	McHugh	Shimkus
Granger	McInnis	Shuster
Greenwood	McIntosh	Sisisky
Gutknecht	McIntyre	Skeen
Hall (TX)	McKeon	Skelton
Hamilton	Metcalf	Smith (MI)
Hansen	Mica	Smith (NJ)
Hastert	Miller (FL)	Smith (OR)
Hastings (WA)	Minge	Smith (TX)
Hayworth	Mollohan	Smith, Linda
Hefley	Moran (KS)	Snowbarger
Herger	Murtha	Snyder
Hill	Myrick	Solomon
Hilleary	Nethercutt	Souder
Hinojosa	Neumann	Spence
Hobson	Ney	Spratt
Hoekstra	Northup	Stabenow
Holden	Norwood	Stearns
Hooley	Nussle	Stenholm
Hostettler	Oxley	Stump
Houghton	Packard	Talent
Hulshof	Parker	Tanner
Hunter	Paul	Tauzin
Hutchinson	Paxon	Taylor (MS)
Inglis	Pease	Taylor (NC)
Istook	Peterson (MN)	Thomas
Jefferson	Peterson (PA)	Thompson
Jenkins	Petri	Thornberry
John	Pickering	Thune
Johnson, Sam	Pickett	Tiahrt
Jones	Pitts	Turner
Kasich	Pombo	Upton
Kim	Pomeroy	Walsh
King (NY)	Portman	Wamp
Kingston	Pryce (OH)	Watkins
Klug	Radanovich	Watts (OK)
Knollenberg	Redmond	Weldon (FL)
Kolbe	Regula	Weller
LaHood	Riley	White
Largent	Rogan	Whitfield
Latham	Rogers	Wicker
LaTourette	Rohrabacher	Wolf
Lazio	Royce	

NOT VOTING—9

Barton	Kaptur	Schiff
Dingell	Molinari	Stark
Hyde	Neal	Young (AK)

□ 1156

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Ms. KAPTUR for, with Mr. BARTON of Texas against.

Ms. DANNER and Messrs. CLYBURN, COX, ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, ROHRBACHER, and MOLLOHAN changed their vote from "aye" to "no." Messrs. PAPPAS, GIBBONS, SUNUNU, and STRICKLAND changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask, what are the rules of the House in terms of distributing literature at the door which absolutely, totally misdescribes and libels the amendment that was just offered by me?

There is a sheet that was distributed which says "Vote no on the Obey

amendment to kill crop insurance". It does absolutely no such thing. This House has a rule against that kind of misinformation. I would like to know what the rule is.

The CHAIRMAN. The rule is that anything that is handed out at the doings or on the floor must bear the name of the Member authorizing it.

Mr. OBEY. Could I ask, Mr. Chairman, what are the rules with respect to sheets which are absolutely, totally false and erroneous?

□ 1200

The CHAIRMAN. The rule of decorum may generally be applied to the contents of such handout.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. Chairman, under the rules of the House, what are the remedies available to a Member when the amendment that he has offered to the House is being falsely described in a sheet handed out by another Member?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is reluctant to address the question in a hypothetical manner but would be pleased to consult with the gentleman.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not understand that response. This is not a hypothetical situation. This just occurred. I thought there was a requirement for truth on the sheets that are being distributed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair suspects the remedy would be the same as the remedy for any action by any Member in any committee.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I suggest this is an outrageous misstatement of the facts. The truth is regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the gentleman's concern but has not had an opportunity to examine the flier.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. MEEHAN

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. MEEHAN: In the item relating to "RISK MANAGEMENT AGENCY" in title I, after the last dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$14,000,000)".

In the item relating to "SALARIES AND EXPENSES"—"FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION" in title VI, after the aggregate dollar amount in the first undesignated paragraph, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 193, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN] and a Member opposed, each will control 5 minutes.

Does the gentleman from New Mexico seek the time in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. SKEEN. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I do. I rise in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN].

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from

Utah [Mr. HANSEN], my Republican colleague, a leader in the fight to protect America's children against tobacco and the cochair of the task force on tobacco and health in the Congress.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, most of my colleagues know that throughout my 17 years in this body I have been keenly interested in decreasing the use of alcohol and tobacco products by our children. I have no issue with the adults who choose to responsibly use legal tobacco and alcohol products, but I have become increasingly upset at the dramatic increase in tobacco use among our young people today.

Cigarette smoking among high school seniors is at a 17 year high. Smoking among eighth and tenth graders has increased 50 percent since 1991. These 13 and 14 year old children are being sentenced to shorter and unhealthier lives by addictive tobacco products. Even the tobacco industry now agrees to this conclusion. Tobacco smoking is a problem that clearly starts with our children. Almost 90 percent of today's adults who smoke started before the age of 18. The average youth smoker begins at age 13 and becomes a daily smoker at age 14. It is self-evident that the message that tobacco kills is not reaching our children or our grandchildren.

We have worked with the Food and Drug Administration over the past 2 years to develop regulations to curb youth tobacco abuse. The comprehensive FDA plan intends to reduce tobacco use by our young people by 50 percent in 7 years.

Some of the initiatives in the plan would require photo ID for the sale of cigarettes and tobacco smoke just like we do for alcohol. It would prohibit vending machine cigarettes, eliminate free samples and the sale of single cigarettes and packages with less than 20 cigarettes, known as kiddie packs, that are known to be given to children.

The FDA rule will also strive to make tobacco products less appealing to children by banning outdoor advertising within 1,000 feet of schools and prohibiting giveaways of products like hats or gym bags that carry cigarette or smokeless tobacco products. These measures will have no effect on adults who choose to use this product.

However, our children should not be bombarded with advertising and promotion which tell them that the illegal use of tobacco products is fun, it is glamorous, it is cool. The age restrictions on tobacco products which are in law in every State exist because children lack sufficient information and experience to decide whether to use a product as harmful as cigarette or spit tobacco.

The proposed FDA regulation would also require tobacco companies to notify consumers about the unreasonable health risks of their product, including warning labels on packages that kids

can understand, for example, warning: Cigarettes kill.

I would urge Members to support the Meehan-Hansen amendment which would do something great for this country on health.

Most of my colleagues know that throughout my 17 years in this body, I have been keenly interested in decreasing the use of alcohol and tobacco products by our Nation's children. I have no issue with adults who choose to responsibly use legal tobacco and alcohol products. But, I have become increasingly upset at the dramatic increase in tobacco use among young people today. Cigarette smoking among high school seniors is at a 17-year high. Smoking among 8th and 10th graders has increased by over 50 percent since 1991. These 13- and 14-year-old children are being sentenced to shorter and healthier lives by addictive tobacco products. Even the tobacco industry now agrees with this conclusion.

Tobacco smoking is a problem that clearly starts with our children: Almost 90 percent of today's adult smokers started using tobacco before age 18. The average youth smoker begins at age 13 and becomes a daily smoker by age 14½. It is self-evident that the message that tobacco kills is not reaching our children and grandchildren.

I have worked with the Food and Drug Administration [FDA] over the past 2 years to develop regulations to curb youth tobacco abuse. The comprehensive FDA plan intends to reduce tobacco use by young people by 50 percent in 7 years.

Some of the initiatives included in the FDA plan would: Require photo ID for the sale of cigarettes and smokeless tobacco, just like for alcohol; prohibit vending machine sales of cigarettes; eliminate free samples and the sale of single cigarettes and packages with fewer than 20 cigarettes, known as kiddie packs.

The FDA rule will also strive to make tobacco products less appealing to children by banning outdoor advertising within 1,000 feet of schools, and prohibiting giveaways of products like hats or gym bags that carry cigarette or smokeless tobacco product names or logos. These measures will have no effect on adults who choose to legally use these products.

However, our children should not be bombarded with advertisements and promotions which tell them that their illegal use of tobacco products is fun, glamorous, or cool. The age restrictions on tobacco products, which are law in every State, exist because children lack sufficient information and experience to decide whether to use a product as harmful as cigarettes or spit tobacco. When tobacco products are seen as popular and cool, you can count on an increase in underage smoking.

The proposed FDA regulations will also require tobacco companies to notify consumers about the unreasonable health risks of their products, including descriptive warning labels on packages of cigarettes that kids can really understand:

WARNING: Cigarettes Kill

WARNING: Cigarettes Are Addictive

WARNING: Cigarette Smoking Harms Athletic Performance

WARNING: Smoking During Pregnancy Can Harm Your Baby

Similar warnings will be included on smokeless tobacco products, such as:

WARNING: Use of smokeless tobacco can make your teeth fall out.

Who among us will stand up and argue with the accuracy of these warnings? This will be the first national program ever undertaken to reduce youth access to tobacco. I believe these are major strides in the right direction.

However good these ideas may be, enforcement is the key to their success. Today, it is far too easy for kids to buy cigarettes and spit tobacco. Studies of over-the-counter sales have found that children and adolescents were able to successfully buy tobacco products 67 percent of the time. Despite the fact that it is illegal in all 50 States to sell cigarettes and smokeless tobacco to minors, our young people purchase an estimated 1.26 billion dollars' worth of tobacco products each year.

Strong enforcement is the key to reducing youth access to tobacco. The Food and Drug Administration seeks \$34 million to fund the enforcement of these regulations. The funding sought by FDA will not create a new Federal bureaucracy and the majority of these funds will go directly to State and local officials for enforcement.

Let me repeat that, this funding will not create a new Federal bureaucracy and the majority of these funds will go directly to State and local officials for enforcement.

The current Agriculture appropriations bill funds this vital program at only \$24 million. The Meehan-Hansen amendment would provide the full funding request for this vital program.

The offset for these funds would come from the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation's Crop Insurance Sales Commission, by decreasing that program's funding by \$14 million and increasing the FDA's funding by \$10 million, for a net savings of \$4 million. The Agriculture appropriations bill currently funds the Crop Insurance Sales Commission at \$188 million—an increase of over \$36 million above the President's request. This program reimburses private insurance companies for expenses associated with selling and servicing crop insurance policies.

A recent GAO audit of this program uncovered numerous inappropriate expenses, such as business acquisitions and lobbying. Also included in the program's expenses were: \$22,000 for a trip to Las Vegas; \$44,000 for a fishing trip to Canada; country club memberships; tickets to sporting events, including \$18,000 for a baseball skybox rental and \$6 million to fund above average individual agent sales commissions by one large company.

In my humble opinion, these are not valid uses of taxpayer money. It appears this program is clearly one that can afford to spare a small percentage of its budget to improve and protect the health of our children and grandchildren. Even with the \$14 million decrease in funding contained in this amendment, the program will still be funded at 114 percent of what Secretary Glickman deems necessary.

Please join with 87 percent of the American public in supporting the FDA policy for restricting tobacco use among children. This is the right thing to do for the health of our children and future generations. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the Hansen-Meehan amendment to fully fund the FDA efforts to enforce tobacco regulations to keep these products out of the hands of our children.

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

We started on this bill last Wednesday, and yesterday we offered a unani-

mous-consent request that would have allowed 30 minutes of debate on this amendment. We were informed to not bother making the offer because it would be objected.

The bill is supported by the administration and they are very happy with this bill. They are very happy with the Food and Drug Administration number. Last year FDA spent \$4.9 million on its antismoking tobacco program. The committee bill provides \$24 million for this program, quadruple what it had last year. In all my years here, I have not ever seen a program that could absorb money that fast and spend it wisely.

Nonetheless, this is an important initiative, and it is obvious that the committee supports it, but enough is enough. They are damaging one program, crop insurance, that also needs help. I ask Members for a no vote.

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

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today because what we need to do with this amendment is fully fund the tobacco initiative. The administration does not support this. The administration requested \$34 million to carry out the necessary enforcement and outreach that will effectively curtail sales of tobacco products to children. I would hope that we could all agree, there are 50 States that have laws that are in effect, to regulate tobacco use to children. This allows the FDA to fully enforce those laws. That is what this is all about.

It does not affect tobacco farmers. It does not deal with the contentious or controversial issues relative to FDA regulation like marketing restrictions and advertising. All this attempts to do is give the FDA the resources that the administration says they need to effectively inform retailers of what they are to be doing; namely, carding a consumer who is underage who comes to buy tobacco products. The evidence is overwhelming that retailers are selling these products that kill children to children. The only thing we are trying to do with this amendment is allow the FDA to implement a program of education so that they can make sure that retailers know how they should protect children from sales. We have to card people, to educate people.

We are talking about tobacco, the leading preventable cause of death in America. In nearly every category, children are using tobacco products more and more, 3,000 children experimenting with tobacco products a day, 1,000 of them have their lives cut short. The minimum that we can do, the minimum we can do is enforce the laws that are in effect now. Let us make them card people. Let us make the retailers stop selling this destructive product to children.

The way we do that is by giving the FDA the authority and the resources they need. Even with this money that

is available, the Department of Agriculture will still get 114 percent of what they asked for. There is no excuse for not passing this amendment. It is in the interest of America's children.

This is a bipartisan bill. It is not a Democratic amendment. It is a bipartisan amendment. There are Members here who have been fighting all across America, attorneys general who have been fighting, hours and months of negotiating to keep tobacco products away from children. Let us join with those health experts. Let us join with the President and protect America's children. Vote for this amendment.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WHITFIELD].

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in opposition to this amendment. Obviously this is an emotional issue. As the gentleman from Massachusetts said, 50 States already prohibit the sale of tobacco products to minors, and those States have the responsibility to enforce those regulations. In addition, as the chairman said, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], \$24 million is in this bill to give FDA the authority to enforce its regulations.

I would remind the gentleman from Massachusetts and the proponents of this amendment that the FDA in the Fifth Circuit in the U.S. District Court in North Carolina has stayed all of the FDA regulations with the exception of carding children 27 and below at retail establishments. There is sufficient funds available for that.

In addition to that, in 1992, this Congress passed the SAMSA regulations with HHS. They also are enforcing these regulations. So this money is absolutely not needed at this time.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I rise against the Meehan amendment and the Hansen amendment. Mr. Chairman, certainly none of the arguments posed here can be objected to by anyone. No one wants children to smoke. As a matter of fact, I do not want adults to smoke. I am so strong in that that I quit myself. But the idea here is simply that we are moving the funding to the wrong area.

It has been said that there is an additional \$24 million in this program. I support that idea. The problem here is that we are affecting all of agriculture. We are affecting wheat and corn and soybeans and all other agricultural products. This is not just directed at tobacco. This is directed against crop insurance.

This is the risk management tool, Mr. Chairman, that we talked about in the last amendment; here again, no one is opposed to increasing WIC. No one is opposed to increasing the battle against children smoking and for tobacco itself. But in this amendment, maybe mistakenly, we have impacted all of agriculture and, again, we are at-

tacking a program that must stay in place for a whole industry, and that is agriculture.

Please, I ask all of my colleagues, again, oppose the Hansen-Meehan amendment.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment to fully fund the FDA's tobacco initiative to enforce restrictions on the sale of tobacco to children. Thirty-three States have pledged to work hand in hand with the FDA to ensure that provisions of its tobacco initiative are fully enforced. This amendment is critical to ensuring our Nation's success in reducing youth access to tobacco.

Cigarette smoking among high school seniors is at a 17-year high, and smoking among 8th and 10th graders has increased by more than 50 percent since 1991. According to a University of Michigan study, an astonishing 18.6 percent of eighth graders smoke. And they are getting cigarettes from stores—on average, kids are able to buy tobacco products over-the-counter 67 percent of the time.

I cannot emphasize enough how important it is to stop kids from smoking. Very few adult smokers picked up their habit after age 20. In fact, 9 percent of adult smokers started smoking before age 12, and 90 percent started before age 18. Every day, approximately 3,000 young people begin smoking, and over half of them become addicted.

Despite the fact it is against the law in all 50 States to sell cigarettes and smokeless tobacco to minors, kids purchase an estimated \$1.26 billion worth of tobacco products each year. The FDA's initiative will make it more difficult for kids to sustain their smoking habit by reducing their access. It will require retailers to conduct ID checks of all tobacco purchasers who appear to be under age 27. This may appear to be a pretty high age for an ID check, but teens—particularly older teens—are notorious for being able to make themselves look older and more sophisticated.

There are other important reasons to stop kids from smoking—including a finding that heavy teen smokers are far more likely than nonsmokers to use heroin or other illegal drugs. Young smokers are also susceptible to a host of other health problems, including decreased physical fitness, respiratory illnesses, early development of artery disease, and reduced lung development.

The offset for this amendment, the Crop Insurance Sales Commission program, reimburses private insurance companies for expenses associated with selling and servicing crop insurance policies.

The GAO has found many inappropriate expenses included in reimbursement rates, including funds to cover country club memberships, a \$44,000 fishing trip to Canada, and tickets to sporting events—including \$18,000 for a baseball skybox rental.

As a remedy, the GAO recommended a \$152 million appropriation. Even if this amendment is adopted, the Insurance Sales Commission program will still be funded at \$174 million—well above what GAO recommended.

Passage of this amendment is critical to reducing teen access to tobacco. The price of our failure to do so will be millions of tobacco-addicted adults, billions of dollars in lost productivity and health care costs, and unmeasurable pain and suffering. Let's cut our losses and support this amendment.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Meehan-Han-

son amendment which would increase funding for the Food and Drug Administration [FDA] by \$10 million. This money would be used for outreach efforts to educate businesses about their responsibilities regarding the sale of tobacco products to children.

Yes, it is against the law to sell tobacco to children. Unfortunately, these laws are rarely enforced. A review of 13 studies of over-the-counter sales reveals that children and adolescents were able to successfully buy tobacco products 67 percent of the time. Young people purchase an estimated 1.26 billion dollars' worth of cigarettes and smokeless tobacco each year.

The bill that is on the House floor does not adequately fund the FDA's initiative to reduce children's access to tobacco products. The FDA's tobacco initiative mandates that retailers must check the photo identification of individuals who want to buy cigarettes. Without full funding, the FDA will not be able to adequately enforce this crucial restriction on the sale of tobacco to children.

Tobacco continues to be a major health problem in the United States. The American Heart Association emphasizes that:

more people die each year in the United States from smoking than from AIDS, alcohol, drug use, homicide, car accidents, and fires combined.

Tobacco use accounts for more than \$68 billion in health care costs and lost productivity each year.

Nearly all tobacco use begins in the teenage years. Adolescent smokers become adult smokers. The key to reducing the rate of disease resulting from tobacco use is to discourage young people from starting to use tobacco products.

Mr. Chairman, we can no longer close our eyes to a product that brings into its deathly fold 3,000 children each day. Teenage smoking is a national health care crisis that can be curbed by fully funding the FDA's tobacco initiative.

It is my understanding that, in order to pay for this increase in funds to the FDA, \$14 million would be taken from the crop insurance sales commissions of the USDA's Risk Management Agency. Under this program, private insurance companies are reimbursed for expenses incurred in the process of providing crop insurance for Federal programs. I believe this is a reasonable offset because the bill provides \$36 million more than was recommended in the President's budget for this program, which is funded at \$188 million. I also understand that a GAO report has raised some concerns about this program. According to the GAO, in past years, some of the reimbursements have included expenses for a trip to Las Vegas, \$22,000, rental of a skybox, \$18,000, and fishing in Canada, \$44,000.

What kind of an America will we leave for our children if we do not take steps to prevent yet another generation from becoming addicted to tobacco? Providing the FDA with adequate funds to implement and enforce

their tobacco initiative will change for the better the landscape of smoking in the United States.

I urge my colleagues to support the Meehan-Hansen amendment.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman will state it.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, with so many of our children that are 18 years old—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman will state her inquiry.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, emphasizing the facts of how many of our children are smoking, the inquiry is, Mr. Chairman, with so many of our children dying from tobacco, why this debate is limited to 5 minutes? What are the rules and why are we limited to not allowing the 24 Members who want to speak on this amendment, why can they not speak on this amendment opposing death by cigarettes to children?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman is not stating a parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, why can we not speak beyond the 5 minutes or the 10 minutes allotted?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman has not stated a parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Meehan amendment to H.R. 2160, the Agriculture Appropriations Act of 1998.

This amendment would transfer \$14 million of the excess funds over the Department's request for their Federal Crop Insurance Sales Commission Program to fully fund the Food and Drug Administration's tobacco initiative. This transfer of funds from the Federal Crop Insurance Sales Commission would leave that account with 114 percent over the President's request for that area.

The Federal Crop Insurance Sales Commission Program reimburses private insurance companies for expenses associated with selling and servicing crop insurance policies. This amendment would leave \$22 million in funding over the President's request.

According to the University of Texas-Houston School of Public Health study titled "Why Kids Start to Smoke," the smoking prevalence rates for minorities in Texas are slightly higher than the national statistics according to Dr. Steven Kelder, assistant professor of behavioral sciences and principal investigator with the Southwest Center for Prevention Research at the university.

According to Dr. Laura K. McCormick, smoking is clearly a danger to health, and the number of teenagers who do smoke is considerable.

Tobacco use is a problem that starts with children. Almost 90 percent of adult smokers began smoking at or before age 18. Every day 3,000 children and adolescents become regular smokers, 1,000 of whom will eventually die prematurely because of tobacco use. More than 5 million children under age 18 alive today will die from smoking-related disease unless current rates are reversed.

Thirty-three State attorneys general have requested that the FDA receive full funding for the tobacco initiative to help their States fight to protect kids from tobacco. Today, in our Nation 4.5 million kids age 12 to 17 are current smokers, while smoking among high school seniors is at a 17-year high.

Since 1991, the answer to the question, "Have you smoked over the past month," the response among eighth graders and tenth graders has increased by almost 50 percent. If we do not act to stem the tide of teenage smokers more than 5 million children under age 18 alive today will die from smoking-related disease, unless current rates are reversed.

This amendment will have no effect on individual farmers. It leaves the Federal Crop Insurance Sales Commission Program very well funded by \$22 million more than USDA Secretary Glickman has indicated is needed to effectively fund the crop insurance program.

The Food and Drug Administration will use the funds made available by this amendment to begin work through training programs for the half million retailers in this country who sell tobacco products regarding their responsibilities under the law regarding tobacco sales to minors.

I thank Congressman MEEHAN for his leadership in bringing this amendment to the House for adoption to the Agriculture appropriation bill.

I would like to encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

□ 1215

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 193, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN] will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

CORPORATIONS

The following corporations and agencies are hereby authorized to make expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to make contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for such corporation or agency, except as hereinafter provided.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION FUND

For payments as authorized by section 516 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, such sums as may be necessary, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b).

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION FUND

REIMBURSEMENT FOR NET REALIZED LOSSES

For fiscal year 1998, such sums as may be necessary to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for net realized losses sustained, but not previously reimbursed (estimated to be \$783,507,000 in the President's fiscal year 1998 Budget Request (H. Doc. 105-3)), but not to exceed \$783,507,000, pursuant to

section 2 of the Act of August 17, 1961, as amended (15 U.S.C. 713a-11).

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE FOR HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT

For fiscal year 1998, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not expend more than \$5,000,000 for expenses to comply with the requirement of section 107(g) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 9607(g), and section 6001 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 6961: *Provided*, That expenses shall be for operations and maintenance costs only and that other hazardous waste management costs shall be paid for by the USDA Hazardous Waste Management appropriation in this Act.

TITLE II

CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment to administer the laws enacted by the Congress for the Forest Service and the Natural Resources Conservation Service, \$693,000.

NATURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION SERVICE

CONSERVATION OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses for carrying out the provisions of the Act of April 27, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 590a-590f) including preparation of conservation plans and establishment of measures to conserve soil and water (including farm irrigation and land drainage and such special measures for soil and water management as may be necessary to prevent floods and the siltation of reservoirs and to control agricultural related pollutants); operation of conservation plant materials centers; classification and mapping of soil; dissemination of information; acquisition of lands, water, and interests therein for use in the plant materials program by donation, exchange, or purchase at a nominal cost not to exceed \$100 pursuant to the Act of August 3, 1956 (7 U.S.C. 428a); purchase and erection or alteration or improvement of permanent and temporary buildings; and operation and maintenance of aircraft, \$610,000,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b), of which not less than \$5,835,000 is for snow survey and water forecasting and not less than \$8,825,000 is for operation and establishment of the plant materials centers: *Provided*, That appropriations hereunder shall be available pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 2250 for construction and improvement of buildings and public improvements at plant materials centers, except that the cost of alterations and improvements to other buildings and other public improvements shall not exceed \$250,000: *Provided further*, That when buildings or other structures are erected on non-Federal land, that the right to use such land is obtained as provided in 7 U.S.C. 2250a: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for technical assistance and related expenses to carry out programs authorized by section 202(c) of title II of the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act of 1974, as amended (43 U.S.C. 1592(c)): *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation may be expended for soil and water conservation operations under the Act of April 27, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 590a-590f) in demonstration projects: *Provided further*, That this appropriation 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 \$25,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That qualified local engineers may be temporarily employed at per diem

rates to perform the technical planning work of the Service (16 U.S.C. 590e-2): *Provided further*, That the Secretary is authorized to transfer ownership of land, buildings and related improvements of the plant materials facilities located at Bow, Washington to the Skagit Conservation District.

WATERSHED SURVEYS AND PLANNING

For necessary expenses to conduct research, investigation, and surveys of watersheds of rivers and other waterways, and for small watershed investigations and planning, in accordance with the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act approved August 4, 1954, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1001-1009), \$10,000,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation 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 \$110,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

WATERSHED AND FLOOD PREVENTION OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses to carry out preventive measures, including but not limited to research, engineering operations, methods of cultivation, the growing of vegetation, rehabilitation of existing works and changes in use of land, in accordance with the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act approved August 4, 1954, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1001-1005, 1007-1009), the provisions of the Act of April 27, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 590a-f), and in accordance with the provisions of laws relating to the activities of the Department, \$101,036,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b) of which not more than \$50,000,000 shall be available for technical assistance: *Provided*, That this appropriation 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 \$200,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$1,000,000 of this appropriation is available to carry out the purposes of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (Public Law 93-205), as amended, including cooperative efforts as contemplated by that Act to relocate endangered or threatened species to other suitable habitats as may be necessary to expedite project construction.

RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses in planning and carrying out projects for resource conservation and development and for sound land use pursuant to the provisions of section 32(e) of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1010-1011; 76 Stat. 607), the Act of April 27, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 590a-f), and the Agriculture and Food Act of 1981 (16 U.S.C. 3451-3461), \$29,377,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b): *Provided*, That this appropriation 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 \$50,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

FORESTRY INCENTIVES PROGRAM

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, to carry out the program of forestry incentives, as authorized in the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2101), including technical assistance and related expenses, \$6,325,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized by that Act.

OUTREACH FOR SOCIALLY DISADVANTAGED FARMERS

For grants and contracts pursuant to section 2501 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279), \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended.

TITLE III

RURAL ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development to administer programs under the laws enacted by the Congress for the Rural Housing Service, the Rural Business-Cooperative Service, and the Rural Utilities Service of the Department of Agriculture, \$588,000.

RURAL HOUSING SERVICE

RURAL HOUSING INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For gross obligations for the principal amount of direct and guaranteed loans as authorized by title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, to be available from funds in the rural housing insurance fund, as follows: \$3,950,000,000 for loans to section 502 borrowers, as determined by the Secretary, of which \$3,000,000,000 shall be for unsubsidized guaranteed loans; \$30,000,000 for section 504 housing repair loans; \$15,000,000 for section 514 farm labor housing; \$128,640,000 for section 515 rental housing; \$600,000 for section 524 site loans; \$25,000,000 for credit sales of acquired property; and \$587,000 for section 523 self-help housing land development loans.

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: section 502 loans, \$128,500,000, of which \$6,900,000 shall be for unsubsidized guaranteed loans; section 504 housing repair loans, \$10,300,000; section 514 farm labor housing, \$7,388,000; section 515 rental housing, \$68,745,000; credit sales of acquired property, \$3,492,000; and section 523 self-help housing land development loans, \$17,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, \$354,785,000, which shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for "Rural Housing Service, Salaries and Expenses."

MULTI-FAMILY HOUSING GUARANTEES

For gross obligations for the principal amount of guaranteed loans for the multi-family housing guarantee program as authorized by section 538 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, \$19,700,000.

For the cost of guaranteed loans for the multi-family housing guarantee program as authorized by section 538 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, including the cost of modifying loans, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, \$1,200,000.

RENTAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

For rental assistance agreements entered into or renewed pursuant to the authority under section 521(a)(2) or agreements entered into in lieu of debt forgiveness or payments for eligible households as authorized by section 502(c)(5)(D) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, \$493,870,000; and in addition such sums as may be necessary, as authorized by section 521(c) of the Act, to liquidate debt incurred prior to fiscal year 1992 to carry out the rental assistance program under section 521(a)(2) of the Act: *Provided*, That of this amount not more than \$5,900,000 shall be available for debt forgiveness or payments for eligible households as authorized by section 502(c)(5)(D) of the Act, and not to exceed \$10,000 per project for advances to nonprofit organizations or public agencies to cover direct costs (other than purchase price) incurred in purchasing projects pursuant to section 502(c)(5)(C) of the Act: *Provided fur-*

ther, That agreements entered into or renewed during fiscal year 1998 shall be funded for a five-year period, although the life of any such agreement may be extended to fully utilize amounts obligated.

MUTUAL AND SELF-HELP HOUSING GRANTS

For grants and contracts pursuant to section 523(b)(1)(A) of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1490c), \$26,000,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b).

RURAL COMMUNITY FIRE PROTECTION GRANTS

For grants pursuant to section 7 of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (Public Law 95-313), \$2,000,000 to fund up to 50 percent of the cost of organizing, training, and equipping rural volunteer fire departments.

RURAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For the cost of direct loans, loan guarantees, agreements, and grants, as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1926, 42 U.S.C. 1472, 1474, 1479, 1486, and 1490(a), except for sections 381E, 381H, and 381N of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, \$86,488,000, to remain available until expended, for direct loans and loan guarantees for community facilities, community facilities grant program, rural housing for domestic farm labor grants, very low-income housing repair grants, rural housing preservation grants, and compensation for construction defects of the Rural Housing Service: *Provided*, That the cost of direct loans and loan guarantees shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended: *Provided further*, That the amounts appropriated shall be transferred to loan program and grant accounts as determined by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated, not to exceed \$1,200,000 shall be available for the cost of direct loans, loan guarantees, and grants to be made available for empowerment zones and enterprise communities as authorized by Public Law 103-66: *Provided further*, That if such funds are not obligated for empowerment zones and enterprise communities by June 30, 1998, they remain available for other authorized purposes under this head.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Rural Housing Service, including administering the programs authorized by the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, as amended, title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, and cooperative agreements, \$58,804,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944, and not to exceed \$520,000 may be used for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

RURAL BUSINESS-COOPERATIVE SERVICE

RURAL DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For the cost of direct loans, \$16,888,000, as authorized by the Rural Development Loan Fund (42 U.S.C. 9812(a)): *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans of \$35,000,000: *Provided further*, That through June 30, 1998, of the total amount appropriated, \$3,345,000 shall be available for the cost of direct loans for empowerment zones and enterprise communities, as authorized by title XIII of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993, to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans, \$7,246,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan programs, \$3,482,000 shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for "Rural Business-Cooperative Service, Salaries and Expenses."

RURAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT LOANS
PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For the principal amount of direct loans, as authorized under section 313 of the Rural Electrification Act, as amended, for the purpose of promoting rural economic development and job creation projects, \$25,000,000.

For the cost of direct loans, including the cost of modifying loans as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, up to \$5,978,000, to be derived by transfer from interest on the cushion of credit payments, as authorized by section 313 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to remain available until expended.

RURAL COOPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

For rural cooperative development grants authorized under section 310B(e) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1932), \$3,000,000, of which up to \$1,300,000 may be available for cooperative agreements for appropriate technology transfer for rural areas program.

RURAL BUSINESS-COOPERATIVE ASSISTANCE
PROGRAM

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For the cost of direct loans, loan guarantees, and grants, as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1926, 1928, and 1932, except for sections 381E, 381H, and 381N of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, \$51,400,000, to remain available until expended, for direct loans and loan guarantees for business and industry assistance and rural business enterprise grants of the Rural Business-Cooperative Service: *Provided*, That the cost of direct loans and loan guarantees shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended: *Provided further*, That \$500,000 shall be available for grants to qualified nonprofit organizations as authorized under section 310B(c)(2) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1932): *Provided further*, That the amounts appropriated shall be transferred to loan program and grant accounts as determined by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That, of the total amount appropriated, not to exceed \$148,000 shall be available for the cost of direct loans, loan guarantees, and grants to be made available for business and industry loans for empowerment zones and enterprise communities as authorized by Public Law 103-66 and rural development loans for empowerment zones and enterprise communities as authorized by title XIII of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993: *Provided further*, That if such funds are not obligated for empowerment zones and enterprise communities by June 30, 1998, they remain available for other authorized purposes under this head.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Rural Business-Cooperative Service, including administering the programs authorized by the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, as amended; section 1323 of the Food Security Act of 1985; the Cooperative Marketing Act of 1926; for activities relating to the marketing aspects of cooperatives, including economic research findings, as authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946; for activities with institutions concerning the development and operation of agricultural cooperatives; and for cooperative agreements; \$25,680,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section

706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944, and not to exceed \$260,000 may be used for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

RURAL UTILITIES SERVICE

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND
TELECOMMUNICATION LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Insured loans pursuant to the authority of section 305 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U.S.C. 935), shall be made as follows: 5 percent rural electrification loans, \$125,000,000; 5 percent rural telecommunications loans, \$75,000,000; cost of money rural telecommunications loans, \$300,000,000; municipal rate rural electric loans, \$400,000,000; and loans made pursuant to section 306 of that Act, rural electric, \$300,000,000 and rural telecommunications, \$120,000,000, to remain available until expended.

For the cost, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, including the cost of modifying loans, of direct and guaranteed loans authorized by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U.S.C. 935 and 936), as follows: cost of direct loans, \$12,461,000; cost of municipal rate loans, \$16,880,000; cost of money rural telecommunications loans, \$60,000; cost of loans guaranteed pursuant to section 306, \$2,760,000: *Provided*, That notwithstanding section 305(d)(2) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, borrower interest rates may exceed 7 percent per year.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, \$34,398,000, which shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for "Rural Utilities Service, Salaries and Expenses."

RURAL TELEPHONE BANK PROGRAM ACCOUNT

The Rural Telephone Bank is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds available to such corporation in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out its authorized programs for the current fiscal year. During fiscal year 1998 and within the resources and authority available, gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans shall be \$175,000,000.

For the cost, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, including the cost of modifying loans, of direct loans authorized by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U.S.C. 935), \$3,710,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the loan programs, \$3,000,000, which shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for "Rural Utilities Service, Salaries and Expenses."

DISTANCE LEARNING AND MEDICAL LINK
PROGRAM

For the cost of direct loans and grants, as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 950aaa et seq., as amended, \$15,030,000, to remain available until expended, to be available for loans and grants for telemedicine and distance learning services in rural areas: *Provided*, That the costs of direct loans shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

RURAL UTILITIES ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For the cost of direct loans, loan guarantees, and grants, as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1926, 1928, and 1932, except for sections 381E, 381H, and 381N of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, \$577,242,000, to remain available until expended, for direct loans, loan guarantees, and grants for rural

water and waste disposal, and solid waste management grants of the Rural Utilities Service: *Provided*, That the cost of direct loans and loan guarantees shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended: *Provided further*, That the amounts appropriated shall be transferred to loan program and grant accounts as determined by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That through June 30, 1998, of the total amount appropriated, \$18,700,000 shall be available for the costs of direct loans, loan guarantees, and grants to be made available for empowerment zones and enterprise communities, as authorized by Public Law 103-66: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated, not to exceed \$18,700,000 shall be for water and waste disposal systems to benefit the Colonias along the United States/Mexico border, including grants pursuant to section 306C of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, as amended: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated, not to exceed \$5,200,000 shall be available for contracting with qualified national organizations for a circuit rider program to provide technical assistance for rural water systems: *Provided further*, That an amount not less than that available in fiscal year 1997 be set aside and made available for ongoing technical assistance under sections 306(a)(14) (7 U.S.C. 1926) and 310(B)(b) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1932): *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated, not to exceed \$8,750,000 shall be for water and waste disposal systems pursuant to section 757 of Public Law 104-127.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Rural Utilities Service, including administering the programs authorized by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, and the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, as amended, and for cooperative agreements, \$33,000,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944, and not to exceed \$105,000 may be used for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

Mr. SKEEN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill, through page 47, line 7, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IV

DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FOOD,
NUTRITION AND CONSUMER SERVICES

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services to administer the laws enacted by the Congress for the Food and Consumer Service, \$454,000.

CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.), except section 21, and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1771 et seq.), except sections 17 and 21; \$7,766,966,000, to remain available through September 30, 1999 of which \$2,548,555,000 is hereby appropriated and \$5,218,411,000 shall be derived by transfer from funds available under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c): *Provided*, That none of the funds made available

under this heading shall be used for studies and evaluations: *Provided further*, That up to \$4,124,000 shall be available for independent verification of school food service claims.

SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION PROGRAM FOR WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN (WIC)

For necessary expenses to carry out the special supplemental nutrition program as authorized by section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786), \$3,924,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 1999: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available under this heading shall be used for studies and evaluations: *Provided further*, That up to \$12,000,000 may be used to carry out the farmers' market nutrition program from any funds not needed to maintain current caseload levels: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding sections 17 (g), (h) and (i) of such Act, the Secretary shall adjust fiscal year 1998 State allocations to reflect food funds available to the State from fiscal year 1997 under section 17(i)(3)(A)(ii) and 17(i)(3)(D): *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall allocate funds recovered from fiscal year 1997 first to States to maintain stability funding levels, as defined by regulations promulgated under section 17(g), and then to give first priority for the allocation of any remaining funds to States whose funding is less than their fair share of funds, as defined by regulations promulgated under section 17(g): *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this account shall be available for the purchase of infant formula except in accordance with the cost containment and competitive bidding requirements specified in section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966: *Provided further*, That State agencies required to procure infant formula using a competitive bidding system may use funds appropriated by this Act to purchase infant formula under a cost containment contract entered into after September 30, 1996 only if the contract was awarded to the bidder offering the lowest net price, as defined by section 17(b)(20) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, unless the State agency demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the weighted average retail price for different brands of infant formula in the State does not vary by more than five percent.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out the Food Stamp Act (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.), \$25,140,479,000, to remain available through September 30, 1998, in accordance with section 18(a) of the Food Stamp Act: *Provided*, That \$100,000,000 for the foregoing amount shall be placed in reserve for use only in such amounts and at such times as may become necessary to carry out program operations: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available under this heading shall be used for studies and evaluations: *Provided further*, That funds provided herein shall be expended in accordance with section 16 of the food Stamp Act: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be subject to any work registration or workforce requirements as may be required by law: *Provided further*, That \$1,204,000,000 of the foregoing amount shall be available for nutrition assistance for Puerto Rico as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 2028: *Provided further*, That \$100,000,000 of the foregoing amount shall be available to carry out the Emergency Food Assistance Program as authorized by section 27 of the Food Stamp Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MRS. CLAYTON

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 12 offered by Mrs. CLAYTON:

Page 49, line 21, insert "(increased by \$2,478,000,000)" after the first dollar figure.

Page 49, at the end of line 14, add the following:

Each amount otherwise appropriated in this Act (other than this paragraph) is hereby reduced by 5 percent.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 193, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] will each control 5 minutes.

The gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized.

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment increases the funding for food stamps by \$2.4 billion in fiscal year 1998. The increase will result in food stamps being funded at the same level as in fiscal year 1997. This amendment is paid for, Mr. Chairman, by an across-the-board decrease of 5 percent on all other accounts, mandatory and discretionary.

Mr. Chairman, last Congress we agreed that our welfare system needed to be reformed, and we were right, but reforms should be directed to moving people out of poverty, not into poverty. Nutrition programs are essential for the well-being of millions of our citizens: the disadvantaged, our children, the elderly and the disabled.

These are groups of people who, in many instances, cannot provide for themselves and need assistance for their basic existence. They do not ask for much, just a little help in sustaining them through the day, to keep their children alert in class, or to help others be productive on their jobs or as they seek and search for jobs.

Nutrition programs in many cases provide the only nutritious meals that many of our Nation's poor receive on a daily basis. Many of those I am speaking about, far too many, are working people, working families. These working Americans are struggling to make ends meet and still cannot afford to feed their families.

One-fifth of families receiving food stamps are working families who have a gross income below the poverty level. Of the 27 million people served by the food stamp program, over half, 51 percent, are children; 7 percent are elderly.

The program allows only 75 cents per person per meal. When was the last time any of us had to exist off of 75 cents per meal?

I am concerned that in our zeal to balance the budget, we are failing to balance our priorities. That failure is demonstrated in a telephone call to my office recently. It was from a woman who, having labored for a lifetime, now lives on her Social Security of \$6,500 a year.

Her Social Security payment was increased by \$16. Because of that increase, her food stamp allotment was lowered by \$7. Her State then made adjustments in their Medicaid Program. Two types of needed medication that had cost her \$1 each before, now cost her a total of \$100. The \$16 increase cost her a \$107 cut in her already paltry income.

We may be gliding toward a balanced budget, Mr. Chairman, but many of our citizens are sliding rapidly to the bottom, and this Congress has an obligation to understand what we are doing. The best efforts of the four Presidents and thousands of people who were in Philadelphia recently talking about voluntarism could not make up the difference required in the food banks and shelters if indeed we do not make that money available.

It is time for us to stop picking on the poor, Mr. Chairman. It is time for us to understand that we, too, have an obligation to them. Hunger has a cure, and Congress is part of that remedy. I urge my colleagues to consider the needs of the poor and those who receive food stamps.

Mr. Chairman, I had wanted to make that point so Congress is aware of our responsibility through the food stamp program and how we had been serving the food stamp program and what those cuts will mean to America.

Mr. Chairman, because I know I will have a point of order, I will not call for a vote, and I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is withdrawn.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMODITY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out the commodity supplemental food program as authorized by section 4(a) of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (7 U.S.C. 612c (note) and provide administrative expenses pursuant to section 204 of the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983, \$141,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 1999: *Provided*, That none of these funds shall be available to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for commodities donated to the program.

FOOD DONATIONS PROGRAMS FOR SELECTED GROUPS

For necessary expenses to carry out section 4(a) of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (7 U.S.C. 612c (note)), and section 311 of the Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended (42 U.S.C. 3030a), \$141,165,000, to remain available through September 30, 1999.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. SANDERS

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 18 offered by Mr. SANDERS: Page 51, line 6, insert after the dollar amount "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

Page 56, line 15, insert after the second dollar amount "(reduced by \$5,470,000)".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 193, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Does the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] seek time in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, yes, I stand in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LOBIONDO] to speak on this bipartisan amendment which increases funding for Meals on Wheels.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] for his cooperation and work on this very important amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in my district the Meals on Wheels programs in Cumberland, Gloucester, Cape May, Atlantic, Burlington and Salem Counties consistently provide a valuable humanitarian service to thousands of seniors. Typically, the recipients of this service are individuals who are unable to leave their homes for a variety of reasons, sometimes due to chronic illness, sometimes because of a handicap, sometimes because of a temporary physical ailment.

At a cost of between \$5 and \$6 per meal per day, county employees and volunteers, I may stress a large number of volunteers, deliver a meal on weekdays and sometimes on weekends to the doorsteps of needy senior citizens. These meals are hot, well planned and nutritionally balanced.

More importantly, Mr. Chairman, these programs safeguard the well-being of local seniors. For instance, volunteers delivering meals can check to see if the water is running. They can check to see, during this summertime when the temperatures are soaring, if air conditioning is working, if the seniors need any help. Library books are often delivered along with the meals. And an ambulance can be sent or help can be summoned if in fact the volunteer determines there is a need.

I have personally participated in delivering Meals on Wheels with volunteers in the past, and can tell my colleagues from firsthand experience that this is a program that makes a positive difference to elderly Americans.

