

detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "Yes" on each vote.

**CONCERNING TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF TIANANMEN SQUARE MASSACRE**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 178.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 178, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 0, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No 150]

YEAS—418

Abercrombie	Clay	Frank (MA)	Kanjorski	Napolitano	Shimkus
Ackerman	Clayton	Frank (NJ)	Kaptur	Neal	Show
Aderholt	Clement	Frelighuysen	Kelly	Nethercutt	Shuster
Allen	Clyburn	Frost	Kennedy	Ney	Simpson
Andrews	Coble	Gallagly	Kilpatrick	Northup	Sisisky
Archer	Coburn	Ganske	Kind (WI)	Nussle	Skeen
Armey	Collins	Gejdenson	King (NY)	Oberstar	Skelton
Bachus	Combest	Gephart	Kingston	Obey	Slaughter
Baird	Condit	Gibbons	Kleczka	Olver	Smith (MI)
Baker	Conyers	Gilchrest	Klink	Ose	Smith (NJ)
Baldacci	Cook	Gillmor	Knollenberg	Owens	Smith (WA)
Baldwin	Cooksey	Gilman	Kolbe	Oxley	Snyder
Ballenger	Costello	Gonzalez	Kucinich	Packard	Spence
Barcia	Cox	Good	Kuykendall	Pallone	Spratt
Barr	Coyne	Goodlatte	LaFalce	Pascrell	Stabenow
Barrett (NE)	Cramer	Goodling	LaHood	Pastor	Stark
Barrett (WI)	Crane	Gordon	Lampson	Paul	Stearns
Bartlett	Crowley	Goss	Lantos	Payne	Stenholm
Barton	Cubin	Granger	Largent	Pease	Strickland
Bass	Cummings	Green (TX)	Larson	Pelosi	Stump
Bateman	Cunningham	Green (WI)	LaTourette	Peterson (MN)	Stupak
Becerra	Danner	Greenwood	Lazio	Peterson (PA)	Sununu
Bentsen	Davis (FL)	Gutierrez	Leach	Petri	Sweeney
Bereuter	Davis (IL)	Gutknecht	Lee	Phelps	Talent
Berkley	Davis (VA)	Hall (OH)	Levin	Pickering	Tancredo
Berman	Deal	Hall (TX)	Lewis (CA)	Pickett	Tanner
Berry	DeFazio	Hansen	Lewis (GA)	Pitts	Tauscher
Biggert	DeGette	Hastings (FL)	Lewis (KY)	Pombo	Tauzin
Bilbray	Delahunt	Hastings (WA)	Linder	Pomeroy	Taylor (MS)
Bilirakis	DeLauro	Hayes	Lipinski	Porter	Taylor (NC)
Bishop	DeLay	Hayworth	LoBiondo	Portman	Taylor (NC)
Blagojevich	DeMint	Herfley	Lofgren	Price (NC)	Thompson (CA)
Bliley	Deutsch	Herger	Lowey	Pryce (OH)	Thompson (MS)
Blumenauer	Diaz-Balart	Hill (IN)	Lucas (KY)	Quinn	Thornberry
Blunt	Dickey	Hill (MT)	Lucas (OK)	Radanovich	Thune
Boehlert	Dicks	Hilleary	Luther	Rahall	Thurman
Boehner	Dingell	Hilliard	Maloney (CT)	Ramstad	Tiabrt
Bonilla	Dixon	Hinchey	Maloney (NY)	Rangel	Tierney
Bonior	Doggett	Horn	Manzullo	Regula	Toomey
Bono	Dooley	Hostettler	Markey	Reynolds	Towns
Borski	Doolittle	Houghton	Mascara	Riley	Traficant
Boswell	Doyle	Hoyer	Matsui	Rivers	Turner
Boyd	Dreier	Hulshof	McCarthy (MO)	Rodriguez	Udall (CO)
Brady (PA)	Duncan	Hunter	McCormick	Roemer	Udall (NM)
Brady (TX)	Dunn	Hutchinson	McCollum	Rogan	Upton
Brown (FL)	Edwards	Eshoo	McIntyre	Roybal-Allard	Velazquez
Brown (OH)	Ehlers	Hyde	Hall (TX)	Royce	Waters
Bryant	Ehrlich	Inslee	McGovern	Rush	Watkins
Burr	Emerson	Isakson	McKinney	Ros-Lehtinen	Visclosky
Burton	Engel	Istoek	McNulty	Rothman	Walden
Callahan	English	Jackson (IL)	Meehan	Roukema	Walsh
Calvert	Eshoo	Jackson (IN)	Meek (FL)	McIntosh	Wamp
Camp	Etheridge	Jackson (PA)	Meeks (NY)	McIntyre	Waters
Campbell	Farr	Jackson (MI)	Hall (OH)	Menendez	Watkins
Canady	Fattah	Jackson (VA)	Metcalf	Menendez	Watt (NC)
Cannon	Filner	Jefferson	Mica	McNulty	Watts (OK)
Capps	Fletcher	Jenkins	Miller (FL)	Meehan	Sabo
Capuano	Foley	John	Miller (GA)	Meek (FL)	Waxman
Cardin	Forbes	Johnson (CT)	Miller, Gary	Meeks (NY)	Salmon
Carson	Ford	Johnson, E. B.	Hilliard	Menendez	Weiner
Castle	Fossella	Johnson, Sam	Horn	Metcalf	Weldon (FL)
Chabot	Fowler	Jones (NC)	Hostettler	Sanders	Weldon (PA)
Chambliss		Jones (OH)	Houghton	Sandlin	Weller
Chenoweth			Hoyer	Saxton	Wexler
			Hulshof	Serrano	Weygand
			Hunter	Sessions	Weldon
			Hutchinson	Gekas	Whitfield
			Eshoo	Graham	Scarborough
			Hyde	McCarthy (NY)	Wicker
			Inslee		Wise
			Isakson		Wolf
			Istoek		Wexler
			Jackson (IL)		Weygand
			Jackson (IN)		Woolsey
			Jackson (PA)		Wu
			Jackson (MI)		Wynn
			Jackson (VA)		Young (AK)
			John		Young (FL)
			Jefferson		
			Jenkins		
			John		
			Johnson (CT)		
			Johnson, E. B.		
			Johnson, Sam		
			Jones (NC)		
			Jones (OH)		

NOT VOTING—15

Boucher	Hinojosa	Millender-
Brown (CA)	Jackson-Lee	McDonald
Buyer	(TX)	Ortiz
Ewing	Kasich	Reyes
Gekas	Martinez	Smith (TX)
Graham	McCarthy (NY)	

□ 1329

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 188) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 188

*Resolved*, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Small Business: Ms. BERKLEY of Nevada; Mr. UDALL of Colorado

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT, DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE) laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable RICHARD A. GEPHARDT, Democratic leader:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
OFFICE OF THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER,  
Washington, DC, May 25, 1999.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,  
*Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Title 44 of the U.S.C. 2702, I hereby appoint the following individual to the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress:

Dr. Joseph Cooper of Baltimore, MD.  
Yours Very Truly,  
RICHARD A. GEPHARDT.

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 and that I may include tabular and extraneous materials on the bill (H.R. 1906) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 185 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1906.

□ 1333

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 consideration of the bill (H.R. 1906)

making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, with Mr. PEASE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPLUR) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN).

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

Mr. Chairman, today I have the honor to present to the House the fiscal year 2000 bill appropriating funds for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies. The bill we are taking up today has a total discretionary budget authority of almost \$13.99 billion. This is \$296 million above the current level and \$531 million below the request.

In mandatory spending, this bill has \$47 billion for fiscal year 2000, about \$4.8 billion over current levels and \$890 million below the request. Almost two-thirds of the mandatory spending in this bill is for food stamps, child nutrition, and most of the rest goes to support basic farm programs. This bill is within the allocations required by the Committee on Appropriations.

This bill is truly a bipartisan product, Mr. Chairman, constructed from hearings that began on February 10 and ended on March 18. The Committee on Appropriations has produced seven volumes of hearing records containing thousands of pages of information on the hearings, the detailed budget requests, and the answers to questions asked by Members and the public as well.

The Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies and the Committee on Appropriations held markups on May 13 and May 19 respectively, and these were public meetings with which the Members participated actively in shaping the bill.

Many Members would like to spend more than is in the bill, and so would I. We have about 250 letters to date, many of them with multiple requests, but only a handful ask for reduced spending.

Once again this year the administration proposed to pay for requested increases, more than \$780 million, with user fees that require legislation. Once again the administration has favored budget gimmicks over reality because the main component of this legislation, user fees on meat and poultry inspection, has been strongly opposed by consumer groups, industry, and the authorizing committee for several years.

This bill does a lot of good in many areas. Farm Service Agency salaries and expenses are increased by \$80 mil-

lion to improve delivery of farm programs; agricultural credit programs are increased by more than \$700 million; and funds to protect our Nation's soils are increased by \$13 million. Rural housing programs are increased over last year's level and rural telephone and electric loans are increased or held at last year's levels.

Once again, the Food Safety and Inspection Service gets the full request, a \$36 million increase. FDA has an increase of \$115 million. Funding for the Food Safety Initiative is provided throughout the bill.

Child nutrition programs have been increased by \$370 million and WIC by \$81 million. P.L. 480, Titles I and II, the two main food aid titles, are restored to last year's levels, and the full request is provided for the Foreign Agricultural Service.

I would also like to say to my colleagues that the bill so far does not have any significant provisions that would bring objections from authorizing committees, and I would strongly urge that we keep it that way.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Chairman Young) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. Kaptur), our even more distinguished ranking member on the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, for their help in putting this bill together.

I would also like to recognize the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON), the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY), the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD), our new subcommittee members who have brought a great deal of enthusiasm and creativity to this bill. I look forward to their participation on the floor today and in the conference.

Mr. Chairman, I say to all my colleagues that this is a bill that will benefit every one of our constituents every day of their lives, no matter where they live in this great country.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to acknowledge the hard work of the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, members of our subcommittee, as well as the staff for their leadership, including our new staff director, Hank Moore, who has worked so hard this year.

This bill makes a reasonable effort to apportion the limited resources available to our subcommittee to keep our Nation at the leading edge for food, fiber, new fuels, and forest production, as well as the counts relating to research, trade and food safety.

May I begin by reminding my colleagues that food is not produced at

the local grocery store. There is no question that agriculture and food processing are America's leading industries. Our farmers and our agricultural sector remain the most productive on the face of the Earth. They well understand, as we do, how difficult it is to maintain our Nation's commitment to excellence in agriculture in tight budgetary times.

While on balance this bill seems like a reasonable effort to stretch a limited sum of money as far as possible, and I would encourage my colleagues to vote for this bill, we simply disagree on the levels of support needed for priority programs, including the Women, Infants and Children feeding program; the Natural Resource Conservation Service, the primary conservation operation in this country; and other programs like farmland protection which were not able to be funded at all in this bill, nor was the school breakfast pilot program that the administration requested.

We must also keep in mind that this bill simply does not do enough to address the Depression-level conditions affecting many sectors of rural America from coast to coast, whether we are talking about the Salinas Valley, cattle country in Florida, hog producing country in the Midwest, cotton fields in Texas, the list goes on and on.

This bill simply is an exceedingly limited response to an extremely serious situation afflicting many sectors of the farm economy across our Nation. As we consider this bill today, I would urge my colleagues to think about what is going on in rural America, as farmers continue to experience significant decreases in commodity prices. It started with wheat and with cattle, and it spread to the feed grains, to oil seeds, to cotton, to pork, and even now the dairy sectors.

At the same time, the costs of production are not decreasing. In fact, they are increasing. Total farm debt has risen now to over \$170 billion at the end of last year, up nearly 9 percent over the last 2 years.

That means people are borrowing against their accumulated equity to make up for their lack of ability to receive a price for their product in the market. In fact, farmland values began declining in 1998, not a good sign.

We know that USDA, the Department of Agriculture predicts the greatest strain this year will be on field crops. We know that wheat, corn, soybean, upland cotton, and rice crops experienced about a 17 percent drop last year; and they project that this year, 27 percent, there will be a 27 percent drop in prices from prior year averages.

So we have a real tender situation here, which frankly this bill does not address. This bill puts blinders onto what is happening in rural America and basically says, well, we really do not have the money, so let us just continue like it was in years past, which will not solve the real situation out there.

Overall, this bill does a number of useful things, but it can hardly be considered adequate. It is moving in the right direction but falls far short of the mark. All I can say is that our Nation has a responsibility beyond this bill to help a sector of our economy so vital to our national security.

What is really happening in our country, as more bankruptcies occur in rural America, is the average age of farmers has now risen to 55. People are making live decisions out there about whether or not they are going to hold on to the farm or sell it off for another suburban development. This is not a good sign for America in the 21st Century. People really should not be selling off their seed corn for the future.

Let me just mention that in the discretionary appropriations, which in this bill total \$13.9 billion for the next fiscal year, if we just take a look at the Farm Credit and the Farm Service Agency people, the people doing the work, administering the programs in our Farm Service Agency offices, and the loans and so forth that are being made, there is an increase of less than one-fifth of 1 percent over the prior year.

If we really take a look at what it is taking to hold agricultural America together today in this severely depressed economy in the rural countryside, we will find that the amounts in this bill are one-third below what was spent during this fiscal year and the last fiscal year as we attempted to prop up the disasters going on out there with the emergency bills that we were forced to pass outside the regular budget process.

So this a very lean bill that truly will not meet the needs of rural America. We may be forced again into one of these extra budgetary sessions to try to figure out how we are going to prop up rural America in the months ahead.

Let me also mention that the bill does try to meet the administration's request for the Food and Drug Administration to process additional drug approvals and to increase the safety of our food supply, with all the additional imports that are coming in here as well as pathogens found in food.

We increased funding for the Food Safety and Inspection Service, very important to the health of the American people, and to some rural housing and rural development accounts, as well as for agricultural research and pest and disease control through the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service as well as the Natural Resources Conservation Service.

But, more importantly, on the minus side there is no provision in this bill for any of the emergency assistance provided to rural America during this fiscal year. We do not continue any support for market support, nor any of the subsidies for the crop insurance premiums or the extra funds we provided to the Secretary of Agriculture to lift surplus commodities off the marketplace to try to get prices to rise in this country.

So the situation facing our farmers in this bill is that, well, we really do not take care of them. We sort of continue things the way they were, and we may be forced to come back later in the year in order to deal with the hemorrhage that is occurring across this country.

Let me also mention that in this bill we will probably be forced to reduce county office staff by another 650 staff positions. I think this is truly tragic, because we have got backlogs around the country of farmers waiting to receive payments after months and months because of disasters that have occurred from coast to coast.

□ 1345

So reducing these staffing levels really does not make much sense, and yet it is the truth that is buried inside this bill.

Further, the bill reduces funding for food aid programs, which are so important to support people around the world who live at the edge of hunger, but also to aid rural America. In fact, we lift surplus during this year that was sent to Russia; we have tried to assist the Kosovo refugees in the emergency supplemental that just passed, but there is nothing in this bill that continues that kind of additional surplus purchase. In fact, it will be reduced.

So the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) and our subcommittee have certainly tried to do what was best under the hand that we were dealt, but the bill falls far short of what is needed to address the urgent problems facing farmers across America.

One thing is certain, no matter what forum or legislative vehicle is chosen, it is essential that Congress act today at least to move this bill forward and to move the first appropriation bill through this session of Congress. We are now approaching Memorial Day.

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

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON).

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to take a moment to express my appreciation to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) for the hard work he has done in putting together this piece of legislation before us today.

Given the tight budget constraints that we face, the chairman has had to make difficult decisions and balance a lot of different needs. He knows, and I think all our subcommittee members know, that this bill will not, as the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) said, address all of the many urgent needs that are there out on the farm right now. Funds are desperately needed for farm programs because of the low prices and tough market conditions for farmers and ranchers all over the country.

However, I think the gentleman from New Mexico has worked with the num-

bers that he was given and done a tremendous job and the best job possible to meet the many needs of farmers and ranchers, and I just want to thank him for the outstanding job he has done.

Let me just take a minute too to highlight some of the aspects of this bill that are critically important to agriculture. Total dollars for agriculture research are up by \$61 million. The bill rejects the cuts in Hatch Act and extension research funding that were proposed by the administration. Export programs, such as P.L. 480, Titles I and II, are funded at or near last year's levels, again rejecting large cuts by the administration.

Many farm State Members of Congress have expressed a concern, as I have, about increased concentration in agriculture markets, and I am pleased this bill includes a \$636,000 increase for packer competition and industry concentration, as well as \$750,000 strictly for poultry compliance activities. There is much needed oversight and enforcement money to ensure our beef, pork and poultry producers are treated fairly.

Now, I personally believe that we should do more and have mandatory price reporting for livestock, but this is a function of the authorizing committee, not the Committee on Appropriations, and I will look forward to working with my colleague from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) on this legislation later on this year.

Our bill also increases farm loan accounts, such as farm ownership, farm operating, and emergency loans from \$2.3 billion to \$3 billion. Not enough, and we will probably need more later, but because there is an increasing demand for these loans due to the hardships in the farm economy, we need the money now and, as I said, we will need more later.

For soybean producers in Missouri and around the country there is continued funding needed to fight the cyst nematode pest. Continued research will help develop soybean varieties that are resistant to the yield and profit endangering pest.

I would simply add this is an extremely tough time for our farmers and ranchers. As the gentlewoman from Ohio noted, this is an issue of national security. My farmers tell me that it is as bad as it has been in decades. Not years ago, but decades. And while this bill does not address all of the problems in the farm economy, particularly as it relates to the staffing in the Farm Services Agency and the National Resource Conservation Service, it is a positive step in the right direction and I would urge a strong "yes" on the bill.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, today I am disappointed and I am outraged. I am almost at a loss for words.

I am angry because this bill does not include the school breakfast pilot program. The school breakfast pilot program tests the benefits of making breakfast available at school to all children in early grades. It was authorized in the William F. Goodling Nutrition Reauthorization Act, and it is included in the President's budget.

As this Nation searches for ways to make our schools safer, surely, surely we want to consider all reasonable ways to improve students' behavior. Well, two studies have already shown that kids who eat breakfast improve both their grades and their behavior at school. So why are some of my colleagues opposed to an official study to evaluate what happens in a school when all the students start the day with a good breakfast?

I plan to fight this and I plan to keep working with the committee, but I want to talk about the whys on this. The answer may be because we already know that school breakfast should be offered by schools as a learning tool, just like a book, just like a computer. It may be that some of my colleagues are too concerned with keeping our schools just the way they have always been, so they fight against any proposals for change. Or it may be that children just do not count enough.

Mr. Chairman, as this Nation, as this body searches for ways to make our schools safer and better for our children, surely we want to consider all reasonable ways to improve students' behavior. The school breakfast program would help us with that, so I will continue to fight, I will continue to work with my colleagues in support of the school breakfast program on the appropriations committee.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to thank the gentlewoman for fighting so hard for this school breakfast program and to say that with her leadership the members of the subcommittee and the full committee have attempted to do what was necessary.

Unfortunately, the administration did not provide us with some of the information that we were expecting. The gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAUR) worked with us at the subcommittee and full committee levels, and it is our firm intention to try to take this issue into conference to see if we cannot do something to move this pilot project forward.

But I just want to say to the gentlewoman that without her interest and research and the deep dedication that she has shown, we would not be this far. I know we are not where the gentlewoman wants us to be yet, but without her leadership we would not be anywhere. We hope that as we move towards conference we might be able to accommodate some of this.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I stand in support of the agriculture appropriations bill. I serve on the subcommittee and can say on a firsthand basis that the staff, on a bipartisan basis, went through this legislation thoroughly to be sure that we have balanced the needs of the American farm, agricultural community, and the American grocery consuming public.

Last year's bill was \$61.7 billion. This year the legislation is down to \$60.8 billion. A lot of this goes back, Mr. Chairman, to the 1997 bipartisan budget agreement, which was pushed by Democrat and Republican leaders alike with the full support of the President. And to get back to that budget agreement, it had some good and it had some bad, as my colleagues can imagine in any huge piece of legislation which Democrats and Republicans come together on.

Now, unfortunately, we are seeing from both sides of the aisle people who are peeling away from the agreement, people who voted for the budget agreement that are now lamenting the fact that it actually does call for some belt tightening here and there and they are beginning to walk away from it.

But the staff on this subcommittee, and again on a bipartisan basis, tried to put together the actual requests of 280 Members asking for specific projects in their districts or of national scope. And it was quite a balancing act, because we do have a certain amount of institutional schizophrenia. We have, on one hand, people who say I want to cut the budget and I want it cut now, but oh, no, not in my district, not in the district that I happen to represent. And, by the way, I want to fund this particular project, which of course is not pork, it is just that it is economic development when it is in my district. So this bill, like all appropriation bills, is a balancing act.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the American farmer is facing probably unprecedented challenges. They have challenges getting credit. Businesses in America, small businesses to Fortune 500 companies, have to have credit. They have to borrow both short- and long-term money. Yet for farmers, they cannot get long-term money any more. Banks, and rightfully so, facing the realities of making a profit on the farm, they will not lend them money any more. So the farmers are scrambling, and that is one of the huge challenges that is facing farmers today.

A second challenge is international competition. I represent Milen, Georgia, little Jenkins County, Georgia, and farmers there can grow oats and do it very inexpensively and very efficiently. And yet at the end of the season, they can still go down to Brunswick, Georgia, and buy imported oats cheaper than they can grow it in America. And that is just one commodity.

That is the story with so many of our imports now. And one reason is that

our foreign competitors are heavily, heavily subsidized in comparison to the American farmers, where we have about \$3.9 billion of this \$60 billion bill that is spent on actual commodity-type programs.

People say, oh, let us cut out the farm "subsidies", yet most of these are not true subsidies. But even so, it is impossible to compete against foreign competitors, even with the modern technology and all the farming techniques we know.

A third challenge that our farmers are facing is that simply of the weather. We do not get the rain that we need in every growing season. Last year Screven County, Georgia, town seat of Sylvania, lost \$17 million because of the drought; \$17 million in farm losses. Now, that is not much for a big country like America, but tell that to somebody in Sylvania, Georgia, and tell that to a third generation farmer who is going to lose his farm because of that drought.

Unfortunately, in Georgia this year, we are facing possibly another bad season because of the lack of rain. We need to help our farmers on all these challenges, Mr. Chairman, and this bill tries to do that. It is not going to do it all the way. It will not do it as well as we would like, but it takes a step in the right direction.

There are a lot of things in this bill, though. There is some money for water projects, there is money for conservation projects. One thing not in the bill, that I want to try to work with the minority and the majority representatives on, is giving some tax credit for precision agriculture. Because if we can move our farmers towards obtaining precision agriculture equipment, then they would know exactly how much fertilizer to apply, exactly how much water to use, and exactly what their profits are per acre so that they can make Ag production as absolutely efficient as possible.

I would also like to see more tax credits for farmers in other areas. I would like to see them taxed more on the use of their land rather than on the potential use of their land. I represent Coastal Georgia, it is a huge growth area. Bulloch County last year, 17 percent; Effingham County, 42 percent; Bryan County, 52 percent. All these are traditionally agricultural counties and now they are becoming urban or suburban counties. There are few family farms left, but they are being taxed out of existence.

□ 1400

I would like to see some tax help for farmers in that direction. I would like to see land taxed on its actual use and not its percentage use. And I of course, Mr. Chairman, would love to see some estate tax or death tax relief so that family farms can be passed from one generation or the other.

This is not going to happen in this bill but this bill takes us in the right direction. Right now, Mr. Chairman,

less than 2 percent of the American population is feeding 100 percent of the American population and a substantial portion of the world. Does our ag policy work? I would say yes, it does. Americans spend about 11 cents on the dollar earned on food and groceries. We spend more than that on entertainment, jet skis, CDs, movies, vacations. We are spending more on recreation than we do on food and groceries.

So the ag policy is working. It has a lot of good potential in it for improvements. We are going to continue to work on that on a bipartisan basis. I urge my Members to support the bill.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY), a distinguished member of the subcommittee who has put in long hours on this bill.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), the chairman of our subcommittee, for the care and craftsmanship with which he worked to put this bill together. It has been a pleasure to work with him as a member of the Subcommittee on Agriculture.

Unfortunately, the constraints within which we have had to operate, constraints imposed by the leadership here in the Congress and traceable directly back to the agriculture bill of 1996, the so-called Freedom to Farm bill, have made it impossible to put together an agriculture appropriations bill here that meets the needs of the agriculture community, the needs of our farmers and the needs of our consumers across the country.

As I said, this is directly attributable to the constraints that flow from the so-called Freedom to Farm bill, which is not in fact a Freedom to Farm bill, but in many cases it has been a freedom to fail bill, almost a guarantee of failure. Farm prices in the farm belts all across our country are at near-Depression prices. Farmers are finding themselves in situations that verge on the desperate and in many cases they are in fact desperate. Farmers are being forced out of business because they cannot sell their crops at a price that is higher than the cost that they had to incur for putting those crops in the ground. It is an absolutely impossible situation.

We cannot have an agriculture that is sustained in a global economy where other countries are subsidizing their agriculture and making certain creating circumstances within which agricultural people are going to prosper. We have failed to do that. In fact, we have taken all the safeguards that our agricultural community has had away from them. We did so in that Freedom to Farm bill in 1996. We need to go back and correct those mistakes, and we need to do so soon. The longer we wait, the more desperate the circumstances will become.

Are we committed to family farms, or do we want farms that are corporate in nature exclusively across this coun-

try? Do we want farmers to make a living, or do we want it all to be processors? Do we want to have an agricultural community that is healthy and strong and providing the food and fiber that our people need domestically here to sustain their lives?

These are the basic questions that are before us. And, unfortunately, this bill, not through any fault of the chairman or members of the subcommittee, but only because of the constraints imposed upon the subcommittee and constraints in the Freedom to Farm bill have made it impossible to meet these needs this year. We need to go back and meet them and we need to do so soon, intelligently, and thoroughly.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I would wish to engage in a colloquy with my good friend from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN).

Mr. SKEEN, I appreciate your willingness to discuss the Department of Agriculture Plant Protection Center located in Niles, Michigan. I know that you share my belief that this center has a very important mission, finding natural means to combat pests. The role of this facility among plant protection centers is important to American agriculture and is of enormous value to the agriculture industry throughout the Midwest.

The work the employees do in Niles is particularly important in light of the probable loss of pesticides as a result of the implementation of the Food Quality Protection Act. In fact, just this past year the Michigan Department of Agriculture and Michigan State University have formed partnerships with the laboratory at Niles aimed at promoting biological control options. This is a prime example of partnering and cost-sharing between State and Federal agriculture interests using the best strengths of both partners to benefit agriculture.

I am greatly troubled that within the past 2 years the budget of this facility has been cut by 26 percent, the staff reduced from 45 to 19 employees. Especially troubling is the fact that this facility receives its funding through the biocontrol line item, which tends to receive increased funding and is scheduled to get a 22 percent increase in fiscal year 2000. I firmly believe that any further reductions in the budget at this Niles facility would be a serious error and would jeopardize the strength of agriculture throughout the Midwest.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to my friend the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) for a response.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I share the gentleman's concern for the future of the critical work that is being done at the Niles Protection Center.

As I understand it, the USDA has not made a final decision. And, of course, we have a long way to go before we produce a conference report with a final number for APHIS. We have pro-

vided the account in question with a significant increase for fiscal year 2000 at a time of a very tight budget, and I hope the USDA will take note of our efforts and our concerns for the Niles facility.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his efforts, and I promise to continue working with him in conference on this matter.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the chairman of our subcommittee, and to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) that we so much support the efforts that he is making for this Niles Center, also on behalf of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER). We have that special situation where Michigan, Indiana, and Ohio all meet. And the services provided through the Center serve the entire country certainly, especially the Midwest. And I want to compliment the gentleman for drawing our attention to it and placing it in the debate today.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Salinas Valley, California (Mr. FARR), another member of our committee who represents the area that really feeds America, a hard working and dedicated member of our subcommittee.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

I rise as a new member of the Committee on Appropriations and of the Subcommittee of Agriculture, first of all to tell them how much I appreciated the leadership that was given in this markup by the chairman, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) and also by our ranking member, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

I represent a productive part of our country. We produce about 84 crops, which no other State in the United States produces that many as are produced in my district, about \$2.5 billion in agricultural sales. And most of it does not receive any help from the Federal Government. But they are interested in research and they are interested in sort of cutting-edge issues.

I would just like to point out, for those that are interested in these budgetary issues, that this markup is about a 1.8 percent increase over last year's discretionary money. Now, remember, last year we had a lot of agricultural debate on the floor because we were putting money into supplements, into emergency aid. If we take the total amount that was spent last year on agriculture and we look at the amount that was spent this year, we are \$6.4 billion below what Congress spent last year, or about a 31 percent cut. So this is a very, very, very tight budget.

And I might add, as tight as it is, it still ranks number four of all the appropriation committees in the amount of spending it does. Why? Because in America we created the Department of

Agriculture when President Lincoln was here, and he indicated that we needed a department that essentially had a little bit for everybody in America, kind of a consumers department.

So the department has all the rural America issues, which are as true today as they were a hundred years ago. Rural America always needs more help. We have all the commodities programs. We have all the foreign sales programs, whether we are going to have commodities abroad. And I know there will be Members up here attacking the fact we put taxpayers' money into foreign sales.

But my colleagues, wake up and smell the coffee. Every day we have Juan Valdez telling us to drink Colombian coffee, and we do. Why? Because that country puts money in advertising in America and Americans buy it. So we do a little quid pro quo in the same way. We take money here and we take products and try to get them to sell abroad. Why? Because we export four times more than we import. Our balance of trade is in the plus in agriculture. We produce more agriculture in America than Americans can consume, so we need to export it, and people want it. And we ought to be proud of it, because it is a labor-intensive industry that is the heart of our country, and it has been the number one production in America historically and today more than ever.

So, with this tough budget that we have adopted, we also left many programs on the table, the conservation program, farm land protection. There is no money in here. We have got to get that before this is over. Also left on the table, we cut wetlands reserves. We left on the table environmental quality initiatives. We left on the table, more importantly, about \$120 million to fully fund all the nutritional programs we need in America.

