

Phelps	Serrano	Thurman
Pickering	Sessions	Tiahrt
Pickett	Shaw	Tierney
Pombo	Sherman	Towns
Pomeroy	Sherwood	Trafficant
Porter	Shimkus	Turner
Portman	Shows	Udall (CO)
Price (NC)	Shuster	Udall (NM)
Quinn	Simpson	Upton
Radanovich	Sisisky	Velazquez
Rahall	Skeen	Visclosky
Ramstad	Skelton	Vitter
Rangel	Slaughter	Walden
Regula	Smith (MI)	Walsh
Reyes	Smith (NJ)	Wamp
Reynolds	Smith (TX)	Waters
Riley	Snyder	Watkins
Rivers	Souder	Watt (NC)
Rodriguez	Spence	Weiner
Roemer	Spratt	Weldon (FL)
Rogan	Stabenow	Weldon (PA)
Rogers	Stark	Weller
Ros-Lehtinen	Stenholm	Wexler
Rothman	Strickland	Weygand
Roukema	Stupak	Whitfield
Roybal-Allard	Sununu	Wicker
Ryun (KS)	Sweeney	Wilson
Sabo	Tancredo	Wise
Sanders	Tauscher	Wolf
Sandlin	Tauzin	Woolsey
Sawyer	Terry	Wu
Saxton	Thomas	Wynn
Scarborough	Thompson (CA)	Young (FL)
Schakowsky	Thompson (MS)	
Scott	Thornberry	

NOT VOTING—52

Becerra	Hilleary	Myrick
Burr	Hinojosa	Norwood
Camp	Houghton	Owens
Campbell	Hulshof	Payne
Chambliss	Isakson	Pryce (OH)
Chenoweth-Hage	Kilpatrick	Rush
Collins	Klink	Sanchez
Cook	LaTourette	Shays
Coyne	Lazio	Smith (WA)
Davis (VA)	Lee	Talent
DeMint	Lewis (CA)	Tanner
Ewing	Linder	Taylor (MS)
Fattah	Lipinski	Taylor (NC)
Forbes	Maloney (CT)	Vento
Fossella	McCollum	Waxman
Gilchrest	McIntosh	Young (AK)
Graham	McNulty	
Hansen	Moakley	

2120

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Chairman, during rollcall vote No. 378 on July 10, 2000, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, due to official business in my district, I was unable to record my vote on the following amendments to H.R. 4461, the Agriculture appropriations bill for fiscal year 2001, on which rollcalls were ordered. On the amendment offered by Mr. COBURN (rollcall No. 373), I would have voted "no;" on the amendment offered by Mr. ROYCE (rollcall No. 374), I would have voted "no;" on the amendment offered by Mr. CROWLEY (rollcall No. 375), I would have voted "aye;" on the amendment offered by Mr. CHABOT (rollcall No. 376), I would have voted "no;" on the amendment offered by Mr. COBURN (rollcall No. 377), I would have voted "aye;" and on the amendment offered by Mr. SANFORD (rollcall No. 378), I would have voted "no."

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to reluctantly support H.R. 4461, the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 2001. I wish to commend Chairman YOUNG, Ranking Member OBEY, Subcommittee Chairman SKEEN and Sub-

committee Ranking Member KAPTUR for their hard work during this stressful time for American agriculture and our hard-working farmers.

I support this legislation with the understanding that while this bill falls short in many areas, Congress needs to move now to stem the flood of debt, drought and despair in rural America.

Indeed, this bill has some acceptable provisions. To address the credit gap that farmers face, this bill appropriates the Administration's request of \$130 million to support \$4.6 billion in loans to farmers and ranchers through the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund. There is increased funding for Farm Operating Loans and Farm Ownership Loans. In addition, there is \$150 million for emergency disaster loans and \$100 million for boll weevil eradication loans. As an increasing number of farmers sell their commodities at prices below their cost of production, the availability of this credit could be the difference in keeping many of the farmers in my District on the land.

This bill appropriates adequate stop-gap funding for Farm Service Agency salaries and expenses which will allow farmers to continue to get the services they need at their local FSA offices.

This Agriculture Appropriations bill increases funding for the Agricultural Research Service by \$20 million over last year. This will allow for improved research for many producers. The bill appropriates \$946 million for Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service to advance research, extension and education in the food and agricultural sciences. Soil and water conservation spending is increased by \$16 million over last year's level. Rural Housing programs will increase by \$89 million.