As the gentleman from Vermont will point out, Meals on Wheels is also an efficient Federal program. For every \$1 spent, \$3 are saved on other senior programs like Medicare and Medicaid. And as we struggle to find those dollars, I think it is important to note how cost-effective these are. There are not many programs that can match this fiscal rate of success.

Clearly, Mr. Chairman, Meals on Wheels is the kind of successful Fed-

eral and local partnership that Congress should be encouraging and looking to do more with. It strengthens the support of family, friends and neighbors. It encourages volunteerism. It is cost-effective.

And yet, despite all these positive aspects, the Meals on Wheels program suffers from a chronic shortage of funding. In fact, this problem is starting to have a tangible effect on the local level.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

This amendment would reduce the funding for the Food and Drug Administration and increase funding for the elderly feeding program. And let me say to my colleagues, we have funded the elderly feeding program at the President's budget request and the same level as last year.

Funding for the operation of this program, also known as Meals on Wheels, is actually contained in the Labor-HHS appropriations bill. The program is administered through the Department of Aging, not USDA. USDA has no say or control over the program. All USDA does is provide a cash reimbursement for each meal served. Increasing the funding for this program in this bill will not increase participation in the program. The funding level provided in the bill supports the President's request.

We all know how important FDA is to the health and safety of this country. We have had hundreds of letters sent to us asking that we increase FDA's funding for food safety and tobacco regulation enforcement. We have done the best we could to meet everyone's needs. The gentleman's amendment reduces funding for FDA, which will negatively impact these and other safety programs.

And let me remind my colleagues that the elderly feeding program is not authorized, but the committee felt strong enough to continue its funding and it is funded at the level the President says it needs.

I ask that the Members oppose this amendment, and ask the gentleman from Vermont to work with the authorizing committee to get this program reauthorized.

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

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

What we are trying to do in a bipartisan way is to provide \$5 million to some of the weakest and most vulnerable people in this country, senior citizens who are in need of nutrition but are too weak to get out of their own homes to get it, and we are taking that money from the salary and expense account of the FDA. I think it is the proper thing to do.

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

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. THURMAN].

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Vermont for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, no person in this country should go hungry. For years, Congress has shown a bipartisan commitment to ensuring adequate nutrition for our citizens, especially children and the elderly. We provide assistance to those in need through food stamps and other Federal nutrition programs, yet 41 percent of the programs still have a waiting list. These are real people.

Now, \$5 million may sound like too much money to some here, it may sound like too little to make a difference to others, but every day millions of people depend on senior nutrition programs.

□ 1230

According to studies, this \$5 million will save \$15 million in Medicare, Medicaid, VA health cost because undernourished people are less healthy.

I urge the Members to support this amendment.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE].

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, one of my highest priorities since coming to Congress has been to ensure that our Nation's elderly are able to live with dignity. One can judge the humanity of any society by how it treats its very young, and its very old, the most vulnerable in our society.

This is personal to me. My own mother, who until her death at the age of 94, 2 years ago, was able to remain in our own family home only because of the Meals on Wheels Program. And because of that, she lived with dignity and with peace of mind. I think we should treat all the people of America as I would want my mother treated. This is a very important program. It is fiscally and morally sound.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, could I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield all of 15 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX].

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this. This is the better public-private partnership I am aware of. Meals on Wheels helps seniors in every State of the Union. We must restore half the cut from last year. Let us support the Sanders-LoBiondo amendment.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I would just conclude and suggest that

last year there was a cut in this program. We are trying to restore half of the cut to the weakest and most vulnerable people in this country. It is the right thing to do. It is a bipartisan effort. I urge the Members to support it.

Mr. Chairman, the elderly nutrition programs funded in this bill, which include Meals on Wheels and congregate meals are excellent examples of good government and common sense, as well as Federal-State-local and public-private partnerships. This is exactly the sort of senior citizen program we should be funding. Therefore, I am delighted to be joined by Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. NEY, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. FOX, and many more of our colleagues in offering a compromise amendment to increase funding for these programs by \$5 million, making up half of the \$10 million cut made last year.

Mr. Chairman, across America today, about 6 million hot Meals on Wheels have been served to senior citizens who do not have the capacity to leave their homes, and another 6 million hot meals have been served to lower-income senior citizens at senior centers and other community locations through the congregate program.

Mr. Chairman, this program is terribly important to millions of Americans. For many recipients of Meals on Wheels, the driver who delivers their meals may be their only visitor, their only contact with the world, in a given day. The Urban Institute recently estimated that as many as 4.9 million seniors—about 16 percent of the population aged 60 and older—are either hungry or malnourished. According to studies from the University of Florida, 89 percent of Meals on Wheels recipients are at moderate to high risk for malnutrition. Meals on Wheels and congregate meals help these Americans stay healthy. Yet, 41 percent of Meals on Wheels programs nationwide have waiting lists today—lists of senior citizens who go hungry because we are not funding this program at an appropriate level.

Let me also point out that today in America, 4 million seniors live in poverty, and another 16 million are near poverty. Half of our senior citizens in this country live on incomes of \$15,000 or less per year.

As Mathematica Policy Research found last year, the senior nutrition programs are well-targeted at poor elderly Americans. The average beneficiary of these programs is 77 years old, and 90 percent of beneficiaries live below 200 percent of poverty; about 40 percent have subpoverty incomes.

At this time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to tell you about how one of my constituents' lives was saved by a Meals on Wheels driver. On March 25 of this year, my constituent Cecil Utley of Barre, VT, fell and broke his hip. Unable to move, he lay on his floor for 5 hours until David Stevens, a Meals on Wheels driver for the Central Vermont Council on Aging, was troubled that Mr. Utley did not answer his door. He had another Council on Aging worker, Kathy Paquet, try to reach Mr. Utley by phone, and when they failed they obtained help from a neighbor who had a key to Mr. Utley's house. They found him barely conscious and called an ambulance. I am pleased to report that Mr. Utley is now doing well in his recovery.

As his son Gayle wrote to the program, "Without your help and concern, my father would probably not have survived this acci-

dent. You * * * will always be remembered fondly by our family. Keep up the great work."

Mr. Chairman, this program not only makes good social policy sense, it also makes excellent fiscal policy sense. Every \$1 spent on these senior nutrition programs saves \$3 in Federal Medicare, Medicaid, and veterans' health care costs since malnourished patients stay in the hospital nearly twice as long a well-nourished seniors, costing \$2,000 to \$10,000 more per stay.

Mr. Chairman, this is a modest, compromise amendment. Last year, the elderly nutrition programs in this bill were cut by \$10 million, from \$150 to \$140 million. In my view, that was a penny-wise, pound-foolish cut to make. Given inflation and the aging of our population, funding for these programs is not keeping pace with either the rising cost of food or the increase in Meals on Wheels customers. Further, when Congress reauthorized the Older Americans Act in 1992, it said the per-meal reimbursement rate of these programs should not fall below 61 cents. Unfortunately, the rate has fallen to an estimated 58.5 cents per meal this year, and will fall further if our amendment is not adopted.

This amendment is fully paid for with a modest, 0.6 percent cut in the FDA through its salary and expenses account. I am not here to bash the FDA or its hard-working staff, and it is not my intent to cut food safety initiatives or tobacco control enforcement activities with this amendment, but I do believe this \$5 million will better serve the country if it is spent on hot meals for homebound senior citizens rather than administrative expenses at FDA.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the LoBiondo amendment to add \$5 million in appropriations for the extremely successful Meals on Wheels Program.

Because of this Federal-State-local program, many home-bound senior citizens in my district are able to receive at least one nutritious meal daily. Because many seniors on this program have disabilities, the \$3 meals provided by this program are especially critical to seniors on a fixed income in Florida, who live alone or do not have anyone to care for them.

As the Appropriations Committee's base bill essentially freezes fiscal year 1998 funding at the fiscal year 1997 level, this small increase in funding is very important to serve the growing number of elderly people who qualify for the program and to reduce the number of disabled who are being placed on waiting lists. I commend my colleague from New Jersey for advancing this meritorious amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MEEHAN

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by a voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 177, noes 248, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 309]

AYES—177

Ackerman	Gonzalez	Nadler
Allen	Green	Neal
Andrews	Gutierrez	Oberstar
Bachus	Hall (OH)	Obey
Baldacci	Hansen	Olver
Barrett (WI)	Harman	Ortiz
Becerra	Hayworth	Owens
Bentsen	Hinchee	Pallone
Berman	Holden	Pappas
Bilbray	Hookey	Pascarell
Blagojevich	Horn	Pastor
Blumenauer	Hoyer	Payne
Borski	Jackson (IL)	Pelosi
Brown (CA)	Jackson-Lee	Porter
Brown (OH)	(TX)	Quinn
Callahan	Johnson (CT)	Ramstad
Campbell	Johnson (WI)	Rangel
Capps	Kanjorski	Reyes
Cardin	Kaptur	Riggs
Carson	Kelly	Rivers
Castle	Kennedy (MA)	Roemer
Clay	Kennedy (RI)	Rothman
Conyers	Kennelly	Roukema
Cook	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Coyne	Kind (WI)	Royce
Davis (FL)	Kleczka	Rush
Davis (IL)	Kucinich	Sabo
Davis (VA)	LaFalce	Salmon
DeFazio	Lampson	Sanchez
DeGette	Lantos	Sanders
Delahunt	LaTourette	Sawyer
DeLauro	Leach	Scarborough
Dellums	Levin	Schumer
Deutsch	Lewis (GA)	Serrano
Dickey	Lipinski	Shays
Dicks	Lofgren	Sherman
Dixon	Lowey	Skaggs
Doggett	Luther	Slaughter
Doyle	Maloney (CT)	Smith (NJ)
Duncan	Maloney (NY)	Smith (TX)
Engel	Markey	Smith, Adam
English	Mascara	Smith, Linda
Ensign	Matsui	Snowbarger
Eshoo	McCarthy (MO)	Stupak
Evans	McCarthy (NY)	Tauscher
Fattah	McDermott	Tierney
Fawell	McGovern	Torres
Filner	McHale	Trafficant
Flake	McKinney	Velazquez
Foglietta	McNulty	Vento
Ford	Meehan	Visclosky
Fox	Menendez	Waters
Frank (MA)	Millender-	Waxman
Franks (NJ)	McDonald	Weldon (PA)
Frelinghuysen	Miller (CA)	Wexler
Furse	Miller (FL)	Weygand
Galleghy	Mink	Wise
Gejdenson	Moakley	Woolsey
Gephardt	Moran (VA)	Yates
Gilman	Morella	

NOES—248

Abercrombie	Bryant	Cunningham
Aderholt	Bunning	Danner
Archer	Burr	Deal
Armey	Burton	DeLay
Baesler	Buyer	Diaz-Balart
Baker	Calvert	Dooley
Ballenger	Camp	Doolittle
Barcia	Canady	Dreier
Barr	Cannon	Dunn
Barrett (NE)	Chabot	Edwards
Bartlett	Chambliss	Ehlers
Bass	Chenoweth	Ehrlich
Bateman	Christensen	Emerson
Bereuter	Clayton	Etheridge
Berry	Clement	Everett
Bilirakis	Clyburn	Ewing
Bishop	Coble	Farr
Bliley	Coburn	Fazio
Blunt	Collins	Foley
Boehlert	Combest	Forbes
Boehner	Condit	Fowler
Bonilla	Cooksey	Frost
Bonior	Costello	Ganske
Bono	Cox	Gekas
Boswell	Cramer	Gibbons
Boucher	Crane	Gilchrest
Boyd	Crapo	Gillmor
Brady	Cubin	Goode
Brown (FL)	Cummings	Goodlatte

Goodling	McCollum	Schaefer, Dan
Gordon	McCrery	Schaffer, Bob
Goss	McDade	Scott
Graham	McHugh	Sensenbrenner
Granger	McInnis	Sessions
Gutknecht	McIntosh	Shadegg
Hall (TX)	McIntyre	Shaw
Hamilton	McKeon	Shimkus
Hastings (FL)	Meek	Shuster
Hastings (WA)	Metcalf	Sisisky
Hefley	Mica	Skeen
Hefner	Minge	Skelton
Herger	Mollohan	Smith (MI)
Hill	Moran (KS)	Smith (OR)
Hilleary	Murtha	Snyder
Hilliard	Myrick	Solomon
Hinojosa	Nethercutt	Souder
Hobson	Neumann	Spence
Hoekstra	Ney	Spratt
Hostettler	Northup	Stabenow
Houghton	Norwood	Stearns
Hulshof	Nussle	Stenholm
Hunter	Oxley	Stokes
Hutchinson	Packard	Strickland
Hyde	Parker	Stump
Inglis	Paul	Sununu
Istook	Paxon	Talent
Jefferson	Pease	Tanner
Jenkins	Peterson (MN)	Tauzin
John	Peterson (PA)	Taylor (MS)
Johnson, E. B.	Petri	Taylor (NC)
Johnson, Sam	Pickering	Thomas
Jones	Pickett	Thompson
Kasich	Pitts	Thornberry
Kilpatrick	Pombo	Thune
Kim	Pomeroy	Thurman
King (NY)	Portman	Tiahrt
Kingston	Poshard	Towns
Klink	Price (NC)	Turner
Klug	Pryce (OH)	Upton
Knollenberg	Radanovich	Walsh
Kolbe	Rahall	Wamp
LaHood	Redmond	Watkins
Largent	Regula	Watt (NC)
Latham	Riley	Watts (OK)
Lazio	Rodriguez	Weldon (FL)
Lewis (CA)	Rogan	Weller
Lewis (KY)	Rogers	White
Linder	Rohrabacher	Whitfield
LoBiondo	Ros-Lehtinen	Wicker
Lucas	Ryun	Wolf
Manton	Sandlin	Wynn
Manzullo	Sanford	Young (FL)
Martinez	Saxton	

NOT VOTING—9

Barton	Hastert	Schiff
Dingell	Livingston	Stark
Greenwood	Molinari	Young (AK)

□ 1252

Messrs. CONDIT, SNYDER and STOKES and Ms. DANNER changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. CLAY, GALLEGLY, PAPPAS, SERRANO, RIGGS and BACHUS changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FOOD PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

For necessary administrative expenses of the domestic food programs funded under this Act, \$104,128,000, of which \$5,000,000 shall be available only for simplifying procedures, reducing overhead costs, tightening regulations, improving food stamp coupon handling, and assistance in the prevention, identification, and prosecution of fraud and other violations of law: *Provided*, That this appropriation 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 \$150,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

TITLE V
FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMSFOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE AND GENERAL SALES MANAGER
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Foreign Agricultural Service, including carrying out title VI of the Agricultural Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1761-1768), market development activities abroad, and for enabling the Secretary to coordinate and integrate activities of the Department in connection with foreign agricultural work, including not to exceed \$128,000 for representation allowances and for expenses pursuant to section 8 of the Act approved August 3, 1956 (U.S.C. 1766), \$135,561,000, of which \$3,231,000 may be transferred from the Export Loan Program account in this Act, and \$1,035,000 may be transferred from the Public Law 480 program account in this Act: *Provided*, That the Service may utilize advances of funds, or reimburse this appropriation for expenditures made on behalf of Federal agencies, public and private organizations and institutions under agreements executed pursuant to the agricultural food production assistance programs (7 U.S.C. 1736) and the foreign assistance programs of the International Development Cooperation Administration (22 U.S.C. 2392).

None of the funds in the foregoing paragraph shall be available to promote the sale or export of tobacco or tobacco products.

PUBLIC LAW 480 PROGRAM AND GRANT ACCOUNTS
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For expenses during the current fiscal year, not otherwise recoverable, and unrecovered prior years' costs, including interest thereon, under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1691, 1701-1715, 1721-1726, 1727-1727f, 1731-1736g), as follows: (1) \$225,798,000 for Public Law 480 title I credit, including Food for Progress programs; (2) \$12,250,000 is hereby appropriated for ocean freight differential costs for the shipment of agricultural commodities pursuant to title I of said Act and the Food for Progress Act of 1985, as amended; (3) \$837,000,000 is hereby appropriated for commodities supplied in connection with dispositions abroad pursuant to title II of said Act; and (4) \$30,000,000 is hereby appropriated for commodities supplied in connection with dispositions abroad pursuant to title III of said Act: *Provided*, That not to exceed 15 percent of the funds made available to carry out any title of said Act may be used to carry out any other title of said Act: *Provided further*, That such sums shall remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b).

For the cost, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, of direct credit agreements as authorized by the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, and the Food for Progress Act of 1985, as amended, including the cost of modifying credit agreements under said Act, \$175,738,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the Public Law 480 title I credit program, and the Food for Progress Act of 1985, as amended, to the extent funds appropriated for Public Law 480 are utilized, \$1,780,000.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION EXPORT LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For administrative expenses to carry out the Commodity Credit Corporation's export guarantee program, GSM 102 and GSM 103, \$3,820,000; to cover common overhead expenses as permitted by section 11 of the Com-

modity Credit Corporation Charter Act and in conformity with the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, of which not to exceed \$3,231,000 may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for the salaries and expenses of the Foreign Agricultural Service, and of which not to exceed \$589,000 may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for the salaries and expenses of the Farm Service Agency.

EXPORT CREDIT

The Commodity Credit Corporation shall make available not less than \$5,500,000,000 in credit guarantees under its export credit guarantee program extended to finance the export sales of United States agricultural commodities and the products thereof, as authorized by section 202 (a) and (b) of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5641).

EMERGING-MARKETS EXPORT CREDIT

The Commodity Credit Corporation shall make available not less than \$200,000,000 in credit guarantees under its export guarantee program for credit expended to finance the export sales of United States agricultural commodities and the products thereof to emerging markets, as authorized by section 1542 of Public Law 101-624 (7 U.S.C. 5622 note).

TITLE VI

RELATED AGENCIES AND FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Food and Drug Administration, including hire and purchase of passenger motor vehicles; for rental of special purpose space in the District of Columbia or elsewhere; and for miscellaneous and emergency expenses of enforcement activities, authorized and approved by the Secretary and to be accounted for solely on the Secretary's certificate, not to exceed \$25,000; \$857,971,000: *Provided*, That none of these funds shall be used to develop, establish, or operate any program of user fees authorized by 31 U.S.C. 9701.

In addition to the foregoing amount, not to exceed \$91,204,000 in fees pursuant to section 736 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act may be collected and credited to this appropriation and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That fees derived from applications received during fiscal year 1998 shall be subject to the fiscal year 1998 limitation.

In addition, fees pursuant to section 354 of the Public Health Service Act may be credited to this account, to remain available until expended.

In addition, fees pursuant to section 801 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act may be credited to this account, to remain available until expended.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. BURR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a point of order against the language in title VI of the Agricultural Appropriations Act for the Fiscal Year 1998 on page 56 of the bill, lines 18 through 24, based on the ground that this provision constitutes legislation in an appropriations bill, in violation of rule XXI, clause 2 of the Rules of the House.

The Prescription Drug User Fee Act, an act within the jurisdiction of the Committee of Commerce, authorizes the collection of user fees. However, this authority expires at the end of the fiscal year 1997. This provision of H.R.

2160 would authorize the collection and expenditure of these user fees beyond the year 1997. Therefore, I make a point of order against the language because it constitutes legislative language in an appropriations measure in violation of rule XXI, clause 2.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

As argued by the gentleman from North Carolina, the unprotected language on page 56 effectively would extend statutory authority that would otherwise expire. The language therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2(b) of rule XXI. The point of order is sustained and the unprotected paragraph on page 56 is stricken from the bill.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For plans, construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities of or used by the Food and Drug Administration, where not otherwise provided, \$21,350,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b).

RENTAL PAYMENTS (FDA)

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For payment of space rental and related costs pursuant to Public Law 92-313 for programs and activities of the Food and Drug Administration which are included in this Act, \$46,294,000: *Provided*, That in the event the Food and Drug Administration should require modification of space needs, a share of the salaries and expenses appropriation may be transferred to this appropriation, or a share of this appropriation may be transferred to the salaries and expenses appropriation, but such transfers shall not exceed 5 percent of the funds made available for rental payments (FDA) to or from this account.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SERVICE

PAYMENTS TO THE FARM CREDIT SYSTEM FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE CORPORATION

For necessary payments to the Farm Credit System Financial Assistance Corporation by the Secretary of the Treasury, as authorized by section 6.28(c) of the Farm Credit Act of 1971, as amended, for reimbursement of interest expenses incurred by the Financial Assistance Corporation on obligations issued through 1994, as authorized, \$7,728,000.

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), including the purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; the rental of space (to include multiple year leases) in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; and not to exceed \$25,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109; \$57,101,000, including not to exceed \$1,000 for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided*, That the Commission is authorized to charge reasonable fees to attendees of Commission sponsored educational events and symposia to cover the Commission's costs of providing those events and symposia, and notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, said fees shall be credited to this account, to be available without further appropriation.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Not to exceed \$34,423,000 (from assessments collected from farm credit institutions and

from the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation) shall be obligated during the current fiscal year for administrative expenses as authorized under 12 U.S.C. 2249: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to expenses associated with receiverships.

TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. Within the unit limit of cost fixed by law, appropriations and authorizations made for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1998 under this Act shall be available for the purchase, in addition to those specifically provided for, of not to exceed 394 passenger motor vehicles, of which 391 shall be for replacement only, and for the hire of such vehicles.

SEC. 702. Funds in this Act available to the Department of Agriculture shall be available for uniforms or allowances therefor as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902).

SEC. 703. Not less than \$1,500,000 of the appropriations of the Department of Agriculture in this Act for research and service work authorized by the Acts of August 14, 1946, and July 28, 1954 (7 U.S.C. 427, 1621-1629), and by chapter 63 of title 31, United States Code, shall be available for contracting in accordance with said Acts and chapter.

SEC. 704. The cumulative total of transfers to the Working Capital Fund for the purpose of accumulating growth capital for data services and National Finance Center operations shall not exceed \$2,000,000: *Provided*, That no funds in this Act appropriated to an agency of the Department shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund without the approval of the agency administrator.

SEC. 705. New obligational authority provided for the following appropriation items in this Act shall remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b): Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, the contingency fund to meet emergency conditions, fruit fly program, and integrated systems acquisition project; Farm Service Agency, salaries and expenses funds made available to county committees; and Foreign Agricultural Service, middle-income country training program.

New obligational authority for the boll weevil program; up to 10 percent of the screwworm program of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service; Food Safety and Inspection Service, field automation and information management project; funds appropriated for rental payments; funds for the Native American Institutions Endowment Fund in the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service; and funds for the competitive research grants (7 U.S.C. 4501(b)), shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 706. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 707. Not to exceed \$50,000 of the appropriations available to the Department of Agriculture in this Act shall be available to provide appropriate orientation and language training pursuant to Public Law 94-449.

SEC. 708. No funds appropriated by this Act may be used to pay negotiated indirect cost rates on cooperative agreements or similar arrangements between the United States Department of Agriculture and nonprofit institutions in excess of 10 percent of the total direct cost of the agreement when the purpose of such cooperative arrangements is to carry out programs of mutual interest between the two parties. This does not preclude appropriate payment of indirect costs on grants and contracts with such institutions when such indirect costs are computed on a similar basis for all agencies for which appropriations are provided in this Act.

SEC. 709. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, commodities acquired by the Department in connection with Commodity Credit Corporation and section 32 price support operations may be used, as authorized by law (15 U.S.C. 714c and 7 U.S.C. 612c), to provide commodities to individuals in cases of hardship as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 710. None of the funds in this Act shall be available to reimburse the General Services Administration for payment of space rental and related costs in excess of the amounts specified in this Act; nor shall this or any other provision of law require a reduction in the level of rental space or services below that of fiscal year 1997 or prohibit an expansion of rental space or services with the use of funds otherwise appropriated in this Act. Further, no agency of the Department of Agriculture, from funds otherwise available, shall reimburse the General Services Administration for payment of space rental and related costs provided to such agency at a percentage rate which is greater than is available in the case of funds appropriated in this Act.

SEC. 711. None of the funds in this Act shall be available to restrict the authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation to lease space for its own use or to lease space on behalf of other agencies of the Department of Agriculture when such space will be jointly occupied.

SEC. 712. With the exception of grants awarded under the Small Business Innovation Development Act of 1982, Public Law 97-219, as amended (15 U.S.C. 638), none of the funds in this Act shall be available to pay indirect costs on research grants awarded competitively by the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service that exceed 14 percent of total Federal funds provided under each award.

SEC. 713. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, all loan levels provided of this Act shall be considered estimates, not limitations.

SEC. 714. Appropriations to the Department of Agriculture for the cost of direct and guaranteed loans made available in fiscal year 1998 shall remain available until expended to cover obligations made in fiscal year 1998 for the following accounts: the rural development loan fund program account; the Rural Telephone Bank program account; the rural electrification and telecommunications loans program account; and the rural economic development loans program account.

SEC. 715. Such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1998 pay raises for programs funded by this Act shall be absorbed within the levels appropriated in this Act.

SEC. 716. (a) COMPLIANCE WITH BUY AMERICAN ACT.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the funds the entity will comply with sections 2 through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a-10c; popularly known as the "Buy American Act").

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS; REQUIREMENT REGARDING NOTICE.—

(1) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—In the case of any equipment or product that may be authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided using funds made available in this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving the assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

(2) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In providing financial assistance using funds made available in this Act, the head of each Federal agency shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the

statement made in paragraph (1) by the Congress.

(c) PROHIBITION OF CONTRACTS WITH PERSONS FALSELY LABELING PRODUCTS AS MADE IN AMERICA.—If it has been finally determined by a court or Federal agency that any person intentionally affixed a label bearing a "Made in America" inscription, or any inscription with the same meaning, to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in the United States, the person shall be ineligible to receive any contract or subcontract made with funds made available in this Act, pursuant to the debarment, suspension, and ineligibility procedures described in sections 9.400 through 9.409 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 717. Notwithstanding the Federal Grant and Cooperative Agreement Act, marketing services of the Agricultural Marketing Service and the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service may use cooperative agreements to reflect a relationship between the Agricultural Marketing Service or the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service and a State or Cooperator to carry out agricultural marketing programs or to carry out programs to protect the Nation's animal and plant resources.

SEC. 718. None of the funds in this Act may be used to retire more than 5 percent of the Class A stock of the Rural Telephone Bank or to maintain any account or subaccount within the accounting records of the Rural Telephone Bank the creation of which has not specifically been authorized by statute: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used to transfer to the Treasury or to the Federal Financing Bank any unobligated balance of the Rural Telephone Bank telephone liquidating account which is in excess of current requirements and such balance shall receive interest as set forth for financial accounts in section 505(c) of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990.

SEC. 719. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to provide assistance to, or to pay the salaries of personnel who carry out a market promotion/market access program pursuant to section 203 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5623) that provides assistance to the United States Mink Export Development Council or any mink industry trade association.

SEC. 720. Of the funds made available by this Act, not more than \$1,000,000 shall be used to cover necessary expenses of activities related to all advisory committees, panels, commissions, and task forces of the Department of Agriculture except for panels used to comply with negotiated rule makings and panels used to evaluate competitively awarded grants.

SEC. 721. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel who carry out an export enhancement program if the aggregate amount of funds and/or commodities under such program exceeds \$205,000,000.

SEC. 722. No employee of the Department of Agriculture may be detailed or assigned from an agency or office funded by this Act to any other agency or office of the Department for more than 30 days unless the individual's employing agency or office is fully reimbursed by the receiving agency or office for the salary and expenses of the employee for the period of assignment.

SEC. 723. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Agriculture shall be used to transmit or otherwise make available to any non-Department of Agriculture employee questions or responses to questions that are a result of information requested for the appropriations hearing process.

SEC. 724. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be expended or obligated to fund the activities of the Western Director and Special Assistant to the Secretary within the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture or any similar position.

SEC. 725. None of the funds made available to the Department of Agriculture by this Act may be used to acquire new information technology systems or significant upgrades, as determined by the Office of the Chief Information Officer, without the approval of the Chief Information Officer and the concurrence of the Executive Information Technology Investment Review Board.

SEC. 726. None of the funds in this Act shall be used to fund the immediate office of the Deputy and Assistant Deputy Administrator for Farm Programs within the Farm Service Agency.

SEC. 727. NONRURAL AREA.—The last sentence of section 520 of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1490) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: ", and the City of Galt, California, shall not be considered rural or a rural area for purposes of this title".

Mr. SKEEN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 68, line 16, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against section 727 as constituting legislation on an appropriations bill in violation of House rule XXI, clause 2(b). It amends section 520 of the Housing Act of 1949 concerning the definition of rural areas for the purposes of providing USDA funds.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member in addition seek to address the point of order?

If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The unprotected general provision in section 727 of the bill proposes a direct change in the Housing Act of 1949. The provision is therefore legislation in violation of clause 2(b) of rule XXI. The point of order is sustained and section 727 is stricken from the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. NETHERCUTT

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 9 offered by Mr. NETHERCUTT: Strike section 726 (page 68, lines 8 through 11), regarding limitation on the use of funds for immediate office of the Deputy and Assistant Deputy Administrator for Farm Programs within the Farm Service Agency.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 193, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. NETHERCUTT] and a

Member opposed will each control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. NETHERCUTT].

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to join in the offering of this amendment with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], who authored this amendment initially, and the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLEY], in restoring the funding for two particular offices within the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Incidentally, I had earlier in the full committee proposed and had adopted by the full committee an amendment which struck funding for the Deputy and the Assistant Deputy Administrator for Farm Programs within the Farm Service Agency. I proposed that amendment and argued in favor of it and was successful in getting it put into this bill because of my dissatisfaction, and others within my State, with the way the Conservation Reserve Program was administered by this office, or these offices, that we were seeking to grab the attention of.

□ 1300

In the last signup there was acreage across the country earlier this spring permitted to be enrolled in the conservation reserve program, which is a very good program that preserves highly erodible land and involves the farm service agency and the USDA in making sure that highly erodible land is preserved. In my State, relative to every other State in the country that had enrollments, my State received 21 percent of those acres that were sought to be enrolled were enrolled. That is compared to my neighboring States of Oregon and Idaho which had about 80 percent that property that was sought to be enrolled enrolled, and there were problems in the administration of this program around the country and other States as well, but it has been dissatisfactory to the members of the minority as well as members of the majority.

So my efforts in the full committee were to bring attention to what we expect to have as legislators, the fair administration of a program that is good for the country, and I had not felt that our State was treated fairly. So I looked for many options and found that this was perhaps the only option that we had at the time and wanting to make sure that there is a fair administration of the conservation reserve program for all States, not the least of which is my own.

After conferring with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], conferring with the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLEY], and having several good conversations with the Secretary of Agriculture this week and previously, it was my judgment that based on assurances that we received that there is going to be fair treatment of all States

in the next signup, which we expect to be September, not the least again of which is my own State, and understanding that the Congress and Members of Congress who are in farm-affected States will have the ability to talk with the Secretary and the agency and have input as to a fair signup ratio so that we do not have these terrible disparities that in my opinion are very unfair to my own State and others, I felt it was appropriate that at this time I join with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] and the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLEY] and others who objected to my approach and the tactics we used to draw attention to this disparity, that we go ahead and do this now and that we allow this bill to proceed unencumbered.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that the Secretary is in my State today meeting with our farmers, addressing their concerns, and I think there is more to do. We need to make sure that the farmers from the districts of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] and the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLEY] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PETERSON] and other farmers, Members who represent farmers, have their needs met so that there is a fair administration of this program. The bureaucracy sometimes gets out of control and is unwilling to be fair and unwilling to change its mind, I shall say more accurately. But nevertheless, Richard Neumann, who is the deputy administrator for farm programs, I believe is a fine person, and understanding a little more about this amendment, my sense is that he was not involved in this decision or what I perceive to be a failure on the part of the Department to correct the mistake. So I have since learned that he is a fine person and a high-quality administrator. But I think there has to be more work done at the assistant deputy administrator's office. I know these Federal employees are trying their best in this very difficult bill to implement, but, by golly, I think that the rest of us in Congress and people who care about farmers and agriculture have the right to expect high standards and high responsibility on the part of all Federal agencies.

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

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to say to the gentleman how impressed I am and our Members are on the manner in which you conducted yourself on this issue. I think the citizens of the State of Washington are extremely well represented, and I want to thank the gentleman for the manner in which he has operated in order to bring his concerns to the Department.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] and cosponsors of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member seek time in opposition?

If not, the question is the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. NETHERCUTT].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 35 OFFERED BY MR. WYNN

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 35 offered by Mr. WYNN:
On page 68, after line 16, add the following new section:

"SEC. . For an additional amount for the purposes provided for under the heading 'Departmental Administration' in Title I of this Act, \$1,500,000, and the amount provided under 'National Agricultural Statistics Service' is hereby reduced by \$1,500,000."

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 193, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN] and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN].

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

I am delighted to be offering this amendment this afternoon along with my colleague the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HILLIARD]. I am also pleased to have been able to work with the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN]. I want to thank him for his cooperation in helping me with this amendment.

This is a very simple amendment. It seeks to add \$1.5 million to the Department of Agriculture's civil rights division. The purpose of this amendment and these additional funds is basically to assist the civil rights division in addressing its backlog of equal opportunity claims.

Many of us on both sides of the aisle have said it is absolutely important that we address the problem of discrimination with our existing EEO laws. These additional funds will enable us to do that in an efficient way. The Secretary has said that with additional funds he can address the backlog with additional investigators and we can begin to move forward in resolving these complaints.

We also have concerns about the problems and the plight of the black farmers in America, and these funds will also enable some of those concerns to be addressed.

So I believe there is bipartisan support for this approach, and I am pleased to be here, as I say, with the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the leadership of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN] and thank both the chair of the subcommittee and our ranking member of the subcommittee for both of them agreeing that this is the right thing to do.

Let me just say parenthetically the \$1.5 million will go a long ways. It does not represent the total amount of monies we need to represent. It goes a long ways to represent what we need, but it does not represent the entirety. I think the department said they needed at least \$3 million.

So I want to think this is a step in the right direction. We need a few more steps before indeed we have enough funds to do the kind of investigation that is warranted to make sure those persons who have complaints have their complaints investigated properly.

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for her outstanding work on this measure. I do not believe we have any speakers in support of the amendment.

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

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN] to say that there have been several versions of this amendment and some of the other ones had scoring problems and this latest version appears budget-neutral and I will be happy to accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the last three lines.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COX OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COX of California: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. 728. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be made available to provide assistance to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, except for assistance that is provided to needy people by the United Nations World Food Program or private voluntary organizations registered with the United States Agency for International Development, and not by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 193, the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to be offering this amendment with my colleague from Ohio [Mr. HALL]. I am

pleased because this is a completely bipartisan amendment and one that I expect will be supported by Members on both sides.

The purpose of the amendment is simple, to ensure that the United States of America, while doing all that it can to assist starving people victimized by the horrifying manmade famine caused by a half century of Stalinist agriculture policies in North Korea, does not empower the dear leader, Kim Jong-il. North Korea is one of the worst pariah states on Earth. North Korea spends over \$5 billion a year militarizing itself. It is one of the most controlled societies on Earth, and the starvation caused by its Communist government and by those Communist government policies is horrific.

We have, of late, been providing through the United Nations and nongovernmental organizations assistance to starving people in North Korea, but we are distressed to learn that this aid is not reaching its intended beneficiaries all too often.

North Korea's chief ideologist, Hwang Jang-yop, defected to South Korea this year, and on July 10 he gave a news conference. He told the world that Kim Jong-il uses food to control people. U.S. taxpayers and the United States of America's policy ought not to support that. What he said at his press conference was that North Korea controls people with food, North Korea controls the entire country and people with food distribution. In other words, the food distribution is a means of control, quote, unquote.

Observers report that Kim Jong-il is practicing regional triage, sealing off the hardest-hit regions in the north and northeast and leaving them to starve so that he can feed the elites, in particular the military. Kim Jong-il has spent tens of millions of dollars in a successful effort to develop medium-range missiles. He is spending many millions more to develop long-range missiles. We heard testimony in February of this year that North Korea was on a military shopping spree for aircraft and air defense systems, submarines, landing ships, and automatic weapons. This year he ordered a massive series of war-fighting exercises that consumed huge amounts of food and fuel.

General Shalikashvili, the outgoing chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, noted this recent increase in North Korea military exercises and asked,

If they are in such great difficulty, and if they are in need of assistance, why are they spending their resources on this kind of exercising? You have to ask yours.

Secretary of Defense Cohen recently stated that North Korea is seeking food to keep its citizenry fed while its military continues to function and soak up what limited sources they have. So in the view of the Secretary of Defense, we are indirectly subsidizing the North Korean military.

Other expenditures by Kim Jong-il should also give us pause as we ask

U.S. taxpayers to foot the bill for assistance that ultimately is controlled by Kim Jong-il: \$83 million recently for a mausoleum for Kim il-Sung, the great leader, the great Stalinist; \$134 million for the dear leader's own residence, for Kim Jong-il's own humble abode; \$6 million to embalm Kim il-Sung; millions more just 2 weeks ago for nationwide ceremonies to honor Kim il-Sung.

No wonder Jim Lilley, our former Ambassador to South Korea, has described these massive expenditures which dwarf our food aid as a veritable death cult.

It is for these reasons that the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. TONY HALL, and I have developed a bipartisan compromise that permits the administration to continue its policy but safeguards the delivery of this food so that the military may not receive it and the government of North Korea may not deliver it. By cutting them out of this process, the amendment will decrease the risk that Kim Jong-il's military government will succeed in diverting the food the United States sends to North Korea or manipulating its distribution.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member seek time in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. COX]?

If not, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], to control the 5 minutes in opposition.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly rise in support of this amendment. It is not a perfect amendment, but it brings the bill in line with a long and proud American tradition, and that is extending humanitarian aid to people who are facing starvation. Not one jot of food should be used to feed North Korea's standing army, and under the current approach the food we donate to the world food program is reaching the program is reaching the children and ordinary civilians who are facing starvation, and that is verified by independent monitors.

The policy we are pursuing towards North Korea is one we have painstakingly coordinated with our allies in South Korea. I believe it offers the best hope for making sure our humanitarian aid does not help North Korea's military.

□ 1315

In a few weeks, North Korea and China are meeting South Korea and the United States for peace talks. Negotiations to arrange these talks took more than a year. They offer the first real promise for peace in nearly five decades, since the Korean war ended.

But now, nearly 50 years later, the best hope is not for a collapse of North Korea's regime. Observers say that almost certainly this would almost en-

danger the 37,000 American troops who safeguard South Korea's borders. They predict it would send millions of refugees fleeing into South Korea and China, and that only a \$1 trillion investment would prevent it. No one expects South Korea would bail out North Korea on its own. I am sure none of us wants to see the United States facing that kind of a bill.

Most experts say that the best hope today is for reforms that will bring to North Korea the prosperity and stability that has made South Korea the world's 11th largest economy. The shape of this reunification is the topic of considerable debate among experts here and in South Korea. But all agree that those changes start with peace.

Undercutting American foreign policy now may make some Members of the House feel good, but it is the wrong thing to do and it is potentially a dangerous course. The right thing to do is to support the approach the United States and allies are taking.

I have seen the conditions in North Korea, and I believe they are as desperate as the dozens of international and nongovernmental organizations working there constantly report that they are. I have watched the humanitarian approach to this difficult situation, and I believe it should be strengthened and not weakened. It is the innocent people in North Korea who suffer, and that is the group I am interested in, not the military. I support this amendment and I urge the House to support it.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, this Member would congratulate the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] for working so diligently on this issue. The compromise is a good one, and this Member certainly supports it.

This Member had tried to be helpful in the effort to reach common language on the North Korean famine, and was prepared to offer a second degree amendment that would have reflected the view that has been expressed in the Committee on International Relations. While the Parliamentarian ruled that the International Relations Committee's language would have been authorizing in an appropriation bill and was not in order. This Member would note, however, the intention of the International Relations Committee to move its North Korea policy language as part of the Foreign Assistance Act. This Member will discuss the components of the Bereuter perfecting amendment momentarily.

Certainly it can be agreed that this Nation should be willing to provide food to starving women and children, regardless of the despicable nature of the regime under which they live. And, there is no more heinous regime than that of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. It is perhaps the last Stalinist regime, and certainly one of the most brutal regimes that ever has existed.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific of the International Relations Committee, this Member has conducted three hearings and countless briefings on the situation in North Korea in the last several years. The subcommittee has followed this issue very carefully.

Certainly there is starvation—some of it as the result of unprecedented flooding, but most due to the utterly incomprehensible and counterproductive agricultural policies of the North Korean Government. This Member would tell his colleagues that this famine is largely Government-induced, and not the result of natural catastrophe. But the famine is real. We have reliable reports of women and children eating grass and tree bark. The famine is so bad that many industries have simply ceased to exist because the workers no longer have the energy to perform even the most simple tasks.

When the United States began working with the World Food Programme to provide humanitarian food aid to the North, this Member, together with the distinguished chairman of the International Relations Committee, Mr. GILMAN, and the distinguished ranking member, Mr. HAMILTON, set forth certain criteria that were absolute preconditions for any U.S. food aid program. These included: One, assurance that our South Korean allies were consulted and supportive of the food aid deliveries; two, assurance that previous food aid and official confessional food deliveries have not been diverted to the military; three, North Korean military stocks have been tapped to respond to the North Korean unmet food needs; four, the World Food Programme would have the monitors on the ground to oversee the delivery and ensure that food aid is not diverted from the intended recipients; and five, that the United States Government encourage the North Korean Government to undertake a fundamental restructuring of its agricultural system.

These basic, commonsense conditions are the essence of the Bereuter second degree amendment that this gentleman would have been prepared to offer had it been ruled in order.

These types of basic conditions were deemed necessary because, in the past, food aid deliveries had in fact been diverted by the North Korean military. This Member would hasten to point out that U.S. humanitarian assistance was not diverted, but significant diversions of assistance from other countries has been detected.

It would be entirely unacceptable if the North Korean military were to benefit from our humanitarian outpouring of good will. This body must be vigilant against this possibility. The Asia and the Pacific Subcommittee and the International Relations Committee are working very closely with the administration to ensure that these conditions have been met. We have taken steps to ensure that the administration dramatically increases the number of trained monitors on the ground to supervise the dispersal of food assistance. The International Relations Committee also has been working with excellent organizations such as Catholic Relief Services and CARE to ensure that the monitoring teams are adequate to perform the tasks they have been assigned. We continue to work with the administration, and this Member can assure his colleagues that the Asia and the Pacific Subcommittee and the International Relations Committee are following this extremely important matter very, very closely.

Again, this Member commends the gentlemen for crafting an amendment that addresses the very real famine in North Korea while at the same time addressing the legitimate security concern that we not provide comfort to the North Korean military.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by gentleman from California [Mr. COX].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to rule 193, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MRS. LOWEY

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mrs. LOWEY:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section the following new section:

SEC. . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to provide or pay the salaries of personnel who provide crop insurance or noninsured crop disaster assistance for tobacco for the 1998 or later crop years.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 193, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] and a Member opposed will each control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

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

The bipartisan Lowey-DeGette-Hansen-Meehan-Smith amendment will eliminate Federally-based crop insurance for tobacco and begin to get the Federal Government out of the tobacco business for good. According to the CBO, this amendment will save taxpayers at least \$34 million.

Tobacco products kill 400,000 Americans each year. Every day more than 3,000 American teenagers start smoking. One in three will die from cancer, heart disease, and other illnesses caused by smoking. American taxpayers should not be subsidizing this deadly product.

The Federal Government is spending millions on crop insurance for tobacco; at the same time, we are spending almost \$200 million to warn Americans about the dangers of tobacco and prevent its use. It is time for this hypocrisy to end. We must make our agricultural policy consistent with our public health policy.

Mr. Chairman, opponents of this amendment will say that we are denying a service to tobacco growers that is available to all other farmers. That is simply not true. Only 65 of nearly 1,600 crops grown in the United States are eligible for Federal crop insurance; honey, broccoli, watermelon, squash, cherries, cucumbers, not covered.

Opponents of this amendment will also say that it will hurt small tobacco farmers. But what they do not tell us is that tobacco is one of the most lucrative crops in America. An acre of tobacco yields a 1,000-percent higher price than an acre of corn. Today we have an historic opportunity to dissolve the Federal Government's part-

nership with the tobacco industry. We must stop using taxpayer dollars to subsidize a product that kills millions of adults, addicts our kids, and costs billions a year in health care.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that one-half of my time be yielded to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR], and that she be allowed to further yield time.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] will control 7½ minutes, and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] will control 7½ minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR].