This is a very tight appropriation, too tight for many people and not tight enough for others. But I do not think we will ever find an appropriation that has had more bipartisan support than this one does, and I think that is attributable to both the leadership on the other side of the aisle and on our own side.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

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

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I want to say from the outset, I come from a farm district of rural northeastern Oklahoma that has a great deal of farmers. And I believe, overall, that the appropriators have done a good job on this bill. But they have not done good enough.

We passed two supplemental emergency bills for farmers in this last Congress, almost \$12 billion, and I am not objecting to the fact that we did that. What I am objecting to is the fact that that money was paid for out of Social

Security receipts. There is no question about it. And what I want to focus on is, where is the money going to come for the increase in this year over the true baseline last year? It is going to come from Social Security.

I want to spend a minute just showing everybody the kind of problems we have. Most young people under 35 believe in UFOs before they believe they are going to get their Social Security money. And do my colleagues know what? They are probably right. This is the Social Security 1999 Trust Report. And what we see in black is the amount of money that is coming into the government in excess of what is being paid out, and my colleagues will note as of 2014 that starts to turn red.

Last year we spent approximately \$29 billion of that money. The Congress appropriated \$29 billion of excess Social Security money for appropriation bills. Twenty-nine billion was taken out of the money that was coming in supposedly dedicated for Social Security.

The other thing that I would like to discuss is we do not have a real surplus. What we have is a Washington surplus, because if we exclude Social Security money, last year we ran a \$29 billion deficit. The debt to our children and our grandchildren is rising at the rate, as we speak, of \$275 million a day. So it is not about whether we should do the right things for our farmers. We should, and probably we should spend more money on our farmers than what we are spending. The question is, how do we spend that money?

If we look at what is about to happen this year, the surplus for the year 2000, as estimated by the Social Security Administration, is \$141 billion. Based on the plans that we see, it is a conservative estimate that \$45 billion of that will be spent. That is Social Security money that people are working every day putting into that, with the trust to think that that money is going to be there for them when they retire. And that does not come close to addressing the issue, can they live on their Social Security payment now?

In my practice in Muskogee, Oklahoma, when I see seniors, I have seniors who are totally dependent on Social Security. And do my colleagues know what they do? They do not buy their medicine because they do not have enough money. They buy food before they buy medicine.

□ 1415

So not only do we have a problem in taking the money that is supposed to be for Social Security, the benefit that we have out there in many instances is not enough for our seniors to live on, let alone live healthily on.

Finally, the point I would make is that we have 102,000 Agricultural Department employees. We have another 87,000 contract employees for the Department of Agriculture. That comes to 189,000 employees in the United States. If we take 260 million people, it is pretty quick you can come up, for

every 1,500 people in the United States, we have at least one Agricultural Department employee. Do we need all those employees? What we have said is we cannot cut the number of employees in the Agriculture Department, we cannot have less employees, and we cannot get more money directly to the farmer, because we are chewing up a vast majority of the money trying to give them the money. It is not about not taking care of our farmers. If we expect to protect Social Security money, which on both sides of the aisle, save two Members of this body, voted for budgets that said they would protect 100 percent of Social Security, then we have to bring this bill back to the level of spending last year. What that requires is about \$260 million worth of trimming amendments to be able to do that. I propose to offer offsetting amendments that will bring us down to last year's level. When we are at that level, then I will stop offering amendments. Until we get to that level, I plan on continuing to offer amendments. This is not done in any precocious fashion. My intention is to help us all do what we all voted, save two Members, to do, and, that is, to preserve Social Security. The best way I know of doing that is the first appropriation bill, to make a first start on that.

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

Mr. Chairman, the reason we have a 1-year appropriations bill is so that the Congress can look at the spending each year and adjust accordingly as the Constitution requires. We do not rubber stamp the administration's request and we do not automatically approve last year's level of spending. This bill has a modest increase in spending over fiscal year 1999, and it is about 30 percent of the increase requested by the administration. I have heard several hundred requests for more spending by my colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats. Frankly this bill does not come near to paying for all those requests. But we did the best we could and I certainly hope that no one who wrote us asking for spending will support this amendment.

In this bill, there is additional money for food safety, for conservation, for rural housing and for a lot of programs that benefit all our constituents. Our bill funds about 130 accounts with many more subaccounts and individual projects. It is always possible to find fault with individual items in the bill, but this bill is a cooperative effort. I believe it reflects the kind of legislation that a majority of our Members want to see for their constituents.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind all my colleagues that although we refer to this as the agricultural appropriations bill, the majority of funding goes to nonproduction agricultural programs. This bill pays for badly needed housing, water and sewer, and economic development in rural America. It pays for human nutrition programs

for children and the elderly. It pays for conservation programs that benefit watersheds in urban and rural areas. It pays for food safety and medical device inspection programs that are literally life and death matters. That is why I oppose this amendment and why I ask my colleagues to do the same.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I also wanted to make a couple of comments about the prior gentleman's remarks. No department percentagewise inside this government of the United States has been cut more than the U.S. Department of Agriculture. In 1993, there were 129,500 employees. Today the request of the department would fund 107,700. This is a reduction of over 21,800 positions. I would like any other department of the United States based on the amount of funds that it receives through the taxpayers to take this kind of cut. There have been over 35,000 positions cut in the U.S. Forest Service, battling forest fires. Look what has happened across this country over the last several years. In meat inspection, so vital to the health of this country, over 9,700 meat inspectors have been cut. I would say to the gentleman, we have had over a 30 percent cut in the staffing levels at the U.S. Department of Agriculture. So if you are looking for cuts, believe me, this agency is hemorrhaging. Part of the damage being caused in Oklahoma and other places in this country is because we are not paying attention to the production side of the equation inside the United States in rural America, and that is a true tragedy.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), a very respected member of the authorizing committee.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time. I rise in support of this bill. I commend the chairman and the ranking member for the hard work they have done under some very difficult circumstances.

We come here today with a situation in agriculture that is worse than it was a year ago. Farm income stress is only intensifying from last year. To those that are worried about the spending level on agriculture, let me make this point. In 1990, net farm income was \$44.7 billion. In 1999 it is projected to be \$43.6 billion, which includes all of the \$12 billion in subsidies that have been written. At the same time look at what has happened to the Dow Jones average. It has gone up 230 percent. My colleague from Oklahoma that spoke, I want to commend him for his honesty and his forthrightness and his persistence. He voted for the Blue Dog budget. Had the Blue Dog budget passed, we would have been talking about increased funding for agriculture today.

We would have been talking about meeting the needs of the cotton step-2 program, meeting the additional needs of research in agriculture, paying the \$100 million the WIC program needs in order to meet all of the human need. The gentleman from Oklahoma voted for it of which I deeply appreciate. A majority of my colleagues on this side of the aisle voted for it. If we had only gotten a majority on both sides, we could have been doing a much more adequate job of meeting the true needs of agriculture.

Now, we have got a lot of problems that need to be solved. They should not be attempted to be solved on this bill. It needs to be done in the House Committee on Agriculture. We have got work to do on crop insurance, opening world markets. We are going to get an opportunity to do that. Coordinated policies, working together with USDA in this Congress. We really cannot afford to wait much longer. I hope and expect that this year under the leadership of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST), the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture and those on both sides of the aisle that we will be able to take up in an orderly fashion those things that need to be done in order to make sure that agriculture will continue to be for all of America what it is today.

Mr. Chairman, I submit the following correspondence for printing in the RECORD:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,  
Washington, DC, May 12, 1999.

Hon. DAN GLICKMAN,  
Secretary, U.S. Department of Agriculture,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We are writing to urge you to give careful consideration to the development of new programs to enhance the competitiveness of U.S. wheat exports by improving the cleanliness and uniformity of grain delivered to foreign buyers.

Over the past decade, competition in the wheat export trade has intensified. The domestic wheat industry believes that cleaner US wheat will be more competitive in foreign markets. We are writing to urge you to develop a program that would provide assistance to export elevators for the financing of high speed cleaning equipment.

In recent months, we have had some very strong reminders of just how important exports are to US agriculture, along with the recognition that we need to make our products as competitive as possible. We believe that improvement of the domestic cleaning infrastructure is a worthwhile investment that will help US wheat gain market share in the years to come. Capital investments made now will ensure the future competitiveness of the US grain industry.

Thank you for your consideration of this proposal, and we look forward to working with you in developing and implementing a program that will enhance US grain competitiveness in world markets.

Sincerely,

CHARLES W. STENHOLM.  
JERRY MORAN.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the esteemed gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAUR) who has spent so many hours and weeks working on this bill.

Ms. DELAUR. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for their hard work in what has been a difficult feat to balance the important priorities of this bill given the budget constraints that the subcommittee faces. I am concerned that we could not do more to support vital programs, however, that improve the day-to-day lives of hard-working American families; providing a safety net for farmers in crisis, reducing smoking among young people, ensuring high quality nutrition for parents and their children. These are issues not receiving enough attention. First there is a crisis facing our farmers today. From low grocery store food prices to safe food on the dinner table, the benefits of U.S. agriculture are immeasurable to each and every American family. Farmers across this country are begging Congress to do something and, by God, we must do something.

This bill does not do enough to address the depression level prices our farmers face. A serious issue before this Nation is tobacco use among America's youth. Each day an astounding 3,000 teenagers take up the smoking habit. The loss to America equals 420,000 lives. This year the President requested a \$30 million increase to expand the partnership between the FDA and States to enforce the laws prohibiting tobacco sales to minors. The additional funding would have enlarged this successful and business-friendly program that would have been expanded to 50 States. Sadly, this bill does not provide this important investment, made even more essential because States like Connecticut, my own State, are not investing their money from the tobacco settlement into educating the public about the dangers of smoking. I am concerned about the little over \$4 billion allocated for the WIC program in that it may not be able to cover all of its participants. WIC guarantees that 7.4 million women and their children receive solid nutrition and health advice, preventing future illness and serious health problems. I am disappointed that funds could not be found to take the first steps toward a study of the benefits and the costs of a universal school breakfast program, a study that has already been authorized by the Goodling Act. Regional studies have linked school breakfast programs with higher test scores, better behavior and improved attendance. But a truly rigorous and a comprehensive study is necessary to nail down and to solidify the proof of that relationship.

This is an unfunded mandate. If the Congress is going to require this study, it must provide the funding. I again applaud my colleagues for facing these restrictions. These issues deserve our highest commitment.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD).

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from New Mexico

(Mr. SKEEN) for yielding me this time and for his leadership in putting this appropriations bill together, and also to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for her leadership with the gentleman from New Mexico.

As many of my colleagues know, Mr. Chairman, I have spent all of my productive life in agriculture and have followed these proceedings in Congress for many, many years as related to a national agricultural policy. In 1996, this Congress decided to write a new farm bill which my people back home called Freedom to Fail. Prior to that time, many of us came to Washington and asked the Congress to take a long, hard look before it changed national ag policy. We had a policy in this country that worked. Obviously there was a consolidation of farming over the years like there has been in every industry that weeded out some of the less efficient operators. But certainly if you were efficient and a good operator, under the policy that existed, you could make a living in agriculture. It established and kept a strong agricultural economy for our Nation. I stand today speaking in support of the bill that is brought to this floor by the gentleman from New Mexico and the gentlewoman from Ohio. They are working within the confines of the Balanced Budget Agreement that we put in place in 1997. Actually I think we were treated very well in these allocations, given the confines of the budget that we are working under. As the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) said earlier, had we passed the Blue Dog budget which many of the folks on both sides of the aisle voted for, we would have a few more bucks to play with here. But I think really the debate today is not about whether this appropriations bill is good or bad, because it is absolutely the best that we can do under the circumstances that we have been presented with. But it has to do with a larger picture, and, that is, what is the national agricultural policy of this Nation?

I just want to throw out a couple of things for Members' consideration. Number one is, in 1996 when that farm bill was written, the farmers were promised if they would give up their safety net, they were promised in exchange a loosening of regulations and, secondly, opening of world markets. Well, they gave up the safety net, but in both cases they did not get what they were promised. They did not get a loosening of regulations and they certainly have not gotten an opening of the world markets.

□ 1430

Now many people want to blame the administration. I do not think the administration is to be blamed here. It was the Congress that wrote this piece of legislation, and it is the Congress that ought to go revisit it.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that I would like to strongly encourage the Members to support this piece of legisla-

tion, and I want to thank the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for their work.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY), the hard-working member of the authorizing committee.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for yielding this time to me, and I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member of this committee for the hard work that they have done.

Mr. Chairman, America is the greatest Nation that has ever been today because of our ability to domestically produce safe, affordable and abundant agriculture commodities. The American farmer is the most productive ever anywhere in the world. The American farmer only asks for a chance. If we will just give him a chance, he will do the rest.

A combination of factors have contributed to historically low commodity prices that are being received by our American farmers today. We have got a crisis in rural America, and we need to face that crisis. This bill is a good effort to begin that. It is a shame that we do not have more money in this bill for America's farmers, but I know that it is the best that the appropriators could do with what they had to work with.

Congress has an obligation to protect the food and fiber security of America. Current budget restrictions and resulting appropriations for agriculture do not allow for adequate devotion of financial resources to properly address the crisis that American agriculture faces today. We need to commit to America's farmers to protect the food and fiber security that our country has historically provided.

I firmly believe, Mr. Chairman, that the further we get from our rural agrarian roots that Thomas Jefferson envisioned, the more social problems we have, and it is something that is of great concern to me. But this is just another reason why we should do the best we can to fund the Department of Agriculture and support America's farmers.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM).

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, I rise in support of this bill and, first of all, would like to thank the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for their very hard work. The subcommittee enjoys a bipartisan cooperation, and I have really enjoyed working with all the colleagues to get this bill on the floor today.

This bill feeds our schoolchildren, ensures the safety of prescription drugs and medical devices, protects our environment to water and soil conservation, restores Congress' commitment to agricultural research and rejects the

President's desire to cut ongoing science. It helps expand our increasingly important export markets, and most importantly, it protects the taxpayer.

Just as importantly, this bill does not include some of the President's proposals. Probably the most egregious is the fact that in the President's budget he had a \$504 million new increase in fees on struggling livestock producers. These are the folks who have undergone some of the worst prices in history, and again, another increase in fee for grain farmers to the tune of \$20 million that the President wanted to put on those farmers.

I would like to engage the gentleman from New Mexico in a colloquy, if I may.

Mr. Chairman, my intention is to clarify the committee to provide not less than \$27,656,000 for the National Plant Germplasm System for Fiscal Year 2000. With this funding, our best and brightest scientists working throughout the Nation will continue to help farmers provide abundant, safe, nutritious and affordable supplies of food fiber.

Mr. Chairman, is it the committee's intention to name that funding level in the conference report?

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

Mr. LATHAM. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to tell the gentleman that the committee will work hard to meet that funding level.

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the gentleman, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) from the authorizing committee, who has worked with us every step of the way on this bill.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for the time, and I want to rise in support of this appropriation bill, and I want to commend both the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) and the ranking member of the subcommittee agriculture appropriations.

I rise in support of the bill because there are many things in this bill that is very much needed in agriculture. It provides obviously the money of more than \$60 billion in agriculture programs including moneys for research, including moneys for farm service administration, including moneys for rural housing, including money for WIC and nutrition programs, agricultural research; so many parts of this program are essential for the infrastructure and ongoing agriculture and research program.

However I also raise issues that are deficits. There are still lack of funding of recognition in these program. One in particular I think, the ranking member from agriculture raised the issue about Cotton Step 2. Obviously that is very, very important to my district in terms

of having the opportunity to market in that area. I am sensitive to the cooperative research is \$14.2 million below the request, and I know all the land grant schools throughout the United States are indeed in need of those monies, and the conservation program again is underfunded, and yet there are more requirements in requiring them to implement the programs. They do not have the resources to do that, and I just say to our colleagues that if they expect for a full implementation, they have to have the resources.

Again, the whole issue of disadvantaged farmers I know will be addressed, and I am appreciative of that, but I want to say now to both the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) and to the ranking member I will be glad to support that amendment. There are issues that I think we can still revisit, hopefully, from the amendment process, but I want to commend both of them and say to my colleagues who think that we are spending too much money that I think we have the unique position of being first out of the box and being most conservative so we get to be kind of whipping boy, whipping girl, and I think that is unfair to rural America, I think it is certainly unfair to the farmers that feed us and provide fiber for us.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT).

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me, and I want to congratulate him and the ranking member on this subcommittee, a subcommittee on which I am proud to serve, for their good work in trying to craft a bill that stays within the budget caps.

Agriculture has some very difficult challenges this year and next, and what I hope this bill will do is provide adequate resources for our farmers, not only in the area of agriculture research, but in other areas in which we think the free market system has a better chance to work.

One of the things I am disappointed that the bill does not contain, I am going to introduce an amendment later about it, is the issue of sanctions relief. I feel we need to be in a position to open world markets that are currently shut off from our farmers, and this may not be the vehicle, but we have to open those markets.

So open markets, adequate funding of agriculture research, and there will be some challenges to that today, but I think we have to resist those challenges to government-funded research. It is critically important to our farmers.

So, I urge support of this bill. I appreciate the good work of the gentleman from Mexico and the people of our subcommittee, and I urge its passage.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire about my remaining time?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) has 2 minutes

remaining, and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) has 30 seconds remaining.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield our remaining time to the distinguished gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) who has fought for agriculture not only in Vermont, but throughout our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Vermont is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding this time to me, and I want to congratulate the chairman and the ranking member for the outstanding work they have done on this bill. I think, however, there is no disagreement that the committee is forced to operate under very severe budget constraints. There is no debate about that, and I would simply want to remind every Member of the U.S. House of Representatives that in this great country, in this country which is wealthier than any other country in the history of the world, today there are millions and millions of Americans who are hungry, who are hungry, and what does it say about our national priorities that we see a proliferation of millionaires and billionaires, that we see a situation when some want to provide over a trillion dollars in tax breaks over the next 15 years, and yet hospital administrators tell us that when senior citizens go to the hospital, they are finding many seniors who are suffering from malnutrition? What does it say about our country when school administrators tell us that when kids get to school in the morning many of these children come from families which do not have enough money to provide them with adequate breakfast or adequate lunches, that these kids are unable to do the school work that they otherwise would be able to do? They fall off the wagon, and they get into trouble.

Is that what America is about? I think not.

Now I understand the limitations that there are in this bill because of the overall budget, but I would hope that every Member of Congress understands that the day has got to come and come soon when this country wipes out the disgrace of having hungry people within our wonderful Nation.

Second of all, Mr. Chairman, within that context we must be aware of the plight that family farmers in rural America are suffering from one end of this country to the other. Other people have made this point, and I want to repeat it. If we do not stand up and protect the small family farmer, we are going to lose that important aspect of what makes this country great.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds, my last one-half minute, to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA).

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

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies for facing a very difficult task head on and doing the absolute best they could in dealing with our agriculture needs this year. With the falling commodity prices and drought, it was a very difficult task that we faced, and the gentleman from New Mexico has taken care of research activities, conservation funding, distance learning and tele-medicine programs, FSIS programs, and it is amazing actually that we were able to get through this as efficiently as possible and deal with these important problems.

I just hope that every Member of this body understands how important it is to support this bill as it is.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, this Member rises in support of H.R. 1906, the Agriculture Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2000.

This Member would like to commend the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), the Chairman of the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, and the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the ranking member of the Subcommittee for their hard work in bringing this bill to the Floor.

Mr. Chairman, this Member certainly recognizes the severe budget constraints under which the full Appropriations Committee and the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee operated. In light of these constraints, this Member is grateful and pleased that this legislation includes funding for several important projects of interest to the State of Nebraska.

First, this Member is pleased that H.R. 1906 provides \$423,000 for the Midwest Advanced Food Manufacturing Alliance. The Alliance is an association of twelve leading research universities and corporate partners. Its purpose is to develop and facilitate the transfer of new food manufacturing and processing technologies.

The Alliance awards grants for research projects on a peer review basis. These awards must be supported by an industry partner willing to provide matching funds. During its fifth year of competition, the Alliance received 23 proposals requesting \$892,374 but it was limited to funding 9 proposals for a total of \$350,000. Matching funds from industry partners totaled \$475,549 with an additional \$82,000 from in-kind contributions. These figures convincingly demonstrate how successful the Alliance has been in leveraging support from the food manufacturing and processing industries.

Mr. Chairman, the future viability and competitiveness of the U.S. agricultural industry depends on its ability to adapt to increasing world-wide demands for U.S. exports of intermediate and consumer good exports. In order to meet these changing world-wide demands, agricultural research must also adapt to provide more emphasis on adding value to our basic farm commodities. The Midwest Advanced Food Manufacturing Alliance can provide the necessary cooperative link between universities and industries for the development of competitive food manufacturing and processing technologies. This will, in turn, ensure

that the United States agricultural industry remains competitive in a increasingly competitive global economy.

This Member is also pleased that this bill includes \$200,000 to fund a drought mitigation project at the Agricultural Meteorology Department at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. This level of funding will greatly assist in the further development of a national drought mitigation center. Such a center is important to Nebraska and all arid and semi-arid states. Although drought is one of the most complex and least understood of all natural disasters, no centralized source of information currently exists on drought assessment, mitigation, response, and planning efforts. A national drought mitigation center would develop a comprehensive program designed to reduce vulnerability to drought by promoting the development and implementation of appropriate mitigation technologies.

Another important project funded by this bill is the Alliance for Food Protection, a joint project between the University of Nebraska and the University of Georgia. The mission of this Alliance is to assist the development and modification of food processing and preservation technologies. This technology will help ensure that Americans continue to receive the safest and highest quality food possible.

This Member is also pleased that the legislation has agreed to fund the following ongoing Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service (CSREES) projects at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln:

Food Processing Center .....	\$42,000
Non-food agricultural products ...	64,000
Sustainable agricultural systems	59,000
Rural Policy Research Institute (RUPRI) (a joint effort with Iowa State University and the University of Missouri) .....	644,000

Also, this Member is pleased that H.R. 1906 includes \$100 million for the Section 538, the rural rental multi-family housing loan guarantee program. The program provides a Federal guarantee on loans made to eligible persons by private lenders. Developers will bring ten percent of the cost of the project to the table, and private lenders will make loans for the balance. The lenders will be given a 100% Federal guarantee on the loans they make. Unlike the current Section 515 direct loan Program, where the full costs are borne by the Federal Government, the only costs to the Federal Government under the 538 Guarantee Program will be for administrative costs and potential defaults.

Mr. Chairman, this Member appreciates the Subcommittee's support for the Department of Agriculture's 502 Unsubsidized Loan Guarantee Program. The program has been very effective in rural communities by guaranteeing loans made by approved lenders to eligible income households in small communities of up to 20,000 residents in non-metropolitan areas and in rural areas. The program provides guarantees for 30-year fixed-rate mortgages for the purchase of an existing home or the construction of a new home.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, this Member supports H.R. 1906 and urges his colleagues to approve it.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1906, Agriculture Appropriations for FY 2000. In particular, I wish to draw my colleague's attention to the

valuable work being done by the Ultraviolet-B (UV-B) Monitoring Program at Colorado State University.

This program provides information on the geographical distribution and temporal trends of UVB radiation in the United States. This information is critical to the assessment of the potential impacts of increasing ultraviolet radiation levels on agricultural crops and forests. Specifically, it provides information to the agricultural community and others about the climatological and geographical distribution of UVB irradiance.

In a broader sense, the monitoring program supports research that increases our understanding of the factors controlling surface UVB irradiance and provides the data necessary for assessing the impact of UVB radiation on human health, ecosystems and materials.

Beginning in 1992, Congress appropriated two million dollars per year in support of this research effort. At that level of funding, the program was able to get underway and to carry forward some money each year. Recently, appropriations have been at \$1,000,000 annually, which, with the carry over amounts have been adequate. As of FY 1999, the carry-over funds have been exhausted. The President's budget calls for \$1,750,000 to simply continue this program at current funding levels. H.R. 1906 appropriates \$1,000,000 for this program, but I remain hopeful that the goal of \$1,750,000 can be accommodated during the upcoming conference committee with the other body.

Mr. Chairman, since the discovery of the Antarctic ozone hole in 1985, I have been personally very concerned about the impact of UVB radiation on all of earth's living systems. This program is surely a step toward understanding and monitoring this significant threat to all of our ecosystems.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Chairman, after experiencing one weather-related disaster after another, the future of production agriculture and family farming in middle and south Georgia faces a threat of almost unprecedented proportions.

This is not a sudden, overnight crisis. Farmers, bankers, and communities dependent on production agriculture have been in a crisis mode for some time.

Our farmers have faced a threatening situation that has now become even more severe.

I have visited farms to meet with farmers all across the Second District and to see firsthand the destruction that has been wrought by the droughts and other disasters which have struck our area. Indeed, the University of Georgia has estimated farmgate value lost during the past crop year at over \$767 million.

The bill contains many of the crucial programs which are needed to restore a vibrant farm economy.

It provides \$2.3 billion for direct and guaranteed farm operating loans, \$647 million more than the current fiscal year.

It contains \$559 million for direct and guaranteed farm ownership loans, \$49 million more than the current year.

Research is the backbone of ag production, and it would be irresponsible for the federal government to abdicate its role in this area. This is why we need to leave all this partisan bickering behind and get on with the business of providing the \$836 million for the Agricultural Research Service that is in this bill.

For the extension service that is so important to our farmers, this bill has \$916 million

for Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service activities.

There is \$71 million for USDA's Risk Management Agency, which manages the federal crop insurance program. How else will the Congress ensure that insurance products that can effectively protect against risk of loss are developed? How will we ever get to the point where farmers can adequately recover their costs of production following a disaster and pay premiums that are affordable?

The bill will fund the \$654 million needed for operation of USDA's Natural Resource Conservation Service. This agency helps farmers conserve, improve, and sustain the soil and water on their land for future generations.

This bill includes a \$300,000 allocation to expand research into ways to protect the few consumers who are allergic to peanuts, and thereby to prevent misguided efforts to ban or reduce peanut consumption.

Prices for southeast timber are at a record low, and it would be financially damaging to force growers facing thinning-out deadlines to sell their harvested timber on the current market. This is why this good bill includes language giving farmers an extension until January 1, 2003 for thinning out and selling their timber under the Conservation Reserve Program.

I ask my colleagues to let this House do the work expected of us by our farmers.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to address some language contained in the Committee report on the FY 2000 Agriculture Appropriations bill. The language "directs" that the FDA not proceed with a highly controversial rule-making on ephedrine-containing products. The inclusion of this report language is an attempt to subvert regular order. The proper course for the proponents of the language to address this issue is to contact the Commerce Committee, which exercises primary jurisdiction over FDA matters. I therefore urge the House-Senate conferees to drop the language in conference. Further, I intend to closely monitor the regulatory proceeding at issue to ensure that FDA meets all of its legal obligations.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

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.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, namely:*

TITLE I  
 AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS  
 PRODUCTION, PROCESSING, AND MARKETING  
 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
 (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture, and not to exceed \$75,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$2,836,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$11,000 of this amount, along with any unobligated balances of representation funds in the Foreign Agricultural Service, shall be available for official reception and representation expenses, not otherwise provided for, as determined by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel of the Department of Agriculture to carry out section 793(c)(1)(C) of Public Law 104-127: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce section 793(d) of Public Law 104-127.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to commend the chairman and the ranking member for their efforts in appropriations in this appropriation bill related to agriculture. Obviously a Member of Congress who comes from the district I come from is very concerned about the agriculture economy, and the impact of this appropriation bill upon my State is significant, and I commend the committee for its efforts.

□ 1445

I do want to raise a topic that is of great concern to me and to the many small businesses that I represent within the agribusiness community of Kansas. I have an amendment to be offered later today that would allow small meat processors with sales under \$2.5 million and less than 10 employees to have an additional year before their compliance with USDA's HACCP, the Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Points Inspection System would take effect and impact them.

This amendment would apply only to the smallest local meat processors and would in no way change the inspection system in our large nationwide plants.

There are significant problems out there. In fact, the U.S. Small Business Administration has concluded in its letter to USDA that something must be done. Their conclusion in their letter to USDA, dated July 5 of 1995, says, "The Office of Advocacy at the SBA remains deeply troubled by the failure of FSIS to analyze properly the impact of HACCP on small businesses." Requires, among other things, that an agency tailor its regulations to impose the least burden on businesses of differing sizes.

There are many alternatives which USDA could pursue which have been either rejected or overlooked by FSIS and which would reduce the compliance burden on our smallest businesses.

This is Sam's Locker across the country in the smallest communities of our Nation, and many of them are going out of business, really on a week-

ly basis. I pick up the paper and the local locker plant in one of my communities across Kansas is closing its doors because of the cost and burden of compliance with this rule which will take effect January 1 of the year 2000.

The Small Business Administration says that the smallest firms face the greatest burden in both absolute and per-unit costs and suggests that there are a number of alternatives which USDA has not explored. So I intend later today to offer an amendment that would delay the implementation for approximately 9 months of this last phase of HACCP regulations.

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

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his concern and his remarks. It is good to know that someone is looking out for the small businessperson.

As it happens, the committee has commissioned a GAO study of the HACCP process, and if possible, I will try to include the gentleman's concern in that study, or work with him during the conference on the issues that he has just raised.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the comments from the gentleman and I look forward to working with the gentleman from New Mexico on this issue. It is a significant one.

Mr. SKEEN. As they say in our country, igualmente, equally.

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

EXECUTIVE OPERATIONS  
 CHIEF ECONOMIST

For necessary expenses of the Chief Economist, including economic analysis, risk assessment, cost-benefit analysis, energy and new uses, and the functions of the World Agricultural Outlook Board, as authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1622g), and including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed \$5,000 is for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$5,620,000.

NATIONAL APPEALS DIVISION

For necessary expenses of the National Appeals Division, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed \$25,000 is for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$11,718,000.

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND PROGRAM ANALYSIS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Budget and Program Analysis, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed \$5,000 is for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$6,583,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COBURN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Coburn: Page 3, line 23, after dollar amount insert "reduced by \$463,000".

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman reserves a point of order.

Ms. KAPTUR. We do not have the amendment on this side and have not seen it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will distribute copies of the amendment.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is that the \$463,000 represents over a 7 percent increase for this department, Office of Budget and Program Analysis. Again, I will restate the obvious.

I believe that the money that we spend on agricultural programs ought to be going to our farmers, and I object to the fact that we are increasing overhead and bureaucratic expense, and that this money is not available to the farmers in my district. This money is not available to put the FSA offices back close to the farmers instead of having it 90 miles away from my farmers.