Many of these programs deserve more, but producers and other recipients need these programs now. I will continue to fight for agriculture's fair share.

Mr. Chairman, there are great deficiencies in this bill. The bill does not contain funding for important peanut research projects at the Dawson, Georgia ARS facility. A project to Develop, Evaluate and Transfer Technology to Improve the Efficiency and Quality in Peanuts and a project to Develop Technology/Methodology for Peanut Quality Management During Production and Post Harvest Processing are left unfunded in this bill. I will do everything I can to see that these important projects are funded in the final Conference Report.

The bill provides \$35.2 billion for domestic nutrition programs—including food stamps, the school lunch and breakfast programs, and the Special Supplemental Food Program for Woman, Infants, and Children. This is an increase of \$186 million over last year's level, but \$1 billion less than the Administration requested. During this time of plenty in much of America we can do better.

I am going to vote for this bill even though it fails to address fundamental problems in providing the economic safety net farmers need to keep growing the highest quality, safest and cheapest food in the world.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote for this bill because it keeps the American food ship afloat. But it remains for this House of Representatives to complete its work to knit a safety net for America's farmers who are drowning in debt, disaster and depressed prices. This vote is just the first step.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the point of order offered by my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-

BALART) to strike Title VIII from H.R. 4461, the Department of Agriculture Appropriations Act. As my colleagues know, Title VIII would amend current law to ease economic sanctions against five nations: Cuba, Iran, Sudan, Libya, and North Korea. While much of the news reports and talk over the last few weeks have focused on the pros and cons of the compromise reached between members of both sides of the aisle on how the provision will affect the communist nation of Cuba, I mainly oppose this provision because of how it deals with—or shall I say ignores—the tragic situation that currently grips Sudan.

As a member of the International Relations Committee and especially the Subcommittee on Africa and the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights, I have been following the situation in Sudan with great interest and concern. One of the reasons I chose to be on the Africa Subcommittee was to address the conflict in Sudan and the practice of slavery that still takes place in this modern day and age. This is a country, which has the longest running civil war in the world, and has been witness to over 1.9 million deaths over the past 15 years. More people have died in Sudan than in Kosovo, Bosnia, Afghanistan, Chechnya, Somalia and Algeria combined, yet few people still seem to take notice. At a time when we are sending military troops and proposing emergency supplemental appropriations for the situation in Kosovo, little is being done to counter these grievous human rights abuses that have been taking place for over a decade. It is time for the United States to take notice of the tragedy in Sudan, and for us to lend assistance to the Southern Sudanese, a people who are being butchered and enslaved by their own corrupt government.

But repealing economic sanctions on Sudan will, without a shadow of a doubt, aid the government of the Sudan, the National Islamic Front in Khartoum, which has perpetuated the deplorable human rights abuses.

I urge my colleagues to reexamine the proposed compromise—exempt Sudan from the provision so that we can all work toward meaningful change in this turbulent region of Africa.

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. TANCREDO) having assumed the chair, Mr. NUSSLE, 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. 4461) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON H.R. 4811, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. CALLAHAN, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-720) on

the bill (H.R. 4811) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, I was delayed on the first two votes this evening because of plane delay due to inclement weather in Cincinnati.

If I had been here on the Coburn amendment prohibiting the development or approval of any drug intended solely for the chemical inducement of abortion, I would have voted "yes."

On the Royce amendment, to reduce the total fiscal year 2001 agriculture appropriations by 1 percent, I would have voted "no."

CORRECTION TO CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF JUNE 21, 2000, ROLL-CALL VOTE NUMBER 305

Pursuant to the order of the House of June 26, 2000, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, of June 21, 2000, was ordered corrected to correctly reflect that Representative ROYBAL-ALLARD did not vote on rollcall number 305 (H.R. 4635/ on agreeing to the Collins of Georgia amendment). The electronic voting system had incorrectly attributed an "aye" vote to Representative ROYBAL-ALLARD.

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.

MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, many of us over the last several years have asked a very basic and fundamental question, and this question is going to be answered again this week, and that is: Is it right, is it fair that under our Tax Code 25 million married working couples pay on average \$1400 more in higher taxes just because they are married?