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PRICE].

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Lowey-DeGette amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am not a reflexive defender of the tobacco industry. I favor effective public health and education measures, and I wish Joe Camel good riddance. But I find this amendment deeply offensive, punitive, and unfair, and I hope fair-minded colleagues will hear me out before they reflexively support it.

Crop insurance is a protection that we offer to farmers of all major crops, as determined by yield, demand, and value. This amendment would stigmatize and deny this protection to one group of farmers. It targets the people who farm, punishing them for the crop which they are able to grow by virtue of climate and geography and the size of their farms. If that is not discrimination, if that is not unfairness, I would like to know what name you would put on it?

Mr. Chairman, in North Carolina, the climate and soil are ideal for growing tobacco. Many of our farms are successfully diversifying, and we are attracting light industry to the countryside. But with an average size farm of just 160 acres, our farmers don't have the luxury of enough acreage to make a living planting only corn or cotton or soybeans; they have to make their living with what is theirs to work.

Denying crop insurance or disaster relief to these individuals will not change their geography or climate or the economic facts of life. It will not miraculously enable them to turn to some other crop or other line of work. It will simply ruin many of them economically, especially those on the margins of profitability, those on the small farms.

The burden of proof is on those who would withdraw crop insurance for one

and only one group of farmers. The Lowey amendment has nothing to do with smoking and health, everything to do with driving the small farmer off the land and hastening the day of corporate and contract farming. To stigmatize a group and exclude them from a common benefit simply because of the size of their farm, their climate, their geography, and what they grow, is the sort of discrimination we would reject out of hand in other realms. I urge my colleagues to reject it here.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlemanwoman from Washington [Mrs. LINDA SMITH], a cosponsor of the amendment and a fighter on antitobacco programs.

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I think the major argument before us today will be that it is discrimination if we do not subsidize tobacco. I want to stand here before Members and tell them, there is only a handful of crops that qualify for Federal crop insurance, only a handful, less than 65.

Mr. Chairman, I believe if people look to their own States and find out which crops are not insured, they will find that good crops, like in the State of Washington, peaches, berries, cherries, Christmas trees, alfalfa forage, are not insured. I would beg Members to go back to find out which crops in their State are discriminated against as they are voting for certain States to get preference.

Let us look at the benefits of a peach. A peach is good for a kid. Now let us look at the benefits of tobacco. Tobacco kills kids. Where is the value for America? I looked up the amount of money pumped into this place for campaigns in the month of June. I did not see a whole lot from peaches. But I sure saw a whole lot from tobacco.

Why would tobacco think, up against this vote, that they had to pump hundreds of thousands, yes, millions of dollars into campaigns of people incumbent in Congress? I did not see them walking down the streets handing out checks to the tourists. I did not see them mailing them to people in my home district. But they do report that they have given hundreds of thousands to this body in the month of June, anticipating this vote.

I would beg Members to go home and look at their priorities, look at the crops that are being discriminated against in their State, and then justify to their constituents why they voted to subsidize tobacco.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment, and to all the tobacco growers in Oregon, I want to explain why. By the way, we do not have tobacco growers in Oregon.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, there are three reasons here that this is a bad idea. One, it unfairly singles out to-

bacco farmers for punishment. Second, it undermines the Federal crop insurance program, which we have discussed here at great length under the other two amendments. Finally, and most importantly, this does absolutely nothing to stop people from smoking.

Mr. Chairman, if there is an effort here sincerely to stop people from smoking, I will join it. But I am not here to punish farmers. I am here to protect farmers. Listen to this, Mr. Chairman: 124,000 farms in 21 States grow tobacco, 90,000 tobacco policies are under the crop insurance program of over \$1 billion. To say that this amendment does not hurt farmers, listen to those numbers.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlemanwoman from Colorado [Ms. DEGETTE], a proud cosponsor of the amendment.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, in 1989 Pat Rose died of lung cancer after smoking for 38 years, starting at the age of 16. Pat Rose was my mother, and she left behind me and my four younger siblings. Millions of Americans like my family are affected every year by smoking, and a new study shows that thousands of kids in this country every year die because of direct or indirect effects of smoking.

The United States recognizes that smoking is not good for our children or our families, which is why last year we spent \$200 million trying to get Americans to stop smoking. Paradoxically, last year we also spent \$80 million for tobacco crop insurance. This is a policy that is schizophrenic and must change now.

Let us debunk some myths, first of all. Members have heard that not every farmer has crop insurance. Only about 65 of the 1,600 crops grown in this country receive it. Healthy crops, as Members have heard, do not get a dime of Federal crop insurance, yet tobacco crops, which have no nutritional value, obtained this insurance. When our amendment passes, tobacco farmers can still obtain crop insurance, just not at the Government's expense.

I daresay that as we move from tobacco in this country, we need to spend our time not arguing about whether we should grow it, but helping these small farmers to find alternative sources of income. I am very sympathetic with the small farmers. I think we need to support their ability to move into healthy crops. I also daresay there are many small tobacco farmers who are killed by the effects of smoking and whose families are affected by smoking as well.

I urge all of my colleagues to think about our constituents, our friends and our families who are struck every year with the effects of tobacco, and the fact that smoking is increasing more than 50 percent among 8th through 10th graders. We must do everything in our power to discourage tobacco and to help the small farmers.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COBLE].

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. Here we are, Mr. Chairman, on our perennial trip to the whipping post. Who is to be whipped? Tobacco, of course, men and women who work 14 to 16 hours a day to get their crop to the barn and then to the market to make lives better for their children, workers who are employed at Lorillard in my hometown, nearby Phillip Morris, Reynolds, and Leggett, formerly, until American was forced to close their doors. And finally, the companies are to be whipped because they pay a million dollars of taxes to local and State governments, to enable these governments to extend services to thousands of citizens.

□ 1330

Tobacco, Mr. Chairman, has traditionally been known as the golden weed in my part of the country. One would think to hear this rhetoric in this hall that the weed was scarlet, the color of sin. Protect the golden weed. That is all we are asking. This is unconscionable what is being done here today, Mr. Chairman. I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment of my friend from New York and see it go down in flames.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN], a cosponsor of this amendment.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, here we go again, confusing the public. I have never seen anything that confuses the public more than what we are doing right now. We spend \$177 million to warn people of the use of this tobacco product. Then on the other hand here we are guaranteeing to subsidize the product.

It is interesting, another statistic that I recently pulled out. We are spending \$50 billion in health care in America to take care of this particular product. But we are still going to subsidize it. We confuse the public a little more. We now find out that more lives are lost due to this product than murder, suicide, AIDS, alcohol and car accidents combined. Still here we go again, let us subsidize the product.

Is it a lucrative product? You bet it is. This amendment that we are working on does not affect the no net cost tobacco price support program for Federal Extension Services. Tobacco farmers are still able to grow tobacco and will still be able to sell it to the tobacco companies. This amendment is simply putting our agricultural policy in line with our health policy. I urge support for the amendment.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. MCINTYRE].

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

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Chairman, if the idea today is to do away with the tobacco industry and smoking, this amendment will not work. All it will do is take some hard-working families from their farms.

The only victims of this scheme are the small farmers. No one will stop smoking because of this amendment. The only thing it will do is take away the already endangered family farm. If we take away crop insurance from our tobacco farmers, we punish them for making an honest living from the soil of the earth. We punish them by keeping them from getting bank loans.

Nobody asked for the two hurricanes that hit my district and destroyed crops in all eight counties last year. Are we going to punish the farmers for something they cannot help. This is what this amendment would do. It is a loser. Families first? No. Families last under this amendment. Mr. Chairman, we need to oppose this amendment and preserve the family farm.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the Lowey-DeGette amendment that would eliminate Federal crop insurance and Federal disaster compensation for tobacco farmers. Mr. Chairman, proponents of this amendment would have you believe that it will curb smoking levels across the country. They would have you believe that removing Federal crop insurance for tobacco would somehow injure the tobacco industry which they hold responsible for youth smoking. The results of this amendment, however, will not be felt by the tobacco industry. That is the big deception. The true fall-out, Mr. Chairman, will be felt by tobacco farmers and their families.

The truth of the matter, Mr. Chairman, is that the Lowey-DeGette amendment would do absolutely nothing to deter or stop the production of tobacco or punish cigarette companies. Can anyone honestly say that removing Federal crop insurance for tobacco farmers would promote a single smoker to give up the habit, or deter a single nonsmoker from initiating one? No.

Mr. Chairman, let's look at exactly who this amendment will affect. The Lowey-DeGette amendment will take away the ability of small farmers to keep their families above the poverty line. Let me repeat that. The Lowey-DeGette amendment will prevent small farmers from growing a legal crop that often means the difference in their efforts to provide food, clothing, and shelter for their families.

As an editorial in today's Fayetteville Observer-Times stated,

If the plan is to do in the tobacco industry, it won't work. What it will do is separate some hard-working people from their family farms.

Picture this (because this is all that the proposed legislation would accomplish). The people who provide the growers with the many things they need to get a crop started wouldn't be affected. Neither would the warehousemen, the corporate buyers, the manufacturers or the retailers. Only growers would fall under its provisions.

Moreover, the victims, if this scheme were to become law * * * would be small farmers.

Whatever the outcome, tobacco will still be produced, sold, processed, re-sold, and

smoked. The only thing that will come close to disappearing is the already endangered family farm.

To paraphrase Shakespeare—and I can say this as a lawyer—the proponents of this awful, unfair, ugly amendment ought to say, "The first thing let's do is to kill all the farmers," for economically speaking, that is exactly what supporters of this amendment will be doing.

Go ahead. Make the farm killers' day. Just blow 'em away. Let a hurricane or tornado or hail storm ruin their lives and the lives of their families.

If we take away crop insurance from our tobacco farmers, we punish them for making an honest living from the soil of the Earth, we punish them by keeping them from getting bank loans, and we punish them again if disaster strikes. Do not do it. Do not take away their chance to make an honest living an be able to provide for their families.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture classifies small farmers whose income total \$20,000 or less for 2 consecutive years as limited resource farmers. The States with the largest numbers of limited resource farmers are Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and North Carolina. It is no coincidence that these States also make up a majority of the leading tobacco producing States in the Nation. Mr. Chairman, the limited resource farmers that grow tobacco are by no means wealthy people. They sweat and toil on small plots of land where oftentimes the only crop that can be grown in such small quantities and still bring a financial return sufficient to maintain their operation from year to year is tobacco. The argument put forth by proponents of the Lowey-DeGette amendment that tobacco farmers could replace tobacco with another commodity is simply not true. The average size farm in tobacco country is 169 acres, of which tobacco is usually grown on 50 to 100 acres. In order to replace the gross income from just 50 acres of tobacco, a farmer would have to produce 235 acres of peanuts, 372 acres of cotton, 1,442 acres of wheat, 1,161 acres of soybeans, or 747 acres of corn. The small amounts of land that are typically available to limited resource farmers makes any of these options mathematically impossible.

My friends in the House, limited resource farmers do not grow tobacco to get rich. They do not grow tobacco so that cigarette companies can get rich. Limited resource farmers grow the legal crop tobacco in order to put a roof over their families' heads. They grow tobacco to put food on their families' tables. They grow tobacco so that they can someday send their children to school; so that they can provide the opportunity of a better life for their children.

Mr. Chairman, proponents of the Lowey-DeGette amendment would have us believe that not a single farmer will lose his or her job as a result of their language. This, my colleagues in the House, is absolutely false. My friends, tobacco is an extremely difficult crop to grow. It is vulnerable to a variety of diseases, infestations, and is especially sensitive to weather variations. In addition, due to its proximity to the Atlantic Ocean, our tobacco farmers are also at the mercy of competely unpredictable natural disasters like hurricanes, two of which hit my district last year and wiped

out entire tobacco fields across the region in all eight of the counties which I represent. The delicate nature of tobacco requires that farmers secure insurance in order to receive operating loans that many farmers rely on for the funding necessary to initiate planting each year.

Without that insurance, farmers will not even be considered for the loans that enable them to begin planting each year. Without insurance, tobacco farmers will not have a means to make a living. USDA Secretary Dan Glickman recognized this and has made the availability of Federal crop insurance a top department priority. In a statement he made this past May, Secretary Glickman said, "I am determined that everyone will have access to crop insurance—large farmers and small farmers alike, especially those with limited resources, minorities, and producers in all areas of the country." In addition, Secretary Glickman announced last week the formation of a National Commission on Small Farms to find new ways to support small farms and limited resource farmers. It would appear, then, that eliminating Federal crop insurance which is relied upon so heavily by small, limited resource farmers is not at all in line with the USDA. It is simply advancing someone's political agenda at the expense and heartache of farmer families. It is stealing bread off of the table. It is discrimination in its ugliest form. It is taking advantage of someone else who falls victim to a natural disaster.

Mr. Chairman, limited resource farmers depend on Federal crop insurance and the protection it provides simply because they cannot afford the high cost of private insurance which proponents of the Lowey-DeGette amendment like to point to as an alternative. Let's take a closer look at that alternative. Limited resource farmers are simply unable to afford current premiums on private insurance. If they could afford it, they would certainly look in that direction for protection, for private insurance offers much more comprehensive coverage than its Federal counterpart. I have spoken with several private insurers in my district about the ramifications of losing Federal coverage. Without hesitation, they provided me with figures that indicate their premiums would increase nearly threefold, making private insurance even further out of reach financially for limited resource farmers. In addition, private insurers are in no way compelled to offer insurance to everyone who applies for it. The harsh truth is that even if limited resource farmers were to attempt to pull together enough capital to apply for private insurance, they would likely be denied. So don't listen to the falsehoods you are being told. Many tobacco farmers simply cannot go out and buy private insurance. No insurance means no loans. No loans means no tobacco crop. No crop means no income, no food, no future for their kids, no retirement. It means moving people from work to welfare—something I thought we were trying to get away from.

This is reality, not the big deception that proponents of the Lowey-DeGette amendment are trying to sell. The Lowey-DeGette

amendment will put farmers out of work, period. Mr. Chairman, this body has made great strides in recent years to reform out national welfare system. This body has passed legislation that thins the welfare roles by putting long-time recipients to work. My colleagues in the House, does it make sense, then, for this body to pass language that will reverse all of that excellent work? Does it make sense to pass language that will take people from work to welfare?

My friends, I urge a no vote on the Lowey-DeGette amendment. Similar language was rejected by the House of Representatives last year, and this very same amendment was defeated by the Appropriations Committee last week. It is a loser. And under it, farm families would lose as well. Families first? Not under this amendment. Families last and political agendas first—that is what this amendment is all about. Do the right thing for families, reject it again.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN], cosponsor of this amendment.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, today it is time to bring our agricultural policy in line with our health policy. As the cochairman of the 83 member congressional task force on tobacco and health, we need to correct this serious disconnect in Federal policy. We cannot credibly discourage the use of tobacco as long as we are subsidizing the growing of tobacco. It is really that simple.

We may be able to come up with assistance to tobacco farmers, we should do that through the settlement that has been negotiated by the attorneys general. But it does not make any sense to take taxpayer money and subsidize the growth of tobacco in this country.

We have made enormous progress on this amendment over the last few years. In fact, we have made so much progress that last year it failed by only two votes. Surely in the last year we have gotten enough information about what tobacco companies knew about the dangers of their product, about decades of duplicity and lying that they have perpetrated upon American people. Now is the time to pass this amendment. This is extremely important.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Kentucky [Mrs. NORTHUP].

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Chairman, first of all I am proud to say I have never taken a dime from the tobacco companies and do not intend to now. I refuse all of their PAC checks. I have also been the proud sponsor of a lot of tough youth access legislation and hope to have that opportunity again. But this will hurt exactly the wrong people.

There are some people that love this legislation. They are the farmers from Malawi and Brazil and Argentina that can grow cheap tobacco and replace our tobacco grown in this country. What does that do? That ruins small poor communities all across Kentucky.

They are the communities with the highest unemployment rate. They are the communities with the fewest resources. This is the crop that enables them to pay their taxes so that they can support our schools, our small communities, and help capitalize the changes they are trying to make in agriculture so that they can convert to other crops. They understand how threatened they are. They understand the cheap tobacco that is flooding the world market. They understand how short a lifeline they are on. They are trying to capitalize the changes to get into other crops. Please, do not ruin our smallest, poorest communities.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. LAMPSON].

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, we know that tobacco use is the most preventable cause of death, yet 400,000 Americans die each year from causes related to the use of tobacco. Our young people have grown up certain in the knowledge that tobacco causes cancer. Yet 3,000 American teenagers start smoking cigarettes every day. Hopefully the new FDA guidelines will help lower that number dramatically.

I believe we need consistency in our policy toward tobacco. If we do not offer Federal crop insurance for commodities that are not a serious public health risk, why should we offer insurance for tobacco? Last year the taxpayers footed the bill for about \$80 million in net tobacco insurance costs. At the same time, we spent almost 177 million trying to discourage tobacco use. Now we must ask the question, should we spend money to promote tobacco use or to discourage tobacco use? That is the fundamental issue that we are discussing right now.

I do not believe the American people want us to continue having it both ways. After all the tough decisions we had in cutting spending, this is a simple one. It is time to stop giving special aid to tobacco. Instead of protecting the special interests, we must take the opportunity to help our families protect their children.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

(Mrs. CLAYTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, in discussing this amendment we really need to discuss the morality of young people smoking or the mortality of those who may be chronic long smokers. In spite of the good intentions of the sponsors, we are not doing that. What we should be talking about is fairness and the appropriate remedy. Is it fair to deny vulnerable persons, deny them and be the only ones who are farmers not receiving the protection of our crop insurance? It would mean those farmers would not be able to get loans, not being able to get loans they would go out of business.

I can tell my colleagues, these are not big businesses. These are small

farmers. These are small farmers who usually grow 10 or less acres of tobacco. I heard someone say how profitable it is. It is profitable. In order to make that same income, we would have to do 15 times as much cotton, almost 20 times as much corn, if we could find the land that would grow the corn, grow the wheat. This is not the right way. Yes, American policy has spoken. It says we should protect our youth. We should bring that in correlation with each other. This is the wrong way to do it. It is the wrong remedy.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING].

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

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the Lowey amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the Lowey amendment.

This is a mean-spirited attack on small farmers throughout the South.

We all know Mrs. LOWEY and her cosponsors don't like smoking, but this amendment will not stop one person from smoking. It will only hurt small tobacco farmers in my district and throughout the South.

The opponents of tobacco always imply that we should not pay farmers to grow tobacco. We do not. Let me repeat that. The Federal Government does not pay subsidies to farmers to grow tobacco.

Sure our Government offers to tobacco farmers some of the same programs like crop insurance that are offered to other farmers.

But we should offer them the same treatment other farmers receive. Tobacco farmers grow a legal crop.

These farmers are not outlaws. They should be treated the same as those who grow corn or raise dairy cattle or any other commodity. Tobacco farmers should be able to purchase the same services almost every other farmer is able to purchase.

What this amendment does is single out the small tobacco farmers who are the backbone of the agriculture industry in my State and all over the South.

Most of these farmers, including the 14,400 tobacco growers in my district own small family farms. They may have a couple or 5 or even 10 acres of tobacco that they use to offset their other costs in farming. Or maybe they use the extra income to send their children to college. So their children may have it just a little bit easier than they did. Where's the crime?

Tobacco is a legal product. We have no right to treat honest taxpaying, hard-working Americans like they are outlaws. They have committed no crime, yet this amendment singles them out and treats them like criminals.

This amendment will not do one thing to prevent smoking. It will not punish the big tobacco companies; it will not decrease the deficit. It will only treat small farmers like criminals.

It's bad policy—it's unfair and it's wrong.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO], a member of the committee.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, this is a debate about saving lives. The deadly effects of tobacco cannot be denied, each year more than 400,000 Americans die of smoking-related illnesses. Each year the Federal Government pays and picks up the tab for many of these health care expenses. Yet our Government provides, pays for, subsidized crop insurance to tobacco growers, \$34 million in taxpayers' dollars.

Other crops such as broccoli and cucumbers are not covered by crop insurance. Why tobacco? Some of my colleagues who oppose this amendment will talk about its impact on farmers. It is not that we are not sympathetic to small farmers. But what about the families whose loved ones die due to deadly smoking habits? What about fathers, mothers, grandparents who are among the 400,000 who die each year due to tobacco habits?

We are working at cross-purposes when we give tobacco subsidies with one hand and then we must spend health and education dollars to counteract tobacco's effects with the other. We have a clear and convincing evidence of tobacco's deadly impact. I urge my colleagues to support the Lowey amendment.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, some have chosen to target the tobacco farmer. The denial of crop insurance is another attempt to suffocate a legitimate industry. This amendment will have a devastating effect on the tobacco farmer and his family. All farmers work hard to put food on the table for their families. The tobacco farmer is no different. He is no different than a corn farmer in the Midwest or a cotton farmer in Alabama. All farmers, including the tobacco farmers, deserve crop insurance. For the sake of fairness, vote "no" on the Lowey amendment.

Some of my colleagues have chosen again to target the tobacco farmer. The denial of crop insurance to tobacco farmers and their family is simply another unfair and insensitive attempt to suffocate a legitimate industry.

Some Members believe this amendment will stop teenagers from smoking. That is absolutely wrong. It will stop one person from smoking; it won't even punish the industry. Instead it will have a devastating effect on the tobacco farmer and his family. The farmer will be left unprotected, unlike any other farmer who grows a legal producing crop.

All farmers work hard to make ends meet, to put food on the table for their families—the tobacco farmer is no different. He is no different than a corn farmer in the Midwest or a cotton farmer in Alabama. This amendment will blatantly discriminate against a legal commodity.

These hard-working farmers struggle every day to make ends meet. You will be dealing them a devastating blow to their ability to

make a living. Insurance premiums will double, if not triple, if they are required to seek private insurance, which may not be available.

The economies of tobacco-producing States will be devastated by this amendment. Tobacco is a \$7 billion industry for North Carolina—the State contributes \$2.8 billion a year in Federal taxes. Schools, hospitals, community buildings, churches, and other community-based projects will not be built because of this revenue loss.

At the national level, tobacco contributes \$22.6 billion a year in Federal tax revenue—this money does not just come from producing States. Even nongrowing States will also be hit economically.

New York, for example, could lose up to \$4 billion if this amendment passes and as indicated it puts the tobacco farmer out of business. Even the State of California could lose up to \$4 billion.

I question whether any State can afford this revenue loss. I would like to ask my colleague from New York who will replace this revenue. In my opinion, it will be on the back of the taxpayer.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Lowey amendment and not to discriminate against our farmers.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. COOK].

Mr. COOK. Mr. Chairman, I wish to rise in strong support of the Lowey amendment. I am a freshman who decided to come to Congress because I wanted to fight to cut Federal waste. We have promised the American people that we would restore balance and prudence to the Federal budget, and yet last year we spent nearly \$80 million on Federal subsidies for tobacco crop insurance. We spent this money to ensure a crop that kills people. Let us not mince words on this point. Tobacco kills people.

Let us not as a nation spend \$177 million to prevent tobacco abuse and then at the same time continue to pour taxpayer dollars into tobacco insurance subsidies.

Mr. Chairman, if we are serious about cutting wasteful, needless Federal programs, let us start here. How can we justify cutting other Federal programs but continue to spend taxpayer dollars to insure crops that have no safe level of use?

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BAESLER].

Mr. BAESLER. Mr. Chairman, a lot of words have been bandied about, one being hypocrisy, one inconsistency. Let me talk about hypocrisy. This amendment, no matter what the rhetoric is, goes just to the farmer. It does not stop anybody from smoking. It does not provide any health care.

We keep on talking about the hypocrisy of the Federal Government. Let me talk about hypocrisy. On one side we want to cut the low man on the food chain, the farmer. On the other side we do not want to say a thing about the excise tax that these States collect from tobacco. New York, \$674 million from tobacco excise tax. Are we stop-

ping that? No. Hypocrisy. Colorado, \$61 million from excise tax from cigarettes and tobacco alone; are we trying to stop that? No. Hypocrisy. Washington State, \$257 million from tobacco excise tax; are we trying to cut that out? No. That is hypocrisy. Texas, \$569 million of excise tax from tobacco. Are we going to cut that out? No. So when we speak of hypocrisy, Massachusetts, \$230 million from excise tax, when we speak of hypocrisy, the hypocrisy is we want to take from the farmer but we want to stick it to the farmer at the same time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE].

□ 1345

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time, and I rise in very strong support of this amendment.

As has been pointed out here today, only 65 of our Nation's 1,600 crops enjoy Federal crop insurance subsidies. Peaches, as was pointed out, watermelon, squash, cucumbers, none of them get these subsidies at all. That is point No. 1.

Second, we have all become familiar with the large tobacco settlement. I do not know the exact amount, but it is in excess of \$300 billion over a period of time. We are talking around \$32 million here for this program that perhaps the tobacco companies would have to step in and do something about.

When we hear about the kind of money we are dealing with here, it is evident and clear to everybody in America that we do not need to continue to underwrite the insurance for the tobacco crops.

And then, and perhaps most importantly, the public probably wonders what are we doing here? We have all these antismoking advertisements, we have all manner and members of the administration who are out saying we should not smoke, and many of us believe people should not smoke, and on the other hand we are paying people, or at least paying for their crop insurance, for the growth of tobacco. That is a tremendous problem.

Tobacco does kill. We need to do something about it. We need to support this amendment.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Lowey amendment.

This is the same proposal we rejected last year and the year before that, that the Committee on Appropriations rejected 2 days ago and the other body rejected yesterday. Here it is again. Here we go again.

They rejected it because it has nothing to do with smoking, teenage smoking, or the hazards of smoking. This is about little tobacco. This is about small farms. This is not big tobacco. Big tobacco would love for us to pass this amendment so they could grow the tobacco overseas at one-third the cost,

lower the price of cigarettes and, in the meantime, encourage more smoking.

It attacks the most vulnerable people. Kentucky farmers grow tobacco because it is the only way they can raise their family, send their kids to school, and buy food and clothing. We will drive out the American farmer and the companies will buy their tobacco overseas at one-third the cost. They will get cheaper tobacco. Cigarettes will become cheaper and smoking will increase.

This is not a debate about smoking or how cigarettes are sold, or who buys them. We should do as we did last year. Reject this amendment.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT], a cosponsor of the amendment.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, the death subsidy must end. That is why I am a cosponsor of this amendment, because the taxpayer subsidy of the only agricultural product in this entire Nation, indeed in this world, when used precisely as directed by the producer, produces death, produces drug addiction, produces disease. Taxpayers do not want to subsidize that product.

If we are ever going to get serious about preventing more of our children from becoming addicted to nicotine, then what we have to do is to break the stranglehold of the tobacco lobby on this Congress. Indeed, they have been successful day after day because they have oiled the machines of government very well.

Only 65 of our Nation's 1,600 crops get the type of crop insurance we are talking about. When the watermelon farmers gather this summer at the Luling Watermelon Thump, and in McDade in central Texas, they will not get a dime of taxpayer subsidies.

Why should we subsidize tobacco? Indeed, why should we subsidize cyanide or arsenic? That is the better comparison. Taxpayers are wasting \$34 million on this subsidy.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BURR].

Mr. BURR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, what is this about? This is about real people and real lives and real communities all over this country. It is about small tobacco farmers that are part of that community.

The sponsors of this bill would suggest to us that this will not affect the crop and it will not affect crop insurance. Secretary Glickman does not think that. He says that the Department of Agriculture opposes this amendment. He went on to say "Crop insurance is an essential part of the producer's safety net envisioned by the administration's agricultural policy." The administration's agricultural policy.

Well, I have to tell my colleagues, crop insurance allows farmers that

sense of security that they will not be financially devastated when there is a Hurricane Fran or a Hurricane Bertha. Most crops in North Carolina were destroyed during those two hurricanes.

What does the gentlewoman from Colorado [Ms. DEGETTE] and the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] suggest we tell our tobacco farmers? Tough break? Well, that dog don't hunt.

We should vote "no" on the Lowey amendment.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BISHOP].

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

I oppose this amendment. It is mean, it is punitive, it is misdirected. It does not attack smoking nor does it attack tobacco companies, as proponents claim, but it does attack small American family farmers trying to protect their land against hurricanes, floods, tornadoes, disease, and drought.

We should not force family farmers to lose their homes and their lands because they cannot buy risk insurance. Help American farmers, not foreign farmers. Kill this amendment. It is bad.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY].

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

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I very strongly oppose the DeGette-Lowe amendment, which is terribly unfair to tobacco farmers.

I understand that there are many in this House who would like to make a political statement against smoking. But this is surely not the right way to go about it.

That's why Secretary of Agriculture Glickman has come out so strongly in opposition to this amendment. Even though this administration has promoted an unprecedented campaign against smoking, Secretary Glickman recognizes that taking away the safety net from small farmers has no place in that campaign.

This amendment will do nothing to stop smoking. It will not limit youth access to cigarettes. It will not restrict tobacco advertising. And it will not put a dent in the profit margins of cigarette manufacturers.

What it will do is inflict a lot of harm on tobacco farmers and the farming communities that depend on them. Many of these communities are located in my district.

This amendment singles out tobacco farmers for treatment we would never consider in any other circumstances. It would deny them the benefit of disaster assistance available to every other farmer. It would deny them Government-backed crop insurance available to every other farmer.

This is not only discrimination against tobacco farmers. It's also discrimination against tobacco farming communities. These communities are the ones who will pay the price if crops fail. They are the ones who depend on disaster assistance to help recover from natural calamities.

Mr. Chairman, this is scapegoating, pure and simple. The backers of this amendment are upset with tobacco companies. So they are taking out their frustrations on farmers, many of them small family farmers struggling just to get by.

I suggest they pick on someone their own size. Small farmers have enough troubles. They don't need to be treated like pariahs by this Congress. They deserve better than that.

I urge you to soundly reject this wrong-headed amendment.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK].

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I hear what the problem is here, but I want to say to America that we have to oppose this amendment.

We have to oppose it because if the people who are proponents of this amendment want to cure this problem of tobacco, we all admit that it is very bad, let us make tobacco illegal. Let us make it illegal. That will cure all the things we have heard here today. It will stop it.

But I tell my colleagues what we need to keep going, and that is these small farmers that are farming tobacco. And I say this every time. My father was a tobacco farmer. Honest man. The only place he could get any work was on a tobacco farm. I will never forget that. I know that was an opportunity for him, just as it is an opportunity now for the small farmer.

It was an opportunity for the farmers when the hurricane that devastated farmers in my district had everything wiped out. If it were not for crop insurance, they could not have survived. If it were not for crop insurance, the orange growers in Florida would not have survived. We do not see those people. They are not here. They do not dress like we do. They do not talk like we do.

They need their insurance to keep their families fed. I say to my colleagues that we must oppose this amendment because of that, survival for the small farmer.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Lowey amendment because of its devastating impact on the family tobacco farmers in my district across Kentucky.

Those offering this amendment today think that they are attacking cigarettes, youth smoking and big tobacco. Those attacks, however, are hitting the tobacco farmers and hitting them hard, that small family tobacco farmer. Most of these farms in Kentucky in my district are small, often part-time. They are hard working farmers who are trying to make ends meet and providing a better life for their children.

Denying crop insurance to Kentucky tobacco farmers will have no effect on youth smoking, will have no effect on tobacco use, will have no effect on the big tobacco companies, will have no effect on the local retailers, and will have no effect on the supply of tobacco.

If we do not grow tobacco in the rural areas of Kentucky, then big tobacco will import it. In fact, big tobacco companies could then import cheap foreign tobacco and benefit, yes benefit from our vote in favor of the Lowey amendment.

The only folks hurt by the Lowey amendment will be the small family tobacco farmer, who deserves the right to participate in the same USDA crop insurance or noninsurance disaster assistance program offered to every other farmer in this country.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ETHERIDGE].

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

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment on behalf of the small farmers of North Carolina.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this attack on farmers. If not for insurance—floods in the Midwest would have devastated wheat farmers; cold would have destroyed Florida orange growers; droughts would have ruined western farmers; southern farmers would not have survived hurricanes in 1996. Yesterday, rain from Hurricane Danny flooded tobacco fields in North Carolina as farmers prepared to go to market. As adjusters survey the damage, farmers will count on crop insurance to pay the bills as they try to salvage what they can. Singling out these farmers is discriminatory and unfair.

This assault on farmers threatens their last safety net. Secretary Glickman opposes the amendment because insurance is a safety net, not a subsidy.

Proponents claim concern for public health and teen smoking. I understand that this amendment impacts neither. It will not stop teen smoking; will not hurt manufacturers profits; and will not reduce cigarette production. The demagoguery of this amendment is shameful. It threatens the balance reached in a tobacco settlement which includes the most extensive public health proposals on smoking in history. Eliminating insurance for tobacco will devastate victims of Hurricane Danny, hurt poor, minority farmers and do nothing for public health. Vote for fairness. Vote "no" on this amendment.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GOODE].

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

Mr. GOODE. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Virginia tobacco growers I urge Members to defeat this amendment.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the remaining time?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] has 2 minutes remaining; the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] has 1 minute remaining, and has the right to close; and the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Upton].

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, it is time to stop this Federal subsidy of a crop that is both addictive and causes cancer.

The passage of this amendment does not stop small tobacco farmers from growing tobacco. It just says we will stop one of the subsidies, one of the incentives for them to do so.

Earlier today we read the debate on the Durbin amendment which bans smoking on airplanes from a couple of years ago. Many of the same folks that are arguing for a "no" vote were the same folks arguing "no" then.

Guess what? The Airline Flight Attendants Union has now filed a \$5 billion suit against the airlines for allowing this to happen. Would it not have been nice if they had not been able to file this suit at all and had this Durbin amendment passed many years earlier?

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WHITFIELD].

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, those of us who oppose this amendment do not represent the tobacco lobby. We represent 142,000 farm families around this country who for generations have grown this product.

If we continue our efforts to destroy the tobacco farmers, we will have to come up with a new program to provide economic assistance to 142,000 farm families who have an average income of \$13,000 a year. This is a supplemental income product.

Mr. Chairman, we do not require anyone to smoke. There still is such a thing as personal responsibility in America.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

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

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, we have heard the rhetoric and the people testifying and talking about tobacco and the ills of tobacco. If we want to vote to do away with tobacco, this is not the way to do it.

We will be called on in just a few minutes to take this little card and we will vote, and potentially the lives and the livelihoods of millions of people across this country will be affected.

But this is not going to stop one teenager, one child, nobody from smoking. We will say to these farmers that go out and mortgage their farms, mortgage their allotments and make commitments, we will say to them, OK, these other folks can get crop insurance, but we are sorry about that. These tobacco farmers cannot have crop insurance. If there is a hurricane or a severe storm or whatever, that is just tough, they will not get any insurance.

That is punitive, and it affects the lives of thousands and thousands of people that are on the small farms throughout all of this country in different places in this country. That is not fair.

And we do not affect the big tobacco companies. This will not have any impact on the big tobacco companies. Somebody said, oh, the big tobacco companies. This does not do anything to the big tobacco companies. All we will do is penalize that hard working family that is trying to send their kids to school and to make a decent living.

This is punitive, it is unfair, and I beg my colleagues when they put their cards in the slot to think of all the people they will be affecting across this country.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER].

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Lowey amendment to eliminate the Tobacco Crop Insurance Program.

Today, we provide crop insurance to 65 of the 1,600 crops grown in the United States. Nutrition-packed vegetables like broccoli and squash are not eligible for crop insurance. But we spend millions of dollars to insure the growth of tobacco.

Millions to promote a crop that is unlike any other covered by the Federal Crop Insurance Program. A crop that is neither food nor fiber. A crop that neither provides us with food for our table nor clothes for our backs.

This amendment eliminates the \$34 million taxpayer subsidy for crop insurance for tobacco growing.

Tobacco—when used according to directions—harms and kills hundreds of thousands of Americans every year.

To combat this health threat, Mr. Chairman, America spends hundreds of millions of dollars each year to curtail tobacco use.

We spend billions of dollars each year to treat emphysema, lung cancer, and heart disease.

In my State, Massachusetts, over 10,000 people die each year from smoking-related illnesses. And the costs of treating those illnesses in my State alone totals more than \$1 billion.

Across America, tobacco use is the single largest drain on the Medicare trust fund. Tobacco costs Medicare more than \$10 billion and Medicaid more than \$5 billion per year.

We now have irrefutable evidence of the damage tobacco use wreaks on our citizens and our Federal budget.

The proposed settlement between the State attorneys general and the tobacco industry requires a payout of \$368 billion over 25 years. This legal settlement is a testament to the disasters of tobacco use. While far from perfect, it represents a step in the right direction for advancing public health.

Clearly, in the case of tobacco, the time has come to bring our agricultural policy in line with our health policy.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are always eager to let the market provide for other sectors of our economy. They do not want to subsidize community service, education standards, economic development, or the arts.

I say to my colleagues, we should not be subsidizing the growth of tobacco.

Tobacco is a lucrative crop. It yields an average of \$4,000 per acre; \$4,000 compared with a yield of only \$200 for an acre of wheat.

Despite the ability of tobacco growers to pay the cost of crop insurance, we continue to fund large portions of their premiums. So, not only do farmers see high profits, but they also have taxpayers footing the bill for their insurance.

Mr. Chairman, we should not subsidize tobacco. We should not promote the growth of a crop that kills. Support the Loney amendment and let the market provide for tobacco plants.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX].

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, we are not antifarmer or antiagriculture. We are prohealth care, we are prochildren. It is our goal to stop lung cancer in our lifetime.

The Government that gives a Surgeon General warning on the dangers of smoking should not be subsidizing insurance for the crop of tobacco.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard that this amendment is mean-spirited and that it will hurt tobacco growers. The simple fact is that tobacco is one of the most lucrative crops in America. Our amendment will not stop these farmers from growing tobacco. The amendment says they can continue to grow tobacco, but they will have to purchase crop insurance on their own.

□ 1400

Now if that is a hardship, it is a hardship for all the small businesses in America that they manage to overcome. My colleagues on the other side of this debate will also say that this amendment will not end smoking. They are right. This amendment is not a cure-all, but it will bring us one step closer to a consistent Federal policy on tobacco.

Every year 400,000 Americans die from cancer. One of them was my dad. My father smoked three packs a day. At the age of 54, he died. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CHAMBLISS].

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

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. We have heard from the proponents of this amendment two things. First, we need to outlaw tobacco companies from producing tobacco that is harmful to Americans. Second, we need to keep children from smoking. This amendment has absolutely nothing to do with either one of those two issues.

I have 5,000 small family tobacco farmers in my district. This particular amendment penalizes those 5,000 farm families who work hard every day to produce a living for their family grow-

ing a legal crop. I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment to eliminate the Federal subsidy for tobacco crop insurance.

This amendment is consistent with Congress' effort to control Federal spending and target our dollars only to the most necessary and appropriate programs. In 1996, Federal taxpayers paid around \$80 million in net tobacco crop insurance costs. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that adoption of this amendment will save \$34 million in the coming fiscal year. Beyond that, eliminating this subsidy will go a long way toward lowering tobacco use and reducing the severe public health risks associated with its use.

Personally, I would prefer to see this \$34 million applied to cancer research, or research into other diseases afflicting millions of Americans in this country.

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, cigarettes kill more Americans each year than AIDS, alcohol, car accidents, murders, suicides, drugs and fires combined. With the growing number of individuals suffering from health problems that are related to smoking, second-hand smoke, and tobacco use, it is in the public interest for Congress to remove taxpayer support for this type of crop which harms, and often kills its users.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Loney-De-Gette-Hansen-Meehan-Smith amendment. This amendment would save \$34 million by eliminating subsidized crop insurance for tobacco—\$34 million in savings scored by CBO.

It is time that we confront the glaring and unforgivable inconsistency in our Federal tobacco policy. We currently spend over \$177 million on programs to prevent tobacco use. Yet, USDA spent \$80 million for Federal crop insurance subsidies in fiscal year 1996. How can we possibly continue to encourage the growth of tobacco?

Some of our colleagues will argue that jobs are at stake here. But passage of this amendment would not result in the loss of any jobs. The private insurance market can provide crop insurance to tobacco farmers who want it—just like it does for the overwhelming majority of crops, such as honey, broccoli, watermelon, cherries, and livestock.

This amendment simply ends one more Federal subsidy for a product that threatens the public health. This Nation can no longer close its eyes to a product that kills 400,000 Americans each year and brings into its deathly fold 3,000 children each day, more than 1 million new smokers each year. It is time to take the necessary steps to prevent another generation from becoming addicted to this deadly product. Ending subsidized crop insurance for tobacco is an important step in this process.