So what we have done by this increase over the baseline from last year is spend money in Washington and not spend money on our farmers.

The purpose of this amendment is to bring us back to last year.

I again want to go back. Any dollar that is spent that should not be spent is a dollar of Social Security money stolen from our seniors and our grandchildren. The Social Security Administration estimates that in the year 2020 to 2022, to stay even with Social Security, despite no other changes, that we will have an effective FICA tax rate, a Social Security tax rate of somewhere between 22 and 24 percent, somewhere double where we are today. So if we continue to have this kind of spending, which we know, if it is not absolutely necessary, will be taking money from our grandchildren, our grandchildren will repay this money. Any money that is spent in this bill for a service that is not absolutely necessary is a dollar stolen from our Social Security.

What does that mean? That means, number one, that the Social Security surplus is less. Number two, that means the debt, external debt that we hold today will not decrease by that amount, and that is what we have been doing with the excess Social Security money; we have been paying off bankers and foreign governments who own our Treasury notes and Treasury bills and putting an IOU in the Social Security system. So that also is a lost opportunity for savings on external debt.

Number three, it pretends to be a situation that rationalizes that in hard times, like we are in today spending money on a war in Yugoslavia, we can afford to have a 7-plus percent increase in bureaucratic overhead.

It is my feeling that the people in my district are best represented when the money that is spent for agriculture goes to our farmers, not to the bureaucratic administration of that aid to our farmers.

So, therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would make the point again that we are going to have close to \$149 billion in excess

Social Security payments in the year 2000, and that this one small area, this one small amount of \$463,000 is enough to supply Social Security in the future for several of our grandchildren, especially if it is not spent and compounded and earned.

Mr. Chairman, one of our colleagues, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) took 6 years, the years from 1944 to 1950, and took the amount of money that was put into Social Security. Had that money been saved and not spent and invested at a rate of 6 percent return, there would be \$3 trillion from those 6 years in Social Security today. So by spending money, rather than saving money as it was initially intended, what we are doing is losing opportunity for our children.

Mr. Chairman, I plan on offering this amendment. I am in hopes that people will support the fact that we do not need to have this much of an increase to be able to accomplish this as the purpose of this budgetary office. It is my hope that we can have an acceptance of this amendment, that the chairman will look favorably on this amendment, knowing that the dollars to pay for this will come not only from the seniors who have trouble getting by today, will come from the commitment that we made not to touch one penny of Social Security.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman insist on her point of order?

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, we have been provided now with copies of this amendment, so I withdraw my point of order.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Coburn amendment because I just believe it is time to keep our promise, and this is one place we have to start. We have told the American people that we balanced the budget, and I really believe that now we need to stick to our word, because otherwise we are not being true to them.

I understand and sympathize with the American farmers; I understand the committee's concerns and problems. In fact, we just passed a supplemental bill that added additional dollars for farmers.

But since this year's budget resolution calls for \$10 billion in discretionary spending cuts, we have to make the cuts to stick to the balanced budget agreement and protect and preserve Social Security, and the time to start is now.

There is never a good time. That is the difficult thing about this place, because it is always hard not to spend money in a culture that is set up to spend, spend, spend. That is what Washington does and does well.

It is always easy to stick pork in bills to spend more money; it happens every day. I think that is wrong.

Mr. Chairman, we have to stand up for our principles of lowering taxes and protecting 100 percent of Social Security for our children and our grand-

children. They are depending on that. They look to us to be responsible, and as we do our bills, as this whole appropriations process goes forward, we have to be really conscious of that.

It is time to put the good of the country ahead of personal ambition and tighten our belts. Without cuts now, and this is a relatively non-controversial bill, if we cannot do it here, how in the world are we going to reduce spending in the other 12 appropriations bills?

Mr. Chairman, for years, Congress has raided Social Security and funded pork barrel spending, and I believe it needs to stop; and today is a good time to stop it. I support the Coburn amendment, and I support fiscal responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

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

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

A recorded vote was refused.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 6 of rule XVIII, the Chair announces that he 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 pending question following the quorum call.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN: The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, is there a planned quorum call at this time? Can the Chair advise as to the planned quorum call?

The CHAIRMAN. There is a quorum call at the point of order request of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. And will that be granted?

The CHAIRMAN. It will be. It has been.

The call was taken by electronic device.

The following members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 151]

#### ANSWERED "PRESENT"—399

Abercrombie	Barrett (WI)	Billey	Gekas	McCarthy (MO)	Meek (FL)
Ackerman	Bartlett	Blumenauer	Gibbons	McCarthy (NY)	Menendez
Aderholt	Barton	Blunt	Gilchrest	McCollum	Metcalf
Allen	Bass	Boehlert	Gillmor	McCrary	Mica
Andrews	Bateman	Boehner	Gilman	McDermott	Miller (FL)
Armey	Becerra	Bonilla	Gonzalez	McGovern	Miller, Gary
Bachus	Bereuter	Bonior	Goode	McHugh	Miller, George
Baird	Berkley	Bono	Goodlatte	McInnis	Minge
Baker	Berman	Borski	Goodling	McIntosh	Mink
Baldacci	Berry	Boswell	Gordon	McIntyre	Moakley
Baldwin	Biggert	Boucher	Goss	McKeon	Mollohan
Ballenger	Bilbray	Boyd	Green (TX)	McKinney	Moore
Barcia	Bilirakis	Brady (PA)	Green (WI)	McNulty	Moran (KS)
Barr	Bishop	Brady (TX)	Greenwood	Meehan	Netercutt
Barrett (NE)	Blagojevich	Brown (FL)			Ney
					Northup
					Nussle
					Oberstar
					Oleary
					Packard
					Pallone
					Pascarella
					Pastor
					Owens
					Oxley
					Peterson (MN)
					Peterson (PA)
					Petri
					Phelps
					Pickering
					Pickett
					Pitts
					Pombo
					Pomeroy
					Porter
					Portman
					Pryce (OH)
					Quinn
					Radanovich
					Rahall
					Ramstad
					Rangel
					Regula
					Reynolds
					Riley
					Rivers
					Rodriguez
					Roemer
					Rogers
					Rohrabacher
					Ros-Lehtinen
					Roukema
					Royal-Allard
					Rush
					Ryan (WI)
					Ryan (KS)
					Sabo
					Salmon
					Sanchez
					Sanders
					Sandlin
					Sanford
					Sawyer
					Saxton
					Scarborough
					Schafer
					Schakowsky
					Scott
					Sensenbrenner
					Serrano
					Sessions
					Shadegg
					Shays
					Sherman
					Sherwood
					Shimkus
					Shows
					Shuster
					Simpson
					Sisisky
					Skeen
					Skelton
					Slaughter
					Smith (MI)
					Smith (NJ)
					Snyder
					Souder



sector are seeing increases in their operating and overhead or their expense or their salaries going up at two-and-a-half times the rate of inflation.

It is estimated by the Congressional Budget Office and the Office of Management and Budget that the Social Security surplus this year will be \$149 billion. On track, the first appropriation bill to meet this House, has an increase over last year. The budget agreement that we agreed to with the President in terms of meeting the targeted spending in 1997, the budget that passed this House, the minority-sponsored budget, all had provisions to protect Social Security 100 percent. The purpose of this amendment is to try to keep us at our word, to protect Social Security dollars. It is my feeling and my conviction that we do that best by, with the first bill, setting an example on how we are going to spend money.

I recently had a Member come up and say that I was a good reason to vote against term limits, because I was offering amendments to decrease the spending in Washington and that I felt we should not spend any money that comes from Social Security. Well, I would portend just the opposite of that. I think that is a good reason to vote for people with term limits.

The fact is that we are spending \$260 million more in this appropriation bill than we did last year. The purpose of this amendment is to trim some of that. It is not to inhibit what we do with our farmers, it is to make sure that the money that we put into the Department of Agriculture gets to the very people that we want it to. By having an 8 percent increase in this office, a portion of that money could be saved, could be preserved in Social Security, could be used to lower the FICA taxes that our children and grandchildren are going to have to pay so they will be able to have Social Security.

It is not anything but incumbent on Members of this body to try to spend the taxpayers' money in the way that they believe is in the best interest of the country and in the best interest of the long-term security for this Nation. I want to be measured by how I left our country. I want to be measured when my grandchildren, who are now 3 and 1, look at their income tax statements and look at their payroll slips and know that we were not responsible for raising the FICA payments from 12 percent to 25 percent. And that is the estimate from the Social Security Administration that is going to be required by the year 2022.

We can change what happens in Washington. We do not have to spend more money.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

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

#### RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 146, noes 267, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 153]	AYES—146	NOES—267
Aderholt	Ganske	Norwood
Archer	Gibbons	Ose
Armey	Goode	Paul
Bachus	Goodlatte	Pease
Ballenger	Goodling	Petri
Barr	Goss	Pickering
Bartlett	Granger	Pitts
Barton	Green (WI)	Pombo
Bass	Greenwood	Pryce (OH)
Biggert	Gutknecht	Ramstad
Bilirakis	Hall (TX)	Rogan
Blunt	Hastings (WA)	Rohrabacher
Boehner	Hayes	Ros-Lehtinen
Brady (TX)	Hayworth	Roukema
Bryant	Heffley	Royce
Burr	Herger	Ryan (WI)
Burton	Hill (MT)	Ryun (KS)
Buyer	Hilleary	Salmon
Camp	Hoekstra	Sanford
Campbell	Hostettler	Scarborough
Cannon	Hunter	Schaffer
Castle	Hutchinson	Sensenbrenner
Chabot	Hyde	Sessions
Chenoweth	Istook	Shadegg
Coble	Johnson (CT)	Shaw
Coburn	Johnson, Sam	Shays
Collins	Jones (NC)	Sherwood
Cox	Kelly	Smith (MI)
Crane	Klink	Smith (WA)
Cubin	Largent	Souder
Cunningham	Lazio	Spence
Davis (VA)	Leach	Stearns
Deal	Linder	Stump
DeLay	Lofgren	Stupak
DeMint	Luther	Sununu
Diaz-Balart	Maloney (CT)	Sweeney
Doggett	Manzullo	Tancredo
Doolittle	McCollum	Taylor (MS)
Dreier	McInnis	Taylor (NC)
Duncan	McIntosh	Thornberry
Dunn	Meehan	Tiahrt
Ehlers	Metcalf	Toomey
Ehrlich	Mica	Upton
English	Miller (FL)	Walden
Foley	Miller, Gary	Wamp
Fossella	Miller, George	Watts (OK)
Fowler	Moran (VA)	Weldon (FL)
Frank (MA)	Myrick	Weller
Franks (NJ)	Northup	
Abercrombie	Chambliss	Ford
Ackerman	Clay	Frelinghuysen
Allen	Clayton	Frost
Andrews	Clement	Gallegly
Baird	Clyburn	Gejdenson
Baker	Combest	Gephardt
Baldacci	Condit	Gilchrest
Baldwin	Conyers	Gillmor
Barcia	Cook	Gilman
Barrett (NE)	Cooksey	Gonzalez
Barrett (WI)	Costello	Gordon
Bateman	Coyne	Green (TX)
Becerra	Cramer	Hall (OH)
Bentsen	Crowley	Hansen
Bereuter	Cummings	Hastings (FL)
Berkley	Danner	Hill (IN)
Berman	Davis (FL)	Hilliard
Bateman	Davis (IL)	Hinchey
Bilbray	DeFazio	Hobson
Bishop	DeGette	Hoeffel
Blagojevich	Delahunt	Holden
Biley	DeLauro	Holt
Blumenauer	Deutsch	Hooley
Boehlert	Dickey	Horn
Bonilla	Dicks	Houghton
Bonior	Dingell	Hoyer
Bono	Dooley	Hulshof
Borski	Doyle	Inslee
Boswell	Edwards	Isakson
Boucher	Emerson	Jackson (IL)
Boyd	Engel	Jefferson
Brady (PA)	Eshoo	Jenkins
Brown (OH)	Etheridge	John
Callahan	Evans	Johnson, E. B.
Calvert	Everett	Jones (OH)
Canady	Ewing	Kanjorski
Capps	Farr	Kaptur
Capuano	Fattah	Kennedy
Cardin	Filner	Kildee
Carson	Forbes	Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)	Murtha	Simpson
King (NY)	Napolitano	Sisisky
Kingston	Neal	Skeen
Kleckza	Nethercutt	Skelton
Knollenberg	Ney	Slaughter
Kolbe	Nussle	Smith (NJ)
Kucinich	Oberstar	Snyder
Kuykendall	Obey	Spratt
	LaFalce	Stabenow
	LaHood	Stark
	Lampson	Stenholm
	Lantos	Strickland
	Larson	Talent
	Latham	Tanner
	LaTourette	Tauscher
	Pitts	Tazin
	Lee	Terry
	Levin	Peterson (MN)
	Lewis (GA)	Peterson (PA)
	Lewis (KY)	Phelps
	Lipinski	Pickett
	LoBiondo	Pomeroy
	Lowey	Porter
	Roukema	Price (NC)
	Ryan (WI)	Quinn
	Ryun (KS)	Radanovich
	Maloney (NY)	Rodriguez
	Markey	Rahall
	Sanford	Udall (CO)
	Mascara	Udall (NM)
	Matsui	Velazquez
	McCarthy (MO)	Vento
	McCarthy (NY)	Visclosky
	McCrary	Walsh
	McDermott	Waters
	McGovern	Watkins
	McHugh	Roybal-Allard
	McIntyre	Rush
	McKeon	Sabo
	McKinney	Sanchez
	McNulty	Sanders
	Meek (FL)	Wexler
	Shays	Sandlin
	Sherwood	Weygand
	Stump	Sawyer
	Menendez	Saxton
	Thornberry	Shimkus
	Wible	Shows
	Wong	Wynn
	Morella	Shuster
		Young (FL)
		NOT VOTING—20
		Jackson-Lee
		Brown (CA)
		Brown (FL)
		Dixon
		Fletcher
		Gekas
		Graham
		Gutierrez
		Hinojosa
		Kasich
		Martinez
		Millender-McDonald
		Nadler
		Ortiz
		□ 1558
		Mr. COOK and Mr. JOHN changed their vote from "aye" to "no."
		Messrs. GEORGE MILLER of California, MORAN of Virginia, DAVIS of Virginia, and KLINK changed their vote from "no" to "aye."
		So the amendment was rejected.
		The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
		Stated for:
		Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Chairman, because of a previously scheduled commitment, I missed rollcall vote No. 153 during consideration of H.R. 1906, the Fiscal Year Agriculture Appropriations Act.
		Had I been present, I would have voted "yea".
		The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.
		The Clerk read as follows:
		OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER
		For necessary expenses of the Office of the Chief Information Officer, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed \$10,000 is for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$6,051,000.
		AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COBURN
		Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.
		The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COBURN: Page 4, line 3, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$500,000)".

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to address the increase that was given to the Office of the Chief Information Officer. What we have heard through the general debate on this bill is that this is a fairly tight bill, and I agree that it is a fairly tight bill. I also agree that there is also an area where if we spend a certain amount, \$61 billion, that we ought to make sure that that money that is allocated, that belongs to the taxpayers, actually gets to the end people that we want it to get to, i.e., the farmers, i.e., the people that are going to be dependent on it.

The Office of the Chief Information Officer under this appropriation request received a 9 percent increase. Now, of that \$500,000 increase, what we will see, if we are honest about where the money is going to come, is it is all going to come from Social Security. We are going to take surplus Social Security money and we are going to spend it to give a 9 percent increase. For us to keep the agreement not to spend Social Security money, to keep the agreement that the President and the Congress signed off on in 1997, that we have to cut spending \$10 billion, not increase it a quarter of a billion as this bill does, we have to make some trims back in these appropriation bills.

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

Mr. COBURN. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am informed that the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies has brought this bill to the floor within their 302(b) allocation and therefore am of the opinion that it is funded by general fund revenues and has nothing to do with the Social Security funds the gentleman is speaking to.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, that is a literal statement that in fact at the end of the day will not be true. Because by saying that this is within the 302(b) means that you also would agree that Labor HHS could be cut \$4.9 billion which is also in the 302(b) for Labor HHS. I assure you that neither you nor I would vote for an appropriation bill at that level. So what I would tell the gentleman is that the 302(b)s really are not applicable to the process that we are seeing going on right now because the end game is we are going to spend Social Security money and we are not going to be below the \$10 billion. I understand how that works, you understand how that works, and although technically this committee is within the 302(b) allocation, the 302(b) allocations are designed so that in the long run we will spend Social Security money.

Mr. POMEROY. If the gentleman will yield further, this House passed a budg-

et. These are the early appropriation bills coming to the floor under that budget. Much was made by the majority in consideration of the budget that it was protecting Social Security. Here we have the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture bringing his bill up within the allocation he had.

Mr. COBURN. Reclaiming my time, if the gentleman would agree to vote for this bill under its 302(b) and agree to vote for the Labor HHS bill under its 302(b), I will be happy to buy his discussion of this argument. But I would portray that I will not vote for a Labor HHS bill that is cut by \$4.9 billion and I would surmise that he probably would not do that under the same argument. The fact is that the 302(b)s are not an accurate reflection of where we are going with the budget process this year. They are in terms of total dollars, and I would agree with the gentleman in terms of total dollars, but what they are is front-end-loaded and at the tail end is the very things that most people are going to need besides our farmers, those that are most dependent on us, the veterans, those that do not have housing, those that are needy in terms of Medicaid, Medicare and the supplemental things that we do to help those people, those dollars are not going to be available. So what we are going to do is we are either going to pass a bill that cuts those severely, which neither of us I would surmise would vote for, or we are going to go into a negotiation again with the President and bust the budget caps and in fact spend Social Security money. So I will stick with my argument that this bill, because it is above last year and is not below last year, will in the end ultimately spend seniors' money.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want us to look very closely at what is going on here. This is an appropriations bill brought up pursuant to the budget plan passed by this House. The chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies was given a 302(b) allocation and he has brought his bill forward under that allocation. This is not about emergency spending. This is not about extra allocation spending. This is a chairman that has done everything right, operating under the 302(b) allocation the Committee on Appropriations received under the budget plan passed by the majority. So I simply do not believe that it is rooted in fact that we need to look at this for other than it is, spending for agriculture.

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

Mr. POMEROY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I guess if we were to ask the seniors who are on Social Security in Oklahoma and those from your State if they believe it is appropriate that this office get a 9 percent increase this year and what did

they get in terms of their Social Security increase, I think most of them would object to the fact that we cannot be more efficient. That is the point I am making.

Mr. POMEROY. Reclaiming my time, I was respectful to the gentleman in his 5 minutes and I want to make a couple of points. The farmers of this country are in a world of hurt. I have lived all my life in North Dakota and I have never seen it as bad as it is today. We have prices that do not cover the cost of production. This body made a decision that we were not going to protect farmers when prices collapsed and prices have collapsed below the cost of production. As a result, we have got farmers going bankrupt all over the country. We have got auction sales in North Dakota that do not quit. Now, this Congress because we have got a farm bill that is not working has tried to do a lot of things. Members will remember last year, we passed increasing the AMTA payments, we passed accelerating the AMTA payments, more money to farmers to somehow tide them through this situation. We passed a disaster bill that has proven to be the most confusing disaster bill ever passed and the U.S. Department of Agriculture did not even get it all fully available until June of this year. Now, through this all, the farmer understands one thing. He is losing money, and he is about out of time. He does not understand all these relief measures that we are trying to pass because they are confusing, they are haphazard, they have been passed in a happenstance way and in an ad hoc way. The Public Information Office of the U.S. Department of Agriculture has never been more important. And if you think everyone gets it in terms of what is available for them, you just call one of your farmers right this afternoon and ask them. It is chaos out there and confusion. They do not know what is available. The U.S. Department of Agriculture needs to do a better job. Secondly, it needs the resources so that it can do the job we expect them to do. We have changed the farm program. We have ended the price support that has been part of farm policy for four decades. We are now operating under ad hoc, give them some money here, get them some money there, build a program, try to tide us through, and all of that is very confusing. This public information function is vital. When we pass a response to farmers, that just does not mean that money appears in the bank account. You have got to run the program. That means have the people understand it, have them come in, have it administered in the field offices and get the checks out. This is an essential part of that bargain. This is under the absolute legitimate function of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture operating under their allocation bringing this money to the floor.

I notice that all of the Republican leadership voted for the last Coburn

amendment. Does the Republican leadership not understand the crisis that we have in farm country? We have an absolutely deadly threat to our farmers. We are going to lose family farming as we know it today without responding. And so I do not want this to be a Republican or Democrat majority-minority thing. This is a bill for farmers at a time when they have never ever needed it more. So let us save those arguments about these unrelated matters, make them in special orders, make them another time, but let us today, this afternoon, stand for our farmers. They desperately need the help.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the gentleman from Oklahoma. While I know that the debate, as we go forward, might get just a little bit convoluted, we might begin that old discussion of apples and oranges, the fact is, the gentleman from Oklahoma recognizes this, that last year we made a solid, ironclad promise to the seniors in this country; and that was that we, as a Congress, would do everything within our power in a bipartisan way, both Republicans and Democrats, to protect the solvency of Social Security.

The fact is, the gentleman from Oklahoma has recognized, I think, as many of us do, that within this total budgetary process, he sees that train wreck coming. The fact is, at the end of the day, after it is all done, if we fund government, if we fund the bureaucracies at the level that all of these proposals are coming in at, we will end up having to rob Social Security to cover up the difference. Frankly, I am not going to be a party to that.

I know the gentleman has risked a lot to put forth, what, close to 100 amendments today because he believes so strongly in the sanctity, the sacredness of making that promise to the seniors in our country, the seniors in this land. Every amendment that he offers, you are going to hear arguments why the bureaucracy that they are defending is more important than the promise and the commitment, the sacred commitment, that we made to our senior citizens. Frankly, I am going to side with the gentleman from Oklahoma on this one.

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

I have listened to well-meaning people here today. The sponsor of the amendment certainly is, and the last speaker certainly was; my friend from North Dakota certainly is. But let us make sure we understand what we are really talking about here.

All this discussion about senior citizens being hurt by something that we might or might not do relative to emergency spending or busting the budget caps or whatever the spending argument might be is just false. No-

body is going to hurt any senior citizens. Senior citizens are not going to be touched in this debate on Social Security.

It is my generation that is going to be hurt. And the younger people who are baby boomers are going to have to face this Social Security issue. It is not going to affect senior citizens. We are not going to cut Social Security that affects their lives. We are talking about out to 2032, for goodness sakes. So I think that is a false argument as we talk about agriculture.

My friend from North Dakota, as a strong advocate of agriculture and rural agriculture, like I am because I come from a district that depends on it, is mistaken relative to the farm bill of 1996 somehow causing the low prices around the world. That is nonsense in my judgment.

What is happening is, we are in a world market economy that has some price depressions. It is not the farm bill that has caused problems for our farmers; it is the fact that we do not have markets, for crying out loud.

My argument is, we ought to be lifting sanctions on those countries which we have previously traded with that have been good customers of our farmers, in a free market system, not more government control or more government regulation or more command and control farming for the government in our system. This free market system is a good one.

□ 1615

Ask farmers. I have asked them, and they have told me: We like the system, but we have to have freedom to market our products overseas, and we do not have it right now, and we need less regulation at the Federal level, at the USDA level. That is what is going to save and help our farmers.

So I am all in favor of making cuts wherever we can, but as my colleagues know, the chairman here has worked hard within our budget allocation to do what is right for agriculture. Most of this money in this ag budget goes for food stamps, WIC programs, as my colleagues know, food safety and other social sides of spending relative to agriculture. It is not the farmers that are getting some great windfall. The farmers are hurting. So the biggest part of this budget goes to the social spending side of agriculture which is lumped into the ag appropriations bill.

So we are not going to hurt senior citizens in this process where certainly our farmers are needing help, but I think it can be done better in the market economy rather than in more government control. As my colleagues know, more regulations and rules at the Federal level are going to hurt our farmers and restrict them even more.

So, Mr. Chairman, let us make sure we understand what we are talking here, and I understand the motivation of my friend from Oklahoma. He has got good motivation, but this bill is within our budget targets, and we are

trying to do all we can for farmers as well as the WIC program and food safety and all the rest that is lumped into this very difficult challenge of trying to make the ag budget work and be balanced.

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

Mr. NETHERCUTT. I do not have much time, but I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's discussion.

One question that the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. Pomeroy) really refused to answer was whether he would be able to support the later appropriation bills with as much as \$3 to \$5 billion in reductions so that we could stay within the overall cap and stop using the Social Security surplus. I know the gentleman has worked with us in the past to make sure that we could do that, but I just wanted to ask for the record, would he anticipate being able to support those types of bills with the lower spending in the later part of the process?

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I think that is what we have to do one at a time. I think we have to make that judgment based on what we have before us. I have got an interest, a strong interest, in biomedical research, which is part of the Labor-HHS bill. That is extremely important to me. But I think we have to make tough choices, and so we are trying to make tough choices. The chairman has in this ag bill in staying within our caps, but as my colleagues know, we have got to get them passed, too.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot just not pass something. This, as my colleagues know, we can fight this bill until the cows come home, but we got to get something passed, and that is the chairman's motivation, the chairman of the big committee, the full Committee on Appropriations' motivation, and as my colleagues know, we can look downstream and figure out what we are going to have to face. But let us face it, but let us pass these bills or else we are going to have nothing to pass until the end of the day.

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

It has been an interesting discussion going on here, and it does not take really a rocket scientist to figure out what is going on when we see this many amendments on this particular bill, and if we want to do something about Social Security, let us bring it out here and get on with it. But if we are going to talk about agriculture, let us say it like it really is.

Agriculture is in a world of hurt. The last speaker, the previous speaker, and I just met in the Rayburn Room with some of my bankers from rural Iowa, and they are talking about the foreclosures that are starting to take place. It is really happening, it is really happening; reflections for me, having come out of the State legislature,

of what went on in the 1980s, and it is not a very pretty sight and it is not good for our country.

Now we might ought to reflect on this a little bit. As my colleagues know, we are pretty unusual in the world of things at 14, 15 percent, Mr. Chairman, of disposable income spent on food compared to anywhere else in the world, modern countries, wherever, 25 or whatever, to undeveloped countries that take everything, and we have got the most plentiful, safest food and the least expensive. Now we do not feel that way when we go to the grocery store, but the truth of it is it is that way. Now we are messing with our machinery, if my colleagues will, with our factory, if my colleagues will, that produces this food and fiber.

Now some of these things said need to be expanded on a little bit. The secretary told us in our Committee on Agriculture here 3 months ago, something like that, unprecedented, unprecedented worldwide, that we have got overproduction. So when we go somewhere else to make a trade or to want to sell, they say: "Excuse me. We want to sell to you."

So, Mr. Chairman, we got a tough situation, and to get the word out and to make sure that, as my colleagues know, those of them that are aware of what is going on in the Farm Service Agency offices and so on, to be able to get the word out as to what is there for them, we need this to be done. We probably need it more than what we are appropriating.

And I want to compliment the chairman, too, and I want to compliment the ranking member for the work they have done within these targets that were established. Pretty tough. I know they have had a tough assignment, but they worked hard and put the hours in, and we thank them for it, and we appreciate it. But we need to pass an ag bill. We need to tell the farmers out there that provide the food and fiber for all of us that we know what is going on and that we want to help them and we want to pass this bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take the time first to compliment my friend and colleague from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) for speaking out so strongly for those who rely on Social Security, because I have the great privilege of representing more Social Security recipients than almost every Member of this House of Representatives, and so I really appreciate the strong work and the strong message, and I am glad that Congress recognizes that it is important to keep our commitment to those on Social Security. And to do that we did adopt a budget resolution that provided the appropriators with a certain amount of money for discretionary spending.

Now in that amount of money, we suballocated that money based on what we refer to as section 302(b) suballocations. Now this is the first of the 13 regular appropriation bills to come before the House. We have already done

two supplemental bills, one conference report on the supplemental bills, and now this is the fourth appropriations vehicle that we have seen for the year. It is within the section 302(b) sub-allocation, and the section 302(b) sub-allocations are within the budget numbers set by the budget resolution and also within the budget caps established in 1997.

As a matter of fact, during the work of the full committee there were numerous amendments that were offered to dramatically increase the amount of money in this bill, and the Committee on Appropriations, determined to stay within the suballocation, the budget ceiling number, resisted those amendments.

So, Mr. Chairman, we bring to our colleagues a bill that has been looked at extremely closely by both sides of the House, both parties, and we came to a workable bill that will meet the requirements of America's farmers for this fiscal year, and as has been pointed out, that is important. It is important that America's farmers stay alive and stay well because while we do import some food, 75 percent of our nutrition comes from what the American farmer produces.

So again, Mr. Chairman, to my colleagues I would say this bill is within the section 302(b) suballocations, which are within the budget resolution number, which are within the 1997 budget caps that all of the leaders of both political parties in the House, both political parties in the Senate and the President in the White House have all said we are going to live within. This bill lives within those budget caps and within its section 302(b) suballocation, and I would hope that we could resist these amendments and get on to passing this bill, and get to conference with the other body and get the funding to the agriculture community where it is really needed.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have the utmost respect for the gentleman. I believe his heart is right.

As my colleagues know, when 1997 was agreed to, we did not have a war in Bosnia, we did not have \$13 billion that we are going to spend on an action over there. Where are we going to get the money to pay for that? Where did that money come from? That money comes from Social Security.

So the debate really is, is the climate in Washington going to change? Are we going to talk to the President? Are we going to bring things down and say: We are spending this \$13 billion because we got to fight a war, and there is probably going to be more where that comes from. We want to plus up defense. I agree with that, but are we going to live within those budget caps as we do that?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would respond to the gentleman that that is a decision that neither he nor I will make. That is a decision that

will be made by the leadership of the House and the leadership of the Senate. Then the Congress will work its will and decide if they want to agree or disagree with the decision made by the leadership.

But I would also respond to the gentleman that for the last 4 years I had the privilege of chairing the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations. Now last year alone, from the time that I submitted the bill to the subcommittee to the time that it came to the floor and to the time it went to conference with the Senate, I had my section 302(b) sub-allocation, it was section 602(b) back then, but now it is section 302(b), I had my suballocation changed three times during that process.