Is it right, is it fair that two people who joined together in holy matrimony, who both happen to work, are forced to pay higher taxes if they choose to get married? Today, the only way to avoid the marriage tax penalty if both the husband and wife work in the workforce is either choose not to get married or to get divorced. That is just wrong, that 25 million married

working couples, 50 million Americans, pay higher taxes just because they are married. It is wrong, I believe, and I know many in this House do believe that it is wrong, that we punish society's most basic institution, marriage, with higher taxes. That is just unfair.

Let me introduce to my colleagues Shad and Michelle Hallihan, two public school teachers, from Joliet, Illinois. Shad and Michelle chose to get married a couple of years ago. They are both in the workforce. They just had a child this past year, a new baby. They pay the average marriage tax penalty of \$1400. They knew that going into getting married, that they were going to pay more in taxes, but they chose to still get married.

I believe it is wrong. They pay \$1400 more in higher taxes. In Joliet, Illinois, which is a south suburban community southwest of Chicago, \$1400 for Shad and Michelle Hallihan, the average marriage tax penalty, is one year's tuition at Joliet Junior College, our local community college. It is 3 months of day care for their child. It is just wrong they have to pay more in taxes just because they are married.

Now, the marriage tax penalty comes into play when two people marry and they are both in the workforce and have two incomes, because under our Tax Code they file jointly, which means they combine their incomes. So in the case of Shad and Michelle, had they chose to stay single and just live together, they would each file as singles and they would each pay in the 15 percent tax bracket. But because they chose to get married, their combined income pushes them into the 28 percent tax bracket, so they get stuck with a higher tax bill just because they chose to get married.

Now, we believe in this House, and it is clearly one of the top agenda items for House Republicans, that we should bring about some tax fairness by eliminating the marriage tax penalty. I am proud that earlier this year every House Republican, and 48 Democrats who broke with their leadership, voted to wipe out the marriage tax penalty for 25 million married working couples. Unfortunately, Senator DASCHLE and the Senate Democrats used parliamentary procedures to block action on that legislation, and we have now had to go through the budget process, or so-called reconciliation, which is a word few people know the meaning of, but it allows us to bring up a bill with a simple majority vote.

2130

With that ability, this week both the House and Senate are going to be voting on legislation which will wipe out the marriage tax penalty for 25 million married working couples.

Now, some on the other side and AL GORE and a few others say, Well, let's give just a little bit of marriage tax relief so we can say we are for it. AL GORE says we should only give marriage tax relief to those who do not

itemize their taxes, those who use the standard deduction.

Well, we want to help those who do itemize, as well as those who do not itemize. If you think about it, most middle-class families, most middle-class couples, itemize their taxes because they are homeowners. Think about that. If you are a homeowner, those who oppose the bill we are going to be passing this week, because they do not want to help homeowners and they do not want to help those who itemize taxes, because they say they are rich, only rich people own homes today, according to AL GORE and other people.

Well, the bottom line is, the only way we can help Shad and Michelle Hallihan is if we pass the legislation we are going to pass this week, legislation that doubles the standard deduction for joint filers to twice that of singles, so we wipe out the marriage tax penalty for those who do not itemize, and then for those who do itemize, such as homeowners, or those who take the charitable deduction because they give to their institutions of faith or charity, we also widen the 15 percent bracket to twice that for joint filers to twice that of singles. That will eliminate essentially the marriage tax penalty for Shad and Michelle Hallihan.

Think about it. If we eliminate the marriage tax penalty, which we are going to vote this week to do, for 25 million married working couples, 50 million Americans, people like Shad and Michelle will have that extra \$1,400 to take care of their child. That is 3 months of daycare. It is a year's tuition at Joliet Junior College if they want to continue to improve their education.

I want to extend an invitation to my friends on the Democratic side to join with us. Let us eliminate the marriage tax penalty this week.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TANCREDO). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss for a few moments the legislation which we have been debating today and will take up again tomorrow in the U.S. House of Representatives. This is the agricultural appropriations bill.

I think many of us have rejoiced in the robust economy we have had here in the United States, but the sad fact is that farmers in America are not sharing in this robust economy. Instead, they are facing unprecedented low prices if you adjust for inflation. They are also looking at higher interest costs and increased fuel costs. This is a toxic cocktail that is going to take its toll on America's farmers as the year wears out.

So as we look at the agricultural appropriations bill, the question is, are