Vote tonight to get the Federal Government out of the tobacco business. Vote "yes" on the Loney-De-Gette-Hansen-Meehan-Smith amendment.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 193, the Chair announces that proceedings will resume on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] immediately following disposition of the pending amendment. The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 209, noes 216, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 310]

AYES—209

Ackerman	Goodling	Obey
Allen	Goss	Olver
Andrews	Greenwood	Owens
Bachus	Gutierrez	Pallone
Baldacci	Gutknecht	Pappas
Barrett (WI)	Hall (OH)	Pascrell
Bartlett	Hansen	Paul
Bass	Harman	Payne
Becerra	Hayworth	Pelosi
Bentsen	Hefley	Petri
Bereuter	Hill	Porter
Berman	Hinchev	Poshard
Bilbray	Hobson	Pryce (OH)
Blagojevich	Hoekstra	Quinn
Blumenauer	Holden	Ramstad
Borski	Hooley	Riggs
Boswell	Horn	Rivers
Brown (CA)	Jackson (IL)	Roemer
Brown (OH)	Jackson-Lee	Rohrabacher
Callahan	(TX)	Rothman
Campbell	Johnson (CT)	Roukema
Canady	Kanjorski	Roybal-Allard
Cannon	Kasich	Royce
Capps	Kelly	Rush
Cardin	Kennedy (MA)	Ryun
Carson	Kennedy (RI)	Sabo
Castle	Kennelly	Salmon
Chabot	Kildee	Sanders
Christensen	Kind (WI)	Scarborough
Conyers	King (NY)	Schumer
Cook	Kleczka	Sensenbrenner
Cooksey	Klug	Serrano
Costello	Kucinich	Shaw
Cox	LaFalce	Shays
Coyne	Lampson	Sherman
Cummings	Lantos	Shuster
Davis (IL)	Lazio	Slaughter
DeFazio	Leach	Smith (NJ)
DeGette	Levin	Smith (TX)
Delahunt	Lewis (GA)	Smith, Adam
DeLauro	Lipinski	Smith, Linda
Dellums	LoBiondo	Snowbarger
Deutsch	Lofgren	Snyder
Doggett	Lowe	Souder
Doyle	Luther	Stabenow
Duncan	Maloney (CT)	Stupak
Dunn	Maloney (NY)	Sununu
Edwards	Manzullo	Talent
Ehlers	Markey	Tauscher
Engel	Mascara	Taylor (MS)
English	McCarthy (NY)	Tiahrt
Ensign	McDermott	Tierney
Eshoo	McGovern	Torres
Evans	McHale	Trafficant
Farr	McHugh	Upton
Fattah	McInnis	Velazquez
Fawell	McKeon	Vento
Filner	McKinney	Visclosky
Foglietta	McNulty	Wamp
Fox	Meehan	Waters
Frank (MA)	Menendez	Waxman
Franks (NJ)	Metcalf	Weldon (FL)
Frelinghuysen	Miller (CA)	Weldon (PA)
Furse	Miller (FL)	Wexler
Ganske	Minge	Weygand
Gejdenson	Moakley	White
Gibbons	Moran (VA)	Wolf
Gilchrest	Morella	Woolsey
Gillmor	Nadler	Yates
Gilman	Neal	Young (FL)

NOES—216

Abercrombie	Barcia	Bliley
Aderholt	Barr	Boehlert
Archer	Barrett (NE)	Boehner
Armey	Bateman	Bonilla
Baessler	Berry	Bonior
Baker	Bilirakis	Bono
Ballenger	Bishop	Boucher

Boyd	Herger	Paxon
Brady	Hilleary	Pease
Brown (FL)	Hilliard	Peterson (MN)
Bryant	Hinojosa	Peterson (PA)
Bunning	Hostettler	Pickering
Burr	Houghton	Pickett
Burton	Hoyer	Pitts
Buyer	Hulshof	Pombo
Calvert	Hunter	Pomeroy
Camp	Hutchinson	Portman
Chambliss	Hyde	Price (NC)
Chenoweth	Inglis	Radanovich
Clay	Istook	Rahall
Clayton	Jefferson	Redmond
Clement	Jenkins	Regula
Clyburn	John	Reyes
Coble	Johnson (WI)	Riley
Coburn	Johnson, E. B.	Rodriguez
Collins	Johnson, Sam	Rogers
Combust	Jones	Ros-Lehtinen
Condit	Kaptur	Sanchez
Cramer	Kilpatrick	Sandlin
Crane	Kim	Sanford
Crapo	Kingston	Sawyer
Cubin	Klink	Saxton
Cunningham	Knollenberg	Schaefer, Dan
Danner	Kolbe	Schaffer, Bob
Davis (FL)	LaHood	Scott
Davis (VA)	Largent	Sessions
Deal	Latham	Shadegg
DeLay	LaTourette	Shimkus
Diaz-Balart	Lewis (CA)	Sisisky
Dickey	Lewis (KY)	Skaggs
Dicks	Linder	Skeen
Dixon	Livingston	Skelton
Dooley	Lucas	Smith (MI)
Doolittle	Manton	Smith (OR)
Dreier	Martinez	Solomon
Ehrlich	Matsui	Spence
Emerson	McCarthy (MO)	Spratt
Etheridge	McCollum	Stearns
Everett	McCrery	Stenholm
Ewing	McDade	Stokes
Fazio	McIntosh	Strickland
Flake	McIntyre	Stump
Foley	Meek	Tanner
Forbes	Mica	Tauzin
Ford	Millender-McDonald	Taylor (NC)
Fowler	Mink	Thomas
Frost	Mollohan	Thompson
Gallely	Moran (KS)	Thornberry
Gekas	Murtha	Thune
Gephardt	Murtha	Thurman
Gonzalez	Myrick	Towns
Goode	Nethercutt	Turner
Goodlatte	Neumann	Walsh
Gordon	Ney	Watkins
Graham	Northup	Watt (NC)
Granger	Norwood	Watts (OK)
Green	Nussle	Weller
Hall (TX)	Oberstar	Whitfield
Hamilton	Ortiz	Wicker
Hastert	Oxley	Wise
Hastings (FL)	Packard	Wynn
Hastings (WA)	Parker	
Hefner	Pastor	

NOT VOTING—9

Barton	Molinari	Schiff
Blunt	Rangel	Stark
Dingell	Rogan	Young (AK)

□ 1421

Mr. MATSUI changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. BEREUTER and Mr. GREENWOOD changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 310, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 310, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COX OF CALIFORNIA

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote

on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 418, noes 0, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 311]

AYES—418

Abercrombie	Costello	Graham
Ackerman	Cox	Granger
Aderholt	Cramer	Green
Arane	Crane	Greenwood
Andrews	Crapo	Gutierrez
Archer	Cubin	Gutknecht
Armey	Cummings	Hall (OH)
Bachus	Cunningham	Hall (TX)
Baessler	Danner	Hamilton
Baker	Davis (FL)	Hansen
Baldacci	Davis (IL)	Harman
Ballenger	Davis (VA)	Hastert
Barcia	Deal	Hastings (FL)
Barr	DeFazio	Hastings (WA)
Barrett (NE)	Delahunt	Hayworth
Barrett (WI)	DeLauro	Hefley
Bartlett	DeLay	Hefner
Bass	Dellums	Herger
Bateman	Deutsch	Hill
Becerra	Diaz-Balart	Hilleary
Bentsen	Dickey	Hilliard
Bereuter	Dicks	Hinchey
Berman	Dixon	Hinojosa
Berry	Doggett	Hobson
Bilbray	Dooley	Hoekstra
Bilirakis	Doolittle	Holden
Bishop	Doyle	Hooley
Blagojevich	Dreier	Horn
Bliley	Duncan	Hostettler
Blunt	Dunn	Houghton
Boehlert	Edwards	Hoyer
Boehner	Ehlers	Hulshof
Bonilla	Ehrlich	Hunter
Bonior	Emerson	Hutchinson
Bono	Engel	Hyde
Borski	English	Inglis
Boswell	Ensign	Istook
Boucher	Eshoo	Jackson (IL)
Boyd	Etheridge	Jackson-Lee
Brady	Evans	(TX)
Brown (CA)	Everett	Jefferson
Brown (FL)	Ewing	John
Brown (OH)	Farr	Johnson (CT)
Bryant	Fattah	Johnson (WI)
Bunning	Fawell	Johnson, E. B.
Burr	Fazio	Johnson, Sam
Burton	Filner	Jones
Buyer	Flake	Kanjorski
Callahan	Foglietta	Kaptur
Calvert	Foley	Kasich
Camp	Forbes	Kelly
Campbell	Ford	Kennedy (MA)
Canady	Fowler	Kennedy (RI)
Capps	Fox	Kennelly
Cardin	Frank (MA)	Kildee
Carson	Franks (NJ)	Kilpatrick
Castle	Frelinghuysen	Kim
Chabot	Frost	Kind (WI)
Chambliss	Furse	King (NY)
Chenoweth	Gallely	Kingston
Christensen	Ganske	Kleczka
Clay	Gejdenson	Klink
Clayton	Gekas	Klug
Clement	Gephardt	Knollenberg
Clyburn	Gibbons	Kolbe
Coble	Gilchrest	Kucinich
Coburn	Gillmor	LaFalce
Collins	Gilman	LaHood
Combust	Gonzalez	Lampson
Condit	Goodlatte	Lantos
Conyers	Goodling	Largent
Cook	Gordon	Latham
Cooksey	Goss	LaTourette

Lazio	Oxley	Sherman
Leach	Packard	Shimkus
Levin	Pallone	Shuster
Lewis (GA)	Pappas	Sisisky
Lewis (KY)	Parker	Skaggs
Linder	Pascrell	Skeen
Lipinski	Pastor	Skelton
Livingston	Paul	Slaughter
LoBiondo	Paxon	Smith (MI)
Lofgren	Payne	Smith (NJ)
Lowey	Pease	Smith (OR)
Lucas	Pelosi	Smith (TX)
Luther	Peterson (MN)	Smith, Adam
Maloney (CT)	Peterson (PA)	Smith, Linda
Maloney (NY)	Petri	Snowbarger
Manton	Pickering	Snyder
Manzullo	Pickett	Solomon
Markey	Pitts	Souder
Martinez	Pombo	Spence
Mascara	Pomeroy	Spratt
Matsui	Porter	Stabenow
McCarthy (MO)	Portman	Stearns
McCarthy (NY)	Poshard	Stenholm
McCollum	Price (NC)	Stokes
McCrery	Pryce (OH)	Strickland
McDade	Quinn	Stump
McDermott	Radanovich	Stupak
McGovern	Rahall	Sununu
McHale	Ramstad	Talent
McHugh	Rangel	Tanner
McInnis	Redmond	Tauscher
McIntosh	Regula	Tauzin
McIntyre	Reyes	Taylor (MS)
McKeon	Riggs	Thomas
McKinney	Riley	Thompson
McNulty	Rivers	Thornberry
Meehan	Rodriguez	Thune
Meek	Roemer	Thurman
Menendez	Rogan	Tiahrt
Metcalf	Rogers	Tierney
Mica	Rohrabacher	Torres
Millender-McDonald	Ros-Lehtinen	Towns
Miller (CA)	Rothman	Traficant
Miller (FL)	Roukema	Turner
Minge	Roybal-Allard	Upton
Mink	Royce	Velazquez
Moakley	Rush	Vento
Mollohan	Ryun	Walsh
Moran (KS)	Sabo	Wamp
Moran (VA)	Salmon	Waters
Morella	Sanchez	Watkins
Murtha	Sanders	Watt (NC)
Myrick	Sandlin	Watts (OK)
Nadler	Sanford	Waxman
Nesbitt	Sawyer	Weldon (FL)
Neal	Saxton	Weldon (PA)
Nethercutt	Scarborough	Weller
Neumann	Schaefer, Dan	Wexler
Ney	Schaffer, Bob	Weygand
Northup	Schumer	White
Norwood	Scott	Whitfield
Nussle	Sensenbrenner	Wicker
Oberstar	Serrano	Wolf
Obey	Sessions	Woolsey
Olver	Shadegg	Wynn
Ortiz	Shaw	Yates
Owens	Shays	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—16

Barton	Goode	Taylor (NC)
Blumenauer	Jenkins	Visclosky
Cannon	Lewis (CA)	Wise
Coyne	Molinari	Young (AK)
DeGette	Schiff	
Dingell	Stark	

□ 1429

Mr. CAMPBELL changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. MILLER OF FLORIDA

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 21 offered by Mr. MILLER of Florida:

Insert before the short title the following new section:

SEC. . . None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act to the Department of Agriculture shall be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel who issue, under section 156 of the Agricultural Market Transition Act (7 U.S.C. 7272), any nonrecourse loans to sugar beet or sugar cane processors.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 193, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MILLER] and a Member opposed will each control 15 minutes.

Who seeks to control the time in opposition?

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 15 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING] if he would yield one half of his time to me and that I be allowed to further yield time.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that one half of my time be yielded to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] and that she be allowed to further yield time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield half of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] for purposes of control.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] will control 7½ minutes, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MILLER] will control 7½ minutes, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING] will control 7½ minutes, and the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] will control 7½ minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment we have before us today is for an incremental change to the sugar program. Last year the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] and I introduced legislation for a total phaseout of the program, but this year the amendment only addresses the issue of nonrecourse loans. The sugar program is considered the sugar daddy of corporate welfare because the benefits go to a limited number of people; in fact, 42 percent of the benefits of the sugar program go to only 1 percent of the growers. The sugar program is an old command-and-control economic model that still exists, unfortunately, in this country, and it keeps the price of sugar at twice the world price.

The sugar program was not changed in the last year's farm bill, and that is unfortunate because last year's farm bill had very significant change in agriculture in this country. But, sadly, sugar was the one product or crop that

was exempted, and this is what happened:

For example, last year in Time magazine, the week that President Clinton signed the legislation a full page article in Time did not talk about all the good things of that program, it talked about the fact that sugar sweetest deal, the landmark farm deal, left sugar subsidies standing, reformers wondering what went wrong. Agricultural socialism was supposed to end this week by the signing by President Clinton. But for America's sugar growers, how sweet it still is.

The fact is the sugar program continues to keep the price of sugar at twice the world price. My colleagues can look at the Wall Street Journal. There are two prices published for sugar, one for the United States and one for the rural price, and it makes it very difficult for us to compete when we have to pay twice as much for sugar. That is unnecessary.

Let me describe how the program works. We cannot grow enough sugar in the United States so we must import sugar, so farmers can produce all the sugar they can grow now but we still must import because the demand is so great. What the Federal Government does is it restricts the amount of sugar allowed to enter the United States, and by so restricting it, we force the price to twice the world price. The incentive for the Federal Government to do that, to maintain this high price, is the nonrecourse loan, because the nonrecourse loan is such that sugar processors, not farmers, these loans do not go to farmers by the way, they go to processors, big companies, and they get to borrow the money and put up the collateral sugar. They can pay back with sugar or money, cash.

But what they do is, the Federal Government does not want to get paid back in sugar, so since the Federal Government does not want to get paid back in sugar, they force the price up high. This is bad for the American consumer, this is bad for jobs in America, this is bad for the American taxpayer, and it is also bad for the environment in this country.

The consumer, according to the General Accounting Office, pays \$1.4 billion more, and for people of lower incomes, when they pay a high percentage of their food, money goes into food cost. This is a very regressive cost to the American consumer.

It is bad for jobs. Refineries are closing. There is an editorial in the San Francisco Examiner today talking about how a refinery may close in San Francisco because there is not enough sugar to process. Then the jobs are also affected because the manufacturers that use a lot of sugar, whether it is candy or baked goods and such, cannot get enough sugar and so they have to pay more for it. They cannot compete with the Canadian companies.

Bob's Candies in Albany, GA, a candy cane company; how can they compete when they pay twice as much for sugar

as the Canadian company? That is unfair, and we are penalizing our manufacturers in this country, and that is wrong.

And then the taxpayers get stuck with it, too. The taxpayers pay in several different ways. One area they pay is that we are major purchasers of food products in the United States, whether it is veterans hospitals or the military. GAO says it is costing the American taxpayer another \$90 million there.

And then we have the Everglades issue. In Florida, my home State, the Everglades, one of the most important natural resources we have in my home State, it is being damaged, the Everglades, by the sugar program because the sugar program encourages overproduction of sugar on marginal lands and it is damaging the Everglades.

And then what we have to do to solve the sugar program is pay additional for the cost of land. We are inflating the price of land because of the sugar program.

The sugar program is a bad program. It is time to start phasing out. This is only a limited change. I urge my colleagues to support this.

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

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, the intent of the Miller-Schumer amendment is to kill an efficient U.S. sugar industry and send those jobs overseas. The sugar program was reformed in the 1996 farm bill. The sugar program retained only protection at the border from the other hundred countries in this world who produce sugar and want the American market to dump their sugar on. It would only hurt those people in the sugar industry and raise costs to the consumer if we were to adopt this amendment.

There are more changes coming in the sugar program. The sugar program must move with the changes in the GATT agreement, and I support that, and most people in this body do for bringing the sugar program into competition in world market.

We cannot change alone. We cannot tie one hand behind us and expect the rest of the world to respect our program.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN].

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my friend from New York for yielding me this time, and I rise in strong support of the amendment.

Our current sugar program is costing us money and it is costing us jobs. It restricts the amount of sugar that can come into this country by having an arbitrarily high price for sugar. That means American consumers are paying twice what they should for the cost of sugar. That is corporate welfare. That is not what it should be.

Talk about costing jobs. In my district, Domino Sugar Refinery has a plant. Seven times within a year they

had to close because they could not get enough sugar at a competitive price in order to refine that sugar. There are 800 jobs there. That is jobs for this country.

So whether my colleagues are interested in the American consumer or they are interested in American jobs, they cannot justify our current sugar program.

The nonrecourse loan program allows sugar production here to guarantee a certain price. As the gentleman from Florida explained, the government does not want to get the sugar for the debt. Therefore the price of sugar is kept at an arbitrarily high level.

For the sake of our consumers, for the sake of jobs, for the sake of fairness, support the Miller-Schumer amendment. It is in the interests of our constituents.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding time to me.

If the Miller-Schumer amendment were to pass today, it would mean virtually the end of the domestic sugar production here in this country, and it would forfeit over 400,000 jobs, about 6,000 in my district.

I come from an agricultural part of Hawaii. We are very proud of the contributions that the sugar industry has made not only to the State but to the country.

The only people that are going to benefit from the Miller-Schumer amendment are the mega-international food cartels because it is in their interests to be able to buy cheap sugar. They are not interested in the American jobs that are dependent upon the sugar program, and contrary to what the gentleman said in offering this amendment, last year in the farm bill there were major revisions made to the sugar program and those revisions were agreed to by those of us who support this program.

So I urge my colleagues, in the interests of saving U.S. jobs, protecting the farmers, understanding the commitment we made for 7 years to this program, I urge them to defeat this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, throughout this sugar debate you have and will continue to hear opponents refer to a 1993 General Accounting Office [GAO] and a subsequent 1997 GAO report that argue for the elimination of the American sugar program. The U.S. Department of Agriculture [USDA] responded to the 1993 GAO report that it was flawed.

In a correspondence I received from the USDA Under Secretary, they found that the GAO used incorrect data and ignored integral components of the sugar program in generating their conclusions. In fact, the USDA found that even using the GAO's flawed methods, it could still show hundreds of million of dollars in benefits to consumers depending upon which years were studied. The letter I received

from the USDA stated that had the GAO looked at 1973–75, rather than 1989–91, the analysis would have showed an annual savings to domestic users and consumers of \$350 to \$400 million, contrary to the opponents claim that the program was costing taxpayers over \$1.4 billion. In fact, the GAO later conceded that the \$1.4 billion was simply unsubstantiated.

The USDA analysis not only revealed the deficiencies of the 1993 GAO report, but it reinforced the fact that America's sugar growers do not receive subsidies and that it is operated at no cost to the Government, as is required by law. The USDA analysis supports the sugar program's proponents assertions that the our Nation's sugar policy benefits consumers by providing a stable supply of sugar at prices 32 percent below other developing countries. In reality, the reason for this price differential is because foreign countries subsidize their sugar industry. On the average, retail price for a pound of sugar in America is 0.41 cents. Compare that to the 0.92 retail cost of sugar in Japan or Norway and you can see that American consumers do not pay the astronomical cost for sugar as opponents contend.

Mr. Chairman, I will submit for the RECORD a letter from USDA Under Secretary Eugene Moos dated October 24, 1995, refuting the April 1993 GAO report.

To recover from last year's embarrassment, adversaries of the U.S. sugar program asked the GAO to conduct another study of the sugar program. Mr. Chairman, Congress reformed the U.S. sugar program just last year. The request for an additional study was a waste of taxpayers money. In fact, to no one's surprise, the subsequent 1997 GAO report used the same flawed methodology as in the 1993 report. Similarly, the USDA found the same errors in the 1997 GAO report and refuted its contentions.

I urge my colleagues to reject these false arguments against the sugar program. It more than pays for itself. It benefits taxpayers, benefits consumers, and provides thousands of American jobs.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, DC, October 24, 1995.

Hon. PATSY T. MINK,
House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office
Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MINK: Thank you for your letter of July 26, 1995, concerning the General Accounting Office (GAO) report that stated that the U.S. sugar program costs domestic users and consumers an average of \$1.4 billion annually and GAO's July 1995 analysis that the sugar program cost the Government an additional \$90 million in 1994 for its food purchase and food assistance programs.

In my opinion, GAO's April 1993 report was flawed in its estimates. Some data were used incorrectly and important data and sugar market issues were not considered. Based on GAO's methodology, but by selecting prices in different time periods, the results are more ambiguous. Depending on the time-frame, one may contend that the domestic sugar program either costs or benefits U.S. users and consumers.

GAO's estimate of \$1.4 billion annually was based on an assumption of a long-run equilibrium world price of 15.0 cents per pound of raw sugar if all countries liberalized sugar trade. GAO added a transportation cost of 1.5 cents per pound of raw sugar to derive a

landed U.S. price (elsewhere in the report GAO stated that the transportation cost adjustment should be 2.0 cents per pound.) To derive a world price of refined sugar of 20.5 cents per pound, GAO added a refining spread of 4.0 cents per pound.

GAO compared its constructed U.S. sweetener price with its derived world price. However, GAO constructed the U.S. price for the 1989–1991 period during which 1989 and 1990 were unusually high price years for U.S. refined sugar. This exaggerated the difference between the so-called world derived price and the U.S. sweetener price. By selecting a period of world price spikes, such as 1973–1975, GAO's analysis would show an annual savings to domestic users and consumers of \$350 to \$400 million.

Clearly, the expected world price of raw sugar with global liberalization is critical to any analyses of the effects of the U.S. sugar program. In 1993, the Australian Bureau of Agricultural and Resource Economics (ABARE) estimated that sugar trade liberalization in the United States, European Union, and Japan alone would result in an average world price of 17.6 cents per pound of raw sugar—2.6 cents per pound higher than GAO's derived world price.

Based on the ABARE analysis and using a transportation cost of 1.75 cents per pound, which more accurately reflects global transportation costs to the United States, plus a refining spread of 4.27 cents per pound (Landell Mills Commodities Studies, Incorporated), a world price of refined sugar is estimated at 23.6 cents per pound. Based on this world price estimate and an average U.S. sweetener price of 1992–1994, a more normal price period, it can be shown using GAO's methodology, that there are no costs to domestic users and consumers.

The estimated effects of the U.S. sugar program are highly sensitive to expected world prices if global sugar trade is liberalized. GAO's analysis, in my judgement, does not adequately consider the complexities and dynamics of the U.S. and global sugar markets.

With respect to the effects of the U.S. sugar program on Government costs of its food purchase and assistance programs, an independent analysis by the Economic Research Service (ERS) estimates the cost at \$84 million based on the difference between U.S. world refined sugar prices in 1994. However, just as for the GAO analysis, different effects could be estimated by using other time periods when the price gap between U.S. and world prices was smaller. Moreover, with global liberalization, the price gap would narrow because of the dynamics of adjustment which were not considered in the ERS analysis.

Sincerely,

EUGENE MOOS,
Under Secretary for Farm and
Foreign Agricultural Services.

Mr. Chairman, the U.S. Sugar Program was significantly reformed in the farm bill passed last Congress. We cannot renege on our 7-year commitment made only a year ago to America's sugar growers and producers. The elimination of the nonrecourse loan provisions will lead to the destruction of the support structure for America's sugar farmers and drive them and their families to joblessness and unemployment. The nonrecourse loan is an integral element of America's sugar program. Without these loans, the sugar operations in my district, with the exception of a refinery owned facility, would probably close. That could mean a loss of a 6,000 jobs directly and indirectly in an already weakened Hawaii economy.

Nonrecourse loans work by allowing the harvested sugar to be used as a collateral in exchange for a loan from the Community Credit Corporation [CCC]. In addition, these loans support sugar prices and ensure that America's sugar growers have the ability to make a profit and repay their obligations with interest. Last year, Congress reformed the sugar program by stipulating that nonrecourse loans, and the guarantee of a minimum raw sugar price, would be available only when imports are high. Furthermore, it imposed a 1 cent per pound penalty on any processor who forfeits sugar to the CCC.

Opponents claim that last year's reforms were inadequate and contributes to higher food prices. Nothing could be further from the truth. Compared with other developed countries, the U.S. price for sugar is about 32 percent below what consumers in other countries pay. The cost for sugar-added products, like cookies, cakes, candy, ice cream, and cereal have all risen 1 to 3.4 percent when the price for raw sugar has fallen.

It's obvious that the very ones making the argument to eliminate the safety net for American farmers and consumers, are generating record profits for themselves. It's sheer greed without regard to our American producers. This amendment promoted by the mega-food corporations is to allow them to buy cheap foreign subsidized sugar and reap bigger profits on the backs of hardworking Americans.

If you vote for this amendment you are allowing greedy candy manufacturers and their allies to gain access to foreign subsidized sugar. Mr. Chair, America's sugar farmers need our help. From September 1996 to May of this year, raw sugar prices have plummeted 3 percent to 0.21 cents per pound. This drop is significant for sugar growers because this determines whether or not they make a menial profit or file for bankruptcy. If this amendment passes it would mean the end of thousands of America's small farmers. This action betrays last year's agreement and is a slap in the face of America's hardworking sugar farmers. I strongly urge my colleagues to keep our promise to America's farmers and vote "no" on this amendment.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SMITH], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues in the 104th Congress passed a contract with agriculture. Over 300 of them voted for it, and it was a contract which I am sure even the proponents of this bill will support, and that means that all subsidies and all support systems are gone in 7 years, now 6 years.

□ 1445

It was a commitment made by Congress with farmers. It allowed farmers to free up their planning, but it also said it is the end in 7 years.

Now, if Members pass this amendment, they break the contract with farmers. They not only break it with sugar, they break it for the rest of the farmers. Why not wheat? Why not soybeans? Why are we not talking about these as well? How about dairy?

We made a contract with the farmers. They depend upon it. They have

borrowed money on the basis of 7 years. The CoBank, the largest agriculture bank in the country, said if we pass this amendment it jeopardizes \$1 billion worth of loans to farmers.

Please, I ask the Members not to jeopardize the farm bill they passed.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD a letter from Mr. Jack Cassidy to Chairman LIVINGSTON.

The letter referred to is as follows:

COBANK,

Denver, CO, July 2, 1997.

Hon. ROBERT L. LIVINGSTON,

Chairman, Appropriations Committee, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm writing to express CoBank's opposition to H.R. 1387, legislation that would effectively end the federal sugar policy.

With \$18 billion in assets, CoBank is the largest bank in the Farm Credit System. We provide financing to about 2,000 customers, including agricultural cooperatives, rural utility systems, and to support the export of agricultural products. At present, CoBank has 25 farmer-owned cooperative customers involved in the sugar or sweetener industry, with loans from CoBank totaling about \$996 million.

CoBank's customers, their farmer members, and CoBank itself have made numerous business decisions and financial commitments based on the seven-year farm bill passed by Congress in 1996. As you know, that legislation included provisions vital to the U.S. sugar industry at no cost to U.S. taxpayers. Great hardship would result to sugar farmers and their cooperatives if Congress fails to live up to the commitments made just last year as part of the farm bill.

For these reasons, we urge you to support the existing farm bill provisions and oppose any proposals that would undermine the existing sugar policy.

Please call me if you or your staff have any questions.

Sincerely,

JACK CASSIDY,

Senior Vice President.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], our distinguished leader.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SMITH] who just spoke, the chairman, is absolutely right. Last year this House made a promise to America's sugar farmers. We promised that we would stand by them, by their families, in case of a natural or an economic disaster. We made this commitment for 7 years. We made it in good faith.

The amendment that we now discuss would break that promise. It would strip these farmers of the security we gave them in last year's farm bill. In my State alone, in Michigan, we have 2,800 sugar beet farmers. They employ, with other ancillary businesses, about 23,000 people in our State.

The modest safety net at issue here simply makes it possible for these families to plan their future with some sense of peace of mind. What we are talking about is enabling hard-working families to weather a tough season without going broke. It is in everybody's interest for the farmers to continue to do what they do best, and that is to farm. One bum crop could

put them in the poorhouse. It would not help anybody: Not them, not the Government, and not the public.

So, contrary to some assertions today, this safety net we are talking about is not a handout. It was a handshake. It was a promise. It was a commitment that we made on the floor of this House when we passed the farm bill. Breaking this promise would be bad policy. Breaking this promise would demonstrate bad faith. So I urge my colleagues to support these farmers and oppose this amendment.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN].

Mr. TAUZIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I would say to the members of the committee, there is no more sacred obligation of this House when it makes a promise to citizens of this country than to keep those promises.

The previous speakers are exactly right. In the 1996 bill we set the course for the farm communities of America for the next 7 years. The sugar program was the only one where we said non-recourse loans would not be available to farmers once import levels exceeded 1.5 million tons. We made that commitment in that agreement in 1996. I urge Members to keep that agreement.

If they adopt this amendment, they are saying to American sugar farmers that one bad season means the Government comes and takes their farm, takes their equipment, and they are out of business. That is not the way this Government ought to work. It certainly is not a thing this Congress ought to do.

The bill we passed with over 3,300 votes last year sets the stage for the farm communities for the next 7 years. We ought to keep our word, keep our promise, defeat this Miller-Schumer amendment.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY].

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, the Miller-Schumer amendment has very strong bipartisan support. It would delete sugar price supports and laws that keep sugar prices artificially high. Eleven out of 22 sugar refineries in the United States have closed. Domino Sugar, which operates a plant in my district and employs almost 1,000 people in New York State, has closed three plants.

How can anyone look at this record and say the sugar program is a success? Instead of the sugar program providing American jobs, it is taking good, solid jobs away from the refining industry and giving them to a privileged few sugar growers.

This year Domino has suspended production in my district because it could not purchase enough imported sugar to maintain its profit margin. Deregulating sugar prices would keep sugar refiners like Domino up and running. It

also would lower sugar prices and food prices for consumers. American consumers pay twice as much for sugar as the rest of the world.

The American people deserve better. They deserve cheaper sugar and they deserve to keep their jobs. Vote for this amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP].

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, my grandparents were farmers. I represent farmers in east Tennessee. Those same farmers continue to support me even though I voted against the farm bill last year. Why? Because I do not think we can really have reform until we eliminate price supports and subsidies.

These farmers that support me are not in favor of price supports or subsidies. They are in favor of being left alone to do their work, whether it is peanuts, sugar, tobacco. I agree, why not all of them? Why do we not eliminate all the subsidies? It does not make any sense.

After all, the people of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union were willing to risk their lives to have what we not only take for granted but abuse, and that is the free market. We cannot continue to beat up on the free market with price supports and subsidies and have consumers pay higher prices for things because the Government is involved where the Government should not be involved. A pure pro-farm vote is leave the farmers alone and pull the government out of the farm business.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CAMP].

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. Our sugar policy was reformed in the 1996 farm bill, Mr. Chairman, which many speakers have mentioned. But I know our opponents also say that they rely on this discredited GAO report claiming that U.S. sugar is overpriced. They constantly cite this 1993 report.

The authors of this flawed report based their entire analysis on a faulty assumption. They assumed that without a sugar policy, U.S. consumers could pay an outrageously low world price of 14 cents a pound for sugar. They failed to mention that the world price was a dump price, the price sugar-exporting countries get for dumping their highly-subsidized sugar on world markets.

The world dump price for sugar is hopelessly flawed and cannot be used as a gauge for measuring sugar's cost. Even the USDA says the GAO report was "flawed in its estimates, and important data and market issues were not considered." The USDA also said, "Using different world price estimates, it can be shown using GAO's methodology that there are no costs to domestic users and consumers."

Oppose the Miller-Schumer amendment.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE].

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

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. This is all we have to see right here, Mr. Chairman. Do Members want to hear about jobs? We all have people that work hard, and I understand the tradition of this country is if you work hard, you are supposed to be rewarded. Our sugar growers are the most productive people on the face of the Earth, and they are up against wage slavery.

If Members want to vote for wage slavery, do it, but do not do it on the backs of American working people. If Members want to blame corporations and tax them, go ahead and tax them for the profits they are making.

But I would like to bring this forward to Members for their consideration. Do Members think for an instant if they kill the sugar program that Coca-Cola is going to cost us any less because it is Diet Coca-Cola? They pocket those profits right now, and if Members kill the sugar program they are inviting Coca-Cola and everybody else to take even more profits, laugh all the way to the bank, and hurt the American working man and woman.

Stand up for the American working man and the American working woman, and fight off the big corporate profits that will be made if Members pass this amendment today. I rest my case.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, no sugar is used in Coca-Cola. It is corn syrup. They priced themselves out of the market. There is no sugar in Coca-Cola.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, there is a misconception about bringing the sugar prices down by doing away with this program. I served for 4 years as the Deputy Administrator for Farm Programs in USDA. I assure you that today's agricultural policy is developed based on the priorities of having an abundant supply of food and fiber at a reasonable price for the American consumer.

Consumers are paying less for sugar in this country than most of the major countries of the world. It makes no sense to compare a dumping price for sugar from another country against the current domestic price. Consider our vulnerability and what we are going to have to pay for sugar if we do away with our sugar producers in this country, it is ridiculous. Our price for sugar is one of the cheapest in the world. Do not compare it to the dump price of sugar. Keep producing quality sugar in this country. Keep this program.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from

Florida [Mr. MILLER], who is going to yield a minute of my time.

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my friends, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DAN MILLER] and the gentleman from New York, Mr. SCHUMER. This amendment prohibits the use of any funds in the bill to carry out the nonrecourse loan portion of the sugar program. It only affects nonrecourse loans. We are losing sight of that fact. It leaves in place recourse loans for processors and the sugar tariff rate quota. I think that is an important distinction.

The sugar industry obviously is a very particular concern in my home State of Florida for economic and environmental reasons. The delegation, frankly, is split. The sugar industry has contributed great benefit to the economy in Florida, but it has also contributed to some of the problems in the Florida Everglades, and I hope that the industry will continue to pitch in to help with the cleanup efforts and future preventative activity.

But the critical issue here today, I believe, is the great majority of the people I represent in Florida believe that the time for deep Government involvement in agricultural markets has ended. It actually ended a long time ago. So on their behalf I am pleased to support the Miller-Schumer amendment, and I commend them for their efforts.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR].

(Mr. FARR of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. It is a choice between farmers and candy. Vote for farmers.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BARCIA].

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

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I also register my strong opposition to the Miller-Schumer amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Miller-Schumer amendment. It is an amendment that should not even be considered on an appropriations bill because it is clear from statements made in "Dear Colleagues" by our two colleagues that their intention is to change the sugar program, a legislative action if I ever saw one.

I join my colleagues who say that this battle has been fought and is over until the next farm bill. Remember last year when our opponents resorted to fairy tale characters to try to undermine the zero-cost and well-intended sugar program. Well, in the words of a former President, there they go again. Now they are looking for the big bad wolf to keep huffing

and puffing until he can find a house to blow down.

I represent some of the hardest working, most efficient farmers in this country. They have worked their entire lives to bring the best quality food supply to our consumers at the most reasonable prices in the world. We made a 7-year deal with them last year, and it is wrong for us to change it after they have made their plans based upon our holding out a multiyear program to them.

Mr. Chairman, those who want to end the sugar program any way they can have resorted to using false information to denigrate the program. We have heard them claim that the Food and Agricultural Policy Research Institute has a study that was kept secret that says damage to our domestic sugar industry would be minimal if we changed the program.

That's an old story. The facts now are that FAPRI's 1995 report was not buried, but rather was publicly released, provided to congressional staff, and available on the FAPRI website for several months. FAPRI, in fact, found that the harm to U.S. sugar producers would be substantial if our sugar policy was lost, not minimal as the opponents to the sugar program claim. And FAPRI has acknowledged that it probably understated the probable damage to American sugar growers, and that because of errors on FAPRI's part on U.S. costs of production, if the study were updated, FAPRI would likely demonstrate even larger declines in domestic production.

Mr. Chairman, it is a bad thing to change a good program when it is working. It is even worse to change a good program based on misleading and discredited information. I urge a "no" vote on Miller-Schumer.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, the family farmers that work in their fields in the Red River Valley that I represent must be watching this debate with utter amazement. After all, U.S. sugar prices are 32 percent below developed countries. U.S. retail prices are the third lowest in the developed world. U.S. spending on sugar is the lowest in the world per capita.

Last year we reformed the sugar program, addressing many of the concerns raised by the opponents. We gave them a straight up-or-down vote on whether this program should be continued.

Now all North Dakota farmers, like farmers everywhere, ask for is that this body maintain the commitment made in last year's farm bill that there will be some price safety net on this product as they deal with the vagaries of weather and other external circumstances that make farming such a high-risk, low-profit business. Do not pull the rug out on America's farmers. This country has a good deal with the sugar program. It should be continued.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

□ 1500

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Miller-Schumer

amendment. I have people in my district who are working hard to support their families. What we are seeing is that this anticompetitive program costs consumers over \$1 billion per year in higher prices. Because of this program, it is threatening jobs in my district. We see it at Refined Sugars in Yonkers. At Domino's in Brooklyn. It is so critical that we reform the program. I rise in strong support of the Miller-Schumer amendment.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SANFORD].

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment because there has been much talk about commitment. Yet what I think we need to ultimately be committed to is to the simple theme of common sense. What we have with our sugar subsidy program is a system that does not make common sense. I say that because here we have a program that costs American consumers an additional \$1.4 billion a year in the form of higher sugar price. All that benefit is handed to in essence the hands of a very few, for instance the Fanjul family that live down in Palm Beach and get \$65 million a year of personal benefit. They have got yachts and helicopters and planes. They are on the Forbes 400 list.

So what I have got are people that live in my home district, living in trailers subsidizing the lifestyles of the rich and famous. To me that does not make common sense. I urge adoption of this amendment.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time to me.

I do rise in opposition to the amendment. The U.S. sugar program is not about corporate welfare. It is not about lower prices for consumers. It is not about environmental protection. The amendment is about eliminating a self-financing, substantially reformed and positive program for American sugar growers and producers and taxpayers.

I think it is important to keep in mind that the sugar program is almost a new program. The 1996 farm bill created a free domestic sugar market, froze the support price at 1995 levels. It required that the USDA impose a penalty on producers who forfeit their crops instead of repaying their marketing loans, and it increased imports.

Do not doubt these reforms have a significant impact on all sugar producers. Sugar producers in my district and all across the country have accepted it and generally welcome the opportunity to work in the new program, an opportunity for them to succeed.

I am proud to represent our sugar beet growers, and I would urge my colleagues to oppose this misguided amendment and support American sugar producers.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS].

(Mr. HASTINGS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, this issue is about American jobs, not about highfalutin Congress speak. I live where these people grow this sugar. I live with the pain of those who think for a moment that they may not have a job at some point in time. We stand around here and talk about jobs in my districts and your district. Let me tell my colleagues about the 44,000 jobs that are produced by the American sugar industry. I can assure my colleagues of this, the argument about who makes profits, do we penalize Bill Gates for owning Microsoft? Hell no. What we do is we support those efforts of manufacturers and businesses and so does the sugar industry. If you do not get it here, you are going to get it there. And if you get it there, it is going to cost more and it is going to cost more in American jobs.

Please know that this is an important program not just to Members but to people and to hospitals in these rural areas and to the little bitty stores and to the little bitty businesses that crop up as a result of this.

Completely defeat this amendment.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO].

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

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. JOHN].

Mr. JOHN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for yielding me the time.

Let us be very honest about what we are doing here. This amendment has nothing to do with saving taxpayers' dollars. It has nothing to do with protecting American consumers. In fact this amendment has everything to do with bad public policy. It is about doing through the appropriations process what could not be done in the 1996 farm bill.

In the gentleman's own words, the gentleman from Florida said we tried to totally eliminate this program last year and we could not do it. So please, I urge my colleagues, do not go along with this amendment. This is a backdoor approach to try to wreck the American farmers and not the big farmers but the small farmers.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore [Mr. QUINN]. The Chair announces that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MILLER] has 2 minutes and 10 seconds remaining, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING] has 2 minutes remaining, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] has 1½ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] has 2¾ minutes remaining.

For the purposes of closing the debate, the Chair announces that the

gentleman from Florida [Mr. MILLER] will close. The gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] will go third to last. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] will finish his time first, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING] will go second to last.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FOLEY].

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, something was mentioned today on the floor about the environment. The Miami Herald, an environmental newspaper located in Miami, FL: Congress weighs sugar policy. Dismantling the U.S. sugar program will not save the Everglades. Sugarcane, the plant, is still the most benign crop grown in the Everglades agricultural area, requiring less water than rice, releasing fewer polluting nutrients than vegetables or cattle pastures. Studies show that the crops that might supplant sugarcane would pose a greater threat to the environment and, if the land became fallow, it would be quickly overtaken by melaleuca and Brazilian pepper.

We heard about price. Let me show my colleagues what the farm bill did last year. Raw sugar prices down 3.4 percent. Wholesale refined sugar down 5.2 percent; cereal up 1; ice cream up 1.8; 2 percent for candy; 2.1 for retail refined sugar; and cookies and cakes up 3.4 percent.

Reducing the price of sugar as the amendment would suggest will not create a consumer benefit. Reject this amendment. It is about jobs, as the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS] said. It is about a bill that was fairly negotiated on this floor. They lost. They should accept their defeat. Protect the program. Defeat Miller-Schumer.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I would first of all like to correct my good friend from Florida in his original statement. He said a couple of things that are just flat wrong. First of all, we changed the sugar program in the last Congress, and that needs to be understood. Second of all, this does not just affect processors. This affects farmers because in my district the plants are owned by the farmers. These are people that have 500, 600 acres. They have a cooperative. They own this plant. They have put tremendous investments into these plants. We have made a commitment with them in this farm bill last year that we were going to leave this alone for 7 years. It is not fair to do what they are doing to these farmers.

I just wish that we would be honest about what we are doing here. What we are trying to do, legislate on an appropriations bill. We are trying to do what could not be done last time. It is not fair to the farmers in my district and

the farmers of this country. We need to defeat the Miller-Schumer amendment.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Let me thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MILLER], my coauthor on this amendment. We have heard a lot of passion on the floor. We have not heard too many facts. I would like to rebut a few.

People say the sugar program was reformed in 1995. That is not true. Wheat was reformed, corn was reformed. Sorghum was reformed; soybeans was reformed. All of you reformed your programs. Sugar and peanuts refused to be reformed. Right now the average subsidy per acre of sugar is \$480. No other industry farm or farmer otherwise gets that. The average subsidy for wheat is \$35. The average subsidy for corn \$45. No wonder the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FOLEY] says, do not change it. If you were making \$480 per acre, you would not want to change it either. We all pay for it.

Second, it emasculates the poor sugar farmers. Do you know who the money goes to? The refiners. The farmers did not get a nickel from this program. And in fact the program is so skewed to the top that the 1 percent wealthiest, including the Fanjuls, my friend from California said this is farmers versus candy, this is the American people versus the Fanjuls, plain and simple.

One percent of the subsidy, 1 percent of the people get 56 percent of the subsidy, the top 1 percent of those subsidized get 56 percent. This is a rich man's benefit.

Finally, the environment, every day, my colleagues, another 5 acres of the Everglades is destroyed; 500,000 acres of precious Florida wetlands are destroyed. Is it no wonder that free market think tanks, environmental groups, consumer groups all are together in eliminating the program? Let us be honest. There are jobs on the sugar side. There are jobs on the refiner side. Jobs are being lost. We argue net jobs are being lost. But why do we give such a huge subsidy to this one program?

The gentleman in the well said, Bill Gates, Bill Gates prospered. Yes, my colleagues, he prospered without a Federal subsidy. If the Fanjuls can prosper without a Federal subsidy, God bless them. If they were American citizens, I would say God bless America.

But they do not. They prosper to subsidize. That is why they are here with everything they are giving to everybody. That is why they can afford to buy refiners and offer to buy my refinery. That is why they can afford to spread all their money around because of all the money we make, and it comes from the average hard-working American who nickel by nickel pays for that. End this subsidy once and for all.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

There has been a lot of conversation about reform of the sugar program.

Those of us who have studied it know that it was reformed and reformed as much as any agricultural program. Now, right now this amendment, who is interested in this amendment? It is not the little guy that you are worried about. It is not the senior citizen. It is the big consumer of sugar, the manufacturers who want to destroy the sugar price in America.

The sugar price in America as compared around the world, we are less than the developed world. What is at risk here is opening the doors because all that is left is border protection to dumping of foreign sugar on America's sugar industry and destroying it. Then we will put out of business those who create jobs in the sugar industries and those farmers who pursue a livelihood there. Vote no on this amendment.

□ 1515

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], the distinguished ranking member of the authorizing Committee on Agriculture.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, quickly, fact: The sugar program has not cost the U.S. Treasury 1 cent since 1985. Fact: We will reduce the deficit by \$288 million over the life of the farm bill that some said was not reformed.

Now I want to talk about M&M candy. I like M&M candy. They include sugar in M&M candy. They also have less than 1 percent corn starch in M&M candy.

This reference that the consumer is going to pay a billion dollars more is laughable. There is 25 grams of sugar in this package. The market price is 22 cents. That makes 1.23 cents worth of sugar in this candy.

If we lowered it to the world prices, as the authors of this amendment want us to do, it will lower it to 8 cents a pound. That will make 0.78 cents per pound worth of sugar in this candy. We can buy this in the Capitol from the vending machines for 55 cents. Do we believe for a moment that there will be a new price at 54.217 cents on that vending machine if we pass this amendment?

Vote "no" on this amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I want to correct some of the information stated today. First of all, there was no significant change in the sugar program last year. It only lost by a handful of votes. Five votes made a difference. As Time magazine said, "The landmark farm bill left sugar subsidies standing." They did not get changed last year.

We just have to look at the price of sugar. Five years ago the price of sugar was 22, 23 cents a pound. Today it is 22, 23 cents a pound in the United States. And under this farm bill it will stay at

that same price for the next 5 years. But look at the world price. In Canada it is about 11 or 12 cents a pound. That is the world price of sugar.

What will happen to those candy companies is that they are going to ship their jobs to Canada. It is happening now. It is not right for the jobs in this country.

When we talk about subsidized sugar, France has subsidized sugar. There are laws on the books to keep that sugar out of the United States. I agree with that. When countries like France are not allowed to ship it in, that is what I agree with. But a country like Australia, the largest exporter of sugar in the nation, they are allowed to ship and sell it anywhere in the world at 11, 12 cents. We can compete with Australia.