So it is certainly possible that, as we go through the consideration of the 13 appropriations bills, we will re-look at adjustments under the section 302(b)s. But the section 302(b) suballocations that we have before us today are the best job that we could do based on where we are and what the budget resolution provides for and what monies are available and identifying those important items that need to be identified.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has expired.

(On request of MR. MCINTOSH, and by unanimous consent, Mr. YOUNG of Florida was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I want to say I also appreciate the chairman's hard work in this area. It cannot be emphasized enough how difficult the task is.

I think the real question that the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) was asking and I would be interested in knowing and I think frames this debate is: "Do you think, as chairman of the committee, when we are finished with all 134 bills we will have met the overall cap, the 132(a), and not have had to go above that?"

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I would respond to the gentleman that we will probably spend every nickel and every dime that is provided for in that budget resolution because, as the gentleman knows because I have told him this many, many times, if we just froze every account at last year's level we would be \$17 billion over those '97 budget caps, and that tragedy that we experienced last year, the end of the year so-called omnibus appropriations bill, if we did everything that that bill committed us to do, we would be \$30 billion over those budget caps that the gentleman is talking about.

But let me close out this conversation on this subject because Social Security was Mr. Coburn's original discussion. No one will fail to receive

their Social Security check if this bill passes. No one Social Security check will be late unless the Y2K problem does not get solved, and that is something else that we have to worry about.

And I have heard these arguments in this Congress for many years in an attempt to, whatever the attempt was, and I will not suggest what the attempt was, to frighten people into thinking that if we did not do this or did not do that, their Social Security check would not be coming. That did not happen. The Social Security checks go out, they go on time, they are deposited electronically on time, and this bill's passage is not going to affect the outcome of anyone's Social Security check 1 hour, 1 minute or 1 second or \$1.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have had difficulty figuring out where I am today. When I came over here, I thought that I was attending a session of the House of Representatives. I did not know that I was really attending a session of the Republican Caucus.

□ 1630

It has been very interesting. I am not quite sure what to say about it. Let me simply suggest that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has, on three occasions, tried to produce legislation which would meet with bipartisan approval in this House. Each time, it is interesting to note that he has run into a roadblock.

That roadblock has not been constructed by members of our party, the minority; that roadblock has been placed in his way by members of the majority party, the Committee on Appropriations chairman's own party.

I think all of us know that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) is trying to do the right thing both for his party and for this institution, and for this country. And I, for one, make no apology, and I do not think he does either, for the level at which this bill is funded.

I know of no group in the country that has suffered a larger erosion of income over the past decade or two decades than have American farmers. I know that we hear a lot about urban poverty, but the fact is, I can take my colleagues into communities where poverty is just as excruciating in rural areas. It is just a little bit more anonymous and it is a little bit further away from the television reporters who are located in the urban centers of this country.

So I think, given that fact and given the fact that American farmers are now being exposed to the crunch of world markets as never before, I do not think we have to apologize for the high funding level in this bill. This bill, if we compare it to what we appropriated last year, out of all spigots including emergency appropriations and the famous Omnibus Appropriations bill, this

bill represents a 31 percent cut from last year.

Now, I would simply say this: We have tried on this side of the aisle. I did not vote for the budget 2 years ago. I thought that it was ill-conceived for this Congress to pass it; I thought it was ill-conceived for this President to sign it.

There are a lot of things that this Congress and this President have done that I think are ill-conceived. That was the most spectacular, in my view. But nonetheless, even though I have disagreed with that budget, I tried to cooperate with the committee, because that is our institutional responsibility. But sooner or later, we are going to have to face the fact that we either make some compromises or nothing further will get done this year.

This is, as I say, the third time that we have seen a different play called after the committee brought its legislation, or tried to bring its legislation, out of subcommittee.

On the last vote, I understand virtually all of the Republican leadership voted for the amendment that eliminated the funds contained in the original committee bill. I make no apology for supporting this bill, but I want to say this to those on my side of the aisle. I do not believe that we have any greater obligation to stick to the committee product than does the majority party. And if the leadership of the majority party is going to vote for amendments which are admitted by the author to be part of a tactical filibuster, then I would say the leadership of the House on the Republican side is cooperating in the destruction of its own ability to produce any progress on appropriation bills for the rest of the year.

Now, if they want to do that, that is up to them, but I do not think that is going to be healthy for the House or, in the end, healthy for their record come October.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to tell the gentleman from Wisconsin just my perspective on roadblocks by one member or another member. My perspective is that we do not have roadblocks, we do not have partisan politics. Basically, we have differences of opinions. We come here as Members of Congress to exchange information, for the most part, have a sense of tolerance for somebody else's opinion, and then we vote. And what I see here from the gentleman from Oklahoma and those who support his position, they have a strongly held conviction that we need to reduce various budget items for the purpose of saving Social Security, all of which we would agree with.

I would also say that this is not the Republican Caucus on the House floor right now; this is the Congress, and we are speaking to various issues. I know the gentleman from Massachusetts is going to strike some very humorous comment about that, and I am going to

wait around to listen, because I would appreciate it.

What I do want to say, however, is that I strongly disagree with the gentleman from Oklahoma on this issue; and what I would like to do is to read part of the committee bill and then give my opinion on the need to enhance and preserve and save agriculture and not talk about agriculture like it is General Motors and we are producing cars out there, or Westinghouse producing light bulbs.

This is an industry that produces life-needed food for this country, and we are, for the most part, the warehouse for foodstuffs for the world. They are doing this on less and less land.

This is what the committee bill says. This bill "provides funding for research to strengthen our Nation's food supply to make American exports competitive in world markets, to improve human nutrition, and to help ensure food safety. Funds in this bill make it possible for less than 2 percent of the population to provide a wide variety of safe, nutritious and affordable food for more than 272 million Americans and many more people overseas."

What we are seeing in agriculture is, we are losing 1 million acres of ag land a year. That is not a million acres of ag land 10 years ago or over the decade, that is every single year we lose 1 million acres or more of agricultural land for a variety of reasons, but we are losing it.

So that means, because the population continues to increase, we need to produce more poultry on less land. We need to produce more milk on less land. We need to produce more vegetables and more agricultural products on less land with fewer farmers, and in order to do that, we need the best technology.

There is all kinds of technology out there, but not all of it is the best, and not all of it is environmentally safe. Not all of it is going to work within the confines of what we understand to be the mechanics of natural processes.

One might be able to create genetically safe corn from the southern boll weevil, but what other forms of life are going to be damaged in the process? This is an intricate, very complex, scientific undertaking that we are doing here today.

Now, I would say that Social Security is safe. This has nothing to do with Social Security. We are going to preserve Social Security not only for seniors today, but for future generations.

This bill is about how we, as people, will understand how we are going to provide food for a growing population on less land; and I would urge my colleagues to vote for the bill of the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN). It is a good one.

Also for the bill of the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPUR).

In conclusion, on the House floor, we have various differences of opinions. We do not see these arguments in Cuba

or North Korea or Iraq. This is the way we do business in this country. We come down here, sometimes in a very volatile atmosphere, but we discuss, debate, argue, disagree. We have a sense of tolerance of someone else's opinion, and then we vote. And that is the final say.

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

That is the hope, Mr. Chairman, that we will have a chance to vote.

Mr. Chairman, I serve on the Committee on the Budget, and as I recall, the Committee on the Budget set certain limits, and my understanding is that agriculture being the first out is under its 302(b) allocation. So the issue about spending more monies than allocated that are out of compliance of the budget resolution is not directed at appropriations of agriculture. It is only directed because it is a convenient model to discuss this issue.

So although this may be a worthy issue to talk about, saving Social Security, not spending it, and I would entertain the gentleman's argument that it is a worthy issue, it is misdirected. It should not be directed here. We should not make agriculture the scapegoat for the gentleman's worthy discussion. I think it is misplaced.

I do not know what the issue is with agriculture. The gentleman says he is from an agriculture community. Oklahoma, the last time I heard, has a lot of issues that are equally as pressing as Social Security. This agriculture bill takes no more from Social Security than if it had not passed. It will take a lot from Oklahoma farmers, however, if it does not pass.

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

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

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, we just heard the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations say that if we come through with last year's spending, just if we came through with last year's spending, we would bust the caps from 1997 by \$17 billion.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, that is my point, if we came through the whole process.

We are just starting this process, and the gentleman is attacking the beginning of the process as if we were the culprit in making that happen. We are not. So why not apply this theory to the whole?

It is inappropriate to say, if we go through 13 appropriations bills, the likelihood is that we will bust the caps, that may happen. That is not the case; it is inappropriate.

So I would just urge my colleagues, and I know the gentleman's strategy is indeed to prolong this. If, indeed, he wants to have this discussion, this discussion is an appropriate discussion, but it is ill-placed directed at the agriculture appropriation.

In fact, I would suggest that it may be better when we talk about the

lockbox. We are going to have that opportunity. I do not see the gentleman planning to do that.

We are talking about the subject of Social Security. Here the gentleman is applying Social Security safety on an agriculture appropriation as if they are in conflict with each other, and they are not. The gentleman is making the conflict. The gentleman is placing it as if the appropriation for agriculture is breaking the caps. It is not doing that. The whole process may do that, but why make us the scapegoat for what the gentleman thinks may be an evenuality in that process.

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

Mr. Chairman, I had understood that the leadership on the other side had brought this bill up because this was the easy appropriations bill. I know we are not supposed to address the audience watching this on television, but my guess is that some of them may be eagerly anticipating the fun they will have watching the hard appropriations bills if this is what we do with the easy one. Were it possible to sell tickets to this circus, we could probably do something about the revenues, but of course we cannot.

But what I want to talk about is what I think is, in fact, the real issue here. The real issue is that one of the signal achievements of the Republican Party, the 1997 Balanced Budget Act, is an unmitigated disaster. Now, there are efforts going on to mitigate it. But let us be very clear. That is the unspoken premise of this whole debate.

What a terrible mistake this House made with the acquiescence of the other body and the President in 1997. Everybody gets up and says, oh, those budget caps, what a terrible thing they were, sort of. Some people are saying, we are going to hold you to them, and the suggestion that we are being held to them is considered to be an unfortunate one.

But everybody acts as if the budget caps fell down from the heavens like the rains or the hail. People have forgotten. Those budget caps are not a force of nature. They were the vote of this House, and they were, as I understand it, one of the great achievements of the Republican Party.

I also agree, by the way, that Social Security is not at risk here. What is at risk is Medicare. Because that same wonderful 1997 Balanced Budget Act, which is the greatest orphan in history since it does not appear to have any parent left, that 1997 Budget Act cut Medicare very substantially. It cut home health care, it cut prescription drugs in my State; it has cut hospital reimbursements.

And what do we have now? Surprise, surprise, the 1997 budget caps which said spending would be the same in 2002 as in 1997. People are shocked that it is inadequate.

□ 1645

People are shocked at having voted to cut \$115 billion out of Medicare to

pay for a capital gains tax cut, and Medicare is suffering. What is all the shock coming from? Were Members in a coma when they voted for the 1997 budget act? Did people not think that voting to keep spending at the exact level 5 years later was going to cause problems? Did people think cutting \$115 billion out of Medicare would have meant there would be a shortage of monopoly money the next time they sat down at the game?

Never in the history of humanity have so many people professed surprise at the foreseeable consequences of their own actions. Members ran for office on this budget in 1998. They bragged about it. Now they are acting as if it was some terrible act of God that we have to live with.

Everybody in here is Job; Oh, look what has happened to us, and we will have to live with it.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I disagree that that is what the issue is. I believe the issue is, did the Congress speak and say something, and are they willing to have the American people believe that they are going to do what they told them they would do.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I will respond to the gentleman, when the gentleman says "do what they say they were going to do," that is what we said we were going to do in 1997, is that correct? The issue is whether we are going to live up to the Act of 1997.

I would ask the gentleman, is that right?

Mr. COBURN. I will answer when I have my own time, because I am not sure I am going to get to answer the way I want to.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Yes, the gentleman can. I just wanted to make sure I understood it.

Mr. COBURN. Wonderful.

Mr. Chairman, what the American people are looking for from this body is honesty, integrity, and truthfulness about what our situation is. We can have wonderful debates about where our priorities should be, but the fact is that we did have an agreement. I did not happen to vote for the 1997 budget agreement, but we did have an agreement with this President, with the Congress of the United States, that said we are going to live within this agreement.

What the American people are wondering is are we really going to do it, or is Washington going to continue to do what it has done the last 40 years, to say one thing and do something completely other, and at the same time spend their pension money?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I will take back my time.

I would only make one edit. When the gentleman said "Washington," read

for that, "The Republican Congress." That is what he means by "Washington," because the Republicans control the House and control the Senate.

So my friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma, says the issue is, is this Republican-controlled Congress going to live up to this Republican accomplishment of 1997. And I think the answer is, they are looking for a way not to. He may not like the implications of what he said, but that is what he said.

He said, here is the issue, is this Republican Congress willing to live up to this Republican 1997 budget act. And I think here is the problem with the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) has expired.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my objection.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I have been here too long to be proud. I will accept second chances.

Mr. Chairman, I would just say I think the issue is in fact, and I am not as sure as the gentleman as to what the American people think, but I think the American people may be conflicted.

I think they may have a preference, on the one hand, for a low level of overall spending, and on the other hand, for particular spending programs that add up to more than the overall level. That is, I think the American people may be in a position where they favor a whole that is smaller than the sum of the parts they favor, and that is what we have to grapple with.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a comment about the first Republican President, Abraham Lincoln, and this is with regard to the caps, and I say this with all sincerity.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I knew Lincoln was a pretty smart fellow, but if the guy that was around in 1865 has made a comment about 1997, he was even smarter than I thought. But go ahead.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, here is what I think he would say, that he would restate his comment that the foolish and the dead alone never change their minds.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I guess he would say that, but I do not know why.

If the gentleman is saying, "change your mind," okay, but let us be clear

what "change your mind" means. If it means he admits that this great accomplishment of 1997, this Balanced Budget Act that has been the basis for so much that they have taken credit for, they are really ready to throw it over the side, I do not blame the Members. I never liked it in the first place.

The one thing the Members are not entitled to do is to express surprise at the entirely foreseeable consequences of their action. They are not entitled, having done it in 1997 and taken credit for it in the 1998 election, to throw it over the side and say, what do you guys think this is, term limits, a promise one makes and then forgets about?

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

Mr. Chairman, agriculture is very important to me. I am a farmer. Agriculture has been shortchanged. We need to pay attention to agriculture and the survival of the family farm as other countries protect and subsidize their farmers.

But I think that is one reason that this is the first of the appropriation bills where we are faced with the decision of overspending. Are we going to start inching our way into a situation where we have to break our word on keeping our commitment on the caps that we set in 1997.

Just to make it clear, synonymous with sticking to the caps under the current CBO projections is whether or not we spend the social security trust fund surpluses to accommodate that extra spending.

For most every year in the last 40 years, we have used the social security surpluses to mask the deficit; in other words, we have spent the social security surpluses for other government programs. A lot of people here say, well, do not worry about it, somehow social security is going to take care of itself.

I disagree. The easy step, the easiest possible thing that we can do, is say that we are going to stop spending the social security surpluses for other government programs. That is a baby step. That is so easy compared to the program changes that are going to have to be implemented to change social security so it can stay solvent.

So when we are faced with a situation that we inch our way into overspending and using Social Security surpluses on this important Agricultural budget, which is so difficult for so many of us to vote against, we set the pattern. Then the next budget that is also important, we are faced with more overspending. Then a situation at the end is that we cannot possibly stay within our caps and not spend the social security surpluses.

Look, if the spending is so important, have the guts, the fortitude, to say, we are going to increase taxes to accommodate this kind of spending. Do not say, we are simply going to reach under the table, take the social security surpluses that are coming in be-

cause current workers are being overtaxed, and use that money, because few will notice the abuse. Nobody is going to see it or realize it until it runs out of money.

We have ground this country into a \$5.5 trillion debt. We are increasing that debt on a daily basis. Sometime we are going to have to face up to the fact that we are transferring our shortsighted desire for more overspending to our kids and our grandkids and future generations.

Not only will they be asked to come up with additional income taxes but also social security taxes to pay for our overindulgence. I just give the Members a couple of situations. Germany did not pay attention to this early on, and now they are spending almost 50 percent of their wages in taxes to accommodate their senior retirement program.

I am very concerned that we are going down, if you will, the primrose path of thinking all of these expenditures are necessary and important.

I would just like to encourage my colleagues to face up to the consequences. If spending is so important, let us increase taxes to accommodate that spending. Let us reduce other expenditures to accommodate that spending. But let us keep our promise and not spend social security surpluses.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to remind my colleagues that we are actually debating an amendment. Now, we have heard speeches here on social security, we have gotten into Abraham Lincoln's life, and everything else. But I become increasingly angered as I see the irresponsibility of the majority party inside this institution.

I am a loyal Member of this House, and I am rarely as partisan as some of my colleagues on this side of the aisle. But I am going to get partisan now, because a bill that I have major responsibility for is being held up on this floor because of disarray inside the Republican Party. Who it is hurting is the farmers across this country.

Mr. Chairman, I will not yield until I finish my statement to any Member on the other side of the aisle, since they are the reason for the continuing delay here today.

I have served in this Congress now for 9 terms and I have the highest respect for the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), who has worked under enormous pressures of various types as we have moved this bill to the floor, the first appropriation bill to arrive on the floor, and rightly so for rural America, because no sector of this country is hurting more than rural America today.

But as I look at the record of the Republican Congress during my tenure over the last several years, last year they could not clear a bill to assist rural America. We had to end up with

that omnibus atrocity at the end of the year where we threw in some help for rural America, because they could not deal with their appropriation bills on time.

And then just last week, 6 months late, they appropriated more money under an emergency basis to try to help rural America, as well as defense and Kosovo and Hurricane Mitch victims and all of the rest. They did not do it under regular order. The only part of the bill that they required to be offset for budget purposes was the agriculture piece, the part that affected citizens of the United States of America who have paid taxes.

Now today I come down here, and what do I see? I see delay by a Member who is not up for reelection, let us put the cards right on the table; who has, according to what we have been told, between 100 and 200 amendments to an agriculture bill which is very important to rural America. So what I see today are delay tactics.

I do not understand what is going on on the Republican side of the aisle. They can check my whole career, I probably have not used the word "Republican" in speeches on the floor 10 times in 17 years, but I am sick of it and what they are doing on agriculture. They are holding up our bill.

I would just beg of the leadership, I will say to the leadership of their side of the aisle who voted with the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), if this is any indication of what is about to happen over the next several days as we string this agony out and they make rural America wait again, I would just say, why do they not go back into their own little caucus and figure out what they are really for, because we have worked very hard for several months to produce this bill, and the people of America, particularly rural America, are waiting, and they are continuing to delay.

I will specifically say to their leadership, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), those who voted with the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), why are they doing this? There are over 100 to 200 more amendments yet to come, and they are going to delay this bill?

If these Members want a vote on social security, bring up a social security bill. They are in the majority. They can do anything they want. But why do they continue to take it out of the hide of rural America?

I have a real problem here. I would just beg of the leadership to treat their committee chairs with respect, bring their bills to the floor in regular order, and do not nitpick us to death.

Thank God we are not the other body. We are not supposed to have filibusters here. We are supposed to move the people's business. I am here to do that as a Democrat, and I wish they were here to do that as Republicans.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Members are reminded that their remarks are to be di-

rected to the Chair, not to other persons.

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

I would like to say that I have tremendous respect for the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTR) who just spoke. I would like to think that later she will regret some of the intensity that she feels, because this is the first day of a debate on the agriculture appropriations bill.

We have a right, even in the majority, to amend majority bills, just as the minority has a right to offer amendments to these bills. That is what we are doing, and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) in my judgment, is showing a lot of courage and integrity.

I was sitting in my office and I was thinking, he is speaking the truth. We all need to have this dialogue, and if Members disagree with it, they disagree with it.

The fact is, when we set the 302(b) allocations, we decided to give more to agriculture; we decided to give a lot more to defense; and, obviously, we decided to give less to Labor and Health and Human Services. These departments are going to receive a \$10.7 billion cut. We also decided to give less to HUD. That department is also going to receive a significant cut.

What we are saying is that when we increase agriculture spending, the only way we can do this is by cutting other departments. And we do not want that.

What I am saying is that I will vote for appropriations bills that do not increase spending and that stay within the caps.

□ 1700

I understand that the chairman can say we are staying within the cap, because we could triple the agriculture budget. It is the first budget, and we could spend all the 302(b) allocation on agriculture and still not be above the cap.

But we have to recognize that this budget is going to affect all the other budgets that follow. That is why I am on the floor to say I will vote against this budget, not because I dislike farmers, but because I do not like the bureaucracy in the Agriculture Department.

I have a hard time understanding why we need over 95,000 employees in the Agriculture Department and less than 10,000 in HUD. I have a hard time understanding why we have over 85,000 contract employees working in the Agriculture Department.

I do not think they help farmers as much as some of the other things we do. We have a gigantic department that, in my judgment, makes HUD look efficient.

As a Member of Congress, I think I have a right to come here, speak on the amendment that the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) has offered, and vote for it with pride.

I would gladly take credit for the balanced budget agreement, but I cannot

take credit because a lot of people share in that credit. That agreement is one of the reasons why I think our country is doing as well as it is today.

Our challenge is we have a gigantic surplus, and we simply do not know how to deal with the surplus, so we want to spend it and make government bigger and bigger and bigger.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding to me.

Everybody said what my intention was, but they never asked me exactly what my intention was. The reason for the number of amendments that have been offered is because the real debate is about what we are going to do with all this money that we are spending.

As a Member of this body, I think, and I think the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTR) will agree, that I was just as obstructive in my desire to not spend wasteful money last year and the year before and the year before and the year before. I have not changed at all. I have been this independent ever since I have been up here, because I believe that we have an obligation to not spend one additional dollar that we do not have to.

What I hear throughout the whole body is that we cannot. We cannot be better. We cannot get better. We cannot be more efficient. That the product of the appropriation process is the best that it can be.

We all have an equal vote in here in terms of what we think and how we get a vote on certain issues. I, quite frankly, think that there are a lot of areas in this appropriation bill that we can trim spending, that will help us have money for Labor-HHS, Commerce, Justice and State, that will not have one effect on our farmers. Do my colleagues know what? Most of my farmers think so, too.

So it is not a matter of just obstructing the process, it is a matter of reestablishing confidence within this body with the American people that we said we were going to hold spending down, that we were not going to waste money, and that in fact it is really true that, if we spend \$1 that we do not need to, we are stealing the future from our children.

So the debate is about Social Security because the money that we are going to end up spending is going to come from the Social Security surplus that, guess what, our children are going to have to pay back.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to, if I could, see if we cannot back out of the trees and look at the forest a little bit. I appreciate the comments earlier by the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I think that he had it exactly right.

One of my favorite movies is "Indiana Jones." In the movie, his father is

killed, and they are drinking from the silver chalice. If Indiana Jones picks the right chalice to drink from, his father will live. If he picks the wrong one, he will die.

In one of the moving lines of the movie, the bad guy says to Indiana Jones, "Indiana Jones, it is time for you to decide what you believe."

I think what the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) is trying to do is to force that question on this party, the Republicans, to decide what we believe. The gentleman from Massachusetts had it exactly right.

I will tell my colleagues that, as one Republican, I am not ashamed of what we did in the 1997 balanced budget agreement. It is the best thing we have done since I have been here, and I am proud of that and will gladly defend it to my dying day. But are we all willing to do that?

What we have really is a logjam of ideals that are coming together in this first appropriation bill. The ideals are saving Social Security and the surplus, balancing the budget, and spending more money.

I would have bet my last dollar that several years ago, had my colleagues asked me a question, if we had a logjam of those three ideals, which one would win, I would have bet my last dollar that Social Security would trump all the others. But what we are finding evident in this process is that is not true. Spending trumps everything else in this body. Big spending trumps everything, including Social Security.

Again, let us back out of the woods and look at the forest. What we have here is the first of 13 bills, checks that the Congress writes to fund all the discretionary spending in the budget, about \$600 billion. It may be a little bit more than that. This is the first one.

What the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) has had the nerve and the courage to do is take the high ground and try to see if we can figure out where the end of this road is going to be.

I will tell my colleagues where the end of the road is. It is a box canyon. It is a dead end. That is where we are headed.

An old Chinese proverb says, "The longest journey begins with the first step." This is the first step, and it is a step in the wrong direction. If we continue down this path, we will end up with another disaster like we had at the end of the last Congress.

So what the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) is doing, he is not railing against agriculture, he is railing against this process. Sure, my colleagues are right, this is a problem within the Republican conference; and leadership is what is needed.

We need to talk about what is the end game, not agriculture. What is the end game? Where are we going? Are we going to end up with the same disaster that we had last year, where we end up spending billions of dollars above the

budget caps, \$17 billion if we freeze all spending right now? That is the point that the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) is trying to make.

I was always taught, say what you mean and mean what you say. Now say what you mean is a communication issue; and I hear that wherever I go, speaking across the country on behalf of the Republican Party: What is the problem with your communication?

One of the problems is we do not say what we mean. We are trying to do a better job of that. Do my colleagues know what we are saying? We are the party that wants to save Social Security first, not 62 percent of the surplus, as the President said from that lectern not long ago, but 100 percent.

Mean what you say is an integrity issue. That is what this issue is about. It is an integrity issue of this party. Because if my colleagues are going to ask me to go around the country and hail the Republican Party and say we are the party that is to save Social Security first, then my colleagues better mean what they say, because I want to mean what I say. If we do not mean what we say, then I am going to quit saying it.

That is the issue, are we going to mean what we say when we say we are going to save Social Security first? This bill is the first test on that issue.

Again, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) has had the foresight and the courage to take the high ground and look ahead and say, if we continue down this path, we have a disaster coming in the form of VA-HUD and Labor-HHS that none of my colleagues will vote for under the 302(b) allocations. Not one of my colleagues will vote for a \$4 billion cut in VA-HUD and \$5 billion cut in Labor-HHS. Not one of my colleagues will vote for it, not one.

So that is the problem. It is a leadership issue. I agree with the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR). It is a leadership issue that we need to deal with. I will tell my colleagues that this was our last resort, was to come to the House floor, because we hit dead end after dead end in trying to carry on this family discussion inside our own house.

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

Mr. Chairman, I had not planned to come and speak on this bill today. As I was over in my office and watching it, I was thinking I am sure my farmers are out in the field this afternoon, and I hope they are, working, and not seeing what was going on that would have such a dramatic impact on their lives.

We are here in an air conditioned building and, as my friend the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LARENT) said who just spoke from the majority side, we are in an air-conditioned building, well-lighted and comfortable; and they are out in hot fields, their lives on the line. As he said, and he put it correctly, we are having a family fight.

I am not going to get in the middle of this family fight. I am going to let my colleagues all fight it out. But I hope my colleagues will settle it, because this bill has a significant impact on the farmers in my State and the farmers all across this country.

Yes, there are other bills to come that will affect the children. But this bill does, too, because it affects the quality of family life.

I am proud to be a Member of the United States Congress. I am not proud when we bring our dirty laundry to the floor. There is nothing wrong with offering amendments. I have no problem with that. I will stay here all night and tomorrow morning, all day tomorrow. But we ought to know where we want to get to. It ought to be about getting to a destination. It ought to be about making it better rather than just to stop the process, to make a point. That is not what legislation is all about.

I am only in my second term in Congress. I served 10 years in the General Assembly in my State. I understood stalling tactics, but it ought not to be about that. It ought to be about making it better and providing a better opportunity for people in America and specifically about our family farmers, because they are hurting.

Our small farmers are going out of business. They are going broke. I have had farmers tell me, and I met with bankers, I met with someone earlier today and they said to me, "If you do not have crop insurance, I will not make a loan. If you do not get a program in place, we are going to quit lending money."

If that should happen, I pray to God it does not, but if that should happen, it will not happen with my vote. I trust the majority party will come to their senses and make sure it does not happen with their vote either, because we have been fortunate in America, we have been blessed, as no other country in the world, to have a bountiful food supply.

Oh, sure, there are children that do not have as much food as they should have; but over the years we have tried to do a good job. We have not done as much as we should to make sure that they are fed with the child nutrition program and other programs like that.

But, Mr. Chairman, we have a job to do. We are paid to do it. So let us get on and pass this bill and get on to the other appropriations bills and get the people's business done.

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

Mr. Chairman, I wrote down a few different thoughts here that we have all heard. Rome was not built in a day. The first step is the hardest step. The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LARENT) just mentioned the Chinese proverb, which was the longest journey begins with the first step. Do not do tomorrow what you can do today. To me, this is what the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) is all about.

As has already been stated numerous times on the House floor, we have a train wreck coming unless we go out and basically reroute this little train. So it is a family fight. It is an internal discussion. But it is a conversation that really has to take place now because the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTR) mentioned the 302(b) numbers. There is no way we are going to cut \$3 billion from VA-HUD. There is no way we are going to cut \$5 billion from Labor-HHS. If we are going to get ahead of this curve, we have simply got to do it now.

So I would just commend the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN). I would say that farmers that I talk to are the most straightforward people in the world. What we are dealing with, again, goes back to what the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LARGENT) was talking about in terms of the word "integrity". What we have is a budget plan that cannot work.

When we talk about this idea of a surplus, last year we borrowed \$100 billion from Social Security to give us a surplus of about \$70 billion. Most folks I talk to say basically we are still \$30 billion in the hole if that is the math.

A family, if one had to go out and borrow against one's retirement reserves to put gas in the car and food on the table, one would say that family was not running a surplus. In the business world, if one borrowed against one's pension fund assets to pay for the current operation of the company, one would go to jail. That is how we are getting to this surplus.

So we are building on very shaky ground. That is what the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) is trying to get us away from with this particular amendment.

□ 1715

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

Mr. SANFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I want to go back and make a couple of points. This amendment is about cutting a 9 percent increase in an office that is full of computers for an Office of Public Information for the Department of Agriculture. And here we have people saying that we have to have 9 percent when every other aspect of our economy is not seeing any kind of increases near that.

It is sacrosanct because of what has to continue; the way we used to do it, we always have to do it that way in the future. It is a process that needs to be shaken up.

I would love to have been in a room with our Founding Fathers, because while we talk about majority-minority parties, I am sure they did not talk about majority-minority parties. They talked about doing what was best for this country regardless of what an individual's party says.