Now, last year, we did not pass a total reform. What we want to do now is just a modest change, which is a nonrecourse loan. Veterans do not get nonrecourse loans. Students do not get nonrecourse loans. Businesses around this country do not get nonrecourse loans. So why should sugar farmers get nonrecourse loans?

Now, to my Republican colleagues, 55 percent of the Republicans last year voted with me for total repeal. This is just an incremental change and there is no reason why they should not be able to come along with me this time. It is pro-jobs, it is pro-consumer, it saves taxpayers money, and it is a good environmental vote.

This will be a scored vote by environmental groups, and the free market, the think tanks all say, hey, if we believe in the free enterprise system, this is a bad program with sugar so we should support this amendment.

To my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that are concerned about the environment, this is a big environmental vote, and it is bad for consumers and for lower income people who pay so much for their food. It does impact the cost of their food.

So I encourage all my colleagues to say let us begin the process. This is one step in the direction of reforming sugar which did not get reformed last year. This is the right thing to do for the American consumer and the American taxpayer.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to strongly oppose the Miller-Schumer amendment. This ill-conceived measure breaks the market-oriented contract made with the hard-working sugar farmers around the country and in my home State of Montana and undermines the viability of our rural communities.

This amendment flies in the face of common sense. Montana's sugar producers and their families have made investments based upon the Federal Government's word in the 1995 farm bill. In this planting year alone, farmers are counting on these promises for a fair return on their investment. Yet, this amendment would place America's sugar producers at great risk by eliminating the safety net they were promised in the farm bill.

For example, Montana's sugar producers are counting on getting up to 70 percent of

their net returns from the nearby processors in December of this year. These net returns are ultimately based upon what was supposed to be a 7-year Federal sugar policy commitment. The Miller-Schumer amendment ignores that commitment and compromises the financial investments made by our Nation's producers. Mr. Speaker, Montana's farmers can't unplant what has been planted and can't recover their investments if Congress erases those investments.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment. This dangerous amendment puts our farmers and communities at great and unfair risk and forgets our word to the people. It's time to assure our agriculture community that the promises made by the Federal Government are promises kept.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Miller-Schumer amendment to eliminate the nonrecourse portion of the U.S. sugar program. As you know, during consideration of last year's historic farm bill, significant reforms were made to the U.S. sugar program. Among the changes were the elimination of all domestic production controls, an increase in the marketing assessments sugar farmers must pay to reduce the Federal deficit, and new penalties to further discourage loan forfeitures and maintain the now 12-year-old no-cost operation of sugar policy.

Our domestic sugarbeet and sugarcane growers provide taxpayers with almost \$300 million in Federal revenues through the collection of assessments. In fact, because our domestic growers have been so successful in providing U.S. consumers with stable, high-quality supplies of sugar at a retail price well below the developed country average, our farmers were willing last year to contribute their fair share in the overall goal of reforming Federal farm support programs.

But while our sugar industry has been successful, it does face stiff competition from subsidized sugar growers throughout the world. GATT mandated no reduction in the price support for sugar in the European Union. Thus, while U.S. growers operate under a strict loan program, European farmers receive subsidies to artificially lower the market cost on their sugar sales.

Recognizing the threat that dumping sugar by foreign countries could have on the United States, sugar growers have one remaining safety net, the nonrecourse loan guarantee. While some of my colleagues here have attempted to portray this as a gimmick to raid the Federal Treasury, in actuality, this program would only come into effect when at least 1.5 million tons of foreign imports begin to flood our markets.

I believe this safety net is important to keep our domestic sugarbeet and sugarcane industry viable. Without this small measure of protection from the vagaries of foreign subsidized sugar, a critical sector of our farm economy could collapse. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, today, I rise in support of the Miller-Schumer amendment to the fiscal year 1998 agriculture appropriations bill which would prohibit the U.S. Department of Agriculture from spending Federal funds to implement the nonrecourse loan program for sugar producers.

This amendment takes another step forward in our continued efforts to phase out the Federal Government's out-dated sugar price sub-

sidy. The USDA's complex program of loan subsidies, price supports, and good old-fashioned protectionism benefits only a handful of farmers at the expense of American consumers.

I think the American people would be appalled to learn that more than 30 farmers and corporations receive in excess of \$1 million annually in USDA sugar subsidies. Meanwhile, consumers pay \$1.4 billion a year in higher prices on sugar products and hundreds of consumer items that use sugar.

Last year, Congress passed landmark agriculture legislation, known as the FAIR Act, which opened up most American farmers to the free market and new agricultural opportunities. There is no reason why these same free market principles should not apply to sugar farmers. If passed, this amendment would also have the benefit of opening up new opportunities to sugar farmers while still providing them refuge from foreign dumping and unfair trade barriers in markets overseas.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend Mr. MILLER and Mr. SCHUMER for their collaborative work on this issue and I urge all my colleagues to support their amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MILLER].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 175, noes 253, answered "present" 1, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 312]

AYES—175

Allen	English	Kolbe
Andrews	Ensign	Kucinich
Archer	Eshoo	LaFalce
Armey	Fawell	Lantos
Barr	Forbes	Largent
Barrett (WI)	Fox	LaTourette
Bartlett	Frank (MA)	Lazio
Bass	Franks (NJ)	Lewis (GA)
Berman	Frelinghuysen	Linder
Bilbray	Galleghy	LoBiondo
Billrakis	Gejdenson	Lowey
Blagojevich	Gekas	Luther
Blumenauer	Gibbons	Maloney (CT)
Boehlert	Gilchrist	Maloney (NY)
Borski	Goodlatte	Manzullo
Brown (OH)	Goodling	Markey
Campbell	Gordon	Mascara
Capps	Goss	McCarthy (MO)
Cardin	Greenwood	McCarthy (NY)
Castle	Hall (OH)	McDermott
Chabot	Hansen	McGovern
Clement	Hayworth	McHale
Collins	Hilleary	McHugh
Conyers	Hinchee	McKinney
Cook	Hobson	McNulty
Cox	Hoekstra	Meehan
Crane	Horn	Miller (CA)
Cummings	Hostettler	Miller (FL)
Davis (IL)	Hoyer	Moakley
Davis (VA)	Hutchinson	Moran (KS)
DeFazio	Inglis	Moran (VA)
DeGette	Jackson (IL)	Morella
DeLauro	Johnson (CT)	Nadler
DeLay	Kanjorski	Neal
Deutsch	Kasich	Neumann
Dickey	Kelly	Ney
Doggett	Kennedy (MA)	Northup
Doyle	Kennedy (RI)	Olver
Dreier	Kennelly	Pallone
Duncan	Kim	Pappas
Dunn	Kind (WI)	Pascarell
Ehrlich	Kingston	Paul
Engel	Klug	

Paxon
Payne
Petri
Pitts
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rogan
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce

Rush
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger

Souder
Sununu
Tauscher
Tierney
Upton
Velazquez
Vislosky
Wamp
Waxman
Weldon (PA)
White
Wolf
Yates
Young (FL)

NOES—253

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berry
Bishop
Bliley
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Carson
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Combust
Condit
Cooksey
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Deal
Delahunt
Dellums
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Foley

Ford
Fowler
Frost
Furse
Ganske
Gephardt
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Graham
Granger
Green
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilliard
Hinojosa
Holden
Hooley
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Istook
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Kildee
Kilpatrick
King (NY)
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
LaHood
Lampson
Latham
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
Livingston
Lofgren
Lucas
Manton
Martinez
Matsui
McCollum
McCrery
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-
McDonald
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Murtha
Myrick

Nethercutt
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Pastor
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Redmond
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ryun
Sabo
Sanchez
Sandlin
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Vento
Walsh
Waters

Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)

Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield

Wicker
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn

Towns
Turner
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky

Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand

Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

NOT VOTING—5

Barton
Molinari

Schiff
Stark

Young (AK)

□ 1538

Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. ORTIZ, and Mr. OWENS changed their vote from "aye" to "no." Messrs. SAXTON, COOK, VIS-CLOSKY, and EHRlich changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER].

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore [Mr. QUINN] announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 158, noes 265, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No 313]

AYES—158

Abercrombie
Allen
Andrews
Baldacci
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Conyers
Coyle
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta

Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchev
Hinojosa
Holden
Hooley
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lofgren
Lowe
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markley
Mascara
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McKinney
McNulty

Meehan
Menendez
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (CA)
Mink
Moakley
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Neal
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Rangel
Rivers
Rodriguez
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schumer
Serrano
Sherman
Skaggs
Slaughter
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres

Aderholt
Archer
Army
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boyd
Brady
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combust
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dooley
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Fattah
Fawell
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrist
Gillmor

Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand

Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOES—265

Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lampson
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Davis (VA)
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luther
Manzullo
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar

Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Riggs
Riley
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Traficant
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Ackerman	Meek	Schiff
Barton	Molinari	Stark
Gonzalez	Reyes	Young (AK)
Lewis (GA)	Sanford	

□ 1600

So the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. NEUMANN

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 17 offered by Mr. NEUMANN:

Insert before the short title the following new section:

SEC. . None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to carry out, or to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel of the Department of Agriculture who carry out, a noncourse loan program for the 1998 crop of quota peanuts with a national average loan rate in excess of \$550 per ton.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 193, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN].

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield half of my time, or 7½ minutes, to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI] for purposes of control.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI] will control 7½ minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] will control 15 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that half of the time, 7½ minutes, be yielded to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] the ranking member, for purposes of control.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN].

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

First, I would like to thank my very competent staff for bringing this issue to my attention and getting me fully informed on the details of this particular program. It is a very interesting program. It is a program in which the United States Government controls the amount of peanuts that can be produced in the United States under a system called a quota system. By limiting the amount of peanuts that are available for sale in the United States of

America, a very interesting thing happens and it is not unexpected; by controlling the availability of peanuts that limits the supply, naturally with a limited supply the price of peanuts goes up. And the fact is when a hard-working family walks into a store to buy a jar of peanut butter, they literally wind up paying 30 cents a jar extra for no other reason than that the U.S. Government is in the middle of the program.

Let me give my colleagues some of the numbers here that lead to the 30-cent increase in the cost of making peanut butter and jelly sandwiches for lunches in many of the hardworking families across America. In the world market, peanuts sell for \$350 a ton, but because the U.S. Government is involved in this quota system, peanuts in the United States of America sell for \$650 a ton, almost double the world price on peanuts. As a matter of fact, our Government has this loan guarantee program in place where they guarantee a loan at \$610 per ton.

Now an interesting fact came to light in our research. In fact, our American farmers produced peanuts that are sold in the world markets. That is to say they are producing roughly 300,000 tons of peanuts that are sold in the world markets at \$350 a ton. So why is it that here in the United States of America, we are asking our consumers to pay all this extra money every time they want to make a peanut butter and jelly sandwich for their kids' lunch when they head them off to wherever it is, whether it be a job or to school or whatever?

Another interesting fact came to light when we started studying who owns these quotas, who has got this limited right to raise peanuts in the United States of America. A lot of people were saying, "Well, it helps the farmers, and therefore you should allow it to continue."

Sixty-eight percent of the quotas are owned by nonfarmers in the United States of America. It is time for this program to end.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SMITH], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Again, in the last Congress they passed a couple of bills. One was, of course, the Freedom to Farm which eliminated all subsidies in 7 years, and prior to that they changed the peanut program. It is no longer a Government-subsidized program. In fact, by the year 2002, \$434 million will be saved. That is what they did.

But I am sure many of my colleagues do not like the peanut program. They may not, but they signed a contract, the contract with farmers, the Government with farmers. They signed the contract for 7 years. For 7 years there will be no peanut subsidy or no peanut program.

So remember this: It is a contract, it is a commitment, it is a Government promise, the Government-farmer agreement. Do not violate the agreement. Vote against this amendment.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment which implements the first step in the Shays-Lowe peanut program elimination bill.

The peanut program epitomizes wasteful, inefficient Government spending. It supports peanut quota holders at the expense of 250 million Americans, consumers and taxpayers.

The GAO has estimated that this program passes on \$500 million per year in higher peanut costs to the consumers. What does this mean to average American families? Well, as a mom who sent her three kids to school with peanut butter and jelly sandwiches for years, I find it unacceptable that this program forces American families to pay an average of 33 cents more for an 18-ounce jar of peanut butter. Now that is not peanuts.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for American consumers and support this amendment. It is good fiscal and consumer policy.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RODRIGUEZ].

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

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to defend the peanut farmers in my district and throughout the Nation. Once again we see the multinationals trying to come in and be able to take the profits. When we look at it, the family farmer is less than 100 acres, and so we are looking at a situation where less than 100 acres for the average family farmer in this country. These farmers must compete with multicultural corporations in dealing with them. They had, last time around they had, and it was cut from 678 to 610; now they are coming back for more.

My colleagues, before you is a Snickers. I paid 60 cents for it. It has gone up 5 cents. Have my colleagues seen a cut on it? No.

In addition to that, the peanuts that are in this Snickers is approximately 2 cents. Do my colleagues foresee that there will be a cut of 58 cents? I will attest to my colleagues that that is not going to occur.

What we see before us is an attempt by the multinationals to be able to get some additional moneys. I thank my colleagues, and I ask them to vote no on the amendment.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON].

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, in 1934 the Great Depression led Congress to establish the Federal peanut program to protect the peanut producers

and to control the domestic supply. Well, the peanut program is now 63 years old. That is 63 years of price controls, 63 years of higher prices for consumers and 63 years of centrally-planned economics.

I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] which compels the USDA to be fair to consumers when establishing a loan level for the peanut quota.

Mr. Chairman I grew up on a family farm, a small family farm in Arkansas, and this is not about farming but this is about Government and Government quotas. The peanut program combines production quotas, price support, loans and import restrictions which stifle the U.S. peanut industry and endanger trade for other agricultural commodities.

This is a program which benefits only the elite few. The GAO reports that 68 percent of quota owners do not actually participate in farming. They rent their Government quotas for a profit. If a farmer does not sell his crop, he can forfeit to the Government and receive \$610 per ton.

The world market price is only \$350 per ton; that is more than what is necessary. That is an additional \$500 million a year in inflated prices for American consumers. It is time we stop this arcane Government program. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that is the pending business before the House should be entitled the "How Many Rural Economies Can We Wreck in 1997 Amendment". Simply put, the Neumann amendment will devastate rural economies throughout the South. Last year's farm bill contained significant reforms for the Nation's peanut program. Further reductions in the support price will cause the economic ruin of thousands of family farms, rural banks and country towns that they support. Contrary to the claims of many, this amendment will not give consumers cheaper candy bars or peanut butter. It is anti-farmer, and it should be defeated.

Mr. Chairman, let us let the 1996 farm bill work. I repeat. Let us let the 1996 farm bill work.

I would urge my colleagues in joining me to vote against this amendment.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ETHERIDGE].

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment. Peanut farmers are the backbone of the economy in the poorest counties in the South. They agreed to the reforms in the program just last year. Loan rates were reduced, quotas were reduced, programs were opened to new producers, out-of-State quota holders were eliminated. In return they have been given a farm bill, a 7-year promise of stability.

Mr. Chairman, peanut farms face many obstacles without having to worry about whether or not they can pay their bills. Too much rain gives soggy peanuts, drought turns them to dust. Peanut farmers are hardworking people. They need stability. They do not need to face this problem.

Proponents claim they are fighting for consumers. Hogwash. Candy manufacturers have said they will not pass on any of the savings to consumers. Savings will be passed on to a few of the multibillion-dollar companies, and the price of candy bars will not go down.

If there is any integrity left in this Congress, we will live up to the commitment that was made last year to the peanut farmers and defeat this amendment.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] the former Governor.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me, and I rise in strong support of the Neumann-Kanjorski amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Federal peanut program is completely antiquated, and only those who believe in Peter Pan could believe that the program works well. Over the last 2 years USDA announced the national peanut quota production level of 100,000 tons below expected demand. What does this mean? USDA basically created an artificial government-induced shortage of peanuts which, in short, means peanut-loving taxpayers get Jiffed; I mean gypped. At a time when we are reviewing every program for savings in order to balance the budget, it is simply nuts to spend taxpayer dollars on a program that refuses to adopt commonsense reforms to achieve real savings.

Mr. Chairman, the Neumann-Kanjorski amendment is a positive step toward true reform of the peanut program. I believe it does help to protect consumers from Government price fixing, create a more competitive peanut economy and lower prices on peanut products. I ask all of my colleagues, Republicans, Democrats, crunchy peanut butter lovers and creamy peanut butter lovers, to support the Neumann-Kanjorski amendment.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY].

□ 1615

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, it is interesting, I have been doing this a pretty long time. I used to be in the packaging business. To say that you would save 18 cents with peanut butter and jelly is a nice little symbol, but let me just tell the Members something. For the last I think 5 years peanut paste from China has been coming through Canada into the United States like at 25 percent cheaper. Members will see in a few mo-

ments a chart showing the rise in peanut butter prices. Oddly enough, oddly enough, the price of peanut butter in Canada is more than the price in the United States.

There are many reasons to vote against this amendment, but I would like to focus on another one. Many Members may not know it, but we have already voted to enact annual cuts in the effective support price for peanuts. Along with a long list of reforms, last year's farm bill contained a 10-percent price cut in the support price for peanuts, but it also froze that price for 7 years with no adjustment for inflation. The freeze amounts to an automatic annual cut in the support price, and each year, as Members know, expenses go up.

If my colleagues really want to cut the real support price for peanuts, there is one alternative to this amendment: Leave the farm bill alone and vote against this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Neumann-Kanjorski amendment, which would devastate peanut farmers in the State of Virginia.

This controversy is not new. Almost every year we consider yet another proposal to cut the peanut support price. I'm afraid many Members may be forgetting that last year's farm bill already cut the support price by 10 percent.

The farm bill contained a long list of reforms that transformed the peanut program. From the perspective of Congress, the most important of these reforms may have been doing away with all cost to the taxpayer. The program actually gives back \$83 million to the Treasury that goes toward reducing the deficit.

For most peanut farmers, however, the most important change was losing 10 percent of their support price. A close runner-up was having their support price frozen for 7 years—with no adjustment for inflation.

Many farmers in my district were not happy with this deal. The 10 percent cut was a bitter pill to swallow. A price freeze over 7 years, with expenses cutting into revenue more and more every year, was even tougher.

But it was a deal, and farmers accepted it. What we're talking about today is renegeing on that deal. This amendment would effectively gut the peanut program before we've had a chance to determine the effects of last year's reforms.

We still don't know how farmers will adapt to all the changes in the farm bill. The 10 percent cut in the support price has already taken most of the profit out of peanut farming in Virginia.

Fortunately, though, farmers have not felt the full effects of that cut. That's because prices for other commodities have been high, and farmers have not had to rely on peanuts to keep them in the black.

But believe me, that will change. Already, bad weather has taken its toll on farmers in Virginia. With only an inch of rain since planting, many farmers won't be able to harvest enough cotton to make a profit. Prices on other commodities have also fallen.

And what about 6 years from now? We don't know how farmers are going to adjust to a support price frozen at a level 10-percent lower than before. Remember, this freeze

amounts to an automatic annual cut in their support price. Every year, their support is reduced by the amount of inflation.

In fact, if the U.S. support price drops below \$610, many farmers in Virginia are not going to be growing peanuts anymore. At \$550, they simply won't be able to get financing. Rural communities will lose the bread and butter of their economies, on which so many other businesses depend.

Now, we've all heard about how the world price for peanuts is supposedly half the U.S. support price. But this argument dissolves on closer inspection. The so-called world price is simply not comparable.

It generally applies to an inedible, poor quality peanut used mainly for oil. We might as well be talking about the world price for oranges. If the U.S. price were at the so-called world level, there wouldn't be many American peanut farmers left.

If my colleagues really want to cut the support price for peanuts, there is an alternative. Do nothing.

The price freeze in last year's farm bill amounts to an automatic annual price cut. Let the freeze take effect over the full term of the farm bill. Let's see the real-world effects of what we've already done.

In the meantime, I urge my colleagues not to renege on last year's deal. We should not be making it impossible for peanut farmers to make a living at a time when Mother Nature is making it hard enough.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge a "no" vote on the Neumann/Kanjorski amendment.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Augusta, Georgia [Mr. NORWOOD].

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I will tell the Members quick what is nuts. What is nuts is people from Delaware and people from Wisconsin getting up here and talking about something they do not know the first thing about. My good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] actually saw a peanut plant one time.

Mr. Chairman, I have lived in a family who grew peanuts. They hated the Government regulations. They wanted to get away from them, but we made them do it. Now give them a chance over the next 7 years to live with this no-cost program to the taxpayers, and undo what we have done to them for the last 50 years. Get off the back of the peanut farmer.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my good friend, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SANFORD].

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, because leaving aside the good and the bad of what we have heard about the peanut program, I think what we need to consider is the fact that if Members look at the peanut program as it is now configured, Members would look straight back to the Dark Ages. In the Dark Ages there was a feudal system wherein if you were lucky and drew the long end of the straw you were lord of the

manor, and if you were unlucky you were a serf out there toiling on the land.

In 1997, with our peanut program the way it is configured, if you draw the long end of the stick you have a quota from the Government and can sell your peanuts for about \$600 a ton, and if you draw the short end of the stick you can sell them for about half that, the same peanuts. To make matters worse, about two-thirds of the quota owners, and again we are not talking about farmers here, are people that live in Los Angeles and New York and Miami.

So I would simply make the observation that we need to move from the Dark Ages and into the light ages of a market-based system. I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 90 seconds to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EVERETT].

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

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment which is based on false information. It is poor from a policy standpoint and unworkable from a practical standpoint.

We reformed the peanut program last year extensively. We, the Committee on Agriculture, and the House and the Senate and the President authorized a reform program at no cost to taxpayers, and yes, at no additional cost to families who buy peanut products.

Opponents claim that the peanut program costs families additional money. That is not true. What they do not tell us is in one of the reports they used when they quote from, the GAO identifies consumers as those corporations who first purchased the peanut from the farmer; again, not the housewife but the corporations.

As far as passing along lower prices to the housewife, that is a joke. The only person who would believe that would be somebody who does believe in Peter Pan. Since the peanut farmer received the cuts for their peanuts that were slashed last year, the price of peanut products has increased, not been passed on. Not one penny of the money taken from farmers has been passed on to the families, not one penny.

Also, studies show thousands of jobs in farm-related industries, such as manufacturing of farm equipment and those supplying farmers, will be lost if this flawed amendment passes. This issue was fully considered last year. Now let the program work. This Congress, both House and Senate, and the administration made a commitment to our farmers. We should honor it, and stop this silly and flawed business of trying to rewrite the farm bill every year.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Neumann-Kanjorski amendment which is based on false information, is poor from a policy standpoint and unworkable from a practical standpoint.

The appropriation bill is not the appropriate place to consider this issue. This is nothing

more than an attempt to rewrite the farm bill in a way that is punitive to farmers.

I could stand up here all day long and discuss the merits of the peanut program, the reforms we made in the 1996 farm bill, and the financial situation of the peanut farmers. But Mr. Chairman, this is not the time or the place to do it. You see, we did that last year * * * extensively, and we, the Agricultural Committee, and subsequently the House, Senate, and President, authorized a reformed program that benefits all Americans and at absolutely no cost to taxpayers, or, and please hear this—at no cost to families who buy peanut butter and other peanut products.

We have been fighting this fight for many years. The fight, however, is not about reform, we have done that, this effort is about corporate greed, pure and simple. These multinational corporations have been lining the Halls of Congress with money for years claiming that the Peanut Program cost families additional money. That is simply not true. The GAO report you will hear quoted does not say the program cost the housewife and families one thin dime. In the report, the GAO identifies "consumers" as those multinational corporations who first purchase the peanut from the farmer. Again, not the buying public, but these corporations who are trying to increase their profits by taking money out of the pockets of already struggling farmers.

As a matter of fact, since the peanut program was reformed last year, the price farmers received for their peanuts has been slashed, their profits greatly reduced, and, consequently many farmers have stopped farming. But guess what, the price of that candy bar has increased, the cost of that jar of peanut butter is still the same, but the profits of these manufacturers have increased. Not one penny of the money taken from farmers was passed on to families. Not one penny. This amendment is purely about corporate greed and it is a sad thing to hear these members say it cost families money when what they are really doing is siding with greedy corporations against working farmers. Members who do that do a serious disservice to both working farmers and working families while they increase the profit margins of these corporations.

And, should this flawed amendment carry the day, it will not be only farmers who lose jobs. Studies show many more thousands of jobs in farm related industries such as the manufacturing of farm equipment and those supplying farmers will be lost. We saw it happen a few years ago when thousands of farm equipment employees lost their jobs. That's real jobs lost, not the pie in the sky stuff you'll hear today. If these members are successful today, they will continue to attack all other farm programs and the jobs lost in farm related industries will occur in the tens of thousands.

This issue was fully considered last year, now let the program work. This Congress, both the House and the Senate and this administration made a commitment to our farmers—we should honor it and stop this silly nonsense of trying to rewrite the farm bill every year.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I come from Pennsylvania, and I understand the pleas of all my friends from the agricultural

States, the arguments that they make, and they are credible arguments. I heard the gentleman from Georgia argue about how we are getting into the key commodity and economic activity of the State of Georgia. I understand that. Then I watch my friend, the gentleman from Virginia, a very good friend of mine. I had the occasion to talk to him. This does affect and impact his district.

We are not trying to completely end the peanut subsidy program here today, because I think that would be unfair. We are merely trying to set in the appropriation bill a 10-percent reduction, from \$610 a ton to \$550 a ton. Furthermore, it is only effective through the next year, the life of this appropriation bill.

Mr. Chairman, we do this in this way and support this amendment because we are sensitive to economies that need help, and to sectors of economies that need help. But I know as an addict of nicotine that, regardless of how many pledges you make, you invariably will go back to smoking until you find a substitute or you find a way to wean yourself from your addiction.

Now we have a price support addiction. It is a pathetic addiction. If we were arguing that these quotas were farmers' quotas alone and all the profit went to the farmer, the person who worked in the field, that would be one thing. But when we read the statistics: over 68 percent of these quotas are traded as securities by very wealthy people in this country who are buying and selling quotas, and then renting those quotas out to little old farmers who are really their tenant farmers. The major part of the peanut profit goes to these speculative investors. Sixty-three years of that support system.

When this program started, I have no doubt that in 1934 the State of Virginia, the State of North Carolina, the State of Georgia, the State of Alabama, needed that help. I would have been one of the Members of Congress who would have argued for this program or any other that would have supported the peanut farmer at the time or the family farmer.

But suddenly we grandfathered this provision. You now inherit a quota from the U.S. Government because your granddaddy had one. You can go out and buy it speculatively in the market and trade it and negotiate it and sell it. We have created Government-supported securities here that are being readily traded in the market, all with the idea that we are saving the economies of these peanut-producing States.

I say, if Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama need economic development money, I will be the first one up here to vote for it. But we will not have it grandfathered and we will not have it in speculators' hands and it should not exist for 65 years. There has to be a time that you wean off Federal support.

I am speaking to many Members on my side because I think we sometimes have a hard time getting away from subsidies, but I want to talk to my conservative friends on the Republican side that are always telling me about the great nature of the free enterprise system: "Let the market work. Do not vote and create favoritism."

What are we doing, after 63 years, is continuing this favoritism. And what States are we now supporting? I know there are rural areas of Georgia that need help, but there is no more dynamic economy in the United States than Georgia today, with a 2-percent unemployment rate. I urge my colleagues to start the process of weaning us off peanut quotas by supporting this amendment.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BOYD].

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I want to rise in opposition to this. I want to address the subject that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI] brought up, and also my friend, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SANFORD].

Mr. Chairman, last year this Congress changed the peanut program. It fixed the abuses that those gentlemen are talking about, whereby people who live not on the farm and are not active producers are no longer able to own those peanut allotments, and that is the reason they are being sold and put in the hands of people who actually farm. I want to make sure that we get that straight.

I would urge Members to defeat this well-intentioned but poorly thought-out amendment.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, if we look at the guts of the farm bill, it is, indeed, as complicated as the inside of the Pathfinder. As the Pathfinder trudges and scrutinizes the surface of Mars, the American public and Members of Congress are scrutinizing the inside of the farm bill. Anyone who looks at it looks at it in pure disbelief, not knowing what components mean what, and so forth.

It is true, the peanut program under the new reforms is a no-net-cost program that contributes \$83 million to deficit reduction, it supports about 30,000 jobs, and there is a phaseout of the program in under 7 years.

But if we take a step back and shut the hood and look at the total picture, Americans have an abundant food supply at cheap prices year around. We spend 11 cents on the dollar on food. The farm bill is working, Mr. Chairman. I urge my colleagues to let it work, and do not do reforms on a piecemeal basis, which is what this amendment would do. I urge a "no" vote.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BISHOP].

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

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I have the largest peanut-growing district in the country. A lot of people in our area depend upon peanuts. It is the economic foundation of our area. But I have to say that those people came together well before the farm bill last year and put their heads together and worked with people of good will to address the critics of this program, and to address the issues that were raised, such as those raised by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI].

We addressed that in the farm bill last year. We created a no-net-cost program to the taxpayers. It is a market-oriented program, but yet it still provides a safety net for the farmers. We enacted a contract, a 7-year contract, for this farm bill by which we promised that this is what we would operate our farm policy on for 7 years. Our people mortgaged property, they made loans, they bought equipment on time and installments with that in mind.

Now we want to pull the rug out from under them and renege on that commitment. Let us defeat this amendment. Let us stand up for the farm bill we passed last year.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington, Mrs. LINDA SMITH.

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Neumann amendment because something really simple happens when we mess with prices. That is, the cost of the peanut butter sandwich for the kid goes up.

□ 1630

That is what we are seeing today. But greater than that, we hear that it is for a small number of farmers. The reality is only one-third of the quota holders are actually farmers. The rest are people who inherited the quotas or purchased them and who lease them to the real farmers who then get less than the quota floor price.

I think it is important that we realize that is a subsidy. But really what is greater, it just raises the cost to the consumer. We need to stop doing this. We need to get in line with what is really happening in the world market and stop this practice. I really do support the Neumann amendment and encourage the rest of the Members to take a look at who really benefits from this system.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is real important, as we wrap up my portion of this debate, that we really understand what this program is all about. This program is about, because of the rules and regulations of the U.S. Government, people that go into the store and buy peanut butter or peanut related products pay more money than they otherwise would. Of course somebody benefits because other people are overpaying for a product. Of course there

are people that benefit from that sort of practice.

Why is it that the U.S. Government should have these quotas out there that limit the production of peanuts and by limiting the production of peanuts keep the price of peanuts higher than they otherwise should be? What is there that would tell the people in Washington that they ought to be in the middle of developing these quotas.

I think the kicker in this whole argument is who owns the quotas, these quotas that have been passed down from generation to generation. These quotas limit the amount of peanuts that can be grown and tell the peanut owners, they literally tell the peanut owner how high the price is going to be because the more they limit the number of pounds of peanuts that are grown, the higher the price goes. So by limiting the price, they have kicked the price all the way up to \$650 a ton in the United States, where in other countries we find and in the world markets we find the price is actually \$350 a ton.

I heard some arguments today like, well, the Freedom to Farm Act was passed last year. I think every Representative in this House understands that the peanut program was virtually untouched in that compared to other farm programs that were weaned off of these subsidy. And the reason for that, of course, was that vote was very close, and in order to provide the votes necessary to pass the bill, peanuts were left alone, along with the sugar products.

I heard another argument, the other argument went like this, that person held up a product, and they said, look, even if the price of peanuts comes down, these companies are not going to lower the price to the consumer. I have to tell you, I am a home builder. I come out of the home building business. I find that argument to be borderline ridiculous because, if somebody said to me in the home building business, well, starting tomorrow you get the siding for these houses free, would that mean that I am going to charge the same price to my consumer even if I did not have to pay for some of the products going into the house? Of course not. We would have been able to produce the houses at a lower cost if the siding would not have cost us anything as a company or if the siding would have been free.

The argument that somehow, if the price of peanuts comes down, the price of this jar of peanut butter will not be affected just does not add up in a free market society and the kind of society that we live in today. I cannot put much credence in that particular argument.

I think, to wrap it up, we should talk about what this is really all about. It is not really all about the U.S. Government and quotas and these regulations. It is about hard-working families in this great Nation of ours that work very hard to earn their money. And typically they get up every morning of

the week and go to work but before they go to work they pack lunches either for themselves or the kids. Many times these lunches include peanut butter or candy or other peanut related products.

What this is really all about is asking these hard-working families that go to work five days a week when they pack those lunches in the morning to pay more than they otherwise should be asked to pay because of regulations of the U.S. Government.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. My home State of North Carolina ranks third nationally in the production of peanuts. I want to appeal to my colleagues' sense of justice, fairness and equity as we toy with the livelihood of many of my constituents who do not think they are on charity but feel they are working every day. This amendment does nothing to lower the consumer prices. Today's peanut prices are lower, not higher than they have been for the last 10 years.

Remember too that the farm price of the peanut, that the real price of the peanut as it goes to the farmers is only 26 percent of the total price, 26 percent. Where does that other 74 percent go? Yet you are picking on those people who are contributing less than one-fourth, not much more than one-fourth of the total price. Again, we did reform. We did reform, contrary to what has been said. Perhaps not the reform we wanted, but there was reform to the peanut program. We lowered the price of the peanut farmer. We lowered the amount of the quota; therefore, it should not have been, as you say, that we did nothing. Those pounds were reduced and therefore the family farmer expected that you will live toward that commitment.

I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, in regard to whether or not what we did last year had any effect on farmers, I would like to insert into the RECORD a letter from the Steventville Production Credit Association that stated if we did the 10-percent reduction last year in the support we would lose 36.1 percent of our farmers. We lost 34.42.

Also when we talk about prices to consumers, is it not interesting that in Mexico and in Canada, they pay \$2.55 in Mexico, \$2.72 for an 18 ounce equivalent jar of peanut butter. In the United States, our consumers get at \$2.10. Yet our consumers pay this outlandish price to producers for peanuts.

Let us talk about the M&Ms again. When we start talking about the

consumer, there are 25 grams of peanuts in this. The price support is 30.1 cents per pound. That is 1 $\frac{2}{3}$ cents cost in this peanut. If you reduce it by 10 cents, you are correct. Those who have argued the consumer will benefit, the cost will go down by .168 percent. That would reduce this price in the vending machine in this Capitol building to 54.832 cents. I will introduce legislation to mint a 54.832 cent coin to make sure that the consumer gets the benefit of the gentleman's amendment. Vote no on the amendment.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time. I think the debate shows what is going to happen. There are those interests in the House that still want to hold on to the peanut support system.

I hope that this amendment serves one good purpose. Which is to point out that we can no longer afford to continue to do business in this institution as it has always been done. If we are really going to go to a supply and demand free enterprise economy, we have got to wean ourselves from the subsidy systems of the last 63 years. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the Neumann-Kanjorski amendment.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CHAMBLISS], in the heart of peanut country.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, let me just very quickly respond to my good friend from Wisconsin who I agree with on so many issues but on this one I must disagree with him very vehemently.

I look at the jar of peanut butter that you hold up and you say that the peanut program adds 33 cents to the cost of that peanut butter jar. Let me tell you that the amount of peanuts that goes to the farmer that is in that jar of peanuts is 43 cents. So if your amendment reduces the amount of money by 33 cents, then the farmer is going to get 10 cents out of that peanut jar. So somewhere along the way the figures have been skewed.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. NORWOOD].

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I just want us to also recognize and ask the American consumer to recognize, do you want Mexican peanuts or do you want American peanuts? None of us disagree totally with some of the things they are saying. I say to my friend from Pennsylvania, we do not want your derved subsidy. But you should have done that in 1950. You forced this program on us for 60 years. Give them a chance to get out from under it. That is all they are asking to do.

Vote against this silly amendment.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, my friend from Texas held up his M&Ms awhile ago. We share a very favorite candy here and a hope folks eat a lot of it because it contains good American

peanuts. I went back and bought this bag of candy a minute ago in the cloakroom. I did not get as good a deal as my friend from Texas. I paid 75 cents for this. But I asked Helen back there, I said, Helen, we reduced the price of peanuts 10 percent last year. Has the price of candy gone down any to you from last year? She said absolutely not. It is the same price. But here we are arguing again that this support price program inflates the cost of products to consumers.

It is just not true, Mr. Chairman. The average peanut farm in Georgia is 98 acres. That is not the big corporate farm, the big rich farmer that lives out of State that my friend from Pennsylvania has reference to. In fact, in last year's farm bill, we produced a no net cost program, a program that is more market oriented because we eliminated all those out-of-State quota holders. They are no longer going to be eligible to participate in the program.

At the same time we provided a safety net for our farmers, the small farmers in my area which number about 7,500 plus the other small farmers throughout the South that depend upon the peanut program. We made a deal. We made a deal in April 1996 with the 1996 farm bill. It expires in 7 years. Let us let it work.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Neumann/Kanjorski amendment to establish a maximum market price for peanut sales of \$550 per ton.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment attempts to keep our promise to the American people to reform the peanut program, one of a number of inappropriate and outdated subsidies.

While last year's Farm Act, better known as the "Fair Act" gave farmers of agricultural commodities greatly expanded flexibility, removed the heavy hand of government, and reduced government payments to farmers; the peanut program continues to waste taxpayer's dollars.

The sole beneficial peanut provision for consumers in the farm bill—the 10 percent price reduction, sold to Congress as reform, has been severely undercut by the Department of Agriculture's deliberate reduction in the national marketing quota for peanuts. As implemented, the peanut program completely ignores the needs of consumers for more reasonable peanut prices.

Under the current system it is up to the USDA to project what the domestic consumption of peanuts will be and set a marketing quota. In the past the USDA has underestimated the quota creating an artificial shortage of peanuts and thus raising the price. By creating an artificial shortage, USDA has effectively denied the promised reduction in the price of peanuts under the reform provision contained in the farm bill.

This amendment follows through with our commitment to reform the peanut program. It will ensure that the Secretary of Agriculture provides the small measure of reform that was promised in the Farm bill.

I urge all my colleagues to support this important amendment.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I want to urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment, not only because it is a sound economic

decision, but also because it will ensure that consumers will have the opportunity to buy peanuts at a more reasonable price. Let me explain:

By reducing the load rate from \$610 per ton to \$550 per ton, the amendment forces the Secretary of Agriculture to provide a measure of the reform that was promised in the 1996 Farm bill.

Just as was then predicted, the USDA has administered the peanut program so as to create an artificial shortage of peanuts by reducing the national production of quota peanuts.

A limited national supply of peanuts has ensured that the so-called price reduction is rendered meaningless.

The General Accounting Office has determined that the peanut program inflates the price that consumers pay for peanuts and peanut products by as much as one half billion dollars every year, which is \$3 billion over the 6 remaining years of the farm bill.

The artificial government price inflation translates to an extra 33 cents per 18-ounce jar of peanut butter. This extra cost can be especially significant for low-income families that would otherwise substitute peanuts for more expensive sources of protein.

While some proponents of the current peanut program argue that manufacturers will keep any savings from a reduction in the loan level, what seems to happen is that the retail price of peanut butter closely tracks the movement of peanut prices. Between 1991 and 1993, for example, when the price of shelled peanuts dropped three cents per pound, the retail price of peanut butter dropped from \$2.15 to \$1.79.

If you are concerned about consumers and this includes virtually all the parents of young children, the U.S. peanut industry, and good government, I encourage you to vote for this peanut program amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 185, noes 242, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 314]
AYES—185

Allen	Christensen	Engel
Andrews	Clay	English
Archer	Clement	Ensign
Armey	Collins	Eshoo
Barr	Conyers	Fattah
Barrett (WI)	Cook	Fawell
Bass	Cox	Foglietta
Berman	Coyne	Forbes
Bilbray	Crane	Fox
Blagojevich	Danner	Frank (MA)
Blumenauer	Davis (IL)	Franks (NJ)
Boehkert	DeFazio	Frelinghuysen
Boehner	DeGette	Gallegly
Borski	DeLauro	Ganske
Brown (CA)	DeLay	Gekas
Brown (OH)	Deutsch	Gibbons
Burton	Dickey	Gillmor
Callahan	Doggett	Gilman
Campbell	Dooley	Goodling
Cannon	Doyle	Goss
Capps	Dreier	Greenwood
Cardin	Duncan	Gutierrez
Castle	Ehlers	Hall (OH)
Chabot	Ehrlich	Hayworth

Hinchey	McDermott	Rush
Hobson	McGovern	Ryun
Hoekstra	McHale	Salmon
Holden	McHugh	Sanders
Horn	McIntosh	Sanford
Hostettler	McNulty	Sawyer
Hulshof	Meehan	Schumer
Hutchinson	Menendez	Sensenbrenner
Inglis	Miller (FL)	Shadegg
Jackson (IL)	Moakley	Shaw
Johnson (CT)	Moran (KS)	Shays
Kanjorski	Morella	Sherman
Kasich	Murtha	Shuster
Kelly	Nadler	Skaggs
Kennedy (MA)	Neal	Slaughter
Kennelly	Neumann	Smith (NJ)
Kim	Northup	Smith, Adam
Kind (WI)	Obey	Smith, Linda
King (NY)	Olver	Snowbarger
Klug	Pallone	Souder
Knollenberg	Pappas	Strickland
Kolbe	Pascarell	Sununu
Kucinich	Paul	Tauscher
LaFalce	Payne	Taylor (MS)
Lantos	Petri	Tiahrt
LaTourette	Pitts	Tierney
Lazio	Porter	Upton
Levin	Portman	Velazquez
LoBiondo	Pryce (OH)	Vento
Lofgren	Quinn	Visclosky
Lowe	Ramstad	Wamp
Luther	Regula	Waters
Maloney (CT)	Rivers	Waxman
Maloney (NY)	Roemer	Weldon (PA)
Manzullo	Rohrabacher	Weygand
Markey	Ros-Lehtinen	White
Mascara	Roukema	Wolf
McCarthy (NY)	Royce	

NOES—242

Abercrombie	Dixon	Kilpatrick
Ackerman	Doolittle	Kingston
Aderholt	Dunn	Klecza
Bachus	Edwards	Klink
Baesler	Emerson	LaHood
Baker	Etheridge	Lampson
Baldacci	Evans	Largent
Ballenger	Everett	Latham
Barcia	Ewing	Leach
Barrett (NE)	Farr	Lewis (CA)
Bartlett	Fazio	Lewis (GA)
Bateman	Filner	Lewis (KY)
Becerra	Flake	Linder
Bentsen	Foley	Lipinski
Bereuter	Ford	Livingston
Berry	Fowler	Lucas
Bilirakis	Frost	Manton
Bishop	Furse	Martinez
Bliley	Gephardt	Matsui
Blunt	Gilchrist	McCarthy (MO)
Bonilla	Goode	McCollum
Bonior	Goodlatte	McCreery
Bono	Gordon	McDade
Boswell	Graham	McInnis
Boucher	Granger	McIntyre
Boyd	Green	McKeon
Brady	Gutknecht	McKinney
Brown (FL)	Hall (TX)	Meek
Bryant	Hamilton	Metcalfe
Bunning	Hansen	Mica
Burr	Harman	Millender-
Buyer	Hastert	McDonald
Calvert	Hastings (FL)	Miller (CA)
Camp	Hastings (WA)	Minge
Canady		Mink
Carson		Mollohan
Chambliss		Moran (VA)
Chenoweth		Myrick
Clayton		Nethercutt
Clyburn		Ney
Coble		Norwood
Coburn		Nussle
Combust		Oberstar
Condit		Ortiz
Cooksey		Owens
Costello		Oxley
Cramer		Packard
Crapo		Parker
Cubin		Pastor
Cummings		Paxon
Cunningham		Pease
Davis (FL)		John
Davis (VA)		Johnson (WI)
Deal		Johnson, E. B.
Delahunt		Johnson, Sam
Dellums		Jones
Diaz-Balart		Kaptur
Dicks		Kennedy (RI)
Dingell		Kildee

Price (NC)	Shimkus	Thornberry
Radanovich	Sisisky	Thune
Rahall	Skeen	Thurman
Rangel	Skelton	Torres
Redmond	Smith (MI)	Towns
Reyes	Smith (OR)	Trafficant
Riggs	Smith (TX)	Turner
Riley	Snyder	Walsh
Rodriguez	Solomon	Watkins
Rogan	Spence	Watt (NC)
Rogers	Spratt	Watts (OK)
Rothman	Stabenow	Weldon (FL)
Roybal-Allard	Stearns	Weller
Sabo	Stenholm	Wexler
Sanchez	Stokes	Whitfield
Sandlin	Stump	Wicker
Saxton	Stupak	Wise
Scarborough	Talent	Woolsey
Schaefer, Dan	Tanner	Wynn
Schaffer, Bob	Tauzin	Yates
Scott	Taylor (NC)	Young (FL)
Serrano	Thomas	
Sessions	Thompson	

NOT VOTING—7

Barton	Molinari	Young (AK)
Cejdenson	Schiff	
Gonzalez	Stark	

□ 1701

Mrs. CHENOWETH and Mr. CUMMINGS changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mrs. KELLY, Mr. RYUN, and Mr. CHRISTENSEN changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I take this time simply to talk about something that has not at all been addressed today. I want to talk about something I intended to talk about but have been precluded from doing so under the rule.