It should be what is best for our districts, not what is good for our party.

The Founding Fathers never once rationalized getting in power and having control so they could stay in power. What they said was, we are going to put this Union together and we are going to make it work because the people are going to have the integrity to do what is best for their constituents and they are going to have the vision to make sure that they do not make a short-run choice that sacrifices the long-run choice.

These amendments are about sacrificing the short run so we secure a future for our children in the long run. It is not about which party controls. It is a matter of living up to our responsibility to secure a future for our children. And, quite frankly, I am not sure this body is up to it, because I think the body is more interested in power politics than principle. I find that evident as we have had the debate today.

So I would yield back to the gentleman and thank him for the additional time, and I would reemphasize that this is a debate about cutting a 9 percent increase out of the Office of Information for the Department of Agriculture, and that will not impact one farmer.

I would rather see this same money moved and go to our farmers.

It is not about not having enough money for our farmers; it is about having way too much bureaucracy and not having the guts to change it.

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

First off, I think it is important that we know just exactly what the proposed increased spending is for. And I have great respect for the gentleman from Oklahoma, I do not believe he intends to misspeak, but this is an attempt to do something that many of us have been attempting to do since 1992, and that is bring the USDA into the next century technologically. And that is what these computers are all about. It is to allow our farmers to be served better by less people.

And that is what the cuts that are being proposed are all about, and that is why some of us have opposed these cuts.

But let me make a couple of other observations. If we want to save Social Security, let us bring a Social Security bill to the floor of the House from the Committee on Ways and Means.

Now, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH), on this side of the aisle, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) have brought bills and ideals but not to the floor. This is the wrong time for us to be picking on an agricultural bill, particularly making cuts that do just the opposite of what the gentleman from Oklahoma wants to do, in my opinion.

But the gentleman is correct in many of the observations that he makes with his amendments today. We have no appropriations strategy, "we" meaning

this body, unless those who voted for the majority's budget are prepared to cut \$6 billion from the Veterans Administration and HUD, unless they are willing to cut \$11 billion in Labor HHS, unless they are willing to cut 8 percent in Commerce, State, Justice, and the energy and water bills, and unless they are willing to cut 20 percent from the Interior and Foreign Operations.

Now, I did not vote for that budget, because I am not willing to make those kinds of cuts in those areas, because I believe it would be counterproductive, and I am perfectly willing to say what I mean. But I did vote for the Blue Dog budget, and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) did also, which suggested that in the areas of agriculture, defense, education, health and veterans we might need to spend a little bit more on those areas, subject to the scrutiny of this body, which is perfectly okay for any Member in this body to challenge the Committee on Appropriations at any time on anything we are doing, and I do not begrudge the gentleman for doing that.

We also, in our amendment, saved Social Security, and I would submit we did it really, and the gentleman agrees because he voted for it. We also provided for a 25 percent tax cut, or using 25 percent of the on-budget for cutting taxes. But we also recognized there was going to be a need for additional spending, and we are proving it today. And this is an area in which when I say "we," the leadership of this House needs to look at the train wreck that they are leading us down by the proposed 302(b) allocations.

The gentleman from New Mexico and the gentlewoman from Ohio are doing what they were told to do. They were given a mark in the budget. This budget passed by a majority vote of this body. Therefore, that means a majority must support it.

Well, if it means a majority do not wish to spend that which has been designated for agriculture, vote against it. Cut the agriculture bill. Vote to adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma, in which he will cut the very technology that we need in order to make the efficiencies to do more work with less people. That is what this is all about.

I know the gentleman has not looked into it. I have spent since 1992. I was the chairman of the Subcommittee on Department Operations, Oversight, Nutrition, and Forestry that started us down the road of USDA reorganization, and I have been fought every step of the way by the bureaucracy. We have made some substantial improvements and changes, and one of the things that we must do now is provide our people with the technology that they need in order that they might do that which they are criticized every day for doing.

Secretary Glickman has been criticized day after day after day because he has not been able to deliver that which our farmers expect. Part of the reason he has been criticized is we have

not given him the tools to use. So before we start blindly making amendments and trying to make points, let me just say this agricultural function is within the budget that passed by a majority of this House.

It does not meet the criteria of the Blue Dogs. Those who supported us, which was a majority on my side of the aisle and 26 on that side of the aisle, said, no, we cannot do that, we have some other needs, and we are willing to stand up and be counted for those needs in a very responsible way.

But if we truly want to save Social Security, let us bring a Social Security bill to this floor and do it tomorrow. Then we will have an honest debate about how we can best do it, not on an agricultural bill.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. Mr. Chairman, I will not take the full 5 minutes. I would just like to make two points.

One is that for those who have mentioned in the debate that the farmers are waiting in the fields for us to resolve this issue, I would remind them that this bill does not become law for at least 4 months, regardless of how long this debate goes on. So no one is going to be harmed by this debate except perhaps the patience of the Members who are participating in it or whose constituents are listening to it back home.

So this is not going to cause any breakdown in USDA or in the delivery of services or anything else. This is next year's appropriations bill.

The second thing is, the gentleman from Oklahoma has every right to offer these amendments, but that does not mean we have to debate every one of them. This could go on for a long, long time. Why do we not just agree that he has his right to bring the amendments and let us vote them down?

The committee, the subcommittee, went through the process according to Hoyle. We did the right thing. Let us just vote these amendments down. If we debate every amendment, it could be 4 months before we complete.

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

Mr. Chairman, I will not take 5 minutes, but I think it is wonderful that we can be in this position. When I was running for Congress in 1996, the major theme was that the Congress ought to live within its own means, it ought not to spend more money than it takes in. And I am proud of the U.S. Congress for what they have done in the past few years to get us there.

I know the gentleman from Oklahoma played an integral role in that, and I respect his right to bring these amendments. But I want to tell the gentleman that we have to live within these budget caps that we have imposed upon ourselves, or we are going to have a train wreck.

Now, I did not happen to vote for the budget that we are operating under right now. Like the gentleman from

Texas, I voted for the Blue Dog budget, as did the gentleman from Oklahoma. And I think the major difference between the two was that we recognized, as Blue Dogs, that we could not do the cuts quite as deeply as were shown in the budget that came out of the majority of this House.

So, obviously, that Blue Dog budget went down, and now we are living within the constraints of the one that we have. And as my colleagues know, the main difference in those was the depth of the tax cuts.

So I just wanted to remind the gentleman from Oklahoma that, as I have listened to this discussion today, much of it has focused on senior citizens and the issue of Social Security. What has not been mentioned today is the fact that much of this bill that we are debating right now is of direct benefit to senior citizens. Actually, only 12 or 13 billion goes directly into the farm programs, the balance goes into WIC and some other programs that are directed at senior citizens.

Our rural housing programs, particularly the multifamily housing and rental assistance programs are heavily oriented towards seniors. We have housing repair loans and grants that help senior citizens fix their homes and rentals and repair handicapped access. Our community facility loans and grants build community centers that are used by all age groups in rural America.

A significant part of our research in this bill has gone for the elderly nutrition. This bill supports several feeding programs for senior citizens in urban and rural areas. This bill also supports people, the computers, the buildings and all other things necessary to make these programs work.

Now, I have spent most of my life in agriculture, and I go in and out of the FSA office regularly; and we have cut the staff in those offices, we have consolidated those offices to the point where we are doing a disservice to our farmers now all across this Nation. And the only way for us to be able to continue to sustain that is with technology. I am embarrassed when I go in and see some of the computers that they are using.

So I strongly urge the defeat of this amendment, and I certainly am thankful to the gentleman from Oklahoma for continuing this debate.

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

Mr. Chairman, I thought one of the most interesting talks was given by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LARGENT). This is not about agriculture today, as far as what the gentleman is doing. It is about spending and it is about the future and, in the long run, farmers are going to be better.

I grew up in a little town called Shelbina, Missouri, which had a population of 2,113 folk, and I want to tell my colleagues that most of my friends

were farmers, and most of them are having to have second and third jobs just to hang on to their farms. And I understand that. But when I look at this body and the argument, not just with our party, but with the other party as well, on total spending for the future, it is important.

Most of us could live within the budget caps, even national security. We could live under the budget caps set with national security if we did not have the Somalia extension, which cost billions; Haiti cost billions; Bosnia has cost \$16 billion so far, and that is not even next year; Kosovo has already cost \$15 billion; going to Iraq four times cost billions of dollars.

And all of this money, every penny of this, we could put in farms, we could put in Social Security, and we could do all the other things we want to. But this White House has got us in folly all over this planet, costing billions of dollars. So there is spending there.

I also look at the different things that we fight, and not just agriculture. Take a look at the balanced budget process. If I had my way I would do away with the budget process, and I think the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) would too, and I would just go with an appropriations bill.

I would get rid of the authorization, and I would reduce the entire size of government so that we do not have to tax farmers so much, so that neither a State nor local nor Federal tax means more than 25 percent. That would help farmers.

□ 1730

Look at the Endangered Species Act. Look at how that hurts farmers. Increased taxes hurt farmers. All of these things that we talk about on this floor on almost all the bills, whether it is defense or environment or other things, affect farmers negatively.

The supplemental we passed, we passed a pretty good bill out of the House. It was clean but it went to the other body and it was a disaster coming back here. And that took money out from the things that we are trying to do in medical research and all the other things.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas talked about this office and this amendment. I want to get back to it for a minute.

I just want the American people to know, in 1964 there were 3.2 million farms in this country and there were 108,000 agricultural employees working for the U.S. Government. In 1997 there were 40 percent fewer farms, 1.9 million, and there were 107,000 Department of Agriculture employees plus 82,000 contract employees that did not exist in 1964.

So the question that I am wanting to raise, the philosophical question is why

can we not get the government smaller if we have fewer farmers, they are more efficient, they are doing better, and send more of the money that we have for agriculture to the farmers? How is it that we cannot do that? We can do that. It is that we choose not to do it.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I appreciate focusing, as the gentleman did, on the fundamental issue here. And I think we do have a question as to the adequacy of the caps. The gentleman from California said we could live under the cap, even for national security, and he said if it were not for Somalia, Haiti, Bosnia, Kosovo and Iraq.

My point to the gentleman is this: Kosovo came after, but the other military efforts he mentioned all preceded the cap. The cap was 1997. So if the gentleman says we could have lived under the cap except for Haiti, Somalia, Bosnia and Iraq, then he must be saying, seriously, that the cap was too low. Because those four items which he said make it impossible to live under the cap, four of the five predate the cap.

So I ask the gentleman, does he still say the cap was adequate in 1997?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CUNNINGHAM was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, what I would say to the gentleman is this. The Joint Chiefs, for example, in defense said that we need \$150 billion, that is an additional \$22 billion a year just to pay for defense, and that is because of all of those deployments that have happened.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue, I understand that. But my point to the gentleman is we can differ about that, although I hope we can work together to reduce some of these excessive commitments. But I would say to the gentleman this: Most of those things happened before my colleagues voted for the cap. So I am simply saying it is impossible logically to say both that these interventions make the cap unrealistic and to have voted for the cap, because the cap came after most of those interventions.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I think the gentleman is missing the point. Even though the cap came afterwards, those other events preceded it and all of those bills were carried on down the line.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, yes. Then why did my colleague vote for the cap? I agree that because the events preceded it, the cap came after it. That I agree to.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, again it is about spending. And I would say, look at [www.dsusa.org](http://www.dsusa.org). That is the Democrat Socialists of America. And under that are 58 of the members in this body.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, would he tell me what that remotely has to do with anything?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. They want increased spending. They want increased government control. They want increased taxes. They want to cut defense by 50 percent. And every single one of those hurts farmers.

So this is about spending. And they in the minority want to increase spending. They want to increase taxes. They want to increase government control. All of those things hurt farmers.

So this bill and this debate is good, because it is not about agriculture. It is about a principle of spending and taxes and whether Congress is putting us in the hole for future generations or not.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Members are reminded that they are to refrain from characterizing the actions of the other body.

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

Mr. Chairman, last Sunday afternoon I spent 3 hours at the Emmanuel American Lutheran Church in rural Fulda in Minnesota. The Fulda Ministerium had organized a service to minister to the anguish of the farm community. The local Catholic priest and several ministers participated.

Farm families are struggling to decide if they can continue to farm. Business families are wondering if their businesses will survive. Churches are wondering if they will survive. Teachers are wondering if their schools will stay open in the small communities in rural America.

As I sat in the service, I looked up at the wall in the front of the sanctuary and I noticed that the Ten Commandments were there. The Seventh Commandment states, "Thou shalt not steal." The Seventh Commandment, which states, "Thou shalt not steal," had a very strange and eerie relevance to the meeting that afternoon.

What is happening in this country has a cheap food policy and we have been stealing from America's farm families for decades. We are driving, by our national cheap food policy, thousands of families from the farms of America every year.

This year we are struggling with the first appropriations bill, Agriculture Appropriations. It is a humble bill. From my reading of the approach that we are taking, there is no real policy in this bill. We are not making progress. And I fear that the American farmers are getting rolled again in fiscal 2000. Their bill comes up first, and there is all this debate about whether their bill is too high.

Well, I can assure my friend from Oklahoma that we are not investing

enough in agriculture. It is far from the truth. And the 100,000 employees he is talking about at the U.S. Department of Agriculture, they are not dealing with our agricultural programs. Almost all of them are dealing with nutrition and Forest Service and other programs. It is not agriculture.

Let us quit treating our farmers like dirt. We expect them to farm in the dirt, but they deserve to be treated with dignity. I do not see any progress in this series of amendments. We are squandering hours of floor time on a frivolous debate over these amendments.

What we need to do, Mr. Chairman, we need to recognize the fact that, as we move through this appropriations process, one appropriations bill after another is going to exceed the caps. The Agriculture Appropriations bill is probably the one that is considered easiest to pass without protracted debate over whether we should not be spending more.

Tragically, when the end of the year comes and we have the new CBO budget baseline and the pressure is there for other programs, we will start to find ways to explode the caps. I think all of us know that. But for agriculture, no, there is no new program. There is no crop insurance reform for fiscal year 2000. We are not increasing the loan rates for fiscal 2000. We are not providing additional money for new and beginning farmers in fiscal 2000. We are not investing in our rural communities for fiscal 2000 to a greater degree.

We have a static program. We are regressing for America's rural communities in fiscal 2000. And I think to blame the White House, to blame this and to blame that, is absolutely wrong. It is asinine. We need to look at ourselves and blame ourselves for the fact we are not doing justice to America's farm families.

I urge that we defeat this amendment and that we move on to consider the substance of this bill so that we no longer are insulting rural America.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 239, noes 177, answered "present" 3, not voting 14, as follows:

	[Roll No. 154]
	AYES—239
Aderholt	Barrett (WI)
Andrews	Bartlett
Archer	Barton
Armeny	Bass
Bachus	Becerra
Baird	Bentsen
Baker	Bereuter
Baldwin	Berkley
Ballenger	Berman
Barr	Biggert
	Bilbray
	Blagojevich
	Bliley
	Blumenauer
	Blunt
	Boehner
	Borski
	Brady (PA)
	Brady (TX)
	Brown (OH)

Bryant Hastings (WA) Pombo Knollenberg Nussle Simpson  
 Burr Hayes Portman Kolbe Oberstar Sisisky  
 Burton Haworth Pryce (OH) Kuykendall Obey Skeen  
 Buyer Hefley Rahall LaFalce Olver Skelton  
 Calvert Herger Ramstad Lampson Ose Smith (WA)  
 Camp Hill (MT) Rangel LaTourette Owens Spence  
 Campbell Hilleary Reynolds LaTourette Oxley Stabenow  
 Cannon Hoeffel Riley Rivers Lewis (CA) Packard Stenholm  
 Capuano Hoekstra Rogan Lewis (GA) Payne Strickland  
 Cardin Holt Rohrabacher Lofgren Peterson (MN) Peterson (PA) Talent  
 Castle Hostettler Ros-Lehtinen Lowey Pickett Tanner  
 Chabot Hutchinson Roukema Lucas (KY) Pomeroy Tauscher  
 Chenoweth Inslee Royce Lucas (OK) Porter Tazuin  
 Clement Istook Royce Markey Price (NC) Thomas Thompson (CA)  
 Coble Jefferson Ryan (WI) Mascara Quinn Thompson (MS)  
 Coburn Johnson (CT) Ryan (KS) McCarthy (MO) Radanovich Thurman  
 Collins Johnson, Sam Salmon McCrery Regula Traficant  
 Conyers Jones (NC) Sanchez McHugh Rodriguez Turner  
 Cook Kelly Sanford McIntyre Roemer Udall (CO)  
 Costello Kennedy Sawyer McKeon Rogers Vento  
 Cox Kind (WI) Scarborough McKinney Roybal-Allard Rush Visclosky  
 Coyne Kleczka Schaffer Meek (FL) Miller (FL) Sabo Walsh  
 Crane Klink Sensenbrenner Sessions Minge Sanders Watkins  
 Crowley LaHood Shadegg Mollohan Sandlin Watt (NC)  
 Cubin Lantos Shaw Moran (KS) Saxton Wexler  
 Cunningham Largent Shays Moran (VA) Schakowsky Wilson  
 Davis (VA) Larson Sherman Morella Scott Wolf  
 Deal Lazio Sherwood Shimkus Napolitano Serrano Wynn  
 DeFazio Leach Sessions Nethercutt Shows Young (AK)  
 Delahunt Lee Slaughter Smith (MI) Ney Shuster Young (FL)  
 DeLay Levin Smith (NJ)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3  
 Kaptur Kucinich Menendez  
 NOT VOTING—14  
 Brown (CA) Jackson-Lee Ortiz  
 Clay (TX) Pallone  
 Graham Kasich Reyes  
 Hinojosa Millender-Rothman  
 Holden McDonald Smith (TX)  
 Nadler

## □ 1800

Mr. ROEMER and Mr. STRICKLAND changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. BAIRD, Ms. SANCHEZ, Ms. VELAZQUEZ and Messrs. MOAKLEY, NEAL of Massachusetts, DEUTSCH and GREEN of Texas changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I will not take the 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I had planned on offering an amendment that would have attempted to strike funding for the Office of the Secretary as well as other offices and programs within USDA in an attempt to provide some \$40 million for onion and apple farmers in the State of New York that were severely struck by bad weather, a disaster-type of problem that they had last year.

We, our good Committee on Agriculture, adopted a \$5.9 billion emergency relief measure. Our farmers still have yet to see one dollar of that, and I wanted to mention as we are considering this major agriculture measure, I wanted to make my colleagues aware of the poor manner in which the United States Department of Agriculture has addressed emergency relief for our farmers at a time when this Congress passed a \$5.9 billion emergency relief measure last October, and yet very few of our farmers have received the kind

of relief they are entitled to. Moreover, when they go to seek relief, they find that the crop insurance program leaves a lot to be desired.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture in the House and the Senate for taking a hard look at revising that program.

So again I just wanted to take this opportunity to remind our colleagues that while the USDA speaks highly of trying to do something for the farmers, their programs leave a lot to be desired.

Mr. Chairman, I had planned on offering an amendment that would have attempted to strike funding for the Office of the Secretary as well as other offices and programs within the USDA in an attempt to provide \$40 million for onion and apple farmers from New York.

However, in observance of comity as well as in recognition that such amendment would not pass, I will not offer such an amendment.

Moreover, along with my colleague the gentleman from New York, Mr. WALSH, we attempted to add \$30 million to the recently approved emergency supplemental for emergency assistance for our apple and onion producers, but we were denied such relief.

However, the manner in which the Secretary of Agriculture and the USDA has chosen to handle the current crisis which continues to plague our onion producers from my congressional district in Orange County, New York is wholly unsatisfactory.

One year ago this month, a devastating hail storm swept through the Orange County region causing severe damage to vegetable crops and adversely affected the production of our onion crops. When our farmers went to their Federal crop insurance for assistance, they encountered a system that hindered them, rather than helping them.

In the year that has followed since the last disaster, the United States Department of Agriculture has utterly failed to act within their mandate to secure and protect the interests of our nations farmers. Many of our farmers face bankruptcy as a result of multi-year losses and absolutely no assistance from USDA. In Orange County, our farmers began planting for the new season, despite receiving no indemnities on their claims. They could not afford to buy the seed and supplies needed to ensure a bountiful growing season and many are struggling to keep themselves afloat in the midst of the maelstrom that the Department has unleashed upon them. We called upon the Secretary of Agriculture, noting that unless the emergency funds so desperately needed were released immediately, a number of them may not be able to survive.

Despite numerous pleas from a number of us in the Congress, the Department has continued to follow a course of action that puts the best interests of our farmers at risk. This bureaucratic blockade of emergency funding stands in stark contrast to the mission of the Department of Agriculture and has succeeded only in prolonging the suffering of our farmers, rather than assuaging it.

Once again, I renew my call to the Secretary to take every appropriate action to ensure that these emergency disaster funds that were appropriated by Congress back in October of last year are promptly disbursed and I urge the Secretary to take whatever steps are necessary to thoroughly revise the Federal

## NOES—177

Abercrombie Cooksey Gilcrest  
 Ackerman Cramer Gilman Gonzalez  
 Allen Cummings Hansen Hastings (FL)  
 Baldacci Danner Davis (FL)  
 Barcia Davis (IL) Hill (IN)  
 Barrett (NE) Bateman DeGette Hilliard  
 Berry DeLauro Hinchey Hobson  
 Bilirakis Diaz-Balart Hooley Hooley  
 Bishop Dickey Hough Hough  
 Boehlert Dicks Horn  
 Bonilla Dingell Houghton  
 Bonior Dixon Hoye Hulshof  
 Bono Dooley Hunter  
 Boswell Edwards Hyde  
 Boucher Emerson Isakson  
 Boyd Engel Jackson (IL)  
 Brown (FL) Etheridge Jackson (IL)  
 Callahan Everett Jenkins  
 Canady Ewing John Johnson, E. B.  
 Capps Farr Jones (OH)  
 Carson Fletcher Kanjorski  
 Chambliss Forbes Kildee  
 Clayton Ford Kilpatrick  
 Clyburn Frelinghuysen King (NY)  
 Combest Frost Kingston  
 Condit Gekas

Crop Insurance Program. We should not continue programs that provide no substantive relief to those who look to them for assistance. The time is now for the Secretary to begin such a revision process.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman will state her parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to perhaps have the gentleman from Florida on the other side talk about the schedule at this point, or the Chair, whomever knows what the schedule is for this evening. We understand that votes may be being rolled. If someone could clarify it for us, what is happening here now?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Ohio could move to strike the last word and yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word and would yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of our full committee.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the plan is as follows:

The freshmen have a commitment between now and 8 o'clock at the Holocaust Museum, and we will continue the debate, but we will roll the votes that occur between now and 8 o'clock. Then at 8 o'clock we will take the votes that have been postponed, and then after we have completed that, a decision will be made whether to proceed further into the evening and take votes or to proceed further into the evening and roll the votes until tomorrow or to rise.

Mr. Chairman, one of those three options will be announced after the votes at 8 o'clock.

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

So, there will be no votes between now and approximately 8 p.m., but debate will continue.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. That is correct.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Chief Financial Officer, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed \$10,000 is for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$4,283,000.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ADMINISTRATION

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration to carry out the programs funded by this Act, \$613,000.

AGRICULTURE BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES AND RENTAL PAYMENTS

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For payment of space rental and related costs pursuant to Public Law 92-313, including authorities pursuant to the 1984 delegation of authority from the Administrator of General Services to the Department of Agriculture under 40 U.S.C. 486, for programs and

activities of the Department which are included in this Act, and for the operation, maintenance, and repair of Agriculture buildings, \$140,364,000: *Provided*, That in the event an agency within the Department should require modification of space needs, the Secretary of Agriculture may transfer a share of that agency's appropriation made available by this Act to this appropriation, or may transfer a share of this appropriation to that agency's appropriation, but such transfers shall not exceed 5 percent of the funds made available for space rental and related costs to or from this account. In addition, for construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities as necessary to carry out the programs of the Department, where not otherwise provided, \$26,000,000, to remain available until expended; making a total appropriation of \$166,364,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SANFORD

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Sanford:

Page 4, line 25, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$21,695,000)".

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a very slight and modest change within the whole of the \$13-plus billion that will go to agriculture. It deals specifically with the agricultural buildings and facilities rental payments section, and what it does is it deceases by a little over \$21 million the specific agricultural buildings and facilities rental payment section.

Now what this really gets at is, there is what they call the space plan within the Department of Agriculture, and there are numerous Department of Agriculture buildings throughout the country, and what we do not have in schools across this country where we have actually students in trailers is this kind of money being spent.

So this is to take out \$21 million which seems to me to be a Washington phenomenon, to go simply on planning on where buildings may or may not be, where leases will or will not go next, and so this is a 420 percent increase in this one category of expenditure, and again it is something that we do not see in the private sector. We do not see somebody in the private sector spending \$21 million planning on where they are going to lease or sublease next, we do not see \$21 billion additional being spent on planning when it could go into real buildings.

One of the choices that we will be having later this year is do we spend this \$21 million on planning, or do we put the money, for instance, into education? This could actually buy books for the classroom, it could actual buy computers for the classroom, it could actually take people out of trailers.

In South Carolina we see trailers that actually house students. It could take them out of those facilities and put them in a real facility.

There is, for instance, if the choice right now is between this \$21 million and, for instance, VA-HUD, would we rather spend the \$21 million on veterans or would we rather spend the money, the \$21 million, deciding where

we are going to put bureaucrats in and around Washington, D.C.?

That is all this amendment does. It is part of a much greater context, and that is the context of what comes next. If we do not get ahead of the curve on where Washington is spending money, we have a train wreck coming this fall. There is no way this institution will cut \$5-plus billion out of Labor-HHS, there is no way this institution will cut \$3-plus billion out of VA-HUD, and the simple question before us is:

Can we save this \$21 million to go toward planning where bureaucrats will be housed in Washington, or would we rather save that for these greater purposes later on?

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

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might inquire of the gentleman?

My understanding of this is that last year we spent \$5 million in this area and that we are increasing it to 21 million 600 and some odd thousand dollars, and I profess to not understand the rationale behind that, and I would like to know where this \$16 million, how it is actually going to be spent. Is that a contract with some outside firm to help the Department of Agriculture better utilize its space or to give them a strategic plan? Where is the \$16 million going to be spent over this next year, and how is it that we have a 420 percent increase?

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

Mr. COBURN. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate it.

The gentleman is talking about the wrong section of the bill, because it is not the building account his amendment goes after. His amendment goes after the repairs and the rental accounts. These are contracts that have been made by the Department of Agriculture in renovating some of the older buildings that they own.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Mexico for that explanation.

I would like to read from the committee print.

The Department's headquarters staff is presently housed in a four-building, government-owned complex in downtown Washington and in leased buildings in the metropolitan Washington area. In 1995, the USDA initiated a plan to improve the delivery of USDA programs to American people, including streamlining the USDA organization. A high priority goal in the Secretary's plan is to improve the operation and effectiveness of the USDA headquarters in Washington.

To implement this goal, a strategy for efficient reallocation of space to house the restructured headquarters agencies in modern and safe facilities has been proposed. This USDA strategic plan will correct serious problems which USDA has faced in its facility program, including inefficiencies of operating out of scattered lease facilities

and serious safety hazards which exist in the huge Agriculture South Building.

During Fiscal 1998, the Beltsville office facility was completed. This facility was constructed with funds appropriated to the departments located on government-owned land in Beltsville, Maryland. Occupancy by USDA agencies began in 1998 and will be completed in 1999.

I guess my point is the same point that the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) had, is we are going to be trading classrooms for children, we are going to be using Social Security money to facilitate new buildings, new headquarters and new facilities for the USDA, and that does not help farmers one bit that I can figure out. It does help the people who work for the Department of Agriculture, but it does not help the farmers, and it is my hope with this kind of increase that we could take a look at that and perhaps trim that down or eliminate it, or bring it down to something realistic because, in fact, we do have a war that is costing \$15 billion thus far, and we are going to have to make some choices.

Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman like to respond to that?

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is still in the wrong account. That is an operations and maintenance account that we are talking about for buildings that are in use by the Department of Agriculture, and it is not planning money at all.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I would again thank the gentleman for responding to that. Again, I would stand by what I just read in the committee print, which is how this money was labeled in terms of the strategic space plan, and I guess I will just have to be satisfied.

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

Mr. COBURN. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. It is still the wrong number. We will be happy to show the gentleman where it is.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I will be happy to wait on the gentleman.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. He should not hold his breath.

Mr. COBURN. Okay, again I would make the point.

The point is this: There is a significant increase in this section of the bill.

□ 1815

It is \$21 million in a time when we are spending money on a war, where we have made a commitment not to spend Social Security dollars to run this government, and in an area that offers nothing for our farmers.

Now, there is no question that I want more dollars to go to our farmers. That is why we spent almost \$12 billion in emergency supplemental dollars last year for our farmers. That is why we advanced the Freedom to Farm pay-

ment of \$5 billion last year. That is why the baseline for the agricultural bill was up \$5 billion over last year, because what was appropriated in the initial appropriations was \$55 billion, almost \$56 billion; and when we adjust that for the emergency spending that raises the baseline, we come to \$61 billion.

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

Mr. COBURN. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I would just ask the gentleman this question.

How would this strategic space plan in fact help a farmer?

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, that was the question I asked.

Mr. SANFORD. In other words, Mr. Chairman, I think it is a question that goes straight to the heart of the matter of do we really need to spend this additional \$21 million.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise reluctantly in support of this amendment. My good friend from New Mexico, I know has worked very hard on this legislation, and I know him to be a talented Member who works very hard. He is from my neighboring State of New Mexico, and I applaud him for his efforts. Indeed, I applaud him for his efforts throughout this legislation because I think he does a good job for the agricultural community, and this is an important piece of legislation which we are considering here today.

I certainly support all of his efforts and all that he has done to support the ag community.

However, I must rise in support of the amendment itself because of the circumstances in which we find ourselves. It seems to me that there is a proper time in the course of events when one can look at, how could we improve the situation at the Department of Agriculture buildings; how can we ensure their proper maintenance, how can we indeed perhaps strategically plan their use of space; and there is a time in the course of events when one can afford to do those kinds of things.

But my belief is that at this particular moment, this particular allocation of \$21 million, a little over \$21.5 million, comes at a moment in time when we face some very, very difficult challenges, challenges having to do with the confrontation we face in the Balkans, the challenge we face in meeting our commitment to the American people in other spending priorities, and particularly with regard to our overall spending plan.

It seems to me what we have done is, we have placed individual subcommittee chairmen, individual cardinals such as my good friend, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) in a difficult position, because right now, what we have done is, we have

come to the floor to debate one of the 13 appropriations bills which we need to debate and which I agree we must, in fact, pass as we move forward; and I think we must pass them as expeditiously and as quickly as possible because it is our obligation to fund the government and it is our obligation to do that in a timely fashion.

However, when we engage in that debate, we need to put it in a context in which we look at the entire spending pattern of the government.

I am now beginning to serve my fifth year in the Congress and to look at our spending priorities, and I know that when I look back at how we have handled the appropriations process in the last few years, the commitments we made to the American people when we came here and the way we have on, quite frankly, too many occasions allowed the process to spin out of control and gotten ourselves in a position where late in the game, late in the appropriations process, we cannot come to agreement, and we wind up breaking our commitment as to how much money we should spend to fund the government. We come back and we break our word to the American people about what we are going to do in terms of putting a tax burden on them.

I think we do not engage in this overall debate and have a plan and have each bill come with a measured response that will fit into an overall plan, and what we instead do, as it appears we are doing this year, is we bank on the future, bank on a windfall, bank on extra monies coming in and kind of put off to the side the financial commitments we have made to live within our means or to put off until a later date that debate; and all we do is create problems.

Mr. Chairman, I stood on this floor and watched us year after year get into a confrontation with the President where he demands higher spending and higher spending and higher spending, but we have put ourselves in a crunch at the end of the legislative process where we have, in the end, absolutely no choice but to agree with that. I, for one, am very reluctant to ever again come to this floor, vote for a spending bill which puts us in that position at the end of the year, and then I have to go home and look my constituents in the eye and say, yes, we did not live up to our word.

So I rise in reluctant support of the gentleman's amendment and in reluctant opposition to my good friend from New Mexico on the bill, because I think, on balance, he has done a good job on this bill. But the bill is a part of a larger mosaic, it is a part of a 13-piece puzzle.

Earlier in the day, I raised the question of how does this bill fit into our overall commitment to the American people, because I simply think we cannot break faith with the American people yet one more time, on spending.

Mr. Chairman, we have all kinds of rules back here. We live within these

budget caps and we get to talking about caps and we get to talking about the 1997 Budget Act. Quite frankly, the people back home in my district say that discussion of budget caps is a lot of inside-the-Beltway gobbledegook that they quite frankly do not understand.

However, they understand one thing. They understand fundamental principles and they understand hypocrisy. And we have put out a commitment to the American people that we will not break our word and spend one penny of the Social Security surplus. We have laid that marker down.

Now, that is not some big notion of budget caps, that is not some law dictated by something we did 5 years ago; that is a very clearly enunciated principle that says, we will not this year, once again, raid Social Security. And yet I see us, because we have all 13 pieces of this puzzle put into place, risking that commitment.

So I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) has expired.

(On request of Mr. COBURN, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SHADEGG was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. SHADEGG. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Chairman, I think one of the important things, and I have discovered, thanks to the chairman and his committee staff, that we do in fact have a drafting error on this amendment; and I am going to in a minute ask for unanimous consent for that drafting error to be changed. If it is not agreed to, then I will withdraw the amendment.

But I think the real question is, if we took a poll of farmers out there on whether or not we ought to have a 420 percent increase in this area, what would they say right now? They would not just say no; they would be screaming up and down, saying no, because they know not one penny of this money are they ever going to see, and they know it is going to be spent in Washington.

I mean, that is what the committee print talks about, about space needs and organizing the space for the bureaucracy that is in the Department of Agriculture. So I think it would be an interesting question as to what farmers who are actually out there struggling, what cattlemen would say about a 420 percent increase for this area in the Department of Agriculture.

It would be my hope that we would agree with what the farmers would say. I know what the farmers from my district would say and I know what the ranchers would say.

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

Mr. SHADEGG. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, on that very point, the back of the envelope, what we are really looking at here, if the gentleman figures he can get a good used tractor for about \$20,000, we could just go out and buy 1,000 tractors for farmers across this country rather than spending the \$20 million on space needs in Washington, D.C.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I applaud the gentleman for being willing to withdraw the amendment if he cannot get permission to fix the drafting error.

Again, I want to make my point, and that is the subcommittee chairman, my colleague from New Mexico, my neighboring State, did do a good job of trying to craft this legislation. I think the bigger question is, how does it fit into a larger puzzle. That is the concern I wanted to raise.

I would agree with the gentleman that I think the cattlemen in Arizona and the farmers in Arizona, they are in dire shape and they do need help. The least thing they are concerned about is space planning in the Department of Agriculture, and they are more concerned about the dollars we can get to them that would help them very much.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to mention in regard to this amendment, which apparently has been withdrawn, it is just another example of misfeasance on the other side of the aisle trying to write legislation on the floor, not carefully thought through, never brought before the committee, account numbers even wrong on the amendment that is proposed.

Now, I think the gentleman in his heart probably is trying to do what is right for the country, but again, the people that suffer from these kinds of ill-advised amendments are the people in rural America; and if the gentleman is not running for office again, that means the gentleman is really not accountable to them for his actions here today. This is just another example where we have been subjected to using our time as we watch the gentleman try to rewrite and correct this amendment on the floor.

At the same time, we have had more bankruptcies today across this country. Some of the people that the gentleman really derides, that the gentleman says work in these buildings, they are the people that administer the programs that are trying to serve the farmers and the ranchers of this country, and I have great respect for them. A lot of them have given their lives over to the service of the American people. They are the finest, most educated, most dedicated employees anywhere in the world.

As I have traveled the world and I have looked at agriculture in other places, and I have seen the faces of hungry people, and I have watched nations unable to take the best information available to humankind and make

it available to those in the field, I understand how important these people are to America. We not only feed our own country, we feed the world. That does not happen by accident.

Frankly, I do not want people to have to work in dilapidated circumstances with bad air-conditioning and bad heating systems and bad ventilation. I want the best for America. I want the best for our people to be able to serve the public, which is what we are here to do.

I really think that whoever advised the gentleman on this amendment obviously was not studying the legislation very carefully, and I wish the gentleman had come before our subcommittee. We have a fine chairman. We have never had a better subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations than the Subcommittee on Agriculture. We would have been open. We would have worked with the gentleman. The gentleman never did that; the gentleman never made an appearance. I do not think he ever sent us a letter.

I just want to put that on the Record.

REQUEST FOR MODIFICATION OFFERED BY MR. COBURN TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SANFORD

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Sanford amendment be changed from page 4, line 25, to page 5, line 11.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification offered by Mr. COBURN to the amendment offered by Mr. SANFORD:

Change the page and line numbers from "Page 4, line 25" to "page 5, line 11".

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I do so to try to get an indication of how many amendments we might be considering here tonight. I have heard that there might be as many as 130 amendments offered just to filibuster this bill. If that is the case, we are just going to rise and move on to other business.

So I wonder if we can get an idea from any of the Members that are present if we are going to consider 130 amendments tonight, or whether we are going to consider 20. I would like to know where we are, because if we are going to have to go all night long, I am going to object to every opportunity that would slow down the process.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, it is my intention, as I stated during the general debate and during the rule, to do everything I can to bring this bill back in line with last year's spending and do it in such a way that will not affect farmers, but will affect the overhead costs that are oftentimes markedly inefficient.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, that does not respond to my question. Is the gentleman going to offer the 135 amendments that he advertised?

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, we are \$500,000 closer to that after the last amendment that the House agreed to in terms of trimming. That means we only have \$249,500,000 to go. Some of those amendments are \$60 and \$70 million, some of them are \$200,000. When we achieve last year's freeze level, then I will stop offering amendments.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for reserving the right to object, and I wanted to state that to our knowledge, we have been given a minimum of 20 amendments by the Clerk. We have been told there are an additional 80 amendments that have been filed, and there may be more of which we are not aware.

As the gentleman may know, we have been on the floor this afternoon having to consider amendments we have never seen. In fact, on this current amendment, it is unclear to us whether line 12 of page 5 is included in the amendment or not.

So I would support the gentleman in his efforts to try to put some rational process in place here. I realize we are in the minority, but I think our Members have a right to be informed as to what is going on, because they are coming up to me, and I would prefer to have a more orderly process.

□ 1830

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, for the other gentleman who was talking about trying to bring us back to last year's budget, as we told him in the initial discussions, there have been \$6.4 billion below what we spent in agriculture last year. This bill is way under. In fact, it is 31 percent less than what was spent on agriculture last year.

I think that we met the mark, and these amendments are essentially a filibuster tactic that are frivolous.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, let me say, I will not object to allowing the gentlemen to correct their error in drafting their amendment. However, I will object to any extensions of time or anything that would delay the process.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I just wanted to ask, in the way of a parliamentary inquiry, when the gentleman intends to

amend his amendment, does he intend to also amend the \$166,364,000 figure in line 12 on page 5? Is that part of his amendment?

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

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

Mr. COBURN. That is not part of the amendment. It is intended that the conference could make that adjustment as a technical correction, and we amended exactly what we intended to amend in this change.

Ms. KAPTUR. Then, if I might just state for the RECORD, then the amendment is a frivolous amendment because it does not change the total amount of dollars in the account.

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

Mr. POMEROY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I must say that I am profoundly surprised by what is occurring on the floor. I represent farmers, and these farmers are in a world of hurt.

A bill comes to the floor, the agriculture appropriations bill, prepared and reported out of the committee with a bipartisan vote within the appropriations allocation assigned to that committee, and we begin to see a slew of amendments, amendments that would eviscerate the help my farmers need.

Now we see, with the unanimous consent request before this body, just what haphazard nonsense these amendments are. They have not been printed, they have not been distributed. We have had no notice. They are not even accurate.

Now the Member seeks unanimous consent to correct his amendment on the floor as we meet as a Committee of the Whole, because he did not even go to the preparation of getting it in proper form before bringing it to us. We have also heard in the preceding discussion that we can expect more than 100 similar amendments to be offered from this Member.

Back in North Dakota, just like all across this country, farmers are trying to get their spring financing together. They are trying to get their crop in. They are trying to figure out how they are going to make it another year, in light of the financial trouble they are under.

Here in Congress, we cannot even get an agriculture appropriations bill out of this Chamber without having Members of this body attack this bill in this fashion. It is shameful.

The only thing that is more shameful than the amendments themselves is the fact that they have had the support of the majority leadership, leadership which we are led to believe gave no notice to the subcommittee chairman that his budget was going to come under attack in this fashion.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the majority leader, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) owe it to the farmers of this country to stop these amendments and get this bill out.

Mr. Chairman, I object to the Member trying to correct his amendment. If he wanted to have this amendment considered, he should have had it in proper form the first time.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The unanimous consent request is not granted.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise, and not on a specific amendment, but on this process that we are following under.

As I said earlier in the debate, I respect the gentleman's right to offer amendments. I respect the principle that he is trying to uphold by reducing the size of this budget. I do not think he is trying to gut the services and the programs that the U.S. Department of Agriculture provides to our constituents.

I would remind my colleagues that this bill does not become law for at least 4 months, so there is nothing wrong with debate. However, there is something wrong with dilatory tactics. That is exactly what this seems to be. But I am going to offer the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) who is offering these amendments a chance to prove me wrong.

What I would ask him is, if the purpose of this is to reduce the bill to last year's level, or to get to the level that he would like to see us at with this bill, would the gentleman agree to take all these amendments, make them en bloc, and present them as one amendment so that we can deal with this issue right now, and get the work of this bill done?

Would the gentleman take all these amendments and roll them into one, offer them en bloc, \$249 million, and give the body the opportunity to vote up or down? If that is the gentleman's point, then I would ask the gentleman to please respect the Congress, respect the House, respect this debate process, respect the chairman, certainly, who has worked endlessly on this, and give us the opportunity to vote on this up or down, one vote.

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

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Not speaking for the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. Chairman, but it seems to me the problem in that strategy would be well witnessed by the last vote.

The last vote succeeded and saved the taxpayers a number of dollars. There are some things that clearly will work and some that will not, and therefore, the idea of going en bloc might guarantee a defeat of what the gentleman is trying to do, which is save money.

Mr. WALSH. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, and I would be happy to carry this on, the gentleman has already conceded that they cannot win all of these, so if there are some amendments that the Members think

they can, why do not Members offer those en bloc and not offer the ones that they do not think will pass?

Let us try to be a little bit pragmatic here. If Members want to accomplish their goal, then work within the normal constraints of the body and give us an opportunity to move forward on the bill.

I would like to offer, again, the opportunity to the gentleman who has put these 100-some-odd amendments forward, the opportunity to enter into a colloquy to determine whether or not he is willing to end this what I perceive as a dilatory tactic, offer this en bloc, and give us one vote up or down.

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

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, first of all, the reason I was hesitating responding to the gentleman is I do not think I can respond to the gentleman in the time that is remaining. I am going to ask for unanimous consent for additional time.

This is not about dilatory tactics, in spite of everything the gentleman hears. I do not say things I do not mean, and I mean exactly what I say. That is something different than what this body is known for, unfortunately, over the last 40 years, as we have confiscated and put \$5.6 trillion on the books owing by our children.

My purpose is to reduce this and to have a discussion, as is my right in this body, so that the people of this country can hear the people's business.

I want to tell the Members, there are some farmers out there right now talking about the 420 percent increase. They had no idea the money was spent that way. I guarantee a lot of us will hear about it tomorrow in terms of strategic planning.

Mr. WALSH. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I would again offer the gentleman the opportunity to, with the help of the Parliamentarian, roll all these amendments into one to accomplish his goal, which is, I think, an honest goal, something he believes in; roll them into one, give us an en bloc amendment, let us vote up or down on this, and then move forward on the really additionally important aspects of this bill, which is the agriculture policies and feeding policies of the Nation.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, it would seem to me that the problem with that logic would be that that assumes that all things are equal within the Department of Agriculture funding, which I do not think are.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the problem with

that logic assumes that all things are equal within this category of expenditure. I do not think that to be the case, which is why I would think that the proposal of gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) does make sense, because some things we will like, some things we will not.

By going through the debate process amendment by amendment, we find where the good is and where the bad is.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I listened with great interest to the gentleman from New York as he made his comment about dilatory tactics, and the comments that I have made earlier about an apparent filibuster.

I am looking at a Dear Republican Colleague letter here, I guess it was an e-mail, that was forwarded through several people and finally was sent to the Committee on Appropriations staff.

It says, "I just submitted 115 amendments to the Agriculture Appropriations bill. It is my intent to first oppose the Rule for the Agriculture Appropriations bill and should the rule be adopted, then proceed to filibuster the bill with amendments." The signature line is the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

So the fact of the matter is he has admitted this is a filibuster. We ought to get to the business of the House. We do not have filibuster rules in the House. They do in the other body. Here, we deal with important legislation that has merit and that has some substance.

The gentleman himself has admitted this is a filibuster. If the Members of the House want to go along with a filibuster, then we will stay here until the wee hours of the morning, but if they really are not pleased with sitting here just spinning our wheels on a filibuster, then we will proceed to vote these down, and we will not extend anybody's time limit.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, it would seem to me that a lot of those farmers, whether in Oklahoma or Texas or in South Carolina, for that matter, a lot of them did not send in \$500,000 worth of taxes. The gentleman's last amendment saved \$500,000. I think that is the core of what he is getting at, not filibuster, but \$500,000 that they would have had to send to Washington that now they do not.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. If the gentleman would make substantial amendments to this bill, then I think we might remove the suspicion that this is simply a filibuster.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma, with whom I am normally on the same side of the issue.

Mr. COBURN. We are on the same side, we are just maybe talking past each other. Mr. Chairman, \$500,000 in Florida, in South Carolina, and Oklahoma is substantial money. This last amendment was \$15 million difference,

bringing it back down. That is substantial money.

If we do that at \$15 million a clip, it is not going to be long until we have the \$250-some million that we are trying to get to get back down to last year's level.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. The way the gentleman is proceeding, an inch at a time, is a filibuster. These amendments could have been put together. They could have been done en bloc. They could have been several major amendments that we could have had a substantial debate, and we have wasted a lot of time here talking about philosophy that should have been discussed on the budget bill, when the budget resolution was here. That is the time these arguments should have been made.

I would say to my friend that this bill and all of the other bills that we will present to this floor are under the freeze and are within the budget caps of 1997, and meet the section 302(b) sub-allocation as provided for by the budget resolution.

So try to cut the money if the gentleman wants, and believe me, I have been here to vote for a lot of amendments to cut a lot of money out of spending bills, but let us do it in a reasonable, responsible way. Let us combine the amendments so they have some substance to them, and so that we do not spend the next 3 or 4 or 5 days here going over 115 amendments that the introducer admits is a filibuster.

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

□ 1845

Mr. Chairman, I just want to admonish everybody, first of all, that it is a violation of House rules to question the motives of other Members. I just want to make it clear, whether one agrees with these amendments or one disagrees with the amendments, clearly the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) has every right to offer these amendments.

Also, I want to say something else. I have been listening to the debate and watching on C-SPAN back in my office. It bothers me a little bit right now. I represent a farm State, and my farmers are hurting, and that is the truth, and all of my colleagues should know that.

But I will tell my colleagues something else, my farmers do not want to steal from the Social Security Trust Fund either. Frankly, they feel a bit abused sometimes when people say things like, well, we have to do this because of the farmers. They do not want this huge bureaucracy that we have here in Washington.

I mean, this amendment, as far as I know, deals with \$21 million for new buildings. I will tell my colleagues, on behalf of most of my farmers, if one asks them, "Do you think we ought to build \$21 million worth of new buildings for more bureaucracy in Washington, and at the end of the day be

forced to take that money out of Social Security Trust Funds or to borrow it from our grandchildren for one more generation," the answer to that question is no.

I mean, this idea that we have to patronize farmers, farmers are Americans, too, and they care about their future. They care about their kids' future. They care about the future of the Social Security Trust Fund. They care about these things, too. So I care about what is happening to farmers.

But I think the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) is raising some very, very good points. For too long in this Congress, every year, we did what I call "manana" budgeting. We will make the tough decisions "manana". We will make the tough decisions next year. Well next year is here and we have got to make some of those tough decisions.

I supported that budget resolution. Frankly, a couple of weeks ago we had that vote on the emergency supplemental. I voted against it because I thought that was the first crack in the wall. We are going to see this happening on every single appropriation bill.

Let me just remind Members, the people of this country did not send us here to do what was easy. This is tough. Balancing this budget is not going to be easy this year. In fact, in some respects it is harder now because we, quote, have a surplus, and everybody, every group that I can imagine has been in my office saying "We just want a little bit of an increase here. If we could, just squeeze out a little more money for my program." Do my colleagues know what happens when we do that? We never balance the budget. We continue to steal from Social Security.

I care about my farmers. Let me tell my colleagues something. My farmers care about this budget. They care about the future of this country. They care about Social Security. I admire the gentleman for bringing this amendment.

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's objective of trying to deal with the budget is a worthy objective. Can I ask the gentleman, since he is in the majority party and we, as the appropriators, and I particularly in the minority, have had to abide by the budget caps they gave us, and we have done that on this Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, why do my colleagues not go back and redo the budget rather than put our subcommittees through this agony on the floor? I am missing something here.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, if my colleagues ask the average American, whether they are a farmer or a machinist, whether they live in Ohio or Minnesota, if my

colleagues ask them, "Do you think the Federal Government can meet the legitimate needs of the people of this country, of the national defense, and of all the people who depend upon the Federal Government, do you believe that the Federal Government can live with spending only \$1,700 billion, do my colleagues know what? If they ask that question, whether it is in Ohio or Minnesota or Oklahoma, if my colleagues ask people, "Do you think we can meet the legitimate needs of the United States of America, spending only \$1,700 billion?" they will say, "You betcha." Seventeen hundred billion dollars is a lot of money.

That is what the spending cap is all about, saying that is all we are going to spend. We are going to have an argument and a fight about how much is going to go to defense, how much is going to go to agriculture, how much is going to go to transportation, all the other departments; but at the end of the day, we ought to live by these spending caps.

I believe in the spending caps. In fact, I have heard leadership on the other side, I have heard leadership in the Senate, I have even heard the President of the United States say we are going to live by the spending caps. Well, this is the first installment to find out if we really mean it.

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, but did the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies not abide by the caps that were given to us from the Committee on the Budget, the budget under the 302(b) allocation?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, it is my understanding that, no, the subcommittee did not. The subcommittee overspent it by the smallest amount. Listen. According to what I have been told by my staff, this bill actually does overspend the budget allocation by two-tenths of 1 percent.

Admittedly, the gentleman from New Mexico (Chairman SKEEN) has done a fabulous job. I am not here to criticize the subcommittee. But when I hear people criticizing the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and criticizing his motives in this debate, I think that is wrong, and my colleagues have overstepped their bounds.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, if I am not incorrect, and I will be happy to be

corrected on this, we still have the amendment before us that was rejected in terms of it; and if we have spoken, we can not speak again. I am not sure I recall whether the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) has spoken or not.

The CHAIRMAN. As the gentleman will note, the Chair said, without objection, the gentlewoman is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. COBURN. I do not object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, in terms of how the Members of our side of the aisle functioned, we accepted the budget numbers that were given us and we acted in good faith on our subcommittee.

We have produced a bill that meets the budget mark that we were given. So, therefore, to rip apart the bill because maybe my colleagues do not like some provision in the bill, they want to do something else with it, well, I think most Members come to the floor but they do not come with 150 or 200 amendments. We operated in good faith here.

I will tell my colleagues it is a little hard to maintain it as the hours go on here today, but the point is, if my colleagues do not like the budget, go back and redo the budget. Do not pick apart every appropriation bill that comes to the floor.

We have lived within our budget. Let our committee function. Frankly, my colleagues really risk great damage to this Republic, because we could end up where we were last year when the majority here rammed that big bill through here at the end of the year because we could not complete our appropriation bills on time and on schedule.

Here we are here in the Committee on Agriculture, because of the crisis in rural America, on time with our bill, within the allocation we are given; and now my colleagues are holding us up again. I fear that the very same mess that was created last year is going to repeat itself this year.

So if my colleagues have a problem with the allocation, go back to their budgeteers; work the problem out there. But when we have subcommittees acting in good faith and doing their job, do not disenfranchise them. I think that is the height of my colleagues' responsibility inside the Chamber.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am probably not going to take the full 5 minutes, but I heard the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) a little while ago saying he did not want to do anything to hurt farmers. Well, I have to tell my colleagues I have the greatest respect for the gentleman, but the last amendment hurt farmers a lot.

When my colleagues look at the services that they are trying to provide to farmers in the FSA offices, NRCS offices, with the computer systems that

today cannot work together, and the whole purpose of that funding is to finally get some coordination at USDA, now this is an area that I have worked in in the last 3 years trying to fix this problem so that we can actually deliver services to our farmers, and cutting this money out of that is wrong.

I did not enter into the debate before because I thought it was silly, but to make a statement like that simply is wrong. The gentleman should be aware that many Members who have voted for some of these amendments have actually come to us and asked for little research projects. Maybe the two-tenths of 1 percent that is overspent in this budget may be some of that that is going to different parts of the country for folk who today are voting to cut in this budget.

I mean, I have heard of rice studies, wild rice, things like that. There are projects that people have asked all over to be included in this bill and now are voting against this bill.

We are in the budget caps. If my colleagues do not think that this is going to hurt farmers, what they are doing, they are wrong. I will tell my colleagues directly, it may be fine to stand up and talk about protecting Social Security. The fact of the matter is we do not know what the budget surplus is going to be at the end of the year. We may in fact have surplus beyond what Social Security is this year. Then my colleagues' argument is not correct. Then we are not taking money out of Social Security.

The fact of the matter is, I agree with my colleagues, we have got to balance the budget, but the fact of the matter is my colleagues are hurting farmers. If this is some filibuster today just to take advantage of an opportunity from very well-meaning people here who have worked their tails off on a bill, trying to accomplish a bill that helps a lot of Members around here with very important research projects that having a lot of them put us over maybe slightly, if in fact that is the case, but to talk about how this is not hurting farmers here is simply wrong.

What we are doing here, it makes this House, it really is not the bright point of the day around here, let me just say that. Because in fact we have done the hard work of staying within the caps. We have done what we have been given as far as staying inside our allotments. But I just take very strong exception to the fact that we are not hurting farmers here today.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I take the gentleman's admonition. But I also would point out that in the last supplemental we gave \$47 million to the Department of Agriculture for Y2K, if I would be allowed to continue, for Y2K just upgrades, just for that one segment.

I would point out that, in fact, by taking the whole assumption of the

gentleman's argument is that this is the only way we can get there. My objection to being above what we spent last year is that it is not the only way. I am not saying my way is the best way, but I am wanting the people of this country to hear the debate on all of the areas.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I will tell the gentleman we have heard the debate this afternoon. But why does the gentleman not talk to somebody who has been involved in an issue like this for 3 years now, trying to get the chief information officer to straighten out the travesty that is going on at USDA, where we have got 29 agencies down there, smokestacks, which each have their own computer system, cannot talk to each other, they cannot even e-mail from the north building to the south building. We are trying to fix that.

Five hundred thousand dollars, maybe my colleagues do not think that is a big deal, but it is in a nonfunctional agency that is trying to straighten itself out. It will hurt our farmers, and I just want the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) to know that. That amendment that passed hurts his farmers at home and hurts the services that USDA provides them as far as the FSA offices and NRC offices.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to first associate myself with the comments of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM) a moment ago. Indeed, that last amendment did hurt farmers.

If my colleagues had been following, as he has for the last 3 years and I have for the last 6 years, what we are trying to do at USDA, they would understand there was a little wisdom in the money that was proposed to be spent.

Let me speak specifically to the amendment the gentleman proposes to cut now, a \$21 million increase, which the gentleman said a 420 percent increase, which sounds like a whole bunch of money, and it is a whole bunch of money, but this is to implement the strategic space plan, which includes the new USDA office facility on Federal land at Beltsville. The construction of the Beltsville office facility started in June 1996, was substantially completed in 1997, and we are completing the occupancy this year in 1999.

The 2 million gross square feet south building is over 60 years old, eligible for listing in the National Register. The required renovation work includes fire protection, abatement of hazardous materials, such as asbestos, PCB light fixtures, and lead paint, replacement of old, inefficient heating, ventilation, and all conducting air conditioning systems for improved energy conservation.

The construction contract for phase one of the modernization was awarded in July of 1998 but has been tied up in

a legal suit, and is now being proposed to be funded. The fiscal 1999 appropriation of \$5 million included funds necessary to continue the south building modernization.

One of the problems we have got with delivering services to our farmers, we have not kept up with the technology. We are doing it in our offices. Notice what happens when we improve the computer technology here, there is a lot of wires get run. We have to go back and do things. They are very expensive.

When we are trying to do that to our USDA headquarters so that we will be able to coordinate our services, it requires spending of some money. This was a plan that was proposed and is being implemented.

We can cut this money, very easily cut it. But then do not stand up and criticize USDA for not being able to deliver the services to our farmers and ranchers as we have been doing, many have been doing, blaming it all on the Secretary of Agriculture because the disaster payments were not delivered on time.

□ 1900

Part of that we are dealing with in this first few lines of the bill. It is what the gentleman from New Mexico and the gentlewoman from Ohio have been supporting and trying to do.

I know the gentleman's intentions are very honorable. I do not question those at all. And I am certainly one that would never stand up and suggest the gentleman does not have a right to do it. But it would be helpful if the gentleman's staff would spend a little bit of time talking specifically about what the gentleman is doing before he stands up and talks about how he is not doing harm to farmers, because the gentleman from Iowa stated it very, very accurately and succinctly.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. The gentleman makes some good points. However, Mr. Chairman, there is one underlying point that I disagree with, and the underlying assumption with his statement is that the Department of Agriculture is efficient now and that the money used, and just let me finish my point, the money that is going to be appropriated above last year to accomplish these things, that there is no way it could be found anywhere else.

That is my objection. It is not what the gentleman is doing or how he is doing it, it is where the money comes from.

The fact is, we do not have the courage to say the Department of Agriculture has to do this and we are going to write it into the bill and they will find the money there and they will have to make sure it gets done because we will have the oversight to make sure that the Department does do it.

My objection is that this is an inefficient organization. That is not a slam

on the employees, it is a slam on the organizational structure that we have piecemealed together through the last 40 years or so.

Mr. STENHOLM. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I doubt any other Member has been more critical of the Department of Agriculture since 1992 in not doing what the gentleman is talking about. But I find it rather ironic that at the moment we are actually beginning to propose to put the money into doing what I have been criticizing them for; we are now going to cut it out and say we want them to do a better job without it. That is my problem.

And again, fundamentally, the chairman of the committee a moment ago stated the absolute fact: This bill is within the caps according to the budget that passed this House, period. So let us not keep talking about we are doing all of this to save Social Security.

If the gentleman wants to save Social Security, bring a Social Security bill to the floor and let us talk about Social Security. If he wants to make points on the agricultural bill, let us debate them. We can stay and debate them until the cows come home, but we will be talking specifically about what the gentleman is doing, and again, the gentleman is hurting farmers in these amendments when he passes them.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 185, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT  
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Department of Agriculture, to comply with the requirement of section 107(g) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, 42 U.S.C. 9607(g), and section 6001 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, 42 U.S.C. 6961, \$15,700,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That appropriations and funds available herein to the Department for Hazardous Waste Management may be transferred to any agency of the Department for its use in meeting all requirements pursuant to the above Acts on Federal and non-Federal lands.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION  
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For Departmental Administration, \$36,117,000, to provide for necessary expenses for management support services to offices of the Department and for general administration and disaster management of the Department, repairs and alterations, and other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for and necessary for the practical and efficient work of the Depart-

ment, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed \$10,000 is for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be reimbursed from applicable appropriations in this Act for travel expenses incident to the holding of hearings as required by 5 U.S.C. 551-558.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COBURN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Coburn:

Page 6, line 3, after the dollar amount inserted "reduced by \$3,049,000".

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to talk about the 12 percent increase in the Department of Agriculture administration budget. The increase is from the fiscal 1999 level of \$32 million, increasing it by \$3,949,000.