Rural Members will already know what I am talking about, but I really would ask urban Members to listen for a moment to understand what it is I am going to say. We are debating an agriculture appropriation bill which can provide some help to rural communities. But, in fact, we are operating under the handicap of national farm policy.

We have, I believe, for a number of administrations, the previous two and this one, which are essentially anti-rural and which are driving farmers to the wall. And I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues what I think is a very important study done by an Oklahoma University scientist.

I have an article here by a reporter by the name of Joel Dyer called "Harvest of Rage: How the Rural Crisis Fuels the Anti-Government Movement." I would just like to talk with my colleagues for a moment about some of the points that are raised by this article.

This article points out that suicide is by far the leading cause of death on American family farms and that those suicides are a direct result of economic

distress. This article points out a number of things, as follows: It says, for instance, "Many debt-ridden farm families will become more suspicious of government as their self-worth, their sense of belonging, their hope for the future deteriorate. These families are torn by divorce, domestic violence, and alcoholism. There is a loss of relationship of these communities to the State and the Federal Government. We have communities that are made up now of collectively depressed individuals, and the symptoms of that community depression are similar to what you would find in someone that has a long-term chronic depression."

The article then goes on to point out that "The United States has lost more than 700,000 small to medium-sized family farms since 1980 and that this loss is a greater crisis than was even the Great Depression, if you live in rural America."

It then goes on to say, "By the tens of thousands, some of these same farmers are being recruited by the antigovernment militia movement. Some are being enlisted by the Freeman and Christian identity groups that compromise the most violent components of this revolution in the heartland."

It then goes on to say, "The main cause for the growth of these violent and anti-government groups is economic, and the best example of this is the farm crisis. Men and women who were once the backbone of our culture have declared war on the government, which they blame for their pain and suffering, and not without some cause."

Then the article goes on and says the following: "Losing a farm does not happen overnight. It can often take 4 to 6 years. By the end, these families are victims of chronic long-term stress. Once a person is to that point, there are only a few things they can do."

It then goes on to point out the following: "To lose a farm is to lose part of one's own identity. There is probably no other occupation that has the potential for defining one's self so completely. Those who have gone through the loss of a family farm compare their grief to a death in the family, one of the hardest experiences in life."

And then it goes on to say that "Because of those economic stresses, it is no wonder that many in rural America are falling prey to some of the outlandish theories of some of these anti-government groups."

I simply take the time in quoting a few paragraphs from this story, which I am going to insert in the RECORD in full, to ask Members, especially from urban areas, to understand that we have an incredible crisis in rural America which is not just affecting farmers, it is affecting whole communities, it is affecting a whole way of life. And, with all due respect to the leadership of both parties, if we do not adopt a farm policy which is substantially different than that being followed by any of the

past three administrations, we run the risk of seeing this despair grow deeper, we run the risk of seeing this despair in turn create even more potential for violence. And I do not think any of us on either side of the aisle want to see that happen.

I would simply ask that after this bill is passed, my colleagues understand that until far greater changes are made in American farm programs, we will be complicit in the growth of these anti-government and sometimes violent movements in America.

I urge us to recognize the need to do everything we can to turn that trend in the other direction.

HARVEST OF RAGE

(By Joel Dyer)

It's two in the morning when the telephone rings waking Oklahoma City psychologist Glen Wallace. The farmer on the other end of the line has been drinking and is holding a loaded gun to his head. The distressed man tells Wallace that his farm is to be sold at auction within a few days. He goes on to explain that he can't bear the shame he has brought to his family and that the only way out is to kill himself.

Within hours Wallace is at the farm. This time the farmer agrees to go into counseling; this time no one dies. Unfortunately, that's not always the case. Wallace has handled hundreds of these calls through AG-LINK, a farm crisis hotline, and many times the suicide attempts are successful. According to Mona Lee Brock, another former AG-LINK counselor, therapists in Oklahoma alone make more than 150 on-site suicide interventions with farmers each year. And Oklahoma has only the third highest number of farm suicides in the nation, trailing both Montana and Wisconsin.

A study conducted in 1989 at Oklahoma State University determined suicide is by far the leading cause of death on America's family farms, and that they are the direct result of economic stress.

As heartwrenching as those statistics are, they also are related to a much broader issue. Those who have watched the previously strong family farm communities wither have seen radical, anti-government groups and militias step in all across the country, and especially in the Midwest.

As far back as 1989, Wallace—then director of Rural Mental Health for Oklahoma—was beginning to see the birth pangs of today's heartland revolt. In his testimony before a U.S. congressional committee examining rural development, Wallace warned that farm-dependent rural areas were falling under a "community psychosis."

"Many debt-ridden farm families will become more suspicious of government, as their self-worth, their sense of belonging, their hope for the future deteriorates. . . . These families are torn by divorce, domestic violence, alcoholism. There is a loss of relationships of these communities to the state and federal government.

"We have communities that are made up now of collectively depressed individuals, and the symptoms of that community depression are similar to what you would find in someone that has a long term chronic depression."

Wallace went on to tell the committee that if the rural economic system remained fragile, which it has, the community depression could turn into a decade's long social and cultural psychosis, which he described as "delayed stress syndrome."

In 1989, Wallace could only guess how this community psychosis would eventually express itself. He believes this transition is now a reality.

"We knew the anti-government backlash was just around the corner, but we didn't know exactly what form it would take. You can't treat human beings in a society the way farmers have been treated without them organizing and fighting back. It was just a matter of time."

THE RURAL SICKNESS

"I don't even know if I should say this," says Wallace regarding the explosion that destroyed the Alfred P. Murrah building killing 168 people, "but the minute that bomb went off, I suspected it as because of the farm crisis. These people (farmers) have suffered so much." Wallace, who has spent much of his professional life counseling depressed farmers, could only hope he was wrong.

The United States has lost more than 700,000 small- to medium-size family farms since 1980. For the 2 percent of America that makes its living from the land, this loss is a crisis that surpasses even the Great Depression. For the other 98 percent—those who gauge the health of the farm industry by the amount of food on our supermarket shelves—the farm crisis is a vaguely remembered headline from the last decade.

But not for long. The farms are gone, yet the farmers remain. They've been transformed into a harvest of rage, fueled by the grief of their loss and blown by the winds of conspiracy and hate-filled rhetoric.

By the tens of thousands they are being recruited by the anti-government militia movement. Some are being enlisted by the Freeman and Christian Identity groups that comprise the most violent components of this revolution of the heartland.

Detractors of these violent groups such as Morris Dees of the Southern Poverty Law Center blame them for everything from the Oklahoma City bombing to the formation of militia organizations to influencing Pat Buchanan's rhetoric. They may be right.

But, the real question remains unanswered. Why has a religious and political ideology that has existed in sparse numbers since the 1940s, suddenly—within the last 15 years—become the driving force in the rapidly growing anti-government movement which Dees estimates has five million participants ranging from tax protesters to armed militia members?

The main cause for the growth of these violent anti-government groups is economic, and the best example of this is the farm crisis. What was for two decades a war of economic policy has become a war of guns and bombs and arson.

At the center of this storm is the "Justice" movement, a radical vigilante court system, a spin-off of central Wisconsin's Posse Comitatus system of the 1980s, and which will likely affect all our lives on some level in the future. It may have touched us already in the form of the Oklahoma City bombing.

Freeman/Identity common-law courts are being convened in back rooms all across America, and sentences are being delivered. Trials are being held on subjects ranging from the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms' handling of Waco to a person's sexual preference or race. And the sentences are all the same—death.

We may never prove the Oklahoma City bombing was the result of a secret common-law court, but we can show it was the result of some kind of sickness, a "madness" in the rural parts of our nation. Unless we move quickly to address the economic problems which spawned this "madness," we are likely entering the most violent time on American soil since the Civil War.

Men and women who were once the backbone of our culture have declared war on the

government they blame for their pain and suffering—and not without some cause.

THE ECONOMICS OF HATE

The 1989 rural study showed that farmers took their own lives five times more often than they were killed by equipment accidents which, until the study, were considered to be the leading cause of death.

"These figures are probably very conservative," says Pat Lewis who directed the research. "We've been provided with information from counselors and mental health workers that suggests that many of the accidental deaths are, in reality, suicides."

Wallace, who was one of those mental health workers, agrees. "The known suicides are just a drop in the bucket. We have farmers crawling into their equipment and being killed so their families can collect insurance money and pay off the farm debt. They're dying in order to stop a foreclosure."

This economic stress has been caused by 20 years of government refusal to enforce the anti-trust laws which once protected the small farmer. Now, with only six to eight multi-national corporations controlling the American food supply, farmers and ranchers have no choice but to sell their products to these monopolies, often for less than their production costs. In 1917, wheat was \$2.14 a bushel. In the last five years prices have dipped as low as \$2.17 a bushel, yet costs are a hundred times higher now than then.

As if monopolies weren't enough of a problem, the federal government is allowed to increase the interest rates on its loans to troubled farmers to ridiculous figures, sometimes reaching more than 15 percent. And, as many bitter farmers will tell you, the only reason many of these loans exist is that the government's Farm Home Administration (FMHA) agents sought farmers out in the 70s encouraging them to take out loans. The government agents told them that the value of their farms was inflating faster than the current interest rates and that to turn down a loan was a poor business decision. During this time, FMHA lenders received bonuses and trips based on how much money they lent. But when land values tumbled in the 80s, the notes were called and the farms foreclosed. Ironically, bonuses are now awarded based on an agent's ability to clean up the books by foreclosing on bad loans.

In Oklahoma, the government is foreclosing on Josh Powers, a farmer who took out a \$98,000 loan at 8 percent in 1969. That same loan today has an interest rate of 15 percent—almost twice as high as when the note was first issued. The angry farmer claims that he's paid back more than \$150,000 against the loan, yet he still owes \$53,000 on the note. Says Powers, "They'll spend millions to get me, a little guy, off the land—while Neil Bush just walks away from the savings and loan scandal."

The 1987 Farm Bill allowed for loans such as this to be "written down," allowing farmers to bring their debt load back in line with the diminished value of their farm. The purpose of the bill was to keep financially strapped farmers on the land. But in a rarely equaled display of government bungling, this debt forgiveness process was left to the whims of county bureaucrats with little or no banking experience.

As Wallace points out, "Imagine the frustration when a small farmer sees the buddy or family member of one of these county agents getting a \$5 million write-down at the same time the agent is foreclosing on them (the small farmer) for a measly \$20,000. It happens all the time. When these little farmers complain, they're given this telephone number in Washington. It's become a big joke in farm country. I've even tried to call it for years. You get this recording and nobody ever calls you back.

"These farmers are literally at the mercy of these county bureaucrats and some of them are just horrible people . . . We've had to intervene several times to keep farmers from killing them."

Most Americans are unaware that the farm crisis isn't over. According to counselor Brock, things are as bad now for the family farmer as they were in the 80s. She notes that recent USDA figures that show the economic health of farms improving are, in fact, skewed by the inclusion of large farming cooperatives and corporate farms. Brock also says that "state hotlines are busier than ever as the small family farmer is being pushed off the land."

According to Wallace thousands of people have died as a result of the farm crisis, but not just from suicides. The psychologist says the number of men and women who have died of heart attacks and other illnesses—directly as a result of stress brought on by foreclosure—dwarfs the suicide numbers.

These deaths are often viewed as murder in farm country.

This spring, I went to western Oklahoma and met with a group of farmers who have become involved in the Freeman/Identity movement. This meeting demonstrated not only their belief that the government is to blame for their loss, but also the politics that evolve from that belief.

"They murdered her," says Sam Conners (not his real name) referring to the government. The room goes silent as the gray haired 60-year-old stares out the window of his soon-to-be-foreclosed farmhouse. In his left hand he holds a photograph of his wife who died of a heart attack in 1990. "She fought 'em as long as she could," he continues, "but she finally gave out. Even when she was lying there is a coma and I was visiting her every day—bringing my nine-year-old boy to see his mamma everyday—they wouldn't cut me no slack. All they cared about was getting me off my land so they could take it. But I tell you now, I'm never gonna' give up. They'll have to carry me off feet first and they probably will."

The other men in the room sit quietly as they listen to Conners' story, their eyes alternating between their dirty work boots and the angry farmer. The conversation comes to a sudden halt with a "click" from a nearby tape recorder. Conners looks clumsy as he tries to change the small tape in the micro-cassette recorder. His thick earth-stained fingers seem poorly designed for the delicate task. "I apologize for recording you," he says to this reporter. "We just have to be careful."

With their low-tech safeguard back in place, one of the other men begins to speak. Tim, a California farmer who looks to be in his early 30's, describes his plight: another farm, another foreclosure, more anti-government sentiment. Only this time, the story is filled with the unmistakable religious overtones of the Christian Identity movement; one world government, Satan's Jewish bankers, the federal reserve, a fabricated Holocaust, a coming holy war. "This kind of injustice is going on all over the country," says Tim. "It's what happened to the folks in Montana (referring to the Freeman) and it's what happened to me. That's why LeRoy (Schwelter, the leader of the Justus Township Freeman) was arrested. He was teaching people how to keep their farms and ranches. He was showing them that the government isn't constitutional. They foreclose on us so they can control the food supply. What they want to do is control the Christians."

THE MIND OF THE FARMER

Losing a farm doesn't happen overnight. It can often take four to six years from the time a farm family first gets into financial

trouble. By the end, says Wallace, these families are victims of chronic long term stress. "Once a person is to that point," he explains, "there are only a few things that can happen."

"There are basically four escape hatches for chronic long term stress. One, a person seeks help—usually through a church or the medical community. Two, they can't take the pain and they commit suicide. They hurt themselves. Three, they become psychotic. They lose touch with reality. They basically go crazy. And last, they become psychotic and turn their anger outward. They decide that since they hurt, they're going to make others hurt. These are the people that wind up threatening or even killing their lenders of FMHA agents. They're also the ones that are most susceptible to a violent anti-government message."

Unfortunately, psychotic personalities looking for support can find it in the wrong places. "Any group," says Wallace, "can fill the need for support. Not just good ones. Identity, militias or any anti-government group can come along and fill that role. Add their influence to a personality that is already violent towards others and you have an extremely dangerous individual."

No one knows how many members of the 700,000 farm families who have already lost their land or the additional hundreds of thousands that are still holding on to their farms under extreme duress have fallen prey to this violet psychosis, but those who have watched this situation develop agree the number is growing.

Wallace says that most people don't understand the mind set of farmers. "They ask, why don't farmers just get a new job or why does losing a farm cause someone to kill themselves or someone else?" Another rural psychologist, Val Farmer, has written often on this subject. In an article in the *Iowa Farmer Today*, he explained why farm loss affects its victims so powerfully.

"To lose a farm is to lose part of one's own identity. There is probably no other occupation that has the potential for defining one's self so completely. Those who have gone through the loss of a family farm compare their grief to a death in the family, one of the hardest experiences in life.

"Like some deaths, the loss may have been preventable. If a farmer blames himself, the reaction is guilt. Guilt can stem from a violation of family trust. By failing to keep the farm in the family, he loses that for which others had sacrificed greatly. The loss of the farm also affects the loss of the opportunity to pass on the farm to a child. Guilt can also arise from failing to anticipate the conditions that eventually placed the farm at risk: government policy, trade policies, world economy, prices, weather.

"On the other hand, if the loss is perceived to have been caused by the actions and negligence of others, then the farmer is racked with feelings of anger, bitterness and betrayal. This feeling extends to lenders, government, the urban public or the specific actions of a particular individual or institution."

"The stress intensifies with each new setback: failure to cash flow, inability to meet obligations, loan refusal, foreclosure notices, court appearances and farm auctions." Farmer concludes that "these people start grasping at straws—anything to stave off the inevitable."

PREYING ON THE SICK

Wallace agrees with Farmer and believes the anti-government message is one such straw. "When you reach the point where you're willing to kill yourself, anything sounds good. When these groups come along and tell a farmer that it's not his fault, it's

the government's fault or the bank's fault, they're more than ready to listen. These groups are preying on sick individuals."

It's no wonder that groups like the Freeman, We the People and Christian Identity have found such enthusiastic support. They preach a message of hope for desperate men and women.

The Freeman offer their converts a chance to save the farm through a quagmire of constitutional loopholes and their complicated interpretations of the Uniform Commercial Code. Their legal voodoo may seem nuts to a suburban dweller, but to a desperate farmer they offer a last hope to hang on to the land their grandfather homesteaded, a trust they intended to pass on to their children.

And just how crazy their rhetoric is remains to be seen. Not all in the legal community scoff at the Freeman's claims. Famed attorney Gerry Spence—who represented Randy Weaver, a survivor of Ruby Ridge—has stated that at least some of their interpretations of constitutional law are accurate. It will be years before the court system manages to sort out the truth from the myth, and only then provided it desires to scrutinize itself—something it historically has shown little stomach for.

Organizers of We the People told farmers they could receive windfalls of \$20 million or more from the federal government. They explained to their audiences—which sometimes reached more than 500—that they had won a Supreme Court judgment against the feds for allowing the country to go off the gold standard. They claimed that for a \$300 filing fee the desperate farmers could share in the riches.

The media has repeatedly described the exploits of Freeman/We the People members: millions in hot checks, false liens, refusal to leave land that has been foreclosed by the bank and sold at auction and plans to kidnap and possibly kill judges.

Members of the press, including the alternative press, have commented on the fact that what all these people seem to have in common is that they are unwilling to pay their bills.

The *Daily Oklahoman* quoted an official describing these anti-government groups as saying, "We are talking about people who are trying to legitimize being deadbeats and thugs by denying their responsibilities."

But that analysis is at best partially true and at worst dead wrong.

What most of these radical anti-government people have in common—and what most government officials refuse to acknowledge—is that they were, first and foremost, unable to pay their bills. It was only after being unable to pay that they took up the notion of being unwilling to pay.

These farmers are the canaries in the coal mine of America's economy. They are in effect monitoring the fallout from the ever widening "gap" between the classes. The canaries are dying and that bodes poorly for the rest of us in the mine.

Both Farmer and Wallace agree that, as a rule, farmers have an extremely strong and perhaps unhealthy sense of morality when it comes to paying their bills. They suffer from deep humiliation and shame when they can't fulfill their financial obligations.

Wallace says, "It's only natural that they would embrace an ideology that comes along and says they are not only not bad for failing to pay their debts but rather are morally and politically correct to not pay their debts. It's a message that provides instant relief from the guilt that's making them sick."

In much the same way, only more dangerous, Christian Identity offers a way out for stressed farm families. Identity teaches that Whites and native Americans are God's chosen people and that Jews are the seed of

Satan. Identity believers see a conspiracy of "Satan's army of Jews" taking control of banks, governments, media and most major corporations and destroying the family farm in order to control the food supply. They believe that we are at the beginning of a holy war where Identity followers must battle these international forces of evil and establish a new and "just" government based on the principles of the Bible's Old Testament as they interpret it. They become a soldier in a holy war under orders to not give up their land or money to the Jewish enemy.

AND JUSTICE FOR SOME

The renegade legal system known as the "Justice" movement is now estimated to be in more than 40 states. It seems to have as many variations as the fractional anti-government movement that created it. Some mainstream Patriots hold common-law courts at venues where the press and those accused of crimes are invited to attend. Sentences from these publicly held trials usually result in lawsuits, arrest warrants, judgments and liens being filed against public officials.

In Colorado, Attorney General Gail Norton has been just one of the targets of these courts. She's had millions of dollars worth of bogus liens filed against her. Across the nation, thousands of public officials including governors, judges, county commissioners and legislatures have been the targets of this new "paper terrorism." In most cases they are found guilty of cavorting with the enemy: the federal government.

Ironically, arresting those involved in this mainstream common law court revolution isn't easy. It's not because they can't be found; it's because they may not be doing anything illegal. Last month, Richard Wintory, the chief deputy of the Oklahoma attorney general's office, told the *Daily Oklahoman* that he could not say whether common-law court organizers had broken any laws.

The debate as to whether or not citizens have a constitutional right to convene grand juries and hold public trials will eventually be resolved. It's only one of the fascinating legal issues being raised by the heartland revolt. But there is a darker side to this vigilante court system, one that deals out death sentences in its quest to deliver justice and create a new and holy government.

In his book *Gathering Storm*, Dees describes Identity this way: "There is nothing 'goody, goody' or 'tender' about Identity. It is a religion, a form of Christianity, that few churchgoers would recognize as that of Jesus, son of a loving God. It is a religion on steroids. It is a religion whose god commands the death of race traitors, homosexuals, and other so-called children of Satan."

It is for this reason that the common law courts convened by those groups influenced by the Identity belief system are by far the most dangerous. Death sentences can be doled out for almost any conceivable transgression.

In the remote western Oklahoma farmhouse, Freeman/Identity farmers discussed the Justice movement. One man who had recently lost his farm to foreclosure explained their court system. "What you're seeing right now is just the beginning of taking back our country, the true Israel. The Bible says that we're to be a just people. Where is justice in this country? Our judges turn loose rapists and murderers and put farmers in jail. We're about justice. Why would anyone be afraid of that?"

"We're holding courts right now in every part of this land. We're finding people guilty and we're keeping records so we can carry out the sentences. It's the citizen's duty and

right to hold common law courts. It's the militia's job to carry out the sentences."

The farmer goes on to explain that Identity doesn't believe in prisons. He says that nearly all serious offenses are dealt with by capital punishment and that this punishment system is based on the Bible, the first 10 amendments to the Constitution and the Magna Carta. When asked how these death sentences would be carried out, he says, "There's a part of the militia that's getting ready to start working on that (death sentences). I think they're ready to go now. You'll start seeing it soon."

Perhaps we already have. Was the Oklahoma City bombing only the largest and most recent example? When asked, the men in the room state emphatically that they have no first hand knowledge of the bombing—even though some of them were questioned by the FBI within days of the deadly explosion. They say they don't condone it because so many innocent people died. But they agree that it may well have been the result of a secret court sentence. The court could have found the ATF guilty for any number of actions—including Waco and Ruby Ridge—and the militia foot soldiers, in this case McVeigh and Nichols, may have simply followed orders to carry out the sentence.

Whatever the case in Oklahoma City, it seems likely that this new and radical system of vigilante justice can't help but produce similar catastrophes.

The process that gave us that bomb was likely the result of the same stress-induced illness that is tearing our country apart one pipe bomb or burned-down church at a time. Comprehending and healing that illness is our only hope for creating a future free of more bombs, more death and destruction.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this motion. It is another delaying tactic. I urge a "no" vote on the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 125, noes 300, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 315]

AYES—125

Abercrombie	Dellums	Kanjorski
Ackerman	Deutsch	Kennedy (MA)
Allen	Dicks	Kennelly
Andrews	Dingell	Killdee
Baldacci	Dixon	Kilpatrick
Barrett (WI)	Doggett	Kind (WI)
Becerra	Edwards	Klecza
Berman	Engel	Klink
Blagojevich	Eshoo	Kucinich
Blumenauer	Evans	LaFalce
Bonior	Fattah	Lantos
Borski	Fazio	Levin
Boucher	Filner	Lewis (GA)
Brown (CA)	Flake	Lofgren
Brown (FL)	Foglietta	Lowe
Brown (OH)	Frank (MA)	Maloney (NY)
Clay	Frost	Manton
Clayton	Furse	Markey
Conyers	Gutierrez	Mascara
Coyne	Hastings (FL)	Matsui
Cummings	Hilliard	McCarthy (MO)
Davis (FL)	Hinche	McCarthy (NY)
Davis (IL)	Holden	McDermott
DeFazio	Hoyer	McGovern
DeGette	Jackson (IL)	McHale
Delahunt	Jefferson	McKinney
DeLauro	Johnson (WI)	McNulty

Meehan	Pastor
Millender-McDonald	Paul
Miller (CA)	Payne
Mink	Pelosi
Moakley	Pomeroy
Moran (VA)	Rangel
Nadler	Rodriguez
Neal	Rush
Oberstar	Sabo
Obey	Sanders
Oliver	Sandlin
Owens	Sawyer
Pallone	Schumer
Pascrell	Serrano
	Slaughter

NOES—300

Aderholt	Ewing
Archer	Farr
Armey	Fawell
Bachus	Foley
Baesler	Forbes
Baker	Ford
Ballenger	Fowler
Barcia	Fox
Barr	Franks (NJ)
Barrett (NE)	Frelinghuysen
Bartlett	Gallely
Bass	Ganske
Bateman	Gejdenson
Bentsen	Gekas
Bereuter	Gibbons
Berry	Gilchrest
Bilbray	Gillmor
Bilirakis	Gilman
Bishop	Goode
Bliley	Goodlatte
Blunt	Goodling
Boehlert	Gordon
Boehner	Goss
Bonilla	Graham
Bono	Granger
Boswell	Green
Boyd	Greenwood
Brady	Gutknecht
Bryant	Hall (OH)
Bunning	Hall (TX)
Burr	Hamilton
Burton	Hansen
Buyer	Harman
Callahan	Hastert
Calvert	Hastings (WA)
Camp	Hayworth
Campbell	Hefley
Canady	Hefner
Cannon	Herger
Capps	Hill
Cardin	Hilleary
Carson	Hinojosa
Castle	Hobson
Chabot	Hoekstra
Chambliss	Hooley
Chenoweth	Horn
Christensen	Hostettler
Clement	Houghton
Clyburn	Hulshof
Coble	Hunter
Coburn	Hutchinson
Collins	Hyde
Combest	Inglis
Condit	Istook
Cook	Jackson-Lee
Cooksey	(TX)
Costello	Jenkins
Cox	John
Cramer	Johnson (CT)
Crane	Johnson, E. B.
Crapo	Johnson, Sam
Cubin	Jones
Cunningham	Kaptur
Danner	Kasich
Davis (VA)	Kelly
Deal	Kim
DeLay	King (NY)
Diaz-Balart	Kingston
Dickey	Klug
Dooley	Knollenberg
Doollittle	Kolbe
Doyle	LaHood
Dreier	Lampson
Duncan	Largent
Dunn	Latham
Ehlers	LaTourette
Ehrlich	Lazio
Emerson	Leach
English	Lewis (CA)
Ensign	Lewis (KY)
Etheridge	Linder
Everett	Lipinski

Spratt
Stokes
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder

Shaw
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Traficant

Turner
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Barton	Kennedy (RI)	Stark
Gephardt	Molinari	Waters
Gonzalez	Schiff	Young (AK)

□ 1730

Mr. FARR of California changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. SCHUMER changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. CHABOT

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 22 offered by Mr. CHABOT:

Insert before the short title the following new section:

SEC. . None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to carry out section 203 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5623) or to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel who carry out a market program under such section.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHABOT] will be recognized for 5 minutes on behalf of his motion and a Member opposed will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHABOT].

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in the last Congress, in historic legislation, we overhauled the welfare system as it applied to poor people in this country. I think it was good legislation, we are working on it now, but it affected poor people.

There is one type of welfare that we have hardly touched in that Congress or this Congress and that is something called corporate welfare. Now corporate welfare affects the powerful, it affects the wealthy. We have hardly touched it.

One particularly egregious type of corporate welfare in my opinion is something called the market access program. Now some of the folks on the other side on this issue will argue that it was reformed. This is a program where we spend \$90 million a year in taxpayer money to advertise products overseas for trade associations and essentially for corporations.

Now the folks who favor this will say, well, we reformed it already, and

basically what was done is we changed the name of it from the market promotion program to the market access program. Big deal. That is essentially the reform that we did in the last Congress.

I mean, should corporations advertise their products overseas to promote trade? Of course they should. But who should pay for it; the taxpayers or the corporations and the trade associations that benefit? I would argue not the taxpayers, but the people who benefit, the corporations themselves, ought to pay for this. If they were using their own money, they would be very careful.

There is all kinds of examples where the money has been wasted. A good example was in the case where my colleagues probably remember the Marvin Gay song, and I think Gladys Knight and the Pips had it also: "I Heard It Through The Grapevine," the California raisins commercial. Well, money from this program was used to advertise for raisins over in Japan.

Now the problem is they did some surveys on this afterwards, and it turns out that they did absolutely no good at all. In fact, a lot of the people that saw the commercials, rather than think they were raisins, they thought they were potatoes. They actually scared small children.

Now would the corporations who would have benefited from this program, if they were using their own money, would they have done a little research so that they did not waste this money? Of course they would. But since they are using taxpayer money, the research was not done, the dollars were wasted.

They will argue, those who favor this program will say it creates jobs, but the real jobs it creates are government jobs or the bureaucrats in the department.

So let us end this program.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHABOT] but I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS].

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

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out we can export our products or we can export our jobs, and I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I simply rise in strong opposition to this amendment to cut a program which has been very successful in fighting subsidies that continue to be provided by our international trading competitors in agriculture. We have literally transformed this bill through debates on this floor over the last several years. This program was at one time authorized at \$350 million. It is now down to 90 million.

We are concentrating on small business. Of the 564 companies that are participating in this program, putting up equal amounts to match the Federal dollars, we now have 417 of them, small businesses as defined by the SBA.

We are doing away with the branded marketing concept. I regret that, frankly, but it had critics here and we did away with it.

But the GAO tells us that we need to do more of this, that we are being taken advantage of in the international market. Despite the fact that our ag exports have grown by 50 percent since 1990, we continue to find, in crop after crop, that foreign subsidies push our farmers out of markets.

We should not adopt this amendment.

I rise in opposition to the amendment and in support of this program.

There is probably no more important tool for export promotion than MAP throughout the United States and particularly in California.

I would ask the gentleman what his point is in offering this amendment.

Does he think we spend too much on MAP?

MAP was funded at \$200 million as recently as 5 years ago, and was authorized at one time for \$350 million.

I believe that was some recognition of the importance of market promotion to the American economy—a viewpoint buttressed not just by USDA but by the GAO who reported we should be doing far more of it in the face of enormous subsidies by our competitors.

Now it's down to a barebones \$90 million.

Does the gentleman want MAP funds to go to small companies? FAS says that 417 of the 564 companies participating in MAP qualify as small by the SBA definition.

Is the gentleman against branded product promotion by large companies?

FAS has reduced funding for brand promotion by large companies by 35 percent in 1996, 45 percent in 1997, and will eliminate it altogether in 1998.

Does the gentleman want to make sure that MAP funds don't just substitute for marketing efforts the company would have undertaken anyway?

It is a requirement of the program, and every dollar has to be matched by the company's own funds as well.

But in the gentleman's zeal to oppose so-called corporate welfare, he completely ignores the value of this program to our economy.

Agriculture exports climbed again last year, fiscal year 1996, to \$59.8 billion—up some \$19 billion or close to 50 percent since 1990.

In an average week this past year, U.S. producers, processors, and exporters shipped more than 1.1 billion dollars' worth of food and farm products to foreign markets, compared with about \$775 million per week at the start of this decade.

The overall export gains raised the fiscal year 1996 agricultural trade surplus to a new record of \$27.4 billion.

In the most recent comparisons among 11 major industries, agriculture ranked No. 1 as the leading positive contributor to the U.S. merchandise trade balance.

As domestic farm supports are reduced, export markets become even more critical for the economic well-being of our farmers and rural

communities, let alone the suburban and urban areas that depend upon the employment generated from increased trade.

Agriculture exports strengthen farm income.

Agriculture exports provide jobs for nearly a million Americans.

Agriculture exports generate nearly \$100 billion in related economic activity.

Agriculture exports produce a positive trade balance of nearly \$30 billion.

MAP is critical to U.S. agriculture's ability to develop, maintain, and expand export markets in the new post-GATT environment, and MAP is a proven success.

In California, MAP has been tremendously successful in helping promote exports of California citrus, raisins, walnuts, prunes, almonds, peaches, and other specialty crops.

We have to remember that an increase in agriculture exports means jobs: A 10-percent increase in agricultural exports creates over 13,000 new jobs in agriculture and related industries like manufacturing, processing, marketing, and distribution.

Where do those increased agriculture exports come from?

For every \$1 we invest in MAP, we reap a \$16 return in additional agriculture exports.

In short, the Market Promotion Program is a program that performs for American taxpayers.

I urge my colleagues to support American agriculture and oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that this program is really a waste and a travesty and a giveaway; my colleagues can pick whatever word they want. It should have been killed years ago, but MAP has more incarnations than Vishnu. In the congressional equivalent of the witness protection program, MAP performs so abysmally we had to change its name, not once, but twice, in order to hide the program from the taxpayer. When I got here it was called TEA, then MPP, and after three excoriating GAO reports and billions in corporate welfare giveaways, it became MAP. If my colleagues do not like the name, we can change it again, but what we should do is get rid of the program.

MAP and its forefathers have given 70 million to Sunkist, 40 million to Blue Diamond, 20 million to Sunsweet, 60 million to Gallo. We are figuring out ways to cut the budget and cannot cut this kind of corporate welfare? Of course, we can. One million dollars to McDonald's.

And then this. We are giving \$1 million to McDonald's to advertise overseas. Are there not better needs for our money than that?

And finally, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHABOT] mentioned, and my colleagues ought to listen to this one, it is one of the best they will hear, the California Raisin Advisory Board won a grant to introduce raisins to Japan. What a fiasco, using taxpayer funds, the ad "I heard it through the grapevine" claymation raisin campaign that won many awards in the United States.

But there will be no awards in Japan. First it turns out that these claymation raisins were not bilingual, so in Japan they were singing only in their native English. Second, Marvin Gay is unknown in Japan so the audience did not understand the song or get the pun. Third, since the Japanese have never seen raisins, it is not a product in Japan, they were baffled by these gargantuan vaudevillian dangerous dancing raisins. They thought they were dancing potatoes. And finally, the raisins had four fingers, which apparently is a bad omen in Japan. They frighten children.

Perhaps the raisin board would have done a little bit of market research if they were using their own money instead of the taxpayers'. Let us end this program once and for all.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment and in favor of the market access program that is being so very important to exports in America.

The Market Access Program is a \$90 million USDA cost-share program aimed at helping maintain, develop, and expand U.S. agriculture export markets.

The program was substantially reformed in the 1996 farm bill:

Participants contribute up to 50 percent or more toward program cost.

MAP is targeted toward small businesses, farmer cooperatives, and trade associations.

Requires funds to be used only to promote American grown and produced commodities and related products.

MAP is a key part of the new 7-year farm bill, which gradually reduces direct income support to farmers. Expanding exports is extremely important—exports now account for as much as one-third of domestic production. Export markets are extremely competitive, especially since other nations and the European Union greatly outspend U.S. promotion efforts.

In 1996, Missouri exported approximately 1.3 billion dollars' worth of agricultural products—soybeans, feedgrains, wheat, cotton, poultry, animals/meats—which sustained more than 22,000 jobs.

MAP has helped the agriculture sector become the largest positive contributor to the U.S. trade balance.

PROMOTING MISSOURI EXPORTS AND
PROTECTING JOBS

USDA'S MARKET ACCESS PROGRAM [MAP]

USDA's Market Access Program (MAP) has been a tremendous success in helping promote U.S. and Missouri agriculture. It has also helped protect jobs, counter subsidized foreign competition, and contribute to economic growth and an expanding tax base. As a cost-share program providing assistance to farmers and ranchers through their associations and cooperatives, and to related small

businesses, MAP continues to be of critical importance.

MAP IS IMPORTANT TO MISSOURI AGRICULTURE,
ECONOMY AND JOBS

Number of jobs: Nearly 1 in 6 Missouri Jobs Depend on Agriculture.

Number of farms: 105,000.

Value of agriculture production: Over \$4.5 billion.

Value of agriculture exports: More than \$1.2 billion.

Export-related jobs: Approximately 20,000.

MAP IS IMPORTANT TO U.S. AGRICULTURE,
ECONOMY AND JOBS

Agriculture largest single U.S. industry: Accounts for 16 percent gross domestic product.

Exports key to continued economic growth.

Value of U.S. agriculture exports: Record \$60 billion in 1996.

U.S. agriculture trade surplus: Record \$30 billion in 1996.

U.S. agriculture export-related jobs: Over 1 million American jobs.

MAP HELPS MEET SUBSIDIZED FOREIGN
COMPETITION

The global marketplace is still characterized by subsidized foreign competition. The European Union (EU) maintains a 10 to 1 advantage over the U.S. in terms of export subsidies. Many other countries and the EU also support industry market development and promotion efforts to encourage exports. MAP is one of the few programs allowed under the Uruguay Round Agreement to help U.S. agriculture and American workers meet such foreign competition.

MAP IS A SUCCESSFUL PARTNERSHIP WITH
BROAD PUBLIC SUPPORT

Serves as "Buy American" Program by promoting only American-grown and produced agricultural commodities and related products.

Strongly supported by 75 percent of American public based on 1996 national election day exit poll conducted by Penn & Schoen Associates, Inc.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER].

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. It would be foolish and negligent of us to cut one of our most successful programs that provides Americans with needed jobs, increases American earnings and significantly stimulates our national and local economies. For every dollar spent on value-added products under the market access program, our Nation receives a return of \$7.61. This means we are receiving a 761 percent return on our MAP investment. This program is a major success. Remember, the purpose of the market access program is not to subsidize but to open markets for American small businesses.

Mr. Chairman, this program works, and it works well. I urge my colleagues to support the market access program and vote "no" on the Chabot-Schumer amendment.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE].

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support to eliminate this program which uses taxpayers' dollars to subsidize the overseas advertising budget of major corporations.

Since 1986 this program has spent several billion dollars in this way and, incredibly, has even supported advertising by foreign-owned corporations, including some in Tokyo and in Paris. Studies from several government offices and groups across the political spectrum have blasted the MAP. A U.S. General Accounting Office study reported that MAP funding goes to corporations that have no need for taxpayer funds to support their products.

I urge an "aye" vote.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WICKER].

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

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the market access program and against the Chabot amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment to eliminate funding for USDA's Market Access Program.

The Market Access Program, or MAP, has been a tremendous success in maintaining and expanding U.S. agriculture exports, competing with foreign subsidized agriculture, and protecting American jobs.

This is true across the country as well as in my home state of Mississippi. With the help of MAP, Mississippi agriculture exports—including cotton, soybeans, poultry, rice, livestock, and animal products—reached nearly a billion dollars last year. It helped provide nearly 14,000 jobs statewide. This not only strengthened farm income, it provided a significant economic boost to many local communities.

The program helped promote record U.S. agricultural exports of nearly \$60 billion last year, contributing to a record trade surplus of almost \$30 billion, and providing jobs for over one million Americans. Every billion dollars in exports helps create as many as 17,000 new jobs.

MAP is a cost-share program. Participants are required to contribute as much as 50 percent of their own resources to be eligible for the program. In addition, the program remains a key part of the 1996 farm bill and its 7-year commitment to our farmers and ranchers. The program remains critical to our effort to open up foreign markets and to combat subsidized foreign competition. According to the U.S. Trade Representative, more than 46 countries continue to use trade barriers which limit or restrict U.S. agriculture exports. For example, the European Union spent nearly \$10 billion on export subsidies last year, while the U.S. spent less than \$150 million. Eliminating MAP would hurt our farmers and ranchers, as well as American workers whose jobs depend on agricultural exports.

The choice is simple. We can either export our products or we can export our jobs.

I encourage my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

□ 1745

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR].

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I say to the Members, hey, wake up and smell the coffee. What do Members think this program is all about?

Members sit there and watch television, where Juan Valdez is wandering around the supermarket selling Colombian coffee, where the Greeks are selling olive oil, where the French are selling wine. Where do Members think those countries are paying for those products to get into our markets?

How are we going to do world trade unless we can reach out and sell our products? Agriculture has the best balance of trade, \$30 billion in surplus. Support this program. Members are foolish to cut us off and shoot us in the feet and not allow American products to be sold abroad. Smell the coffee. Defeat this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Market Access Program [MAP] is critical to the future health of our Nation's agriculture. If we cut MAP, we will pull the rug out from underneath American farmers.

First, the Market Access Program benefits American agriculture. Every dollar spent by M.A.P. provides several dollars in export sales. For fruits and vegetables alone, each dollar of MAP creates \$5 dollars in export sales. MAP benefits all American agriculture: grains, livestock, fruits and vegetables, cotton—all benefit from MAP.

Thanks in part to MAP, U.S. agriculture exports are the single largest positive contributor to the U.S. trade balance. Despite years of trade deficits, agricultural trade continues to run a surplus—\$27 billion this year alone. This year alone the United States will export 457 billion in agricultural goods—that's double the size of exports when the program started in 1985.

Second, MAP is very small in comparison to what other countries spend on export promotion. Europe alone spends \$350 million a year on export promotion programs—over three times the amount we spend in our country. Fourteen other countries—including Australia, Brazil, Canada, Japan, and Norway—spend a total of \$400 million per year on export promotion programs. When you buy Juan Valdez coffee, Greek olive oil, or French wine, you're buying a product that profited from foreign export promotion.

Third, some say MAP is a subsidy—but that just isn't true. MAP gives first priority of funding to small businesses, cooperatives, and trade associations. No MAP funding may supplement or replace private sector funding; it can only be in addition to private-sector funding. MAP funding is matched by up to 50 percent, or sometimes more, by participants. MAP funding has been steadily reduced, from \$300 million in 1985 to less than \$100 million today.

American agriculture depends more on exports than ever before—don't kill a program that works. Vote against this amendment.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BASS].

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, I think companies such as Sunkist, Dole, Gallo, and M&M Mars are capable of smelling the coffee themselves. If there ever was a program that defines welfare for corporations, this is it, \$90 million annually for corporations to conduct advertising abroad.

Mr. Chairman, if we ever wanted to cast a vote to end corporate welfare,

this is it. I urge an "aye" vote on the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired on the proponents' side of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHABOT].

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT].

(Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH].

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. This program helps American farmers to find markets in a very competitive global environment marketplace. We are not supporting our farmers nearly to the degree Europe is. I would also like to suggest to the proponents of this amendment that they get some new material. That California raisin story is getting very, very old.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Chabot amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have stood before you many times over the years to praise the achievements of America's farmers and ranchers. And, up until now, I have been somewhat restrained, which is not always easy for a Texan.

In past years I have told you that agriculture was the No. 2 contributor to U.S. trade, behind the aerospace industry—not bad when you consider that airplanes are priced in the millions, and wheat is a few dollars a bushel.

Well, agriculture is no longer No. 2. This year, agriculture is the No. 1 contributor the positive side of our trade balance. Believe me, I am from Texas, and I know big. And our exports of agricultural products in the past year have been big—\$60 billion.

Critics claim that the Market Access Program, or MAP, has been ineffective—that it has not played an important role in the success story of American agriculture. But the experts at the Foreign Agricultural Service disagree. In a detailed 1995 report, they concluded that export promotion activities under MAP and its predecessor programs have been the leading factor in the 200 percent increase in U.S. high-value consumer food exports since 1986.

The University of Arizona's National Food and Agricultural Policy Project agrees. The project analyzed export values, quantities and prices; measures of foreign income, prices, populations, and exchange rates; and export promotion expenditures by commodity, country and year. They concluded that not only does each promotion dollar return multiple dollars to

the commodity being promoted, there is also a halo effect.

This halo effect refers to the contribution that promotion of one product contributes to sales of other U.S. products. The Arizona project concludes that MAP ultimately serves as a "Buy USA" campaign, with broader application than the products it specifically promotes.

Cornell University's National Institute for Commodity Promotion Research & Evaluation has extensively studied the effectiveness of agricultural promotion programs. The institute concluded that export promotion programs are highly effective in increasing private sector investment in export promotion, and that USDA's programs have stimulated promotion expenditures in both the domestic and the export market.

Why have U.S. agricultural exports doubled in the last 10 years? Because American agriculture, long recognized as the most productive in the world, have increased their focus on world markets. They are producing more sophisticated products that cater to the tastes of foreign consumers. And, thanks to MAP, they are marketing those products more effectively.

Last year we voted to phase out subsidies over a period of 7 years. Farmers and ranchers lost their safety net, and were told to look to foreign markets to make up the difference. MAP was an integral part of last year's farm bill.

How important is the program to those farmers who lost the safety net? The Foreign Agricultural Service concluded that in 1992, export promotion boosted net farm income by \$642 million. By the year 2000, the level of net farm income supported by the Market Access Program is expected to exceed \$1 billion. That translates into 124,000 jobs, including 80,000 nonfarm jobs, in trade, transportation, services, food processing, and manufacturing.

Not only does MAP create jobs for farmers and nonfarmers alike, it also contributes to the U.S. Treasury. By the year 2000, annual tax receipts to the Treasury from economic activity generated by the program are expected to reach \$250 million.

Our competitors continue to outspend us in every area of agricultural export promotion—from direct subsidies to market promotion. The EU spends about \$10 billion annually on subsidies and \$500 million on market promotion. USDA research indicates doubling the MAP program level would support 40,000 additional U.S. jobs by the year 2000.

In the competitive world in which we live, we shouldn't be here today talking about eliminating a program that gives us a fighting chance in export markets. We should be here talking about what else we need to do to build markets we can depend on to stay competitive in the years to come.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. Mr. Chairman, the question here is, do we want to advertise our products worldwide or do we not?

We know that the return and the leverage on this Market Access Program is 10 to 1. Sometimes it is 20 to 1. We

are getting huge, huge opportunities from this program. It is one of the few programs we have in our quiver to attack what is happening around the world. If we withdraw unilaterally, we hurt the United States of America. We have built up a \$26 billion trade surplus in this program.

Here is what is happening in Europe: \$45 billion for domestic and export subsidies. We are at \$5 billion, and as I mentioned many times, phasing out at the end of 6 years. Are we going to eliminate our one opportunity here to sell abroad? I think not. It is foolish. It is foolish of us to withdraw from this program. This is no time to withdraw from international trade.

By the way, those of the Members in business, it is the very best business decision you will ever make. Vote against this amendment.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Market Access Program [MAP]. Once again, the opponents of the MAP have their facts wrong and I would like to take this opportunity to correct the rhetoric and misinformation espoused by the opponents of this invaluable program.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, the congressional district I represent includes the Napa Valley, widely regarded as the prime growing region of the U.S. wine industry. The U.S. wine industry produces an award-winning, high-value product that competes with the best in the world.

However, the agriculture sector in the United States, and specifically wine, continues to face unfair trading practices by foreign competitors. Domestic agriculture industries must compete with the lower wages and the heavily subsidized industries of Europe, East Asia, and other emerging global regions. The European Union alone subsidizes its wine industry by over \$2 billion.

Mr. Chairman, opponents of the MAP label the program as just another form of corporate welfare, claiming the program benefits only large corporations. Nothing could be further from the truth. The MAP is an invaluable resource for American agriculture to compete against massively subsidized foreign agriculture exports. What is more, it is a resource that allows America's small farmers to compete in highly restrictive foreign markets. Simply, the MAP is pro-trade, pro-growth and pro-jobs.

Opponents of the program continue to ignore the fact that in 1995, the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee reformed the MAP to restrict branded promotions to trade associations, grower cooperatives, and small businesses. Additionally, Secretary of Agriculture Dan Glickman, in March this year, announced that large companies will no longer be able to participate in the branded program. The primary emphasis of the MAP is toward the small family farmer. A sizable number of the so-called large corporations receiving MAP monies are actually grower cooperatives.

The purpose of the MAP is simple: Move high-value American-grown agriculture products overseas, knock down trade barriers, and create and protect American jobs. A recent study by the University of Arizona showed that for every dollar of MAP funds spent overseas promoting American wine there was a return of \$7.44; for table grapes, a return of \$5.04; and for apples, a return of \$18.19.

In the world marketplace, competition is fierce. Every year, American jobs become more dependent on foreign trade. Efforts to dismantle our leading export promotion program are penny-wise and pound-foolish. To retreat in the international marketplace is shortsighted and counterintuitive. We must actively engage our trading partners and open up emerging markets to our agriculture goods.

Don't be fooled by the rhetoric. Do what is right for America by supporting American jobs and American exports. I urge my colleagues to support the Market Access Program. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this shortsighted amendment which would have a devastating impact on the people I represent in Sonoma and Marin Counties, CA.

The wine and winegrapes from my district are famous worldwide, but vintners have to fight to enter and compete in the world market.

The Market Access Program helps the small wine producers in my district compete with heavily subsidized foreign producers who still dominate the global agricultural marketplace.

The European Union export subsidies amounted to approximately \$10 billion last year. In fact, the European Union spends more on export promotion for wine than the United States does for all of our agriculture programs combined.

We need only look at last year to see this unfair disparity in action—market promotion funds for the American wine industry totaled approximately \$5 million, whereas the heavily subsidized European wine industries received \$1½ billion.

The money we spend to increase the markets for American agricultural products is money well spent. Because of assistance from the market access program, U.S. wine exports had their 12th consecutive record-breaking year in 1996, reaching \$320 million. This level is an \$85 million increase in 1 year, which means that each Market Access Program dollar being spent generated a \$17 increase in exports. In the last 10 years, an additional 7,500 full-time jobs and 5,000 part-time jobs have been created by exporting wine. This is not only good for the American balance of trade—it's good for the American economy.

Mr. Chairman, we should help export U.S. products, not U.S. jobs. Oppose the Schumer-Chabot-Royce amendment.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Market Access Program [MAP] and oppose any attempt to further weaken the program's ability to assist in the promotional activities for U.S. agricultural products. The Market Access Program is good for agriculture, international trade, and promotes small business and American-made products. MAP simply helps develop foreign markets for U.S. exports. The MAP provides cost-share funds to nearly 800 U.S. businesses, cooperatives, and non-profit trade associations to promote their products overseas. Additionally, funds allocated under the MAP are limited to U.S. entities.

In a time when America's farmers and agricultural sector are just beginning to adjust to Freedom to Farm, a way of operating Government farm programs without the assurance of price supports or safety-nets, it makes no sense to take away other underlying support programs like the MAP. I have said the same

thing about research funding and funding for adequate revenue and crop insurance. Congress promised America's farmers certain fundamental things as we moved to Freedom to Farm. Although producers no longer can rely on the Government to come through and pick up the tab when commodity prices are lower than certain target prices, they should be able to rely on certain supplemental programs run by the Department of Agriculture that keep producers' heads above an already narrow margin.

In my State of North Dakota, the MAP contributes to the promotion of \$1.7 billion in exports, and 29,300 jobs. I might add that in Ohio, the home State of the proponent of this amendment, agricultural interests receive support for \$1.6 billion worth of exports related to 27,400 jobs. Source: USDA, Bureau of Census—1996.

Rural income depends on—and is at the mercy of—many variables. Weather and domestic supply are examples. But the ability to export overseas and compete with foreign markets is another integral piece to maintaining rural income. The MAP offers one small opportunity to help American agricultural interests compete with international markets—during a time when farm income is now more dependent than ever on exports and maintaining access to foreign markets. The elimination of MAP would represent unilateral disarmament—shooting oneself in the foot actually—in the face of continued subsidized foreign competition.

Don't take away a great tool from our agricultural sector that has the potential to help even the playing field with foreign market interests.

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose the amendment offered by Representatives CHABOT and SCHUMER, that would eliminate the Market Access Program.

The sponsors of this amendment suggest that the Market Access Program subsidizes large agribusinesses' export promotion activities, and that it is a waste of taxpayers' money.

Nothing could be further from the truth. The 1996 farm bill substantially reformed this program, by targeting it toward small producers, trade associations, and cooperatives, to promote home-grown U.S. agricultural products. In addition, the farm bill requires Federal funds to be matched by the programs beneficiaries.

In reality, the Market Access Program has been a highly effective tool to promote U.S. exports. And as the Federal Government becomes less and less involved in the everyday decisions of farming, it is even more important that the Government take the initiative to increase our share of the world market.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER]. This amendment would eliminate funding for one of the most successful Federal programs that we have. It is unfortunate that the overwhelming support that this program has received over the years illustrates its importance.

Think about this: The European Union's 1996 budget allowed for export subsidies for grains and grain products of \$1.3 billion, for sugar of \$1.9 billion, for fresh fruits and vegetables of \$125 million, for processed fruits and

vegetables of \$18 million, for wine of \$72 million, for dairy products of \$2.5 billion, for meats and meat products of \$2.4 billion and for other processed food of \$752 million. This compares to a total for the United States of less than \$150 million.

The EU spends nearly \$500 million on market promotion specifically. We are debating the fate of a \$90 million program that provides the only market promotion funding available to agricultural producers in the United States. Since 1985, the MAP has provided cost-share funds to nearly 800 U.S. companies, cooperatives, and trade associations to promote their products overseas. In that period, total U.S. agricultural exports have more than doubled, from \$26.3 billion to a projected \$60 billion in 1996. During those same years, exports of U.S. high-value products have more than tripled, and now account for 34 percent of all U.S. agricultural exports, up from 12 percent in 1980. In addition, the U.S. share of world trade in these products has risen from 10 percent to 17 percent.

Over the years the MAP and its predecessor programs MPP and TEA have been criticized for many perceived shortfalls. All of these concerns have been addressed either legislatively or through regulations. The 1996 farm bill made permanent program changes that address these concerns. First, participants are required to contribute up to 50 percent or more toward program costs. Second, for-profit corporations that are not recognized as small businesses are no longer allowed to participate in the program. Third, funds can be used to promote only American grown and produced commodities and related products. Fourth, participants are required to undergo review, certification and a 5-year graduation from the program.

Mr. Chairman, last year we undertook the greatest rewrite of Federal farm programs in nearly 60 years. The changes that we made make it imperative that the U.S. remain a strong force in the international market. The continued health of the U.S. agriculture sector is reliant on continued exports and future export markets. Our competitors have made a financial commitment to export subsidies and export promotion. We need to ensure that we continue our commitment to our Nation's farmers.

I urge my colleagues to continue their support.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHABOT].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 193, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHABOT] will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MICHIGAN

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 14 offered by Mr. SMITH of Michigan:

Insert before the short title the following new section:

SEC. . . None of the funds appropriated or made available by this Act may be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel who work at a regional office of the Natural Resources Conservation Service or to provide a support service for a regional office of the Natural Resources Conservation Service.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a statement, and to have a colloquy with the ranking member and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, I will make a brief statement and proceed into the colloquy. In the last year the National Conservation Service has created a new regional bureaucracy. NRCS has local, State, and national offices. That is what they had before. Now they have put a new tier of bureaucracy between the State offices and the national offices.

There was a situation in Congress in 1994, partially in 1995, when the Democrats and Republicans said that Washington is too top-heavy in USDA. So what happened? There was no firing of personnel, but all of those top-ranking, high-grade executives in the Department of Agriculture, as part of that reorganization, those personnel were not fired or pink-slipped but they were transferred to regional offices, a new tier of six regional offices for our conservation service.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues that are concerned with conservation, concerned about the service to farmers and ranchers in this country, to call their conservationists in their area and ask them about the slow-down of paperwork, the slow-down of personnel.

We have \$22 million in this budget for these regional offices. This, Mr. Chairman, is the first year that these six regional offices existed. I think it is important that we not allow those to be entrenched.

Mr. Chairman, new bureaucracy makes no sense in the era of "re-invented government" and budget cuts. As we phase out payments to producers and scale back agricultural programs, it is unreasonable to add new layers of bureaucracy.

I urge my colleagues to join this effort to cut back unnecessary bureaucracy at NRCS. If we go to conference with this amendment, we can talk out this problem and reach a solution.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call on the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in a colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], would he review this issue and the spending of \$22 million for these new regional offices in the conference committee, and work to include such report language to ensure that these six new regional offices will not continue if they are an unnecessary level of bureaucracy?

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I am also concerned about these new conservation offices using \$22 million of our taxpayers' money. I assure the gentleman that our committee will review this issue. I have no intention of spending \$22 million if it is not a constructive addition to our conservation system.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. If it is a new level of bureaucracy, it makes no sense.

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's constructive work in trying to assure that these regional offices actually serve a useful purpose, and would add my support to the gentleman's request for an inquiry to make sure that the offices themselves are not new nor unnecessary levels of bureaucracy which could complicate our efforts to assist farmers and meet our goals of conservation.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman.

I would like to address the question to the chairman of the standing Committee on Agriculture. Mr. Chairman, can we pursue this question in the gentleman's committee?

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I would say to my colleague from Michigan that I appreciate his concern on the matter, that our committee will pursue an inquiry and review the new regional offices. I think it is obvious that we need to assure ourselves and the American agriculture community that this is indeed an effective and proper use of funds.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I thank my colleagues. Mr. Chairman. Let us remind ourselves, this is the first year of these six new regional offices. If we let them be entrenched, then we go for 2 and 3 and 4 years. It is going to be that much more difficult. It is a cost of \$22 million that could be much better spent at our local county offices, in our State offices. That is where the action is. That is where farmers and ranchers need their help.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make a comment on the general amendments that we have had today. Look, the reason we have farm programs in this country is to assure an adequate supply of food and fiber. Let me tell the Members what these farm programs have done. It does not go into the pockets of farmers. It is not subsidizing.

We have ended up with a farm program that has created the most efficient industry in the world as far as agricultural production. That is why the American people eat and spend only 11

percent of their take-home pay on food, the cheapest, highest quality food in the world.

So when we talk about knocking down these amendments for export enhancement programs, for programs that allow farmers to buy the kind of insurance that is going to move ahead with our Freedom to Farm bill, putting farmers on an even keel with the rest of the world, that is the challenge we have. When other countries are subsidizing their crops and subsidizing their exports into this country, we need to do something to make sure we have a strong industry.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has proposed and seems to have indicated he might be satisfied with a study, and he has gained the support of the ranking member and the chairman of the appropriations subcommittee and the chairman of the authorizing committee. But I would like to put additional facts on the record at this point.

We have heard a little comment or two about these issues. They are all fairly negative by the gentleman from Michigan. But I would like to point out to my colleagues that the staff to form the regional offices came from several former organizational levels, including the national headquarters, national technical centers, of which there were four, and State offices. In fact, only 25 percent of the regional office employees came from positions in the national headquarters.

The regional offices have provided essential and successful managerial and oversight functions for the restructured NRCS by bringing managerial authority closer to the field and the actual work and customers. Previously the NRCS assistant chiefs who held some of the current regional managerial authorities were actually located in this city. They were too far removed from local needs to be effective.

Given the funding realities of the last several years, we have been able to keep significant staff in the field largely by making as many cuts above the field level as possible. Without the regional offices, the move toward them, I would say that some of this would have been impossible.

The NRCS regional conservationists hold full authority for funding within their regions. This has put funding decisions closer to the field and to the customer, the client. Regional conservationists, I would suggest, based upon input I receive, are better able to address priority issues in a timely manner than previously when funds and decisions were held here in the Nation's Capitol.

If the various requirements in the GAO asking for strengthening oversight activities alone were not being handled by the regional offices, we would be forced to assign those responsibilities to the State office level in the

organization. This approach would hinder the ability to put additional staff at the field level, cause the State operations to be more focused on administrative duties, and reduce the amount of technical backup the State offices are now providing the field, which has directly improved customer service.

Mr. Chairman, I think this approach allows the agency to recognize the different parts of the country and the fact that they have very different natural resource needs, different agricultural systems, and different customers. The old system forced our policy to approach solutions which were national in scope and tended to be kind of one-size-fits-all.

□ 1800

The regional approach, I think, is assisting in fostering our efforts of locally-led conservation. And as the regional system continues to mature, it will ensure, I hope, that local needs are met with local solutions. And I say "hope" because we have moved to this arrangement only a year ago. So I would suggest that radical surgery is too premature at this time.

Certainly, it is appropriate for the authorizing committee in particular to examine this issue, but I did want to bring these facts to my colleagues' attention at some point.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] about the important issue of outstanding USDA loans. As the chairman is aware, there are billions of dollars in outstanding USDA loans. There are hundreds of individuals with unpaid debts of more than \$1 million each, and many of these loans are more than several years overdue.

Right now the USDA is receiving less than 10 cents on the dollar on the loans that the Department tries to collect. If we were able to improve our collection on these loans, we could help reduce our budget deficit at a time when we are working hard to balance the Federal budget.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS] that I agree with him. The outstanding loans are a significant problem at the USDA.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, I believe we could be more efficient in the way that we collect on those loans if we allowed qualified private sector firms to contract out for these collections. This is a process being used effectively and efficiently by other Federal agencies.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would again yield, contract-

ing out would be a good way, in my opinion, to try to collect on these loans. It is my understanding that the USDA has the authority now to contract out but has not yet engaged in any such contracts. And, like the gentleman from Texas, I would support efforts to privatize this collection process, and I am urging the USDA to move forward on this plan and to contract out for the collection of these large overdue loans.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his attention to this very important matter.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be withdrawn.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. POMBO

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 23 Offered by Mr. Pombo:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. 728. None of the funds made available in title III of this Act may be used to provide any assistance (other than the servicing of loans made on or before September 30, 1997) under any program under title V of the Housing Act of 1949 relating to any housing or project located, or to be located, in the City of Galt, California.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO] will be recognized for 5 minutes, and a Member in opposition, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO].

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, to start off with, I would like to clear up a little bit about what this amendment is all about. First of all, neither I nor the city of Galt is opposed to affordable housing. As a city councilman, I worked hard to establish affordable housing in the city of Tracy, which I had the pleasure of representing. Also, the city of Galt itself has participated directly in financing of low- to very low-income housing within their city limits.

The city of Galt, which is located in my district, is in a unique and critical situation. They have developed a financial plan to pay for their infrastructure within their city, to pay for their schools, to pay for their roads, their sewer system, their water system. A lot of that was based upon the housing that was going to be developed within their city.

Unfortunately, they have run into a problem. Part of that problem is the fact that they are now making up 70 percent of the rural housing and community development service loans

within the Sacramento region. The reason that that has become a problem is that the Sacramento region, Sacramento County is made up of 1.1 million people. The city of Galt is made up of 16,000 people, and yet they are being asked to absorb 70 percent of these low-income developments into their city.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, the question has come up about whether or not they are trying to keep affordable housing out of their city. I will just point out to my colleagues that the city of Galt currently is made up of 67 percent affordable housing, according to Sacramento County Assessor's Office.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Pombo amendment because I truly do not believe that this is a matter for our Committee on Appropriations.

I am opposed to the amendment of the gentleman from California that redesignates Galt, CA, as an urban community rather than a rural community.

I remain concerned about the purpose of this language and the unintended consequences that may result. The town council of Galt has not voted to ask the Congress for repeal of its eligibility for rural housing assistance. There is no official resolution asking us to do this. And in fact even if they had, the appropriations bill is not the proper place in order to consider this.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, the current Federal statutes do not force any town to take rural housing assistance. It is optional if they wish to seek it. So why would any Member wish to lift this designation from their town?

Finally, it is our understanding that many low-income families seeking to invest their own sweat equity in helping to build their own homes will lose that opportunity in Galt as a result of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have continued to strongly oppose this amendment. This addresses a local matter in which this Congress, certainly the Committee on Appropriations, should not intervene. Why should the Federal Government set a separate policy affecting one community that sets a terrible precedent for other communities to appeal to the Committee on Appropriations for special treatment to resolve their local issues. It is simply not our job to do that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity, and urge a "no" vote on the Pombo amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I have had an opportunity to discuss this with the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO]. It would have been appropriate for this issue to come before the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Development

and for us to be able to determine the facts of the specific request made by the gentleman from California pertaining to the building of low-income housing in his district.

The purpose of this rural housing initiative funded by the Farmers Home Administration is really to provide, in most cases in the area that it is being built, permanent housing for the farm worker community. There is an underlying concern that many people have voiced to me that what this amendment is about is keeping a farm worker community out of a specific part of the district of the gentleman from California, the area of Galt, CA.

Mr. Chairman, if that is in fact what this amendment is attempting to do, then I would oppose the gentleman's amendment with every ounce of strength I could, and I am sure other Members would as well. The gentleman from California assures me that that is not what it is about. The difficulty is that we have no evidence to suggest whether it is or whether it is not and it puts us in a very difficult position.

I have tried to work out with the gentleman an agreement that I think the chairman of the committee as well as the ranking member would have supported. The gentleman has insisted upon taking this to a vote. I think it is a mistake. I think that if in fact the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Development could have had an opportunity to hear directly from the people involved, get a sense of where the farm worker community was coming out, get a sense of what the needs are.

I understand from the statistics cited by the gentleman from California that 67 percent housing in his community in fact is considered affordable. But I also understand that there are only 335 units of subsidized housing in that area. The truth is that if we are going to stabilize the farm worker community of this country, I believe that it is important that we provide permanent housing for that community. It has worked throughout the State of California and other States around the country, and I think if what this is is a veiled attempt to push those people out, that all of us should understand exactly what the policy being pursued is trying to attempt.

Now, as I say, I have been assured that that is not what the policy is and I would just hope that the chairman of the committee, if he would enter into just a brief colloquy with me and make certain that if, in fact, the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Development, working in a bipartisan way, determines that in fact this is an attempt at a "snob zoning" requirement, that the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] would, in fact, try to make certain that that amendment would not be accepted once we get into a conference committee.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I tell the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] it is my understanding that this provision is that it has no effect on the general USDA rural development policy, and I am prepared to accept the amendment and we will work with the gentleman from Massachusetts in any way, in any possible manner, to quell the concerns that he has. I appreciate the work that the gentleman has already done on it.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SKEEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the chairman's indication that we will make certain to find out exactly what the policy is, and I respect the suggestion of the gentleman from California that that is not what he is trying to do, and if in fact that is the case, we would be happy to work with the gentleman.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BONILLA] a member of the committee.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO]. I was the one who originally proposed the amendment in the subcommittee markup.

Mr. Chairman, my understanding of this issue, it is a clear distinction of what we stand for philosophically as conservatives in this body versus those who believe that big government needs to micromanage local government. This is a case where we have a Hispanic mayor and Hispanic leadership in a community that are asking for Washington to let them determine their own future, and with the understanding as well that there is an abundance of low-income housing.

Mr. Chairman, I am a Member who is proud to have been recognized by farm worker organizations throughout my work in Congress. I have a large migrant farm worker population in my district that I work very closely with. Neither I nor the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO], would do anything that would harm this population, because they are hard-working Americans aspiring to live the dreams that all of us have had in this body.

So I would suggest that we should allow the local officials, the mayor and the council, and the others who feel that they should have the latitude to control their destiny, to let them do this. I hope that there is not an implication here that the Hispanic leadership of this local community somehow is not capable of determining their own future, and perhaps because they are people of an ethnic group or people of color that perhaps they are not capable of making decisions that are in the best interest of their community.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask my colleagues in this body to allow these people to determine their future for the best interest of the farm workers and the best interest of this population.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONILLA. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would just point out to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BONILLA] that this was in fact approved by the city council of Galt. That is how we got to this state.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, that is my point; I appreciate the gentleman from Massachusetts reiterating it.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, the housing that we are talking about has been approved by the city council of Galt, CA. They have approved this housing. It was taken to court to try to have that ruling reversed. That is how this housing got to this point.

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

Mr. Chairman, the entitlements for the housing are approved by the city council. That is a local zoning decision that is made. The city of Galt attempted to file suit against USDA to stop this project from proceeding. Their case was thrown out of court because they were told they did not have standing.

Mr. Chairman, I heard somebody say that this was somehow a partnership with local government. They were thrown out of court and told they did not have standing.

So, Mr. Chairman, I do not know what kind of a partnership this might be. This is a dictate from the Federal Government down to the local city council and the local community telling them that this is what they are going to have.

The CHAIRMAN. All time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO].

The amendment was agreed to.
The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. CHABOT

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHABOT] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 150, noes 277, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 316]

AYES—150

Andrews	Army	Barr
Archer	Bachus	Barrett (WI)

Bass	Hilleary	Neal	Lewis (CA)	Pease	Slaughter
Bilbray	Hinchey	Neumann	Lewis (KY)	Pelosi	Smith (MI)
Blagojevich	Hobson	Ney	Livingston	Peterson (MN)	Smith (NJ)
Borski	Hoekstra	Olver	Lofgren	Peterson (PA)	Smith (OR)
Brown (OH)	Horn	Owens	Lucas	Petri	Smith (TX)
Callahan	Hostettler	Pallone	Manton	Pickering	Smith, Linda
Campbell	Hutchinson	Pascrell	Martinez	Pickett	Snyder
Cannon	Hyde	Paul	Matsui	Pombo	Solomon
Cardin	Inglis	Payne	McCarthy (MO)	Pomeroy	Spence
Carson	Istook	Pitts	McCollum	Poshard	Spratt
Castle	Jackson (IL)	Porter	McCrery	Price (NC)	Stabenow
Chabot	Kanjorski	Portman	McDade	Quinn	Stenholm
Coble	Kasich	Pryce (OH)	McHale	Radanovich	Stokes
Collins	Kelly	Ramstad	McHugh	Rahall	Strickland
Conyers	Kennedy (MA)	Rivers	McInnis	Rangel	Stump
Cox	Kennedy (RI)	Rogan	McIntyre	Redmond	Tanner
Coyne	Kind (WI)	Rohrabacher	McKeon	Regula	Tauscher
Crane	King (NY)	Rothman	McKinney	Reyes	Tauzin
Cummings	Klecza	Roukema	McNulty	Riggs	Taylor (NC)
Cunningham	Klink	Royce	Meek	Riley	Thomas
Davis (VA)	Knollenberg	Salmon	Menendez	Rodriguez	Thompson
DeGette	Kolbe	Sanders	Roemer	Roemer	Thornberry
DeLahunt	Kucinich	Sanford	Mica	Rogers	Thune
DeLauro	Lantos	Scarborough	Millender-	Ros-Lehtinen	Thurman
DeLay	Largent	Schumer	McDonald	Roybal-Allard	Torres
Doggett	Lazio	Sensenbrenner	Miller (CA)	Rush	Towns
Doyle	Lewis (GA)	Shadegg	Minge	Ryun	Trafficant
Duncan	Linder	Shaw	Mink	Sabo	Turner
Ehlers	Lipinski	Shays	Mollohan	Sanchez	Upton
Ehrlich	LoBiondo	Smith, Adam	Moran (KS)	Sandlin	Walsh
Engel	Lowey	Snowbarger	Murtha	Sawyer	Waters
Ensign	Luther	Souder	Nethercutt	Saxton	Watkins
Fawell	Maloney (CT)	Stearns	Northup	Schaefer, Dan	Watt (NC)
Foglietta	Maloney (NY)	Stupak	Norwood	Schaffer, Bob	Watts (OK)
Fowler	Manzullo	Sununu	Nussle	Scott	Weldon (FL)
Fox	Markey	Talent	Oberstar	Serrano	Weller
Frank (MA)	Mascara	Taylor (MS)	Obey	Sessions	Wexler
Franks (NJ)	McCarthy (NY)	Tiahrt	Ortiz	Sherman	White
Frelinghuysen	McDermott	Tierney	Oxley	Shimkus	Whitfield
Gejdenson	McGovern	Velazquez	Packard	Shuster	Wicker
Gibbons	McIntosh	Vento	Pappas	Sisisky	Wise
Gillmor	Meehan	Visclosky	Parker	Skaggs	Woolsey
Goss	Miller (FL)	Wamp	Pastor	Skeen	Wynn
Gutierrez	Moakley	Waxman	Paxon	Skelton	Young (FL)
Gutknecht	Moran (VA)	Weldon (PA)			
Hastert	Morella	Weygand			
Hayworth	Myrick	Wolf			
Hefley	Nadler	Yates			

NOES—277

Abercrombie	Combest	Goodlatte
Ackerman	Condit	Goodling
Aderholt	Cook	Gordon
Allen	Cooksey	Graham
Baessler	Costello	Granger
Baker	Cramer	Green
Baldacci	Crapo	Greenwood
Ballenger	Cubin	Hall (OH)
Barcia	Danner	Hall (TX)
Barrett (NE)	Davis (FL)	Hamilton
Bartlett	Davis (IL)	Hansen
Bateman	Deal	Harman
Becerra	DeFazio	Hastings (FL)
Bentsen	Dellums	Hastings (WA)
Bereuter	Deutsch	Hefner
Berman	Diaz-Balart	Henger
Berry	Dickey	Hill
Bilirakis	Dicks	Hilliard
Bishop	Dingell	Hinojosa
Bliley	Dixon	Holden
Blumenauer	Dooley	Hooley
Blunt	Doolittle	Houghton
Boehlert	Dreier	Hoyer
Bonilla	Dunn	Hulshof
Bonior	Edwards	Hunter
Bono	Emerson	Jackson-Lee
Boswell	English	(TX)
Boucher	Eshoo	Jefferson
Boyd	Etheridge	Jenkins
Brady	Evans	John
Brown (CA)	Everett	Johnson (CT)
Brown (FL)	Ewing	Johnson (WI)
Bryant	Farr	Johnson, E. B.
Bunning	Fattah	Johnson, Sam
Burr	Fazio	Jones
Burton	Filner	Kaptur
Buyer	Flake	Kennelly
Calvert	Foley	Kildee
Camp	Forbes	Kilpatrick
Canady	Ford	Kim
Capps	Frost	Kingston
Chambliss	Furse	Klug
Chenoweth	Gallegly	LaFalce
Christensen	Ganske	LaHood
	Gekas	Lampson
	Gephardt	Latham
	Gilchrest	LaTourette
	Gilman	Leach
	Goode	Levin

NOT VOTING—7

Barton	Molinari	Young (AK)
Boehner	Schiff	
Gonzalez	Stark	

□ 1835

Messrs. HILL, DIXON, RUSH, PETRI, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. EVERETT changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. DELAY, GUTIERREZ, ISTOOK, NEUMANN, NEY, MOAKLEY and Mrs. FOWLER changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Meehan amendment to the fiscal year 1998 agriculture appropriations bill. This amendment is the next important step in the fight against teen smoking.

This amendment appropriates \$10 million to the Food and Drug Administration to implement the agency's tobacco initiative requiring retailers to check the photo identification of persons seeking to purchase tobacco products. Similar to the way retailers check ID for alcohol purchases, this amendment does the same for cigarettes.

There is a large body of evidence about the harmful and addictive effects of tobacco. Adults have the right to decide for themselves about the choices they make with regard to what they eat, drink, or smoke. However, children are not always able to make those same decisions. It is illegal to sell tobacco to children under the age of 18. This amendment helps to implement the FDA policy of carding those individuals who smoke. It is merely an enforcement tool in the fight against youth smoking. This amendment should be non-controversial and should enjoy unanimous support in this chamber.

I urge my colleagues to support the Meehan amendment.

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by Messrs. SCHUMER and MILLER.

Mr. Chairman, while I understand and appreciate the proponents' interests in pursuing this amendment, I believe their concerns are misplaced and their proposed remedy misguided. I have worked closely with my friend and colleague from New York, Mr. SCHUMER, on a number of important issues over the years, and I do not question his motives; however, I regret that we are once again at odds over this emotional agricultural matter.

Mr. Chairman, only last year, the Congress enacted major, far-reaching agricultural reform legislation. In that measure, we dramatically changed our Nation's long-standing policies affecting farming and agricultural markets, including sugar production—which, I believe, is the only program crop to lose the Government guarantee of a minimum price. I supported these efforts to reform and modernize the sugar price support program and believe these changes have benefited all segments of the industry. These reforms represented an important first step.

However, we simply have not allowed enough time to pass to ensure we achieved our goals in revising the sugar program and determine whether these changes were sufficient. I would also remind my colleagues that this House defeated a similar amendment during the farm bill debate.

Mr. Chairman, for this reason alone, I believe it is unfair and unwise to make such a drastic change in the U.S. sugar program as proposed in the amendment at this time.

We will hear today that this is an issue of fairness and the free-market system; consumers will be pitted against farmers, producers against refiners and manufacturers. I believe these arguments are overly simplistic, picking and choosing statistics which best represent the proponents' arguments, and the distinctions they promote to do an injustice to the sugar producers of our great Nation, be they farmers of sugarcane, sugar beet, or corn.

Mr. Chairman, I do not deny that there are some very real differences between the proponents and opponents on the issue before us, and I doubt any amount of debate is likely to change the position of the amendment's authors. However, I have learned over my years in Congress, and as a New York City councilman, that no issue is one-sided, nor is there often only one all-inclusive right answer to a problem. Reasonable people can, and often do, disagree.

I believe the issue before us here today falls into that category. We differ on what the impacts of a particular program may or not be, and who best to address these issues. But, I do not believe either side has a claim to the so-called high ground.

And, with all due respect to the amendment's proponents, I do not take a back seat to their concern for the American consumer. I represent a congressional district, a part of New York City, where the 1990 median family income was only around \$30,000 a year. In the areas of Queens and the Bronx which I have the pleasure to represent, the cost of living is a very real issue with everyday impacts on the hard-working families of the 7th Congressional District of New York.

The proponents argue that their's is the only way to protect the consumer, to potentially

lower the cost of sugar and products containing agricultural sweeteners by a few cents or, more likely, fractions of a cent. This is all well and good, if they can ensure the savings they propose will indeed be passed along to the American consumer. A prospect which they cannot guarantee.

But, cost aside, the proponents can also not be sure their amendment, if approved, would not seriously disrupt the supply and availability of sugar throughout our country.

Mr. Chairman, my constituents do not benefit if they have the potential of saving a penny or two on a product but can no longer obtain that commodity or the product is no longer available in a sufficient and steady supply to meet their needs.

I have often commented in meetings I have had over the years that I am unaware of any farms in my urban district, except for one lone Victory Garden started during World War II. But, I am sure of one thing, and that is that each and every one of my constituents eats and needs a secure, steady supply of produce and food products at a reasonable price. As such, I will continue to support those programs which I believe ensure just that, and oppose those measures which I believe will not.

I will note here, also, that New York State does play role in domestic sugar production, with numerous farms that grow corn which is utilized in sweetener production.

Mr. Chairman, my strong, historic support of agriculture programs, including sugar, and the associated refining and processing infrastructure, is based upon this—perhaps simplistic—premise: That the United States must continue to ensure all its people are provided the best, most secure, and stable source of food products possible. And, I believe this goal is best accomplished by reducing our dependence on foreign sources of agriculture products through the encouragement and promotion of a strong domestic agriculture system, and challenging unfair, anticompetitive foreign sources of food.

While we are usually on the same side of most food related issues, from time to time, I part paths with this Nation's food processors. As is the case here, I side with the producers and not the refiners and processors. I do not fault them for their support of this amendment and the desired changes they seek in the sugar program, and I know we will work together on future issues of mutual concern.

I believe the virtual elimination of this program as now proposed would place the U.S. sugar industry as a whole, and the American consumer in particular, at the mercy of the inconsistent and heavily subsidized world sugar market.

Unlike my colleagues who support the amendment, I simply do not believe the American consumer is likely to realize a significant, if any, benefit should the amendment prevail. But, I am concerned that the domestic producers of sugar could suffer from reduced prices and would be made particularly vulnerable to foreign sources of sugar.

While refiners may pass along their savings, I seriously doubt many processors are likely to reciprocate. While the cumulative amounts being bandied about today are significant, and represent real money regardless of one's social standing, the bottom-line is that we are talking about pennies or fractions of pennies on a commodity basis.

Quite frankly, I do not even know how one would calculate the savings that say a manu-

facturer should pass along for their finished product that now may cost them a fraction of a cent less to produce. Are we likely to see cans of soda from a machine selling for 59 cents instead of 60 cents?

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer to some very basic statistics which I believe make clear the short-sightedness of the amendment.

The current sugar program operates at no cost to the Federal Government, and a special marketing tax on sugar farmers is earmarked for deficit reduction. U.S. consumers pay an average of 25 to 28 cents less for sugar than do shoppers in other developed countries. From 1990 to 1995, the retail price of sugar actually decreased approximately 7 percent. U.S. retail sugar prices are approximately 32 percent below the average of other developed countries and the third lowest in the developed world. New York consumers pay 5 percent less for sugar than the average consumer worldwide. Close to \$7 billion are generated each year by the U.S. sugar industry in the State of New York alone. Finally, more than 5,690 jobs in New York State rely on the sugar industry.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment, and cast a vote in favor of a strong, fair and balanced domestic sugar program and to protect the American farmer.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to this amendment. I strongly support the Meals on Wheels Program that provides nutritious meals to our most vulnerable seniors, and I would like to see more money going to this program.

The problem with this amendment is the offset. Time and time again, members searching for easy deficit reduction targets turn to Federal employees and agencies' salary and expenses budgets. Federal employees and agencies have borne a disproportionate share of cuts as we have worked to balance the budget. This raid on Federal employees and agencies must stop. Over the last 4 years, we have streamlined every Federal agency and reduced our Federal work force by nearly 270,000 FTE's.

Already, the bill before us today will reduce FDA's work force by 70 FTE's. The additional cuts contained in this amendment would reduce FDA by another 65 FTE's, leading to a total reduction of 135 from a total of 954—about a 14 percent reduction. Such a reduction would hinder FDA's ability to protect and promote public health. The Office of Women's Health, the Office of Consumer Affairs, the Office of Special Health Issues, the Office of Science, and many important projects would suffer.

The authors had a great idea when they decided to increase Meals on Wheels, but their offset would seriously hinder FDA's important work, and I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing it.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I join in support of my colleague, Congresswoman CLAYTON, and also as a sponsor of this amendment to increase funding by \$2.5 billion to our Nation's food stamp program.

Although our intent is to withdraw this amendment the goal is to bring the issue of food and hunger before the House as we debate the Department of Agriculture's appropriations bill.

In the State of Texas participation in the Food Stamp Program this year for the month

of May, numbered 2.23 million which represents 738,468 households.

The need to provide adequate food to our Nation's poor is of vital importance, and therefore cannot and must not be left underfunded. State and private entities do not have the resources to assist those who are less fortunate in our society.

One key provision of the Emergency supplemental appropriations which finally passed was additional funding to the Women, Infants, and Children's program which was underfunded last Congress. This program would have run out of funds prior to the close of the agency's fiscal year because of lack of adequate budgetary planning on the part of Congress.

It is our budgetary responsibility as Members of the House to adequately fund each area of government so that such readjustments prior to the close of a department's fiscal year are not necessary, unless unforeseen disaster or emergencies beyond our ability to take preemptive action.

In 1995, a reported 14.7 million children lived in poverty, with a national child poverty rate of 20.8 percent. The United States is the highest child poverty rate amongst the 18 industrialized countries of the world. With these numbers we can and should adequately plan to use the resources of our Nation to meet the needs of our Nation's poor.

We must feed our children, provide education that is challenging and offers them the promise of a better life, as well as secure their future through sound government policy.

I ask that my colleagues focus on the needs of all of our Nation's children regardless of social and economic status. This is indeed a blessed nation with wealth and resources in such abundance that we can share with other nations. However when we make decisions to purchase expensive weapons systems which are not requested by the Pentagon, or increase the Intelligence budget over what the administration requests, but underfund nutrient, food, and housing programs, makes me wonder if we have our priorities in a Tom Clancy novel and not on human beings.

I would ask my colleagues to play real patriot games and take care of our Nation's poor.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to address the issue of funds for administrative expenses for crop insurance agents.

The Agriculture appropriations bill presents difficult choices for members from rural America for support for production agriculture—including crop insurance—competes directly against vital nutrition programs such as the Women, Infants, and Children [WIC] program. In a budget climate where discretionary funds are stretched between vital resources such as research, school lunch programs, rural utilities, and food safety, it is easy to forget about production agriculture.

It seems we already have in some aspects. The amendment in full committee to increase funding for crop insurance was not off-set by cuts in nutrition but within production agriculture, namely, the Export Enhancement Program. The choice was difficult but necessary. The Obey amendment, however, would leave farmers with both fewer resources to compete against European subsidies and a less viable crop insurance program to compensate for the loss of the farm program safety net.

Putting "urban" agriculture against "rural" agriculture is not the way to debate this fight.

WIC is a stable program, and funded by the bill with \$118 million more than last year. Further, this amendment would fund the WIC program's "carryover" money, not funds directly for the program. More than likely, the program will not even use this funding.

The federal crop insurance program is still on feeble legs, as are producers as they look to alternatives for risk management. Congress modified farm programs just last year, creating the "freedom to farm" and taking away the safety net for price volatility. Along with changes to the farm programs, producers were assured that certain safeguards would remain in place, like the effectiveness of adequate crop insurance. Crop insurance is just about the only risk management assurance producers have, and these producers depend on the time and effort of thousands of insurance agents to provide adequate coverage and information.

We often forget that it is "rural" agriculture that provides the affordable and safe food and fiber for "urban" agriculture programs and cities.

To address a few other points I have heard during this debate, I urge you to keep some things in perspective:

Crop insurance agents are not typical insurance agents.

Crop insurance agents are working to provide information and coverage for twice the number of acres insured than in 1994. Thus efforts to reduce their administrative expense reimbursements come at a time when they are performing more tasks than ever.

Crop insurance agents don't just sign up farmers once-a-year and then wait until the next year to follow up; they often visit with producers 10 times per year.

The level of funding we put in this bill for administrative expenses, whether it is 24.5 percent, 27 percent, or 28 percent, is not pure commission for agents. Not even close. The percentage figure goes to account for the Department of Agriculture's mandatory requirements on agents to administer the program: like training, compliance, paper work, processing, adjusting, and other overhead. After all that, the real "commission" is closer to 12 percent.

Some of the flaws in the GAO report include:

The report only examined three crop years, two of which were some of the best in history. Of course insurance companies do better in some years than others, especially when there are fewer weather catastrophes.

The GAO report rhetoric makes for nice 2 minute "Fleecing of America" TV clips, but in reality the report only acknowledges "excessive expenses" as the exception, not the norm. Furthermore, the expenses noted by the report as "excessive" were clearly legal.

In this time of transition for production agriculture, shifting from disaster payments and price supports of the old farm programs to reformed crop insurance and the "freedom to farm," farmers are depending more than ever on promises made by the last Congress. During recent reforms of our government's role in agriculture, Congress promised certain foundational assistance for farmers would remain: farmers understood that agriculture research, risk management tools, and technical assistance would be maintained.

If we reduce the administrative expenses for crop insurance agents, we are taking away

our promise to farmers and production agriculture that they would receive effective service in managing risk from unpredictable weather and market prices.

I urge you to maintain the current level of funding for crop insurance.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2160, the 1998 House Agriculture appropriations bill. In particular, I am pleased that this legislation includes sufficient funding to continue the vital research done at the Children's Nutrition Research Center in Houston, one of the six human nutrition centers of the Agriculture Research Service.

The CNRC is one of the world's leaders in the field of pediatric nutrition. Their work has resulted in both better health and reduced health care costs for children. For instance, Texas Children's Hospital in my district has developed a more cost-effective, nutritionally balanced approach for feeding premature children as the result of a CNRC study.

The CNRC has led the way in providing more accurate dietary recommendations for calcium requirements for young girls. With these recommendations, young women will now have the necessary nutritional tools to help reduce the number of low-birthweight babies born to teenage mothers. In addition, these calcium recommendations will help prevent future injuries later in life, such as hip replacement surgeries and broken bones. Girls and women will benefit from new information that will help increase bone density in their system and help prevent these injuries.