According to the committee print, departmental administration is comprised of activities that provide staff support to top policy officials and overall direction and coordination within the Department.

These activities include department-wide programs for human resource management, I believe we have talked about that in a couple of the amendments; management improvement, we have talked about that; occupational safety and health management, we have talked about that; real and personal property management, we just talked about that in the previous amendment; procurement, contracting, motor vehicle and aircraft management, supply management, civil rights, equal opportunity and ethics, participation of small and disadvantaged businesses and socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers in the departmental programs activities, et cetera, et cetera.

Again, I would raise the point, I do not have an objection with any member of this committee. I know that they have done good work. I do not disagree that they have met the targeted caps.

What I am saying is, when was the last time an appropriation bill came to the floor that was below the caps? What a novel idea, if we are, in fact, going to not spend money that does not belong to us.

Now, I understand why other Members do not want to talk about the Social Security issue, and I agree with the members of the committee who say we have met our 302(b) allocation. I agree with that. They have. My purpose in offering the amendments is to drive efficiency in the Federal Government, to ask the question, why, when we spend a 12 percent increase in administrative overhead within a department. I would say that if this is truly the people's House, a debate on those issues ought to be heard by one and all.

The other thing that I would object to is the reference to this bill being the committee's bill. This bill is all of ours. It is not just the committee's bill, it is the House's bill. And to say

that one of us has more priority over this bill than any others is wrong.

The other thing I want to do is to take a minute and perhaps defend my motives. And I am somewhat discouraged that the gentlewoman from Ohio has not recognized my persistence in the past 5 years. Because three times today she said that my motivation is based on the fact that I am not running for reelection.

I never was running for reelection when I came up here on this this year. And I would ask, if the gentlewoman were to look at my voting record and at my challenges in terms of the appropriations process, she would see that I did this same thing last year and the year before and the year before.

So this does not have anything to do with running for reelection, this has to do with questioning why we would have a 12 percent increase in administrative overhead. And if we have to do that, and that is the only way we can do it, and there is no waste in the other \$32 million and it cannot be done better and it cannot be done more efficiently and the American people can be convinced of that and I can be convinced of that, I will be happy to withdraw this amendment.

But as I look at what I read in the committee print, and having been through five of these appropriation bills in the past, I do not believe that that is true. I think they can do better. And I believe that it is wrong for us not to ask the administration within the Department of Agriculture to do better.

Most of the Members of this body would like to see a 12 percent increase in their staff and their capability of running their offices, but the fact is, we are not going to pass that for ourselves, are we? But we are going to say that the Department of Agriculture is underfunded in terms of its administrative capability, does not have the dollars to do what it needs to do and must have a 12 percent increase, when the true cost of living associated with government-run programs in this area, and the area where the vast concentration of these employees are, rose by less than 1.7 percent last year.

So what we did in terms of the computers in the Office of Information was true, and we cannot take it out of this money, or not because it is not that there is not enough money. There is money running all over this bill. And I again would say, ask the farmers.

A \$3,949,000 increase from \$32 million; that is 12 percent. How many of them are going to see 12 percent handed to them? They are not. And how many of them want to see this money spent up here? They want to see it spent on them, not up here. And they want to make sure that we are supporting them with their ability to continue to feed us and that we give them a constant program.

So I do not object to what the committee has done. I said when we talked about the rule that this was a good bill

and that it was probably going to pass. What I said was that I did not think it was good enough and it needed to get better.

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

When the gentleman said that he really is looking for ways for efficiency, I think if he was an astute politician he would know that merely cutting is not necessarily the way to efficiency. Efficiency includes more than dollar amounts.

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

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

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentlewoman that we have not proposed a cut. What we have proposed is leaving it at last year's level.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, the assumption is that the gentleman is looking for efficiency, and therefore, if we leave it at that level, meaning less expenditure, then by that definition, we would have more efficiency.

But let me tell the gentleman what these particular funds he proposes that are not needed will be used for: one, for the Office of Civil Rights. And that may not be important to the gentleman from Oklahoma, but I can tell him it is important to a large number of farmers who felt that this USDA, who the gentleman says is inefficient, had also not been fair, and in fact had to file a lawsuit as a result of their discriminatory actions.

This now allows them to more efficiently respond to those complaints rather than have the U.S. Government to pay out a large settlement because of the failure of their accountability and responsibility. \$1.6 million of the \$3.6 goes to the Office of Civil Rights.

Even more important to socially disadvantaged farmers is the \$931 million that affords the opportunity for small farmers, not just necessarily minority farmers, but small, disadvantaged farmers who will have outreach and technical assistance. This may not be big to the gentleman from Oklahoma, but it is efficiency in their way of thinking to have the kinds of services explained to them, to have the technical assistance so they can more efficiently produce their products with the kind of expectation that they will be profitable in their livelihood.

So the \$3.9 million which is being offered here already is insufficient to meet all of the needs.

If the gentleman's definition were applied, I think he actually would need to add to this, if the gentleman is truly about putting the money where it is most needed and making sure it is implemented. I would think by the gentleman's definition, and I disagree with the gentleman's premise, it would say this is insufficient.

If the gentleman understood what this is doing, he would say they should have been doing this. They should do it better. There should be more outreach

programs, not less. The Office of Civil Rights should have been there before. These farmers should not have had to sue.

Now we are putting a structure there so that there can be the kind of investigation that needs to be there.

So I would think the gentleman would want to be on the side of, not anticivil rights, but the gentleman would want to be on the side of, there should be fairness and there should be a structure there to deal with this. And the gentleman's amendment, in his zeal for his fiscal philosophy denies the very premise of efficiency of this department serving the people who need it most.

So I would urge that this amendment on its merit, not on the philosophy, just on its merit, should be defeated.

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

My colleagues, the Department of Agriculture has been dealing with serious civil rights issues for the last several years. Minority farmers and employees at USDA have filed discrimination litigation, and the increase provided in this account would go a long way towards addressing some of those civil rights issues.

I would like to have that entered in the discussion because I think the gentlewoman from North Carolina had a very pertinent point.

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

My colleague is not on the floor at this time, the maker of the motion, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), but I was rising to appeal to him to allow at least some of us who have some expertise in this area to speak to him, as I would if he were discussing medical issues. I really do believe that he knows a lot more about that than I do.

Now he has dipped over into the legal arena, and I think I know a little bit more about that than he does.

With that in mind, I would offer to him that the status quo would create backlogs, and the creating of backlogs is what this particular 12 percent is intended to try to get rid of. When backlogs occur in any structural system, and it does not matter whether or not it is employment discrimination or if it is in the criminal arena or if it is in the civil arena, it impacts the whole process.

It is not just one thing that is impacted, it is not just this particular office of departmental administration, it is all of what they do in trying to clear up the number of cases that they have.

□ 1915

Over the years, there have been a number of legitimate complaints that have been brought and those people have to sit and wait. Let me see if I can get my colleague to understand the analogy.

In South Florida, at one time we had to try nothing but drug cases. By try-

ing drug cases, we forced civil litigants to have to seek redress elsewhere, and people who needed remedies in the Federal court system were unable to get them because we were busying ourselves with one side of the system, which was mandated that we do.

We need to be very, very careful in expecting in every instance that people can do more with less. What they are asking for is 17 staff years, \$1.6 million, and 11 staff dollars for 931 in the Office of Outreach which, incidentally, also deals with the National Commission on Small Farms, yet another area totally unrelated to anything having to do with civil rights per se, but an initiative that is important so that small farmers have a chance to survive in this system.

I do not know what it will take in order for us to understand this particular dynamic, but I will take it up with the maker of the motion so as he understands that it is not just going to, if his motion were to pass, impact this one arena, it would impact the whole.

And in this particular instance they have not been able to do the job efficiently and effectively with what they have, and there is no need to expect if they leave them in the status quo that they are going to be able to do more.

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

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues, right over there is a dictionary; and if we look up the word "efficient," here is what it says: "ability to accomplish a job with a minimum expenditure of time and effort."

My colleagues, there is a lot of discussion about this amendment, but I think we ought to get back to what it really does. In fact, let us use a little bit of analogy. Let us take a major corporation, and my colleagues fill in the blank. They can say AT&T. They can say Chrysler. They can say IBM, whatever. And let us say this company thinks that they have had a problem with efficiency.

Now, this company has 107,000 employees. They have another 80,000 contract employees. In fact, it works out to about one employee or contract employee for every 10 customers. This is a mythical corporation. And we are the board of directors and we are sitting around saying what can we do to make this thing a little more efficient.

Now, how many of my colleagues think they would raise their hands and say, you know what we ought to do? We ought to increase administration by 12 percent. That is crazy. That would not happen at Chrysler. That would not happen at AT&T. That would not happen at IBM. But, my colleagues, that is what is happening in this bill. We have one employee or contract employee for every 10 farmers in this USDA.

Now, again, I come back, if we ask most farmers do they think that is an appropriate level, they would say that is ridiculous. And so would most voters. And so before we dismiss this

amendment out of hand, this is not an anti-farmer amendment. This is about the board of directors saying we have a terribly inefficient administration right now in the USDA and throwing more money at it is not going to make it more efficient.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. First of all, let me say that if the offerors of the amendment want efficiency, then surely the bill that our subcommittee has brought to the floor is efficient.

In fact, the author of the amendment stated in his last comments on the floor that we were in fact within the budget allocation. So we have a very efficient bill, without question.

Now, this particular amendment is one that goes after one particular function at the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and the proponents claim that it is efficient. Let me say that overall, our bill is efficient. But in making decisions in the public realm, one has to not only be efficient, one has to be equitable, and I would oppose the gentleman's amendment on the basis that it is not equitable.

Why? What are these funds dedicated to? They are dedicated to redressing wrongs inside USDA and an inability, because of discrimination in past years, for that department to deal with all of America, all of America's farmers, regardless of color, regardless of creed, regardless of sex, whatever.

The funding that is provided, and even the Wall Street Journal has done front page stories on this, my colleagues do not have to listen to this Member, they just need to call it up on their web site, is to redress past wrongs.

The inability of this department in past years to serve all of America's farmers, to make sure that the credit programs were open to all farmers, to make sure that when people worked hard, just because they might have had low equity did not mean that their work did not have a value, and that in fact they perhaps should not have been ignored for decades and in fact perhaps for a century and a half.

And so I would say to those who offer this amendment, I would hope they would withdraw this. I think to try to cut funds, for example, for the Office of Outreach, and again our bill is within the budget allocation, means that they will continue the historic discrimination that has characterized so much of the behavior of our Government and our people in this century and the last.

This is the first time we have had a chance to do what is both efficient and equitable. And I would ask my colleagues and those who are offering this amendment to really seriously consider what they are about to do. I really do not think they want to do this. I think they want to do what is right for America, right for all of its people, and right for the future.

I would encourage my colleagues to vote a strong "no" on this Coburn amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I understand the concern of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN). I think it is a concern for this bill as well as the other appropriations bill, and I join in that concern. And I know he had a concern about the supplemental, and I did too, about it running wild, about us missing the point as far as what "emergency" was and what "emergency" was not.

But I serve on this subcommittee, this Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations, and I know the balance that we have to give, so I stand here sort of split and yet not split on this particular issue.

To bring this within the caps, I think the chairman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) did a wonderful job. It has been easy over the years when we could just borrow money and say, well, the heck with it. We do not care about this or that. But we gave our word and we kept our word.

Now, what the problem is, is that I think that the position of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) is lessened somewhat about this accusation of filibuster. And I hope he can hear me and he will come and talk about it. But I know that we have had this before in past years. I would like for the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), if he can, to come and defend that position of filibustering because I think it was his words, from what I understand, and it is going to undermine those elements, that we need to push down the expenses that we have in the appropriations bill.

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

Mr. DICKEY. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to go to this notion that the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) is somehow filibustering. Because just on the back of the envelope, I grabbed my calculator, and if my colleagues look at the amount of money that this particular amendment would save, it would save \$3,900,000. Now, if we take people earning average income, it would take 1,974 taxpayers earning a whole year's worth of income to pay the taxes on \$3,900,000.

So what we are really talking about is, again, 1,900 people paying taxes for a year. That seems to me to be anything but a filibuster but something very real, because what we are talking about are people's lives and where are they sending money.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, one thing I want to add is this applies to almost all the bills, the same type of thing. And what I would like to ask is for us to have a better

way, and I am frustrated too, I would say to the gentleman from Oklahoma, a better way for us to express our frustration and to hope to bring constructive change than this way of doing things.

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

Mr. DICKEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I would disagree. I think that the American people benefit from seeing the debates on how we spend money; and the closer that we put the magnifying glass to it, the better we are as a country.

And I understand the pride of ownership of the Committee on Appropriations as they work hard to bring these bills up. And I am going to remind my colleagues again, when we talked about the rule, I said when we talked on the general debate hour that this was a good bill. I want to try to make it better, and I also want us to not be in a position where we are going to spend the first dollar of Social Security surplus.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, here is another question: Are we going to do this on each one of the appropriation bills? If we are, we are going to lessen the effect of the conservative concerns of my colleague about spending outside the caps.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, I have no intentions to do it on anything other than what I think will not lead us to the commitment that we have made to the American people.

The minority offered a budget and it had some good things in there, but the one common thing it had is they were going to take some of the money and make sure we did not spend any money of Social Security on anything except Social Security and Medicare.

The Blue Dogs had a budget. Same thing. The Republicans had a budget that ultimately passed the House. Everybody agrees, with the exception of two Members of this House who voted for President Clinton's budget which said I am going to spend 38 percent of Social Security money. At least he admitted it.

We either need to say we do not have the courage to trim the spending in the Federal Government and that we are going to take 38 percent, the seniors' money, or we need to say, the President was wrong, we do have the courage to spend less money up here.

I want to make the point again. The 302(b) allocations that my colleagues all have met, they have met the requirement of the budget numbers and the number that was given to them. I am not objecting to that. What I am objecting to is, number one, the 302(b)'s this year are not an adequate representation of what is going to happen. And there is not a person in this body that does not know that. And that is a sham to the American public to say this is one 302(b) but the rest of them are not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. DICKEY) has expired.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas be given 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

To take the 302(b) allocations that we all know on the four big bills are not an accurate reflection of what is going to happen, and their claim to use that as a designation for why we should not trim this bill additionally is not fair to the American people.

I have no fight to pick with the appropriators on this committee, and I have no desire to harm farmers. I say that they can do it better. What we hear in this body all the time is it cannot be done, we cannot do it. Well, I come from a group of people that says we can do it. We can do better. We cannot spend all the money allocated to us. We can get efficiencies without adding money to the Department of Agriculture. We can demand innovation, insight, and new ideas. We can promote efficiency.

The VA Regional Office in Muskogee, Oklahoma, is a great example of that where they cut their costs like crazy and they did not spend any additional money. So if they can do it, why cannot the Department of Agriculture do it? Why cannot the administration and the Department of Agriculture do it? They can do it, but they are never going to do it until we make them do it. We have to demand that they do it.

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

Mr. MANZULLO. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman from Oklahoma, are we doing the right thing by doing it by filibustering? That is my question.

It seems to me that he has got a better argument than to use something that is indirect.

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

Mr. MANZULLO. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, "filibuster" is not my word. My word is let us bring it back to the freeze level of where we were last year and ask for efficiency, and I am willing to do that. And I have said here on this floor, as soon as we are back to the level in terms of cuts, I am through.

I am looking for dollars. The term to "filibuster," it is a filibuster in terms of taking time, but that is not my intention. My intention is to get us back down to where we were last year. My colleagues will see me walk right out

of here as soon as we have done it. But to resist calls for efficiency, to resist debate on issues is not fair to the American public.

And to impugn my motivations. I want to tell my colleagues something. My motivations are pure. I think about my grandkids and I think about the grandkids of all of those patients that I take care of. Every baby, three babies this weekend, I spank the bottom of. I delivered three new babies into this world. Every one of them owes \$21,000, and it is growing at \$500 a year, what they owe.

□ 1930

They will never see the first penny of Social Security unless we have the courage to step up to the plate and demand change in Washington and demand it of ourselves. I am not talking about not having the right priorities. I do not want to punish our farmers. But I want us to create an environment of change that says we are not going to spend more, we can do better, we can spend less.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANZULLO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FARR of California. I would just like to ask the gentleman, did he charge for delivering those babies?

Mr. COBURN. I am a Member of Congress. I can make no money as a doctor.

Mr. FARR of California. I am glad to hear that.

I want to ask one question of the gentleman. I sit on the Committee on Appropriations. I have not sat on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies before.

We had dozens and dozens of hearings. We asked Members to come before the committee. We debated these items because that is the way you put together a budget. To my recollection, the gentleman never came to one of the committee hearings. He never suggested in a letter to the committee that we cut any of these programs. This is the first instance of his litany of cuts that we are faced with.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, I reclaim my time and yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. The gentleman makes the point that I was not before his committee on the cuts. That is a valid criticism, but that does not deny me the right to raise the issue on this floor and to say that I do not have the right to raise the issue on this floor because I was not before his committee. Simply because of the way the House operates, as the gentleman well knows, you cannot be at all those at one time and fulfill the rest of your duties.

The point is, do you agree or do you not agree that we should trim some of the administrative overhead out of this budget? If you do not agree, then, fine, that is what our debate is all about. We

are in the Committee of the Whole. That is what this is. That is why we are doing it in the Committee.

Mr. FARR of California. If the gentleman will yield further, there is a process here, and I think what is disturbing the House is that we try to honor that process. I do not think by bringing 114, as you have stated, amendments to the floor is a process that we use very often, if ever, and certainly I have been here a short while and I have never seen it used before.

Mr. MANZULLO. Reclaiming my time, one of the Coburn amendments saves the taxpayers \$500,000.

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

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

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, discussion has taken place with regard to the motives and the application of the process. I would just like to remind the Members and talk very briefly about an incident that happened on the floor just a couple of hours ago.

That was, I opposed the rule for the consideration of this bill because the bill spends more money than it did last year. The discretionary amount is more than what we passed out of this House last year.

I was asked why I would oppose an open rule, and I think that was a good question. I think that was a good question because the Committee on Rules, I believe, relinquishes a great deal of power whenever they decide to give an open rule, and it was a good question. The reason was not because we had the freedom of an open rule, but merely because the rule allowed for the deliberation on this floor of a bill that spent more money last year, the very first bill in the appropriations process that we deal with is going to spend more money than we spent on this bill before.

And so the reason that the gentleman is offering so many amendments is not for the sake of a filibuster, but for the simple fact that we have an open rule.

I was led to believe that an open rule would allow for free debate. Now we hear that the debate should in fact be reduced, should be cut off by the gentleman from Oklahoma. I think in fact if we are going to have an open rule and a gentleman will go to the hardship of having many of these amendments preprinted in the RECORD and offering them himself, we should at least recognize the Rules of the House.

Secondly, with regard to hurting America's farmers, I do not know, maybe southwest Indiana farmers are different from other farmers, but whenever I ask farmers in southwest Indiana what they would like to see coming from the Federal Government, the first thing they always tell me is tax relief. I tell them we can cut taxes, but if we continue to increase spending

across the board, even in the Agriculture Department, somebody is going to have to pay for that.

And so when I say we can either give you tax relief or we can take more of your tax dollars to allow the various bureaucracies to spend that money in order to help you, they realize in fact that Washington, D.C. is probably not the best source of their help.

Secondly, they ask for regulatory relief. If individuals really want to help farmers, they will indeed support regulatory relief, and for a little bit of commercial activity, I will merely tout the virtues of H.R. 1578, my Protect American Agricultural Lands Act of 1999, which will allow for that land which has been in production 5 of the last 10 years to be exempt from clean water permitting, because in fact it has been used for farming.

Thirdly, the agriculture community wants open markets, places where they can sell their product. But they do not want open market agreements for the sake of merely signing an agreement. They want agreements that can be enforced, enforced by this administration which they see dreadfully lacking.

Finally, I will simply say that this is the opportunity that many of us that do not necessarily serve on the House Committee on Appropriations have to offer amendments in this fashion. When we look at all the various constituencies of all of these provisions, we realize that in fact there is the potential in the future to not cut \$5 billion from the Labor, Health and Human Services and Education Department. There will not be the opportunity to cut almost \$4 billion from the Veterans' Administration and the Housing and Urban Development bill that is going to come up later, that in fact if we are not diligent from the very outset of this whole appropriations process, that in fact it will whirl out of control; and when we get to the end of the appropriations season later this year, that we will in fact be busting the caps and having to reduce our commitment to cutting taxes, our commitment to stopping the raids on the Social Security trust fund; and we will in fact tell America that indeed Washington D.C. knows best, and if you simply give us more of your money, we will prove it to you.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the gentleman's amendment and ask that the Committee do likewise.

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

Again, I think it is important that we focus on the process which we are discussing today. Again, I quarrel not with the motives of the gentleman from Oklahoma. He has every right, as others have said, to bring the amendments before this body that he has brought today; and I have opposed them because I disagree with them.

I think it is important, though, for everyone to understand the real quar-

rel apparently is with the leadership on the other side of the aisle. That is where the quarrel is. Because we are disagreeing with the numbers that have been given to the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies. That was given as a leadership decision.

I happen to have supported a budget that protected Social Security, that paid off \$88 billion more debt over the next 5 years than the budget we are talking about, provided a reasonable tax cut and improved the funding of five priority areas, one of which was agriculture of which I am prepared to say we are \$450 million under what we need to be spending for American agriculture.

Why do I say that? Because I am proud of our American agricultural system, from our farmers on up and down. We have the most abundant food supply in this Nation, we have the best quality of food, we have the safest food supply to our consumers of any country in the world, and we do it at the lowest cost, including all of this, quote, "wasteful spending" we are talking about today.

Now, do I make this argument in saying that we cannot do better? Obviously we could do better. But we have ways of doing it better. It is called the House Committee on Agriculture and it is called the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies that spend the hours looking at these details and making those decisions. I put my trust in them, on the first part because I am one, but I do not quarrel at all with the gentleman who chooses to say that we have not done our jobs properly.

Let me read this letter:

The American Farm Bureau Federation is aware of a long list of amendments to be offered to H.R. 1906. In addition to the letter sent this morning, we are deeply concerned about these amendments and the approach being taken against general agriculture programs.

Specifically, we are opposed to amendments that would prohibit funding to promote the sale or export of tobacco, decrease spending for the APHIS Boll Weevil Program and effectively eliminate the Boll Weevil Eradication Program. We oppose any cut in funding for agricultural research programs for wool, cotton, shrimp aquaculture, blueberries, specialty crops or precision agriculture. We oppose any attempts to decrease funding for agriculture market analysis, promotion and rural development.

Further, we oppose cuts in funding for conservation programs, the peanut price support loan rate and any reductions in research or other cuts to peanut support programs. We also oppose any attempts to effectively eliminate any international or domestic marketing programs.

Farm Bureau has worked closely with the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee and supports the bill as reported by the committee.

This is our largest farm organization that has looked at the work of the gentlewoman and the gentleman and others in saying, in their judgment, we

cannot make these cuts without doing harm. Again, I specifically have objected to the previous two amendments and to this amendment for the reasons that were specified before, in pointing out that if we are going to be critical of inefficient operation in USDA, if we are going to be critical of those "who have not been able to do their job," quote-unquote, then how do we justify coming in and saying we are going to deny them the tools to bring them into the modern century of technology which is what the committee suggested be done?

That is the simple question. It deserves a simple "no" vote on the amendment.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Again, I want to be clear about what we are doing. We are cutting nothing. What we are saying is we are holding to last year's level.

I understand the Farm Bureau. I have worked with them a great amount. A large number of the people who supported me to come here are from that organization.

But I would also say that there probably would not be anything that they would probably say was a good idea to cut out of this bill, because that is not what they are set up to do. They are set up to make sure that their members are protected in this bill.

I just wanted to state, and I thank the gentleman for being so kind as to yield to me, there is not a cut in the bill. It is the old Medicare scam cut, hold spending or cut. What we are saying is, let us not increase the administrative overhead that has been proposed in the bill.

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

I would follow up on the remarks of the gentleman from Texas, specifically the letter, because it seems to me, as the gentleman from Oklahoma just suggested, that naturally they are in the business of protecting the status quo.

What the gentleman from Oklahoma is trying to do is anything but the status quo, and that is, on a line-by-line basis, to walk through money, where it is going, where it is being spent and asking, is the taxpayer getting the best bang for his buck.

I would disagree with the letter on a whole number of fronts. I mean, for instance, the gentleman from Oklahoma's amendments, for instance, do not touch the sugar subsidy program. That letter has basically said the sugar subsidy is right.

I know we would disagree on this, but I have problems with any system wherein you have got the Fanjul family out of Palm Beach who are worth over \$400 million, who get \$60 million a year as a result of a program that is part of this bill. That is not even being challenged by what the gentleman

from Oklahoma is doing. So I think I would have a number of objections to that letter.

But I want to go back to the original content of what he is getting at, which is, line by line, looking at where the money is being spent and simply asking, is the taxpayer getting a good return on his investment. I would say no, because going back to, I guess the comments of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT), if you had any corporation out there in America that had 100,000 employees, had 80,000 contract employees and said, how can we make it better, their solution would not be to increase administration by 12 percent. Yet that is what this does.

All this amendment would do would be to knock out that increase. That is worth doing, it seems to me, for a couple of reasons. If you took out this \$3.9 million that we are talking about at \$20,000 a pop, that would buy tractors for 200 farmers. I would rather put the money into tractors.

It would pay taxes for 2,600 farmers if you figured the taxes on a small farm were \$1,500. It would take 1,900 farmers earning an average income to pay the money for this increase; or turned around a different way, it would take one farmer 1,900 years to pay for the increase that this amendment gets at.

□ 1945

It is a sensible amendment. It gets at where is the money going.

Most farmers I talk to, talk to somebody down at the stockyard or talk to somebody at FTX, these are reasonable, commonsense folks, and the idea of plussing up the administration, and in fact I saw one thing here in the administration portion, and I would have a question for the staff on this, talking about aircraft management.

I mean how many aircraft does the Department of Agriculture own?

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

Mr. SANFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I just want to ask the gentleman one simple question.

He mentioned that there is nothing wrong with going over this line by line, dollar by dollar, and that is not bad.

Would the gentleman move now to abolish the committee system of the United States House of Representatives?

Why are we wasting our time with 13 committees?

They hold hearings, and they have all these experts coming together, and let me finish.

Mr. SANFORD. No. Reclaiming my time, of all people, the gentleman from Vermont has been consistently independent in the way he votes. To suggest that he takes anything lock-step from the committee as it comes, I mean the gentleman would be the furthest person from that. He is the one independent that is here.

Mr. SANDERS. True. But I have never offered 125 amendments, and as

independent as I am, I think the committee process is a reasonable process. We have got 435 people. In all fairness, in all fairness, the gentleman does not think he knows all aspects of that bill.

The gentleman never sat on the committee, nor have I, and I think it is totally reasonable.

I have two amendments that I am offering. The gentleman may have some amendments. But basically really what he is saying is, "If you're supporting the concept of bringing 125 amendments up," what the gentleman is saying is, "Let's junk the committee."

Mr. SANFORD. Absolutely. Reclaiming my time, this is part of a much larger conversation, as the gentleman from Oklahoma has already suggested, and that is, as we all know, if we wait until the end when we run into Labor-HHS, when we run into VA-HUD, we are running into a train wreck, and so I mean unless we address this larger issue; which is, as my colleagues know, we can cherry pick the easy bills, supposedly ag was going to be one of those; do those first, and then wait for the really difficult bills later on. If so, we are in real trouble, and it means we will be taking the money from Social Security, which is why I go back to the simple point: would we rather spend money on this, as my colleague knows, administration here within the Department of Ag, or would we rather save it for Social Security?

I would rather save it for Social Security.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 185, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR CONGRESSIONAL RELATIONS  
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations to carry out the programs funded by this Act, including programs involving intergovernmental affairs and liaison within the executive branch, \$3,668,000: *Provided*, That no other funds appropriated to the Department by this Act shall be available to the Department for support of activities of congressional relations: *Provided further*, That not less than \$2,241,000 shall be transferred to agencies funded by this Act to maintain personnel at the agency level.

OFFICE OF COMMUNICATIONS

For necessary expenses to carry on services relating to the coordination of programs involving public affairs, for the dissemination of agricultural information, and the coordination of information, work, and programs authorized by Congress in the Department, \$8,138,000, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a)

of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed \$10,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, and not to exceed \$2,000,000 may be used for farmers' bulletins.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL  
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Inspector General, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and the Inspector General Act of 1978, \$65,128,000, including such sums as may be necessary for contracting and other arrangements with public agencies and private persons pursuant to section 6(a)(9) of the Inspector General Act of 1978, including not to exceed \$50,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109; and including not to exceed \$125,000 for certain confidential operational expenses, including the payment of informants, to be expended under the direction of the Inspector General pursuant to Public Law 95-452 and section 1337 of Public Law 97-98.

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

For necessary expenses of the Office of the General Counsel, \$29,194,000.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR RESEARCH, EDUCATION AND ECONOMICS

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education and Economics to administer the laws enacted by the Congress for the Economic Research Service, the National Agricultural Statistics Service, the Agricultural Research Service, and the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service, \$940,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COBURN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COBURN: Page 9, line 3, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$400,000)".

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, this again is an area that has a 75 percent increase, and the first thing I would like to do with my time, if I may, is inquire of the committee the thinking behind this increase of 75 percent in this account so that we can have an understanding of it, and actually I would, if the gentleman from Texas knows the reason for that, I would even respond if he could give us the answer for that.

The fact is, this is a significant increase for just the Office of the Under Secretary. We are not talking about research, we are talking about the Office of the Under Secretary for Research, by increasing it by \$400,000, and I just would like an explanation.

Mr. Chairman, it was \$140,000, and it is going to be \$540,000, and I believe that people would like to know why we are increasing that spending, and we ought to have a good explanation of why we are expending. If there is a great one and we should not be trimming this money out, then I will be happy to defer to the chairman, but to me it seems this 75 percent increase, from \$400,000 to \$540,000, is a significant increase.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 185, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE

For necessary expenses of the Economic Research Service in conducting economic research and analysis, as authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621-1627) and other laws, \$70,266,000: *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).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COBURN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COBURN:

Page 9, line 8, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$4,509,000)".