The CNRC has also done important research on obesity in children. This information along with newly discovered molecular genes, will lead to more effective treatments to prevent these ailments in children. This research may also lead to new treatments for serious diseases such as atherosclerosis, osteoporosis, and diabetes.

Again, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and am pleased that it includes vital research funding for pediatric research.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Lowey-DeGette-Hansen-Meehan-Smith amendment to the fiscal year 1998 Agriculture appropriations bill. This amendment is exactly what the doctor ordered.

It is ridiculous for the Federal Government to be subsidizing the crop insurance for a product that is so harmful and addictive.

Taxpayers now pay for the crop to be harvested, provide insurance against crop damage, pay for the health care costs of tobacco related illness through increased Medicare and Medicaid costs, and pay for advertising subsidies for overseas promotion.

It is outrageous to me that while we limit the safety net for our poor, sick and elderly, we maintain a safety net for agribusiness and tobacco. This subsidy should be eliminated.

Mr. Chairman, Joe Camel does not need a government handout. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other amendments to the bill?

If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NUSSLE) 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, pursuant to House Resolution 193, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. SCHUMER

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from New York opposed to the bill?

Mr. SCHUMER. Yes, I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SCHUMER moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 2160, to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the motion to recommit.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 423, noes 4, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 317]

AYES—423

Abercrombie	Bateman	Boswell
Ackerman	Becerra	Boucher
Aderholt	Bentsen	Brady
Allen	Bereuter	Brown (CA)
Andrews	Berman	Brown (FL)
Archer	Berry	Brown (OH)
Army	Bilbray	Bryant
Bachus	Bilirakis	Bunning
Baesler	Bishop	Burr
Baker	Blagojevich	Burton
Baldacci	Bileley	Buyer
Ballenger	Blumenauer	Callahan
Barcia	Blunt	Calvert
Barr	Boehrlert	Camp
Barrett (NE)	Boehner	Campbell
Barrett (WI)	Bonilla	Canady
Bartlett	Bonior	Cannon
Bass	Borski	Capps

Cardin	Hall (OH)	McInnis
Carson	Hall (TX)	McIntosh
Castle	Hamilton	McIntyre
Chabot	Hansen	McKeon
Chambliss	Harman	McKinney
Chenoweth	Hastert	McNulty
Christensen	Hastings (FL)	Meehan
Clay	Hastings (WA)	Meek
Clayton	Hayworth	Menendez
Clement	Hefley	Metcalfe
Clyburn	Hefner	Mica
Coble	Herger	Millender-
Coburn	Hill	McDonald
Collins	Hilleary	Miller (CA)
Combest	Hilliard	Miller (FL)
Condit	Hinchey	Minge
Conyers	Hinojosa	Mink
Cook	Hobson	Moakley
Cooksey	Hoekstra	Mollohan
Costello	Holden	Moran (KS)
Cox	Hooley	Moran (VA)
Coyne	Horn	Morella
Cramer	Hostettler	Murtha
Crane	Houghton	Myrick
Crapo	Hoyer	Nadler
Cubin	Hulshof	Neal
Cummings	Hunter	Nethercutt
Cunningham	Hutchinson	Neumann
Danner	Hyde	Ney
Davis (FL)	Inglis	Northup
Davis (IL)	Istook	Norwood
Davis (VA)	Jackson (IL)	Nussle
Deal	Jackson-Lee	Oberstar
DeGette	(TX)	Obey
Delahunt	Jefferson	Olver
DeLauro	Jenkins	Ortiz
DeLay	John	Owens
Dellums	Johnson (CT)	Oxley
Deutsch	Johnson (WI)	Packard
Diaz-Balart	Johnson, E. B.	Pallone
Dickey	Johnson, Sam	Pappas
Dicks	Jones	Parker
Dingell	Kanjorski	Pascrell
Dixon	Kaptur	Pastor
Doggett	Kasich	Paul
Dooley	Kelly	Paxon
Doolittle	Kennedy (MA)	Payne
Doyle	Kennedy (RI)	Pease
Dreier	Kennelly	Pelosi
Duncan	Kildee	Peterson (MN)
Dunn	Kilpatrick	Peterson (PA)
Edwards	Kim	Petri
Ehlers	Kind (WI)	Pickering
Ehrlich	King (NY)	Pickett
Emerson	Kingston	Pitts
Engel	Klecza	Pombo
English	Klink	Pomeroy
Ensign	Klug	Porter
Eshoo	Knollenberg	Portman
Etheridge	Kolbe	Poshard
Evans	Kucinich	Price (NC)
Everett	LaFalce	Pryce (OH)
Ewing	LaHood	Quinn
Farr	Lampson	Radanovich
Fattah	Lantos	Rahall
Fawell	Largent	Ramstad
Fazio	Latham	Rangel
Filner	LaTourette	Redmond
Flake	Lazio	Regula
Foglietta	Leach	Reyes
Foley	Levin	Riggs
Forbes	Lewis (CA)	Riley
Ford	Lewis (GA)	Rivers
Fowler	Lewis (KY)	Rodriguez
Fox	Linder	Roemer
Franks (NJ)	Lipinski	Rogan
Frelinghuysen	Livingston	Rogers
Frost	LoBiondo	Rohrabacher
Furse	Lofgren	Ros-Lehtinen
Gallegly	Lowe	Rothman
Ganske	Lucas	Roukema
Gejdenson	Luther	Roybal-Allard
Gekas	Maloney (CT)	Royce
Gephardt	Maloney (NY)	Rush
Gibbons	Manton	Ryun
Gilchrest	Manzullo	Sabo
Gillmor	Markey	Salmon
Gilman	Martinez	Sanchez
Goode	Mascara	Sanders
Goodlatte	Matsui	Sandlin
Goodling	McCarthy (MO)	Sanford
Gordon	McCarthy (NY)	Sawyer
Goss	McCollum	Saxton
Graham	McCrery	Scarborough
Granger	McDade	Schaefer, Dan
Green	McDermott	Schaffer, Bob
Greenwood	McGovern	Schumer
Gutierrez	McHale	Scott
Gutknecht	McHugh	Sensenbrenner

Serrano	Stabenow	Upton
Sessions	Stearns	Velazquez
Shadegg	Stenholm	Vento
Shaw	Stokes	Visclosky
Shays	Strickland	Walsh
Sherman	Stump	Wamp
Shimkus	Stupak	Watkins
Shuster	Sununu	Watt (NC)
Sisisky	Talent	Watts (OK)
Skaggs	Tanner	Waxman
Skeen	Tauscher	Weldon (FL)
Skelton	Tauzin	Weldon (PA)
Slaughter	Taylor (MS)	Weller
Smith (MI)	Taylor (NC)	Wexler
Smith (NJ)	Thomas	Weygand
Smith (OR)	Thompson	White
Smith (TX)	Thornberry	Whitfield
Smith, Adam	Thune	Wicker
Smith, Linda	Thurman	Wise
Snowbarger	Tiahrt	Wolf
Snyder	Tierney	Woolsey
Solomon	Torres	Wynn
Souder	Towns	Yates
Spence	Trafficant	Young (FL)
Spratt	Turner	

NOES—4

Bono	DeFazio
Boyd	Frank (MA)

NOT VOTING—7

Barton	Schiff	Young (AK)
Gonzalez	Stark	
Molinari	Waters	

□ 1855

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

MOTION TO RECONSIDER THE VOTE OFFERED BY MS. ESHOO

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider the vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUSSLE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HASTINGS] to lay on the table the motion to reconsider the vote offered by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. ESHOO].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 15-minute vote which may be followed by a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 258, noes 165, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 318]

AYES—258

Aderholt	Blunt	Cannon
Archer	Boehrlert	Capps
Armey	Boehner	Castle
Bachus	Bonilla	Chabot
Baker	Bono	Chambliss
Ballenger	Boswell	Chenoweth
Barcia	Brady	Christensen
Barr	Brown (FL)	Clyburn
Barrett (NE)	Bryant	Coble
Bartlett	Bunning	Coburn
Bass	Burr	Collins
Bateman	Burton	Combest
Bereuter	Buyer	Condit
Berry	Callahan	Cook
Bilbray	Calvert	Cooksey
Bilirakis	Camp	Costello
Bishop	Campbell	Cox
Bliley	Canady	Cramer

Crane Johnson (CT) Ramstad
 Crapo Johnson, Sam Redmond
 Cubin Jones Regula
 Cunningham Kaptur Riggs
 Davis (VA) Kasich Riley
 Deal Kelly Rogan
 DeLay Kim Rogers
 Diaz-Balart King (NY) Rohrabacher
 Dickey Kingston Ros-Lehtinen
 Doolittle Klug Roukema
 Dreier Knollenberg Royce
 Duncan Kolbe Ryan
 Dunn LaHood Salmon
 Ehlers Largent Sanford
 Ehrlich Latham Saxton
 Emerson LaTourette Scarborough
 English Leach Schaefer, Dan
 Ensign Lewis (CA) Schaffer, Bob
 Etheridge Lewis (KY) Sensenbrenner
 Everett Linder Sessions
 Ewing Lipinski Shadegg
 Fattah Livingston Shaw
 Foglietta LoBiondo Shays
 Foley Lucas Shimkus
 Forbes Manzullo Shuster
 Fowler McCollum Sisisky
 Fox McCrery Skeen
 Franks (NJ) McHugh Skelton
 Frelinghuysen McInnis Smith (MI)
 Gallegly McIntosh Smith (NJ)
 Ganske McIntyre Smith (OR)
 Gekas McKeon Smith (TX)
 Gibbons McKinney Smith, Linda
 Gilchrist Metcalf Snowbarger
 Gillmor Mica Solomon
 Gilman Miller (FL) Souder
 Goode Moran (KS) Spence
 Goodlatte Morella Stearns
 Goodling Murtha Stenholm
 Goss Myrick Stump
 Graham Nethercutt Sununu
 Granger Neumann Talent
 Green Ney Tanner
 Greenwood Northup Tauzin
 Gutknecht Norwood Taylor (MS)
 Hall (TX) Nussle Taylor (NC)
 Hamilton Oxley Thomas
 Hansen Packard Thompson
 Hastert Pappas Thornberry
 Hastings (WA) Parker Thune
 Hayworth Paul Thurman
 Hefley Paxon Tiahrt
 Herger Pease Tierney
 Hill Peterson (MN) Traficant
 Hilleary Peterson (PA) Upton
 Hobson Petri Walsh
 Hoekstra Pickering Wamp
 Horn Pickett Watkins
 Hostettler Pitts Watts (OK)
 Houghton Pombo Weldon (FL)
 Hulshof Porter Weldon (PA)
 Hunter Portman Weller
 Hutchinson Poshard White
 Hyde Price (NC) Whitfield
 Inglis Pryce (OH) Wicker
 Istook Quinn Wise
 Jenkins Radanovich Wolf
 John Rahall Young (FL)

NOES—165

Abercrombie DeGette Hastings (FL)
 Ackerman Delahunt Hefner
 Allen DeLauro Hilliard
 Andrews Dellums Hinchey
 Baesler Deutsch Hinojosa
 Baldacci Dicks Holden
 Barrett (WI) Dingell Hooley
 Becerra Dixon Hoyer
 Bentsen Doggett Jackson (IL)
 Berman Dooley Jackson-Lee
 Blagojevich Doyle (TX)
 Blumenauer Edwards Jefferson
 Bonior Engel Johnson (WI)
 Borski Eshoo Johnson, E. B.
 Boucher Evans Kanjorski
 Boyd Farr Kennedy (MA)
 Brown (CA) Fazio Kennedy (RI)
 Brown (OH) Filner Kennelly
 Cardin Flake Kildee
 Carson Ford Kilpatrick
 Clay Frank (MA) Kind (WI)
 Clement Frost Kleczka
 Conyers Furse Klink
 Coyne Gejdenson Kucinich
 Cummings Gephardt LaFalce
 Danner Gordon Lampson
 Davis (FL) Gutierrez Lantos
 Davis (IL) Hall (OH) Levin
 DeFazio Harman Lewis (GA)

Lofgren Nadler Scott
 Lowey Neal Serrano
 Luther Oberstar Sherman
 Maloney (CT) Obey Skaggs
 Maloney (NY) Olver Slaughter
 Manton Ortiz Smith, Adam
 Markey Owens Snyder
 Martinez Pallone Spratt
 Mascara Pascrell Stabenow
 Matsui Pastor Stokes
 McCarthy (MO) Payne Strickland
 McCarthy (NY) Pelosi Stupak
 McDermott Pomeroy Tauscher
 McGovern Rangel Torres
 McHale Reyes Towns
 McNulty Rivers Turner
 Meehan Rodriguez Velazquez
 Meek Roemer Vento
 Menendez Rothman Visclosky
 Millender Roybal-Allard Waters
 McDonald Rush Watt (NC)
 Miller (CA) Sabo Waxman
 Minge Sanchez Weygand
 Mink Sanders Woolsey
 Moakley Sandlin Wynn
 Mollohan Sawyer Yates
 Moran (VA) Schumer Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—11

Barton Lazio Stark
 Clayton McDade Wexler
 Fawell Molinari Young (AK)
 Gonzalez Schiff

□ 1913

Mr. HORN and Mr. HERGER changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUSSLE). The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 56, noes 363, answered “present” 2, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 319]

AYES—56

Barrett (WI) Kennedy (RI) Oberstar
 Blagojevich Kind (WI) Owens
 Brown (CA) Kleczka Pallone
 Brown (OH) Kucinich Payne
 Cardin LaFalce Pelosi
 Conyers Lantos Roybal-Allard
 Coyne Lowey Rush
 Cummings Luther Sanchez
 DeGette Markey Sanders
 Dellums Matsui Schumer
 Dicks McDermott Skaggs
 Doggett McGovern Smith, Adam
 Ford McNulty Stokes
 Frank (MA) Meehan Torres
 Green Meek Velazquez
 Gutierrez Miller (CA) Waters
 Jackson (IL) Moakley Waxman
 Jefferson Morán (VA) Yates
 Kennedy (MA) Neal

NOES—363

Abercrombie Baesler Bateman
 Ackerman Baker Becerra
 Aderholt Baldacci Bentsen
 Allen Barcia Bereuter
 Andrews Barr Berman
 Archer Barrett (NE) Berry
 Armev Bartlett Bilbray
 Bachus Bass Bilirakis

Bishop Gekas Menendez
 Bliley Gephardt Metcalf
 Blumenauer Gibbons Mica
 Blunt Gilchrist Millender-
 Boehlert Gillmor McDonald
 Boehner Goode Miller (FL)
 Bonilla Bonilla Minge
 Bonior Goodlatte Mink
 Bono Gordon Mollohan
 Borski Goss Moran (KS)
 Boswell Graham Morella
 Boucher Granger Murtha
 Boyd Greenwood Myrick
 Brady Gutknecht Nadler
 Brown (FL) Hall (OH) Nethercutt
 Bryant Hall (TX) Neumann
 Bunning Hamilton Ney
 Burr Hansen Northup
 Burton Hastert Norwood
 Buyer Hastings (FL) Nussle
 Callahan Hastings (WA) Obey
 Calvert Hayworth Olver
 Camp Hefley Ortiz
 Campbell Hefner Oxley
 Canady Herger Packard
 Cannon Hill Pappas
 Capps Hilleary Parker
 Carson Hilliard Pascrell
 Castle Hinojosa Pastor
 Chabot Hobson Paul
 Chambliss Hoekstra Paxon
 Chenoweth Holden Pease
 Christensen Hooley Peterson (MN)
 Clay Horn Peterson (PA)
 Clayton Hostettler Petri
 Clement Houghton Pickering
 Clyburn Hoyer Pickett
 Coble Hulshof Pitts
 Coburn Hunter Pombo
 Collins Hutchinson Pomeroy
 Combest Hyde Porter
 Condit Inglis Portman
 Cook Istook Poshard
 Cooksey Jackson-Lee Price (NC)
 Costello (TX) Pryce (OH)
 Cox Jenkins Quinn
 Cramer John Radanovich
 Crane Johnson (CT) Rahall
 Crapo Johnson (WI) Ramstad
 Cubin Johnson, E. B. Rangel
 Cunningham Johnson, Sam Redmond
 Danner Jones Regula
 Davis (FL) Kanjorski Reyes
 Davis (IL) Kaptur Riggs
 Davis (VA) Kasich Riley
 Deal Kelly Rivers
 Delahunt Kennelly Rodriguez
 DeLauro Kildee
 DeLay Kilpatrick
 Deutsch Kim Rogan
 Diaz-Balart King (NY) Rogers
 Dickey Kingston Rohrabacher
 Dingell Klink Ros-Lehtinen
 Dixon Klug Rothman
 Dooley Dooley Roukema
 Doolittle Kolbe Royce
 Doyle LaHood Ryan
 Dreier Lampson Sabo
 Duncan Largent Salmon
 Dunn Latham Sanford
 Edwards LaTourette Sawyer
 Ehlers Lazio Saxton
 Emerson Leach Scarborough
 Engel Levin Schaefer, Dan
 English Lewis (CA) Schaffer, Bob
 Ensign Lewis (GA) Scott
 Eshoo Lewis (KY) Sensenbrenner
 Etheridge Linder Serrano
 Evans Livingston Sessions
 Everett LoBiondo Shadegg
 Ewing Lofgren Shaw
 Farr Lucas Shays
 Fattah Maloney (CT) Sherman
 Fawell Maloney (NY) Shimkus
 Fazio Manton Shuster
 Filer Manzullo Sisisky
 Flake Martinez Skeen
 Foglietta Mascara Skelton
 Foley McCarthy (MO) Slaughter
 Forbes McCarthy (NY) Smith (MI)
 Fowler McCollum Smith (NJ)
 Fox McCrery Smith (OR)
 Franks (NJ) McDade Smith (TX)
 Frelinghuysen McHale Smith, Linda
 Frost McHugh Snowbarger
 Furse McInnis Snyder
 Gallegly McIntosh Solomon
 Ganske McIntyre Souder
 Gejdenson McKeon Spence

Spratt Thompson Watt (NC) Duncanson Kingston Riley Maloney (CT) Neal Sherman
 Stabenow Thornberry Watts (OK) Dunn Kleczka Maloney (NY) Oberstar Skaggs
 Stearns Thune Weldon (FL) Ehlers Klug Manton Obey Slaughter
 Stenholm Thurman Weldon (PA) Ehrlich Knollenberg Markey Olver Spratt
 Strickland Tiahrt Weller Emerson Kolbe Rohrabacher Mascara Owens Stabenow
 Stump Tierney Weygand English LaHood Ros-Lehtinen Matsui Pallone Stokes
 Stupak Towns White Emensig Lampson Roukema McCarthy (MO) Pascrell Strickland
 Sununu Traficant Whitfield Etheridge Royce McCarthy (NY) Pastor Stupak
 Talent Turner Wicker Evans Latham Ryun McDermott Payne Tierney
 Tanner Upton Wise Everrett LaTourette McGovern Pelosi Torres
 Tauscher Vento Wolf Ewing Lazio Sanchez Pomeroy Rivers Towns
 Tauzin Visclosky Woolsey Farr Leach Sandlin McKinney Rangel Velazquez
 Taylor (MS) Walsh Wynn Fawell Lewis (CA) Sanford McNulty Rivers Vento
 Taylor (NC) Wamp Young (FL) Filner Lewis (KY) Saxton Meehan Rodriguez Visclosky
 Thomas Watkins Forbes Foye Linder Scarborough Meek Rothman Waters
 Fowler Livingstone Schaefer, Dan Menendez Roybal-Allard Watt (NC)
 Fox LoBiondo Schaffer, Bob Millender Rush Waxman
 Franks (NJ) Lucas Scott McDonald Sabo Weygand
 Manzullo Sessions Sensenbrenner Miller (CA) Sanders Woolsey
 Martinez Shadegg Mink Sawyer Wynn
 McCollum Shaw Murtha Schumer Yates
 McCrery Shays Nadler Serrano

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

DeFazio

Lipinski

NOT VOTING—13

Ballenger Harman Stark
 Barton Hinchey Wexler
 Ehrlich McKinney Young (AK)
 Gilman Molinari
 Gonzalez Schiff

□ 1923

Mr. ENGEL changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. MORAN of Virginia changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER THE VOTE OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to table the motion to reconsider.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUSSLE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HASTINGS] to lay on the table the motion to reconsider the vote offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 285, noes 139, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 320]

AYES—285

Aderholt Bono Clayton
 Archer Boswell Clyburn
 Arme Coble
 Bachus Boyd Coburn
 Baesler Brady Collins
 Baker Brown (FL) Combust
 Baldacci Bryant Condit
 Barcia Bunning Cook
 Barr Burr Cooksey
 Barrett (NE) Burton Costello
 Bartlett Buyer Cox
 Bass Callahan Cramer
 Bateman Calvert Crane
 Bentsen Camp Crapo
 Bereuter Campbell Cubin
 Berry Canady Cunningham
 Bilbray Cannon Davis (VA)
 Bilirakis Capps Deal
 Bishop Carson DeLay
 Bliley Castle Diaz-Balart
 Blunt Chabot Dickey
 Boehlert Chambliss Dooley
 Boehner Chenoweth Doolittle
 Bonilla Christensen Dreier

Duncanson Kingston Riley Maloney (CT) Neal Sherman
 Dunn Kleczka Maloney (NY) Oberstar Skaggs
 Ehlers Klug Manton Obey Slaughter
 Ehrlich Knollenberg Markey Olver Spratt
 Emerson Kolbe Rohrabacher Mascara Owens Stabenow
 English LaHood Ros-Lehtinen Matsui Pallone Stokes
 Ensign Lampson Roukema McCarthy (MO) Pascrell Strickland
 Etheridge Royce McCarthy (NY) Pastor Stupak
 Evans Latham Ryun McDermott Payne Tierney
 Everrett LaTourette McGovern Pelosi Torres
 Ewing Lazio Sanchez Pomeroy Rivers Towns
 Farr Leach Sandlin McKinney Rangel Velazquez
 Fawell Lewis (CA) Sanford McNulty Rivers Vento
 Filner Lewis (KY) Saxton Meehan Rodriguez Visclosky
 Foye Linder Scarborough Meek Rothman Waters
 Forbes Livingstone Schaefer, Dan Menendez Roybal-Allard Watt (NC)
 Fowler LoBiondo Schaffer, Bob Millender Rush Waxman
 Fox Lucas Scott McDonald Sabo Weygand
 Franks (NJ) Manzullo Sessions Sensenbrenner Miller (CA) Sanders Woolsey
 Frelinghuysen Martinez Shadegg Mink Sawyer Wynn
 Gallegly McCollum Shaw Murtha Schumer Yates
 Ganske McCrery Shays Nadler Serrano
 Gejdenson McDade Shays Nadler Serrano
 Gekas McHugh Shimkus
 Gephardt McNinis Shuster
 Gibbons McIntosh Sisisky
 Gilchrist McIntyre Skeen
 Gillmor McKeon Skelton
 Gilman Metcalf Smith (MI)
 Goode Mica Smith (NJ)
 Goodlatte Miller (FL) Smith (OR)
 Goodling Minge Smith (TX)
 Goss Moakley Smith, Linda
 Graham Mollohan Snowbarger
 Granger Moran (KS) Snyder
 Greenwood Moran (VA) Solomon
 Gutknecht Morella Souder
 Hall (OH) Myrick Spence
 Hall (TX) Nethercutt Stearns
 Hamilton Neumann Stenholm
 Hansen Stump Ney
 Hastert Northup Sununu
 Hastings (WA) Norwood Talent
 Hayworth Nussle Tanner
 Hefley Ortiz Tauscher
 Hefner Oxley Tauzin
 Herger Packard Taylor (MS)
 Hill Pappas Taylor (NC)
 Hilleary Parker Thomas
 Hobson Paul Thompson
 Hoekstra Paxon Thornberry
 Horn Pease Thune
 Hostettler Peterson (MN) Thurman
 Houghton Peterson (PA) Tiahrt
 Hulshof Petri Traficant
 Hunter Pickering Turner
 Hutchinson Pickett Upton
 Hyde Pitts Walsh
 Inglis Pombo Wamp
 Istook Porter Watkins
 Jackson-Lee Portman Watts (OK)
 (TX) Poshard Weldon (FL)
 Jenkins Price (NC) Weldon (PA)
 John Pryce (OH) Weller
 Johnson (CT) Quinn White
 Johnson (WI) Radanovich Whitfield
 Johnson, Sam Rahall Wicker
 Jones Ramstad Wise
 Kasich Redmond Wolf
 Kelly Regula Young (FL)
 Kim Reyes
 King (NY) Riggs

NOES—139

Abercrombie DeLauro Hinchey
 Ackerman Dellums Hinojosa
 Allen Deutschedt Holden
 Andrews Dicks Hooley
 Barrett (WI) Dingell Hoyer
 Becerra Dixon Jackson (IL)
 Berman Doggett Jefferson
 Blagojevich Doyle Johnson, E. B.
 Blumenauer Edwards Kanjorski
 Bonior Engel Kaptur
 Borski Eshoo Kennedy (MA)
 Brown (CA) Fattah Kennedy (RI)
 Brown (OH) Fazio Kennelly
 Cardin Flake Kildee
 Clay Foglietta Kilpatrick
 Clement Ford Kind (WI)
 Conyers Frank (MA) Klink
 Coyne Frost Kucinich
 Cummings Furse Lantos
 Danner Gordon Levin
 Diaz (FL) Green Lewis (GA)
 Davis (IL) Gutierrez Lipinski
 DeFazio Harman Lofgren
 DeGette Hastings (FL) Lowey
 Delahunt Hilliard Luther

Maloney (CT) Neal Sherman
 Maloney (NY) Oberstar Skaggs
 Manton Obey Slaughter
 Markey Olver Spratt
 Mascara Owens Stabenow
 Matsui Pallone Stokes
 McCarthy (MO) Pascrell Strickland
 McCarthy (NY) Pastor Stupak
 McDermott Payne Tierney
 McGovern Pelosi Torres
 McHale Pomeroy Rivers Towns
 McKinney Rangel Velazquez
 McNulty Rivers Vento
 Meehan Rodriguez Visclosky
 Meek Rothman Waters
 Menendez Roybal-Allard Watt (NC)
 Millender Rush Waxman
 McDonald Sabo Weygand
 Miller (CA) Sanders Woolsey
 Mink Sawyer Wynn
 Murtha Schumer Yates
 Nadler Serrano

NOT VOTING—10

Ballenger Molinari Wexler
 Barton Schiff Young (AK)
 Gonzalez Smith, Adam
 LaFalce Stark

□ 1942

Mr. HUNTER and Mr. HANSEN changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUSSLE). The question is on the passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 392, nays 32, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 321]

YEAS—392

Abercrombie Buyer Dingell
 Ackerman Callahan Dixon
 Aderholt Calvert Dooley
 Allen Camp Doolittle
 Archer Canady Doyle
 Arme Capps Dreier
 Baesler Carson Duncan
 Baker Castle Dunn
 Baldacci Chabot Edwards
 Ballenger Chambliss Ehlers
 Barcia Chenoweth Ehrlich
 Barr Christensen Emerson
 Barrett (NE) Clay Engel
 Barrett (WI) Clayton English
 Bartlett Clement Eshoo
 Bass Clyburn Etheridge
 Bateman Coble Evans
 Becerra Coburn Everett
 Bentsen Collins Ewing
 Bereuter Combust Farr
 Berman Condit Fattah
 Berry Cook Fawell
 Bilbray Cooksey Fazio
 Bilirakis Costello Filner
 Bishop Cox Flake
 Blagojevich Cramer Foglietta
 Bliley Crane Foley
 Blumenauer Crapo Forbes
 Blunt Cubin Ford
 Boehlert Cummings Fowler
 Boehner Cunningham Fox
 Bonilla Danner Frelinghuysen
 Bonior Davis (FL) Frost
 Bono Davis (IL) Furse
 Borski Davis (VA) Gallegly
 Boswell Deal Ganske
 Boucher DeFazio Gejdenson
 Boyd DeGette Gekas
 Brady Delahunt Delahunt
 Brown (CA) DeLauro Gibbons
 Brown (FL) Brown (FL) Gilchrist
 Brown (OH) Dellums Gillmor
 Bryant Deutsch Gilman
 Bunning Diaz-Balart Goode
 Burr Dickey Goodlatte
 Burton Dicks Goodling

Gordon Maloney (CT) Roukema
 Goss Maloney (NY) Roybal-Allard
 Graham Manton Rush
 Granger Manzullo Ryan
 Green Markey Sabo
 Greenwood Martinez Sanchez
 Gutierrez Mascara Sanders
 Gutknecht Matsui Sandlin
 Hall (OH) McCarthy (MO) Sanford
 Hall (TX) McCarthy (NY) Sawyer
 Hamilton McCollum Saxton
 Hansen McCreery Schaefer, Dan
 Harman McDade Schaffer, Bob
 Hastert McHale Scott
 Hastings (FL) McHugh Serrano
 Hastings (WA) McClinnis Sessions
 Hayworth McIntosh Shadegg
 Hefley McIntyre Shaw
 Hefner McKeon Shays
 Herger McKinney Sherman
 Hill McNulty Shimkus
 Hilleary Meek Shuster
 Hilliard Metcalf Sisisky
 Hinchey Mica Skaggs
 Hinojosa Millender-
 Hobson McDonald Skelton
 Hoekstra Miller (FL) Slaughter
 Holden Minge Smith (MI)
 Hooley Mink Smith (NJ)
 Horn Moakley Smith (OR)
 Hostettler Mollohan Smith (TX)
 Houghton Moran (KS) Smith, Adam
 Hoyer Moran (VA) Smith, Linda
 Hulshof Morella Snowbarger
 Hunter Murtha Snyder
 Hutchinson Myrick Solomon
 Hyde Nadler Souder
 Inglis Nethercutt Spence
 Istook Neumann Stabenow
 Jackson-Lee Ney Stearns
 (TX) Northup Stenholm
 Jefferson Norwood Stokes
 Jenkins Nussle Strickland
 John Oberstar Stump
 Johnson (CT) Obey Stupak
 Johnson (WI) Ortiz Sununu
 Johnson, E. B. Oxley Talent
 Johnson, Sam Packard Tanner
 Jones Pallone Tauscher
 Kanjorski Pappas Tauzin
 Kaptur Parker Taylor (NC)
 Kasich Pascrell Thomas
 Kelly Pastor Thompson
 Kennedy (RI) Paxon Thornberry
 Kennelly Payne Thune
 Kildee Pease Thurman
 Kilpatrick Pelosi Tiahrt
 Kim Peterson (MN) Torres
 Kind (WI) Peterson (PA) Towns
 King (NY) Petri Trafficant
 Kingston Pickering Turner
 Kleczka Pickett Upton
 Klink Pitts Vento
 Klug Pombo Visclosky
 Knollenberg Pomeroy Walsh
 Kolbe Porter Wamp
 LaFalce Portman Waters
 LaHood Poshard Watkins
 Lampson Price (NC) Watt (NC)
 Lantos Pryce (OH) Watts (OK)
 Largent Quinn Waxman
 Latham Radanovich Weldon (FL)
 LaTourette Rahall Weldon (PA)
 Lazio Ramstad Weller
 Leach Redmond Weygand
 Levin Regula White
 Lewis (CA) Reyes Whitfield
 Lewis (GA) Riggs Wicker
 Lewis (KY) Riley Wise
 Linder Rivers Wolf
 Lipinski Rodriguez Woolsey
 Livingston Roemer Wynn
 LoBiondo Rogan Yates
 Lowey Rogers Young (FL)
 Lucas Ros-Lehtinen
 Luther Rothman

NAYS—32

Andrews Kucinich Rangel
 Campbell Lofgren Rohrabacher
 Cardin McDermott Royce
 Conyers McGovern Salmon
 Coyne Meehan Scarborough
 Doggett Menendez Schumer
 Ensign Miller (CA) Sensenbrenner
 Frank (MA) Neal Taylor (MS)
 Franks (NJ) Olver Tierney
 Jackson (IL) Owens Velazquez
 Kennedy (MA) Paul

NOT VOTING—10
 Bachus Molinari Wexler
 Barton Schiff Young (AK)
 Cannon Spratt
 Gonzalez Stark

□ 1952

Messrs. FORD, SANFORD, and KENNEDY of Rhode Island changed their vote from “no” to “aye”.

So the bill was passed.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER THE VOTE OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to table the motion to reconsider the vote.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 284, noes 132, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 322]

AYES—284

Aderholt Crapo Hastings (WA)
 Armye Cubin Hayworth
 Bachus Cunningham Hefley
 Baesler Davis (VA) Herger
 Baker Deal Hill
 Ballenger DeFazio Hilleary
 Barcia DeLay Hinojosa
 Barr Diaz-Balart Hobson
 Barrett (NE) Dickey Hoekstra
 Bartlett Dicks Horn
 Barton Dixon Hostettler
 Bass Dooley Houghton
 Bentsen Doolittle Hulshof
 Bereuter Dreier Hunter
 Berman Duncan Hutchinson
 Berry Dunn Hyde
 Bilbray Ehlers Inglis
 Bilirakis Ehrlich Istook
 Bliley Emerson Jenkins
 Blumenauer English John
 Blunt Ensign Johnson (CT)
 Boehlert Etheridge Johnson (WI)
 Boehner Evans Johnson, Sam
 Bonilla Everrett Jones
 Bono Ewing Kasich
 Boswell Farr Kelly
 Boyd Fawell Kildee
 Brady Filner Kim
 Bryant Flake King (NY)
 Bunning Foley Kingston
 Burr Forbes Kleczka
 Burton Fox Klug
 Buyer Franks (NJ) Knollenberg
 Callahan Frelinghuysen Kolbe
 Calvert Gallegly LaHood
 Camp Ganske Largent
 Campbell Gejdenson Latham
 Canady Gekas LaTourette
 Capps Gephardt Lazio
 Castle Gibbons Leach
 Chabot Gilchrist Lewis (CA)
 Chambliss Gillmor Lewis (KY)
 Chenoweth Gilman Lipinski
 Christensen Goode Livingston
 Coble Goodlatte LoBiondo
 Coburn Goodling Lucas
 Collins Goss Manzullo
 Combest Graham Martinez
 Condit Granger McCollum
 Cook Green McCreery
 Cooksey Gutknecht McDade
 Costello Hall (TX) McHale
 Cox Hamilton McHugh
 Cramer Hansen McClinnis
 Crane Hastert McIntosh

McIntyre Price (NC) Smith (NJ)
 McKeon Pryce (OH) Smith (OR)
 McKinney Quinn Smith (TX)
 Metcalf Radanovich Smith, Linda
 Mica Rahall Snowbarger
 Miller (FL) Ramstad Snyder
 Minge Redmond Solomon
 Mollohan Regula Souder
 Moran (KS) Reyes Spence
 Moran (VA) Riggs Spratt
 Morella Riley Stearns
 Myrick Roemer Stenholm
 Nadler Rogan Stump
 Nethercutt Rogers Sununu
 Neumann Rohrabacher Talent
 Ney Ros-Lehtinen Tanner
 Northup Rothman Tauzin
 Norwood Roukema Taylor (MS)
 Nussle Royce Taylor (NC)
 Ortiz Ryun Thornberry
 Oxley Salmon Thune
 Packard Sanchez Thurman
 Pallone Sandlin Tiahrt
 Pappas Sanford Traficant
 Parker Saxton Turner
 Pascrell Scarborough Upton
 Paul Schaefer, Dan Walsh
 Paxon Schaffer, Bob Wamp
 Pease Scott Watkins
 Peterson (MN) Sensenbrenner Watts (OK)
 Peterson (PA) Sessions Weldon (FL)
 Petri Shadegg Weldon (PA)
 Pickering Shaw Weller
 Pickett Shays White
 Pitts Shimkus Whitfield
 Pombo Shuster Wicker
 Pomeroy Sisisky Wise
 Porter Skeen Wolf
 Portman Skelton Young (FL)
 Poshard Smith (MI)

NOES—132

Abercrombie Gutierrez Miller (CA)
 Ackerman Hall (OH) Mink
 Allen Harman Moakley
 Andrews Hastings (FL) Murtha
 Baldacci Hefner Neal
 Barrett (WI) Hilliard Oberstar
 Becerra Hinchey Obey
 Bishop Holden Oliver
 Blagojevich Hooley Owens
 Bonior Jackson (IL) Pastor
 Borski Jackson-Lee Payne
 Boucher (TX) Pelosi
 Brown (FL) Jefferson Rangel
 Brown (OH) Johnson, E. B. Rivers
 Cardin Kanjorski Rodriguez
 Carson Kaptur Roybal-Allard
 Clay Kennedy (MA) Rush
 Clayton Kennedy (RI) Sabo
 Clement Kilpatrick Sanders
 Clyburn Kind (WI) Sawyer
 Conyers Conyers Schumer
 Coyne Coyne Serrano
 Cummings LaFalce Sherman
 Danner Danner Lampson
 Davis (FL) Davis (FL) Skaggs
 Davis (IL) Lewis (GA) Slaughter
 DeGette DeGette Lofgren
 Delahunt Delahunt Lowey
 DeLauro DeLauro Luther
 Dellums Dellums Maloney (CT)
 Deutsch Deutsch Maloney (NY)
 Dingell Manton Thompson
 Doggett Doggett Markey
 Doyle Doyle Mascara
 Edwards Edwards Matsui
 Engel Engel McCarthy (MO)
 Eshoo Eshoo McCarthy (NY)
 Fattah Fattah McDermott
 Fazio Fazio McGovern
 Foglietta Foglietta Watt (NC)
 Ford Ford Meehan
 Frank (MA) Frank (MA) Meek
 Frost Frost Menendez
 Furse Furse Millender-
 Gordon McDonald

NOT VOTING—18

Archer Greenwood Schiff
 Bateman Hoyer Stark
 Brown (CA) Kennelly Thomas
 Cannon Levin Wexler
 Fowler Linder Yates
 Gonzalez Molinari Young (AK)

□ 2009

So the motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2209, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-202) on the resolution (H. Res. 197) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2209) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUSSLE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 96, noes 315, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No 323]

AYES—96

Abercrombie	Ford	Moakley
Andrews	Frank (MA)	Nadler
Barrett (WI)	Frost	Neal
Berry	Furse	Oberstar
Blumenauer	Gejdenson	Obey
Bonior	Gephardt	Owens
Boucher	Gillmor	Pallone
Brown (FL)	Hall (OH)	Pascarell
Brown (OH)	Hastings (FL)	Payne
Capps	Hinchey	Pelosi
Carson	Jackson (IL)	Peterson (MN)
Clay	Jefferson	Pomeroy
Clayton	John	Rodriguez
Clyburn	Johnson (WI)	Rush
Conyers	Johnson, E. B.	Sabo
Coyne	Kennelly	Sisisky
Cubin	Kilpatrick	Skaggs
Davis (FL)	LaFalce	Smith, Adam
DeFazio	Lampson	Spratt
DeGette	Lantos	Stokes
Delahunt	Lewis (GA)	Strickland
DeLauro	Lowe	Stupak
Dellums	Manton	Tauscher
Dicks	Markey	Thompson
Dingell	Martinez	Thurman
Doggett	Matsui	Torres
Dooley	McDermott	Vento
Farr	McGovern	Waters
Fazio	McKinney	Watt (NC)
Filner	McNulty	Waxman
Flake	Meek	Weygand
Foglietta	Mink	Woolsey

NOES—315

Ackerman	Armey	Ballenger
Aderholt	Bachus	Barcia
Allen	Baesler	Barr
Archer	Baker	Barrett (NE)

Bartlett	Greenwood	Nussle
Barton	Gutierrez	Ortiz
Bass	Gutknecht	Oxley
Becerra	Hall (TX)	Packard
Bentsen	Hamilton	Pappas
Bereuter	Hansen	Parker
Berman	Hastert	Pastor
Bilbray	Hastings (WA)	Paul
Bilirakis	Hayworth	Paxon
Bishop	Hefley	Pease
Blagojevich	Herger	Peterson (PA)
Biley	Hill	Petri
Blunt	Hilliard	Pickering
Boehlert	Hinojosa	Pickett
Boehner	Hobson	Pitts
Bonilla	Hoekstra	Pombo
Bono	Holden	Porter
Borski	Hooley	Portman
Boswell	Horn	Poshard
Boyd	Hostettler	Price (NC)
Brady	Houghton	Pryce (OH)
Brown (CA)	Hulshof	Quinn
Bryant	Hunter	Rahall
Bunning	Hutchinson	Ramstad
Burr	Hyde	Rangel
Burton	Inglis	Redmond
Buyer	Istook	Regula
Callahan	Jackson-Lee	Reyes
Calvert	(TX)	Riggs
Camp	Jenkins	Riley
Campbell	Johnson (CT)	Rivers
Canady	Johnson, Sam	Roemer
Cardin	Jones	Rogan
Castle	Kanjorski	Rogers
Chabot	Kaptur	Rohrabacher
Chambliss	Kasich	Ros-Lehtinen
Chenoweth	Kelly	Rothman
Christensen	Kennedy (MA)	Roukema
Clement	Kennedy (RI)	Roybal-Allard
Coble	Kildee	Royce
Coburn	Kim	Ryun
Collins	Kind (WI)	Salmon
Combest	King (NY)	Sanchez
Condit	Kingston	Sanders
Cook	Klink	Sandlin
Cooksey	Klug	Sanford
Costello	Knollenberg	Sawyer
Cox	Kolbe	Saxton
Cramer	Kucinich	Schaefer, Dan
Crane	LaHood	Schaffer, Bob
Crapo	Largent	Schumer
Cummings	Latham	Scott
Cunningham	LaTourette	Sensenbrenner
Danner	Lazio	Serrano
Davis (IL)	Leach	Sessions
Davis (VA)	Levin	Shadegg
Deal	Lewis (CA)	Shaw
DeLay	Lewis (KY)	Shays
Deutsch	Lipinski	Sherman
Diaz-Balart	Livingston	Shimkus
Dickey	LoBiondo	Shuster
Dixon	Lofgren	Skeen
Doolittle	Lucas	Skelton
Doyle	Luther	Slaughter
Dreier	Maloney (CT)	Smith (MI)
Duncan	Maloney (NY)	Smith (NJ)
Dunn	Manzullo	Smith (OR)
Edwards	Mascara	Smith (TX)
Ehlers	McCarthy (MO)	Smith, Linda
Emerson	McCarthy (NY)	Snowbarger
Engel	McCollum	Snyder
English	McCrery	Solomon
Ensinger	McDade	Souder
Eshoo	McHale	Stabenow
Etheridge	McHugh	Stearns
Evans	McInnis	Stenholm
Everett	McIntosh	Stump
Ewing	McIntyre	Sununu
Fattah	McKeon	Talent
Fawell	Meehan	Tanner
Foley	Menendez	Tauzin
Forbes	Metcalf	Taylor (MS)
Fox	Mica	Taylor (NC)
Franks (NJ)	Millender-McDonald	Thomas
Frelinghuysen	Miller (CA)	Thornberry
Galleghy	Miller (FL)	Thune
Ganske	Minge	Tiahrt
Gekas	Mollohan	Tierney
Gibbons	Moran (KS)	Towns
Gilchrist	Moran (VA)	Traficant
Gilman	Morella	Turner
Goode	Murtha	Upton
Goodlatte	Myrick	Visclosky
Goodling	Nethercutt	Walsh
Gordon	Goss	Wamp
Graham	Granger	Watkins
Green	Ney	Watts (OK)
	Northup	Weldon (FL)
	Norwood	Weldon (PA)

Weller
White
Whitfield

Wicker
Wise
Wolf

Wynn
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—23

Baldacci	Hilleary	Schiff
Bateman	Hoyer	Spence
Cannon	Klecicka	Stark
Ehrlich	Linder	Velazquez
Fowler	Molinari	Wexler
Gonzalez	Olver	Yates
Harman	Radanovich	Young (AK)
Hefner	Scarborough	

□ 2029

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island and Mr. GREENWOOD changed their vote from "aye" to "no".

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 695

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 695.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUSSLE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2203, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 194 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 194

Resolved, That at anytime after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2203) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 or 6 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first