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, again this is an increase of \$4,509,000 on a budget. Last year was at \$65,000. What we are seeing is a 6.8 percent increase, and the question that I would ask again is if we are going to increase this \$4,509,000, and ultimately when it is all said and done the money is going to come out of the Social Security surplus, that we ought to have a great explanation.

If my colleagues read the committee print on this, and I will take the time to read it, there is not a valid explanation of what we are doing here, and again I would query the members of the committee. Maybe we are supposed to be doing this just to give us a good answer, and I will try to withdraw this amendment. But the fact is that we have silence on the issue.

Let me read what the committee print says.

"For the Economic Research Service the committee provides an appropriation of \$70 million, an increase of \$4,509,000 above 1999 and an increase of \$14 million above the budget we have. The committee has provided \$17,495,000, an increase of 300 above the budget request, for studies and evaluations of work under the Food and Nutrition Service."

Now I am for our elderly food nutrition programs, I am for our WIC programs, but I want to know how we are going to spend this money, and I want to know why we are spending it in the direction and the increase, if, in fact, the committee expects ERS to consult and work with the staff of the Food and Nutrition Service as well as other agencies to assure that all the studies and evaluations are meeting the needs of the department. Is there an area where we are not supplying that need with the \$65 million that we had last year? Is there money that could go to our farmers that are out there starving? Could some of this \$4,509,000 go directly to farmers?

As my colleagues know, we say we want to help farmers, and some gentle-

men have said today that some of our amendments have hurt farmers. Well, if they have, help us take this and change this and move it to the farmers instead of spending it on bureaucracies.

Again, we are going to have a process by which at the end of the appropriation day this \$4,509,000, whether we want to hear it or not, is going to be taken from the Social Security surplus. Most people in this room know that. It is apparent that that is what is going to happen, regardless of whether we have another omni-terrible bill or not. The money on increased spending is going to be taken from the Social Security surplus, and I believe that it is the honorable thing for us to do to stand up and admit that, and then say I believe we ought to take from the Social Security surplus an additional \$4,509,000 to run this branch of the Department of Agriculture.

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

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment, and we have been hearing talk of efficiency, and this is one area where the committee strongly believes that we have been very efficient.

The funding in this account is made up of two parts. One is the base economic research program for USDA, and the other is in the studies and evaluation for the feeding programs in this bill. By consolidating the studies and evaluations funding in this account, we have found that the program can be managed more efficiently.

The increase to this account is made up by corresponding increases in the child nutrition, food stamp and WIC accounts, and if we cut this account there will be no way of determining whether or not the \$36 billion that we are spending on feeding programs in this bill are meeting their goals.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma, and I just wish to state for the record that the Food and Nutrition Service, which is in another account, was conducting some of its own evaluations for a number of years, and the committee felt that a more objective set of evaluations could be done through the Economic Research Service. That is the reason that these funds are in this account, because essentially we have transferred responsibilities from the Food and Nutrition Service to the Economic Research Service.

This is a new function, in a sense, for the Economic Research Service, but we believe with their objectivity they could do a good job of evaluating the two-thirds to three-quarters, actually three-quarters of this budget that is in the mandatory programs, including our major food and nutrition programs.

So I think the gentleman expressed some concern that there were funds in here providing for research, but the point is they are not being provided in the Food and Nutrition Service any more. These responsibilities have been shifted to the Economic Research Service.

So I wanted to state that for the record and to state that we hope that the Economic Research Service will do their job well. We certainly have had waste, fraud and abuse in many of the food and nutrition programs, and we have been going after that through the Inspector General, I think who is doing a tremendous job at USDA in particular, and I would hope that the evaluations that would be done would continue to show progress.

So I would not support the gentleman's amendment because I think it is a rather arbitrary and ill-advised cut.

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

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

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, so I understand what the gentlewoman has said, last year for these programs there was no money for ERS under Food and Nutrition, and all of the increase, this \$4,509,000, all of that increase is only for this area?

Ms. KAPTUR. For the Economic Research Service, yes.

Mr. COBURN. Or associated with Food and Nutrition Services.

Ms. KAPTUR. That is correct.

Mr. COBURN. And the money that was being spent in the Food and Nutrition Services has been reduced by that amount and transferred to this committee.

Ms. KAPTUR. The Food and Nutrition Service will no longer be doing its own evaluations; that is correct.

Mr. COBURN. But that is different than the amount of money that they were spending on it being reduced from their budget and transferred to the ERS.

Ms. KAPTUR. The Food and Nutrition Service will no longer perform their own evaluative research; that is correct.

Mr. COBURN. But they will still have the money that they were using to do that, and those structures will be in place.

Ms. KAPTUR. They will not be doing research in this evaluative research. We changed it because we thought that perhaps they had too much of a vested interest in continuing programs the way they were, and the monitoring might not have been as objective as it should have been.

This may not work under ERS. We are not sure it will work, but we think it is a way of being more objective.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) is withdrawn.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS SERVICE

For necessary expenses of the National Agricultural Statistics Service in conducting

statistical reporting and service work, including crop and livestock estimates, statistical coordination and improvements, marketing surveys, and the Census of Agriculture, as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1621-1627, Public Law 105-113, and other laws. \$100,559,000, of which up to \$16,490,000 shall be available until expended for the Census of Agriculture: *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 \$40,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

For necessary expenses to enable the Agricultural Research Service to perform agricultural research and demonstration relating to production, utilization, marketing, and distribution (not otherwise provided for); home economics or nutrition and consumer use including the acquisition, preservation, and dissemination of agricultural information; and for acquisition of lands by donation, exchange, or purchase at a nominal cost not to exceed \$100, and for land exchanges where the lands exchanged shall be of equal value or shall be equalized by a payment of money to the grantor which shall not exceed 25 percent of the total value of the land or interests transferred out of Federal ownership, \$836,381,000: *Provided*, That appropriations hereunder shall be available for temporary 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 \$115,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That appropriations hereunder shall be available for the operation and maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed one for replacement only: *Provided further*, That appropriations hereunder shall be available pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 2250 for the construction, alteration, and repair of buildings and improvements, but unless otherwise provided, the cost of constructing any one building shall not exceed \$250,000, except for headhouses or greenhouses which shall each be limited to \$1,000,000, and except for ten buildings to be constructed or improved at a cost not to exceed \$500,000 each, and the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 percent of the current replacement value of the building or \$250,000, whichever is greater: *Provided further*, That the limitations on alterations contained in this Act shall not apply to modernization or replacement of existing facilities at Beltsville, Maryland: *Provided further*, That appropriations hereunder shall be available for granting easements at the Beltsville Agricultural Research Center, including an easement to the University of Maryland to construct the Transgenic Animal Facility which upon completion shall be accepted by the Secretary as a gift: *Provided further*, That the foregoing limitations shall not apply to replacement of buildings needed to carry out the Act of April 24, 1948 (21 U.S.C. 113a): *Provided further*, That funds may be received from any State, other political subdivision, organization, or individual for the purpose of establishing or operating any research facility or research project of the Agricultural Research Service, as authorized by law.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SANDERS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SANDERS:

Page 10, line 14 (relating to the Agricultural Research Service), insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$13,000,000)".

Page 50, line 9 (relating to the commodity assistance program), insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

□ 2000

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I want to assure my colleagues that I do not have 150 amendments, not even 50, only 2, and I believe the majority is going to accept one later. So this is it for me, and I would appreciate support for this amendment.

This amendment is cosponsored by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL). This is a very similar amendment to the one that the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO) and I introduced last year, which won in the House by a strong vote. Unfortunately, the conference committee did not support the effort that we had made in the House.

The purpose of this amendment is to increase funding for a nutrition program of extreme importance to many low-income senior citizens, small children and pregnant women, and that program is the Commodity Supplemental Food Program.

This year, the President requested \$155 million for the Commodity Assistance Program, which contains the Commodity Supplemental Food Program. However, the program was funded at \$14 million less than the President's request. We are attempting now to add \$10 million to the program, which would still be \$4 million less than what the President had requested.

Mr. Chairman, it is no secret that malnutrition and hunger among senior citizens is a serious and tragic problem in the United States. Throughout our country, food shelters see more and more use, and hospital administrators tell us that thousands of senior citizens who enter hospitals in this country are suffering from malnutrition. We know that programs like Meals on Wheels have long waiting lists and that large numbers of seniors throughout this country are simply not getting the nutrition that they need.

The Commodity Supplemental Food Program is currently operating in 20 States. Other States are on the waiting list and still more are in the process of applying for the program. We have been told by the USDA that unless additional funds are given to this program, there simply cannot be an expansion, which would be a real tragedy not only for seniors, but for pregnant women and young children who also utilize this important program.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment is offset by cutting \$13 million from the Agricultural Research Service. At a time of very, very tight and unreasonable, in my opinion, budget caps, this particular program received a \$50 million increase this year, which brings the program up to just over \$830 million.

I am not an opponent of the Agricultural Research Service. I think they do

a lot of good. I come from an agricultural State, and they do important work. But it seems to me that we have to put our priorities in a little bit better place.

At a time of significant and growing hunger in the United States, it is frankly more important to be funding nutrition programs than adding \$50 million to ag research in such programs as funding a geneticist plant breeder for lettuce to develop red snapper agriculture, aquaculture, to conduct golden nematode worm research and rainbow trout research.

I do not mean to make fun of those programs. I am sure that they make sense and are useful. But I think in terms of our priorities, when we have seniors who are hungry and small kids who are not getting the nutrition that they need, I think we should do better; and we can do better by supporting this nutrition program.

I want to thank the cosponsors of this amendment, one of whom is the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), and the schedule has been so thrown off today that I do not know if they are going to come and speak to this right now. But the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) are also cosponsors of this amendment, and I would ask for its passage.

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

Mr. Chairman, I hate to do this, but I rise in opposition to this amendment. All programs within the bill were put on the table as we began to make funding decisions under the tight allocation that we had received. No one can deny the importance of commodity assistance programs, but to use as an offset funds from the Agricultural Research Service to find ways to help farmers, who are less than 2 percent of the Nation's population, to feed this country and much of the world, is not acceptable.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, we provided about \$6 million more in this account than the President requested for the Commodity Supplemental Food Program for fiscal year 2000 and maintained TFAP administrative funds at \$45 million. These are the only two programs within the Commodity Assistance account.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Sanders amendment, and this may be the only disagreement that the chairman of the subcommittee and I have on this bill.

I compliment the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) for bringing this amendment to us to get the full body's view on this when we vote very shortly, and I support the amendment for several reasons.

One is, around this country, the feeding kitchens of America are empty. We

have an enormous need for additional food. Just the last two weekends ago the letter carriers across our country did a food drive and tried to replenish the supplies in these food banks, because this is not close to Christmas and they have been drawn down, and with all of the changes that have been made in welfare reform, for example, we do have lots of people who are hungry in America tonight, most of them women and children.

So I would say that there is great merit in the gentleman's proposal.

In addition to that, in this bill, we were unable to fund so many worthy programs that would bring food to people, including the Senior Nutrition Program where there had been a proposal to provide a small subsidy so that seniors would not have to pay so much for lunches when they go into some of their lunch programs. We were not able to include that in this bill.

Finally, I will support in this bill and in any subsequent bills any effort that would lift commodities off this market in order to try to help get prices up for our farmers. This bill itself, in the body of this bill, we were not able to provide the kind of surplus commodity assistance that we would have hoped for. We have done some, but we just have not done enough.

I would say to the author of the amendment, it is difficult for me to take money from the Agricultural Research Service. I would hope that as we move toward conference we might be able to find other ways to fund this very worthy proposal. I will vote for the gentleman's amendment when the time comes for all of the reasons that I have listed, but I would hope that we might be able to find other offsets, because truly we know that the future of American agriculture rests in research, and our bounty is directly related to the investments we make in so many crops.

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

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) understands, I am not against ag research. I know that the gentleman has had a difficult time trying to fit in all of the needs. I do not disagree with the gentleman, and I do not disagree with the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR). I just think that when we have senior citizens going into the hospitals suffering from malnutrition, that is an issue that cannot be ignored.

I would raise that to a higher level and ask for the support of the body in the passage of this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Sanders amendment. I think that a \$10 million increase for the Commodity Supplemental Food Program is warranted.

I represent a district in Cleveland, Ohio, and in my district there are

many seniors who depend on programs like this for their sustenance.

There are those of us who have a prayer that we say that includes the words, "Give us this day our daily bread." This is a very humble and simple request that people have. In America, where there are so many people hungry, where there are so many people who hunger amidst so much plenty, what would it matter to give a mere \$10 million to help our senior citizens have improved nutrition, to reduce the waiting lists for Meals on Wheels, to make it possible for those millions of Americans who rely on emergency food assistance to be able to get some help.

We in this country have a moral obligation to provide for those who are without. It is a work of mercy to feed the hungry, and we should with regard to the great power of this government, with the billions of dollars that are spent on so many things that are questionable, that we have an opportunity here to take \$10 million and feed some people, give them an opportunity to be better fed so that they do not end up in the hospital from malnutrition.

I think the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) has come up with a wonderful amendment, and while I have the greatest respect for the committee which has created this bill, I have to say that the bill can be improved and it can be improved with the help of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Vermont, Mr. SANDERS, so that he can have a few more minutes to explain the importance of this amendment.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his strong support. I think the essence of the problem that we have as serious legislators is that we are confronting a budget which in many ways prevents us from doing the things that we have to do, and that is not the chairman's fault and it is not the ranking member's fault. But I think when we talk about priorities in the United States, in this great country, in this wealthy country, how can we not address the reality that there are senior citizens who are going to the hospital and the administrators and doctors there are telling us they are malnourished? We are wasting huge sums of money spending dollars on hospital care that could have been prevented if we would provide adequate nutrition to our senior citizens.

The same thing is true with low-income pregnant women who are giving birth to low-weight babies.

So again, I would not argue about ag research. That is important. But I think what we are asking for is taking \$13 million out of an increase of \$50 million to use \$10 million for the expansion of this commodities program.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, the Master said, "Feed my sheep." This is our challenge.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to stand tonight in support of this amendment. This year the President requested \$155 million for the Commodity Assistance Program which contains the Commodity Supplemental Food Program. However, this program was funded at \$14 million less than the President's request.

The Commodity Supplemental Food Program is currently operating in 20 States. Also, four States are on the waiting list, as are others, such as the State of Ohio; and we believe that all people should be able to participate in this. Too many seniors are suffering already because they live on such tiny incomes they cannot afford to buy food or else they are forced to choose between the life-saving prescription drugs they need and groceries.

The Commodity Supplemental Food Program is often a life-saving source of food for elderly constituents. The source of the money this is coming from is coming from a program that is receiving ample support, and I come from a State that has agriculture, and I do support obviously where the money is going. But the amount of money that is going to go into this program for the Sanders amendment is not going to hurt the existing appropriation, it is going to do an awful lot, really, to help our seniors. So I think it is a good amendment.

It is a senior program that makes good fiscal sense. Studies have shown that malnourished seniors stay in the hospital nearly twice as long as well-nourished seniors, costing thousands of dollars more per stay. So I think it is cost-effective.

It is a good amendment, it should receive good bipartisan support. I think it is the right thing to do, and I urge the support of my colleagues for this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise, regrettably, in opposition to the gentleman's amendment, because I think he is attempting to do something that is proper and good, but I would point out to the gentleman that all of these funds are very competitive with each other. We have done our level best to fully fund the nutrition programs which make up the majority of this bill.

As the gentleman knows, and we have worked together on funding the Emergency Food Assistance Program, it is a very important program. We have raised the funding for that program, the mandatory programs, food stamps and WIC, and we have done our level best to fund those as close to full funding as we can.

The Commodity Supplemental Food Program, the program the gentleman wants to add an additional \$10 million to, is funded above the President's budget request level.

So we have gone out of our way to try to find the discretionary funds to meet the needs of these programs. We



Rodriguez	Smith (NJ)	Velazquez	Deal	Hunter	Ros-Lehtinen	Ney	Sabo	Thompson (CA)
Roemer	Snyder	Vento	DeLay	Istook	Roukema	Norwood	Sanchez	Thompson (MS)
Rogan	Souder	Visclosky	DeMint	Johnson (CT)	Royce	Nussle	Sanders	Thune
Rogers	Spratt	Walden	Diaz-Balart	Johnson, Sam	Ryan (WI)	Oberstar	Sandlin	Thurman
Royal-Allard	Stabenow	Walsh	Doolittle	Jones (NC)	Ryun (KS)	Obey	Sawyer	Tierney
Rush	Stenholm	Waters	Dreier	Kelly	Salmon	Olver	Saxton	Towns
Ryun (KS)	Strickland	Watkins	Duncan	Largent	Sanford	Ortiz	Schakowsky	Traficant
Sabo	Stupak	Watt (NC)	Dunn	Lazio	Scarborough	Ose	Scott	Turner
Sanchez	Sweeney	Waxman	Ehrlich	Linder	Schaffer	Owens	Serrano	Udall (CO)
Sanders	Talent	Weiner	English	LoBiondo	Sensenbrenner	Packard	Sherman	Udall (NM)
Sandlin	Tanner	Weldon (PA)	Foley	Luther	Sessions	Pascrell	Shimkus	Velazquez
Sawyer	Tauzin	Wexler	Fossella	Manzullo	Shadegg	Pastor	Shows	Vento
Saxton	Terry	Weygand	Fowler	McCollum	Shaw	Payne	Shuster	Visclosky
Schaffer	Thomas	Whitfield	Franks (NJ)	McInnis	Shays	Pelosi	Simpson	Walsh
Schakowsky	Thompson (CA)	Wicker	Gibbons	McIntosh	Sherwood	Peterson (MN)	Sisisky	Waters
Scott	Thompson (MS)	Wilson	Gillmor	Mica	Smith (MI)	Peterson (PA)	Skeen	Watkins
Serrano	Thornberry	Wise	Goode	Miller (FL)	Smith (WA)	Phelps	Skelton	Watt (NC)
Sherman	Thune	Wolf	Goodlatte	Miller, Gary	Souder	Pickering	Slaughter	Waxman
Shimkus	Thurman	Woolsey	Goodling	Myrick	Stearns	Pickett	Smith (NJ)	Weiner
Shuster	Tierney	Wu	Goss	Nadler	Stump	Pomeroy	Snyder	Wexler
Simpson	Towns	Wynn	Granger	Northup	Sununu	Porter	Spence	Weygand
Sisisky	Traficant	Young (AK)	Green (WI)	Paul	Tancredo	Price (NC)	Spratt	Whitfield
Skeen	Turner	Young (FL)	Greenwood	Pease	Taylor (MS)	Quinn	Stabenow	Wicker
Skelton	Udall (CO)	Gutknecht	Petri	Taylor (NC)	Radanovich	Stenholm	Wilson	Stenholm
Slaughter	Udall (NM)	Hall (TX)	Pitts	Thornberry	Rahall	Strickland	Wise	Wise
	NOT VOTING—16	Hastings (WA)	Pombo	Tiahrt	Rangel	Stupak	Wolf	Wolf
Brady (TX)	Kasich	Reyes	Hayworth	Toomey	Reynolds	Sweeney	Woolsey	Woolsey
Brown (CA)	Kleczka	Rothman	Heffley	Pryce (OH)	Rivers	Talent	Wu	Wu
Graham	Millender-	Smith (TX)	Herger	Ramstad	Rodriguez	Tanner	Wynn	Wynn
Granger	McDonald	Stark	Hill (MT)	Regula	Roemer	Tauscher	Young (AK)	Young (AK)
Hinojosa	Morella		Hildeary	Riley	Rogers	Roybal-Allard	Tauzin	Young (FL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)	Oxley		Hoekstra	Rogan	Rush	Terry	Thomas	Thomas
	Pallone		Hostettler	Rohrabacher				

## □ 2039

Messrs. LIPINSKI, GUTIERREZ, REYNOLDS, TIERNEY, RYUN of Kansas, TRAFICANT, and BECERRA and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. MCNULTY, MARKEY, SHAW, DEFAZIO, and LARSON and Mrs. TAUSCHER and Ms. ESHOO changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, on roll-call No. 155, I was inadvertently detained and missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes".

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COBURN

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) on which further proceeding were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 129, noes 289, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 156]

## AYES—129

Aderholt	Boehner	Chenoweth	Crowley	Hyde	Mink	Andrews	Burton	Deal
Andrews	Bryant	Coble	Cummings	Inslee	Moakley	Archer	Buyer	DeFazio
Archer	Burr	Coburn	Danner	Isackson	Mollohan	Armey	Campbell	Delahunt
Armey	Burton	Collins	Davis (FL)	Jackson (IL)	Moore	Baird	Cannon	DeLay
Ballenger	Buyer	Condit	Davis (IL)	Jefferson	Moran (KS)	Ballenger	Capuano	DeMint
Barr	Camp	Cook	Davis (VA)	Jenkins	Moran (VA)	Barr	Castle	Diaz-Balart
Bartlett	Campbell	Cox	DeFazio	John	Murtha	Barrett (WI)	Chabot	Doggett
Barton	Cannon	Crane	DeGette	Johnson, E. B.	Napolitano	Bartlett	Chenoweth	Doolittle
Bass	Castle	Cubin	DeLauro	Jones (OH)	Neal	Barton	Coble	Duncan
Biggert	Chabot	Cunningham		Kanjorski	Nethercutt	Bass	Coburn	Dunn

## NOES—289

Abercrombie	Deutsch	Kaptur	Blunt	Kasich	Reyes
Ackerman	Dickey	Kennedy	Brown (CA)	Millender-	Rothman
Allen	Dicks	Kildee	Graham	McDonald	Smith (TX)
Bachus	Dingell	Kilpatrick	Hinojosa	Morella	Stark
Baird	Dixon	Kind (WI)	Jackson-Lee (TX)	Oxley	Weldon (PA)
Baker	Doggett	King (NY)		Pallone	
Baldacci	Dooley	Kingston			
Baldwin	Doyle	Kleczka			
Barcia	Edwards	Klink			
Barrett (NE)	Ehlers	Knollenberg			
Barrett (WI)	Emerson	Colbe			
Bateman	Engel	Kucinich			
Becerra	Eshoo	Kuykendall			
Bentsen	Etheridge	LaFalce			
Bereuter	Evans	Leah			
Berkley	Everett	Lampson			
Berman	Ewing	Lantos			
Berry	Farr	Larson			
Bilbray	Fattah	Latham			
Bilirakis	Filner	LaTourette			
Bishop	Fletcher	Leach			
Blagojevich	Forbes	Lee			
Bliley	Ford	Levin			
Blumenauer	Frank (MA)	Lewis (CA)			
Boehlert	Frelinghuysen	Lewis (GA)			
Bonilla	Frost	Lewis (KY)			
Bonior	Gallagly	Lipinski			
Bono	Ganske	Lofgren			
Borski	Gejdenson	Lowey			
Boswell	Gekas	Lucas (KY)			
Boucher	Gephhardt	Lucas (OK)			
Boyd	Gilchrest	Maloney (CT)			
Brady (PA)	Gilmal	Maloney (NY)			
Brady (TX)	Gonzalez	Markey			
Brown (FL)	Gordon	Martinez			
Brown (OH)	Green (TX)	Mascara			
Callahan	Gutierrez	Matsui			
Calvert	Hall (OH)	McCarthy (MO)			
Canady	Hansen	McCarthy (NY)			
Capps	Hastings (FL)	McCrary			
Capuano	Hayes	McDermott			
Cardin	Hill (IN)	McGovern			
Carson	Hilliard	McHugh			
Chambliss	Hinchey	McIntyre			
Clay	Hobson	McKeon			
Clayton	Hoefel	McKinney			
Clement	Holden	McNulty			
Clyburn	Holt	Meehan			
Combest	Hooley	Meek (FL)			
Conyers	Horn	Meeks (NY)			
Cooksey	Houghton	Menendez			
Costello	Hoyer	Metcalf			
Coyne	Hulshof	Miller, George			
Cramer	Hutchinson	Minge			
Crowley	Hyde	Mink			
Cummings	Inslee	Moakley			
Danner	Isackson	Mollohan			
Davis (FL)	Jackson (IL)	Moore			
Davis (IL)	Jefferson	Moran (KS)			
Davis (VA)	Jenkins	Moran (VA)			
DeFazio	John	Murtha			
DeGette	Johnson, E. B.	Napolitano			
DeLauro	Jones (OH)	Neal			
	Kanjorski	Nethercutt			

## NOT VOTING—15

Blunt	Kasich	Reyes
Brown (CA)	Millender-	Rothman
Graham	McDonald	Smith (TX)
Hinojosa	Morella	Stark
Jackson-Lee (TX)	Oxley	Weldon (PA)

## □ 2049

Messrs. KLECZKA, COOKSEY and MALONEY of Connecticut changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. COOK changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COBURN

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 139, noes 278, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 157]

## AYES—139

Andrews	Burton	Deal
Archer	Buyer	DeFazio
Armey	Campbell	Delahunt
Baird	Cannon	DeLay
Ballenger	Capuano	DeMint
Barr	Castle	Diaz-Balart
Barrett (WI)	Chabot	Doggett
Bartlett	Chenoweth	Doolittle
Barton	Coble	Duncan
Bass	Coburn	Dunn
Biggert	Collins	Ehrlich
Boehner	Conyers	English
Brady (TX)	Cook	Eshoo
Brown (OH)	Crane	Foley
Burr	Foley	Fossella

Fowler  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (NJ)  
Gibbons  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Gordon  
Goss  
Granger  
Green (TX)  
Greenwood  
Gutknecht  
Hall (TX)  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Herger  
Hill (MT)  
Hilleary  
Hoekstra  
Hostettler  
Hunter  
Inslee  
Istook  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones (NC)  
Kelly  
Kleckza  
Lazio  
Linder  
LoBiondo  
Luther

Maloney (CT)  
Maloney (NY)  
Manzullo  
Markey  
McDermott  
McInnis  
McIntosh  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Metcalf  
Mica  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Mink  
Myrick  
Northup  
Paul  
Petri  
Pitts  
Pombo  
Portman  
Ramstad  
Riley  
Rivers  
Rogan  
Rohrabacher  
Roukema  
Royce  
Ryan (WI)  
Ryun (KS)  
Sabo

## NOES—278

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Bachus  
Baker  
Baldacci  
Baldwin  
Barcia  
Barrett (NE)  
Bateman  
Becerra  
Bentsen  
Bereuter  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop  
Blagojevich  
Bliley  
Blumenauer  
Blunt  
Boehlert  
Bonilla  
Bonior  
Bono  
Borski  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boyd  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (FL)  
Bryant  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Canady  
Capps  
Cardin  
Carson  
Chambliss  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clyburn  
Combest  
Condit  
Cooksey  
Costello  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Crowley  
Cubin  
Cummings  
Danner  
Davis (FL)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (VA)  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
Deutsch  
Dickey  
Dingell

Dixon  
Dooley  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Bachus  
Baker  
Baldacci  
Baldwin  
Barcia  
Barrett (NE)  
Bateman  
Becerra  
Bentsen  
Bereuter  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop  
Blagojevich  
Bliley  
Blumenauer  
Blunt  
Boehlert  
Bonilla  
Bonior  
Bono  
Borski  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boyd  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (FL)  
Bryant  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Canady  
Capps  
Cardin  
Carson  
Chambliss  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clyburn  
Combest  
Condit  
Cooksey  
Costello  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Crowley  
Cubin  
Cummings  
Danner  
Davis (FL)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (VA)  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
Deutsch  
Dickey  
Dingell

Kingston  
Klink  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
Edwards  
Kucinich  
Ehlers  
Emerson  
Engel  
Etheridge  
Evans  
Everett  
Ewing  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Fletcher  
Forbes  
Ford  
Frelinghuysen  
Frost  
Gallegly  
Ganske  
Gejdenson  
Gekas  
Gephhardt  
Bonilla  
Bonior  
Bono  
Borski  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boyd  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (FL)  
Bryant  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Canady  
Capps  
Cardin  
Carson  
Chambliss  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clyburn  
Combest  
Condit  
Cooksey  
Costello  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Crowley  
Cubin  
Cummings  
Danner  
Davis (FL)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (VA)  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
Deutsch  
Dickey  
Dingell

Salmon  
Sanford  
Scarborough  
Schaffer  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shays  
Shows  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (WA)  
Souder  
Stearns  
Mink  
Sununu  
Tancredo  
Paul  
Tauscher  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Tiahrt  
Tierney  
Toomey  
Upton  
Wamp  
Watts (OK)  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
Wu

Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Phelps  
Pickering  
Pickett  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Quinn  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (WA)  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Regula  
Reynolds  
Rodriguez  
Roemer  
Rogers  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roybal-Allard  
Rush  
Sanchez  
Sanders  
Sandlin  
Sawyer  
Saxton  
Schakowsky  
Scott

Serrano  
Shaw  
Sherman  
Sherwood  
Pickett  
Shimkus  
Porter  
Simpson  
Sisisky  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Rahall  
Snyder  
Spence  
Regula  
Reynolds  
Rodriguez  
Roemer  
Rogers  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roybal-Allard  
Rush  
Sanchez  
Sanders  
Sandlin  
Sawyer  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thornberry  
Thune

Thurman  
Towns  
Traficant  
Turner  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Simpson  
Velazquez  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Walden  
Walsh  
Waters  
Watkins  
Watt (NC)  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Strickland  
Wexler  
Stupak  
Weygand  
Whitfield  
Talent  
Tanner  
Tazin  
Terry  
Thomas  
Woolsey  
Wynn

Talbot  
Tanner  
Tazin  
Terry  
Thomas  
Woolsey  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

## NOT VOTING—16

Brown (CA)  
Cox  
Dicks  
Graham  
Hinojosa  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)

Kasich  
Largent  
McCollum  
Millender-  
McDonald  
Oxley  
Pallone

Reyes  
Rothman  
Smith (TX)  
Stark

## □ 2058

So the amendment was rejected.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SHERWOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. Pease, 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. 1906) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

## REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 150, EDUCATION LAND GRANT ACT

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-164) on the resolution (H. Res. 189) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 150) to amend the Act popularly known as the Recreation and Public Purposes Act to authorize disposal of certain public lands or national forest lands to local education agencies for use for elementary or secondary schools, including public charter schools, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

## SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SCHAFER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DIAZ-BALART addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FILNER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CUMMINGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. UNDERWOOD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)