

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

There was no objection.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report to accompany H.R. 4461, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4461, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 617, I call up the conference report to accompany 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.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 617, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of Friday, October 6, 2000 at page H9461.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) each will control 30 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring before the House the conference report on the fiscal year 2001 appropriations bill for Agriculture, Rural Development, the Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has two main parts. The first titles, Title I through VII, comprises the regular fiscal year 2001 appropriations bill, which has a total budget authority of slightly less than \$15.3 billion.

The second part, which is Title VIII, is the emergency title, and that totals just over \$3.6 billion. The administration advised us that it would not submit a formal request for disaster as-

sistance, so as we have done in the past, we worked informally with program managers at USDA and with House and Senate colleagues to address as many concerns as possible.

I believe that we have a good conference report that deserves the support of this body. We were able to make significant increases over the fiscal year 2000 level in research, food safety, domestic feeding, and conservation programs.

This bill also contains compromise language in two critical issues: prescription drug importation, and sanctions of agricultural exports. I believe the language that we are offering will make it easier for our senior citizens to have access to safer, less costly drugs, and make it easier for our farmers and ranchers to export their products to certain countries.

I would like to point out a few highlights of the conference report which I think are important to us all. In the two main research accounts, we have about \$120 million over the current fiscal year level, in direct response to Members' concerns for critical research priorities.

APHIS regular programs have been increased by \$38 million over fiscal year 2000, in response to many Members' concerns about invasive plants, pests, and diseases. There is additional money in the APHIS account to assist in the boll weevil program. The Agricultural Marketing Service has increased by \$15 million, and GIPSA by \$4.5 million.

Meat and poultry inspection has been increased by \$47.5 million, which is actually higher than the official budget request. This represents our efforts to respond to problems that occurred after both bodies had passed their respective bills.

Our FSA loan programs are increased slightly over the current year, and we have met the administration's requests for salaries and expenses.

Conservation programs on the discretionary side are increased by about \$70 million, which is just under the administration's request. On the mandatory side, there is an additional \$35 million for technical assistance for the Wetlands Reserve and the Conservation Reserve programs. There is also \$117 million to enroll an additional 100,000 acres in the Wetlands Reserve Program, since so many Members have requested us to lift the authorized enrollment cap.

In rural development, we have met the administration's request for the Rural Community Advancement Program, and in spite of sharply higher

subsidy rates, we have increased housing and rural utility loan levels by half a billion dollars each.

In domestic food programs, WIC has been increased by \$20 million, commodity assistance by \$7 million, and elderly feeding by \$10 million over fiscal year 2000.

In P.L. 480, I know there was a lot of concern about the low House number. I am happy to report that Title II is now \$837 million, so all of the food aid programs are at the administration's request.

The Food and Drug Administration's salaries and expenses are increased by almost \$31 million, and we will be able to go ahead with the badly needed new building in Los Angeles.

Finally, I think all of us hear on a near weekly basis from the land grant schools about the Initiative for Future Agriculture and Food Systems. In past years, we have had to put a limitation on this program to pay for other important accounts, but this conference report allows the Initiative as well as the Fund for Rural America to go forward in fiscal year 2001, using money saved from the 2000 budget.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that will generate benefits in every congressional district in the country. We are providing strong protection for the health and safety of our citizens, nutrition and feeding programs for the most vulnerable, and agricultural research which makes us the greatest producer of food and fiber the world has ever known, and funding for a strong and productive rural America.

Mr. Speaker, we have tried our best to put together a good, solid bipartisan bill which works for all America. Much of it is compromise, to be sure, but I believe it is good compromise and good policy.

In closing, I would like to thank all of my colleagues on the subcommittee for their help and hard work since we began this process earlier this year. In particular, I would like to thank the staff for all their hard work: Hank Moore, the subcommittee clerk; Martin Delgado; Joanne Orndorff; John Z.; Ann Dubey; Maureen Holohan; David Reich, of the staff of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY); and Jim Richards, from my personal office. Without them, we would not have a bill here today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this conference agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following material related to H.R. 4461:

**AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES**  
**APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001 (H.R. 4461)**  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
<b>TITLE I - AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS</b>						
<b>Production, Processing, and Marketing</b>						
Office of the Secretary.....	15,435	2,914	2,836	27,914	2,914	-12,521
<b>Executive Operations:</b>						
Chief Economist.....	6,408	8,612	6,408	7,462	7,462	+1,054
National Appeals Division.....	11,707	12,610	11,718	12,421	12,421	+714
Office of Budget and Program Analysis.....	6,581	6,765	6,581	6,765	6,765	+184
Office of the Chief Information Officer.....	6,046	14,680	10,051	10,046	10,051	+4,005
Common computing environment.....		75,000	25,000		40,000	+40,000
Office of the Chief Financial Officer.....	4,783	6,465	4,783	5,171	5,171	+388
<b>Total, Executive Operations.....</b>	<b>35,525</b>	<b>124,132</b>	<b>64,541</b>	<b>41,865</b>	<b>81,870</b>	<b>+46,345</b>
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration.....	613	629	613	629	629	+16
Agriculture buildings and facilities and rental payments.....	140,343	182,747	150,343	182,747	182,747	+42,404
Payments to GSA.....	(115,542)	(125,542)	(125,542)	(125,542)	(125,542)	(+10,000)
Building operations and maintenance.....	(24,801)	(31,205)	(24,801)	(31,205)	(31,205)	(+6,404)
Repairs, renovations, and construction.....		(26,000)		(26,000)	(26,000)	(+26,000)
Hazardous materials management.....	15,700	30,073	15,700	15,700	15,700	
Departmental administration.....	34,708	40,740	34,708	36,840	36,010	+1,302
Outreach for socially disadvantaged farmers.....	3,000	10,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.....	3,568	3,778	3,568	3,568	3,568	
Office of Communications.....	8,138	9,031	8,138	8,873	8,623	+485
Office of the Inspector General.....	65,097	70,214	65,097	66,867	68,867	+3,770
Office of the General Counsel.....	29,194	32,881	29,194	31,080	31,080	+1,886
Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education and Economics.....	540	1,356	540	556	556	+16
Economic Research Service.....	65,363	55,424	66,419	67,038	67,038	+1,675
National Agricultural Statistics Service.....	99,333	100,615	100,851	100,615	100,772	+1,439
Census of Agriculture.....	(16,490)	(15,000)	(15,000)	(15,000)	(15,000)	(-1,490)
Agricultural Research Service.....	830,384	894,258	843,584	871,593	898,812	+68,428
Buildings and facilities.....	52,500	39,300	39,300	56,330	74,200	+21,700
<b>Total, Agricultural Research Service.....</b>	<b>882,884</b>	<b>933,558</b>	<b>882,884</b>	<b>927,923</b>	<b>973,012</b>	<b>+90,128</b>
<b>Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service:</b>						
Research and education activities.....	481,881	460,865	481,551	494,044	506,193	+24,312
Native American Institutions Endowment Fund.....	(4,600)	(7,100)	(7,100)	(7,100)	(7,100)	(+2,500)
Extension activities.....	424,174	428,236	431,540	427,380	433,429	+9,255
Integrated activities.....	39,541	76,194	39,541	43,365	41,941	+2,400
<b>Total, Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service.....</b>	<b>945,596</b>	<b>965,295</b>	<b>952,632</b>	<b>964,789</b>	<b>981,563</b>	<b>+35,967</b>
Office of the Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs.....	618	635	618	635	635	+17
<b>Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service:</b>						
Salaries and expenses.....	437,768	512,444	469,985	458,149	530,564	+92,796
AQI user fees.....	(87,000)	(87,000)	(87,000)	(87,000)	(85,000)	(-2,000)
Buildings and facilities.....	5,200	5,200	5,200	9,870	9,870	+4,670
<b>Total, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.....</b>	<b>442,968</b>	<b>517,644</b>	<b>475,185</b>	<b>468,019</b>	<b>540,434</b>	<b>+97,466</b>
<b>Agricultural Marketing Service:</b>						
Marketing Services.....	51,497	66,572	56,326	64,696	65,335	+13,838
Standardization user fees.....	(4,000)	(4,000)	(4,000)	(4,000)	(4,000)	
(Limitation on administrative expenses, from fees collected).....	(60,730)	(60,730)	(60,730)	(60,730)	(60,730)	
Funds for strengthening markets, income, and supply (transfer from section 32).....	12,428	13,438	13,438	13,438	13,438	+1,010
Payments to states and possessions.....	1,200	1,500	1,500	1,200	1,350	+150
<b>Total, Agricultural Marketing Service.....</b>	<b>65,125</b>	<b>81,510</b>	<b>71,264</b>	<b>79,334</b>	<b>80,123</b>	<b>+14,998</b>
<b>Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration:</b>						
Salaries and expenses.....	26,433	33,549	27,801	27,269	31,420	+4,987
Limitation on inspection and weighing services.....	(42,557)	(42,557)	(42,557)	(42,557)	(42,557)	
Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety.....	446	580	446	460	460	+14
<b>Food Safety and Inspection Service.....</b>	<b>649,119</b>	<b>688,204</b>	<b>673,790</b>	<b>678,011</b>	<b>696,704</b>	<b>+47,585</b>
Lab accreditation fees 1/.....	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	
<b>Total, Food Safety and Inspection Service.....</b>	<b>649,119</b>	<b>688,204</b>	<b>673,790</b>	<b>678,011</b>	<b>696,704</b>	<b>+47,585</b>
<b>Total, Production, Processing, and Marketing.....</b>	<b>3,529,746</b>	<b>3,885,489</b>	<b>3,630,168</b>	<b>3,733,732</b>	<b>3,907,725</b>	<b>+377,979</b>
<b>Farm Assistance Programs</b>						
Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services.....	572	589	572	589	589	+17

**AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES  
 APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001 (H.R. 4461) — continued  
 (Amounts in thousands)**

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
<b>Farm Service Agency:</b>						
Salaries and expenses .....	794,394	828,385	828,385	828,385	828,385	+33,991
(Transfer from export loans) .....	(589)	(589)	(589)	(589)	(589)	.....
(Transfer from P.L. 480) .....	(815)	(815)	(815)	(815)	(815)	.....
(Transfer from ACIF) .....	(209,861)	(265,315)	(265,315)	(265,315)	(265,315)	(+55,454)
Subtotal, Transfers from program accounts.....	(211,265)	(266,719)	(266,719)	(266,719)	(266,719)	(+55,454)
Total, salaries and expenses .....	(1,005,659)	(1,095,104)	(1,095,104)	(1,095,104)	(1,095,104)	(+89,445)
State mediation grants .....	3,000	4,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	.....
Dairy indemnity program.....	450	450	450	450	450	.....
Subtotal, Farm Service Agency .....	797,844	832,835	831,835	831,835	831,835	+33,991
<b>Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account:</b>						
<b>Loan authorizations:</b>						
<b>Farm ownership loans:</b>						
Direct.....	(128,049)	(128,000)	(128,000)	(128,000)	(128,000)	(-49)
Guaranteed .....	(431,373)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(431,373)	(870,000)	(+438,627)
Subtotal.....	(559,422)	(1,128,000)	(1,128,000)	(559,373)	(998,000)	(+438,578)
<b>Farm operating loans:</b>						
Direct.....	(500,000)	(700,000)	(700,000)	(500,000)	(525,000)	(+25,000)
Guaranteed unsubsidized .....	(1,697,842)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	(1,697,842)	(1,077,839)	(-620,003)
Guaranteed subsidized .....	(200,000)	(477,868)	(477,868)	(200,000)	(369,902)	(+169,902)
Subtotal.....	(2,397,842)	(3,177,868)	(3,177,868)	(2,397,842)	(1,972,741)	(-425,101)
Indian tribe land acquisition loans .....	(1,028)	(2,006)	(2,006)	(1,028)	(2,006)	(+978)
Emergency disaster loans .....	(25,000)	(150,064)	(150,064)	(25,000)	(25,000)	.....
Boll weevil eradication loans .....	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	.....
Total, Loan authorizations .....	(3,083,292)	(4,557,938)	(4,557,938)	(3,083,243)	(3,097,747)	(+14,455)
<b>Loan subsidies:</b>						
<b>Farm ownership loans:</b>						
Direct.....	4,827	13,786	13,786	13,786	13,786	+8,959
Guaranteed.....	2,416	5,100	5,100	2,200	4,437	+2,021
Subtotal.....	7,243	18,886	18,886	15,986	18,223	+10,980
<b>Farm operating loans:</b>						
Direct.....	29,300	63,140	63,140	45,100	47,355	+18,055
Guaranteed unsubsidized .....	23,940	27,400	27,400	27,400	14,770	-9,170
Guaranteed subsidized .....	17,620	38,994	38,994	16,320	30,185	+12,565
Subtotal.....	70,860	129,534	129,534	84,680	92,310	+21,450
Indian tribe land acquisition .....	21	323	323	166	323	+302
Emergency disaster loans .....	3,882	36,811	36,811	6,133	6,133	+2,251
Total, Loan subsidies.....	82,006	185,554	185,554	106,965	116,989	+34,983
<b>ACIF expenses:</b>						
Salaries and expense (transfer to FSA) .....	209,861	265,315	265,315	265,315	265,315	+55,454
Administrative expenses.....	4,300	4,139	4,139	4,139	4,139	-161
Total, ACIF expenses.....	214,161	269,454	269,454	269,454	269,454	+55,293
Total, Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund .....	296,167	455,008	455,008	376,419	386,443	+90,276
(Loan authorization) .....	(3,083,292)	(4,557,938)	(4,557,938)	(3,083,243)	(3,097,747)	(+14,455)
Total, Farm Service Agency.....	1,094,011	1,287,843	1,286,843	1,208,254	1,218,278	+124,267
Risk Management Agency.....	63,983	67,700	67,700	65,597	65,597	+1,614
Total, Farm Assistance Programs.....	1,158,566	1,356,132	1,355,115	1,274,440	1,284,464	+125,898
<b>Corporations</b>						
<b>Federal Crop Insurance Corporation:</b>						
Federal crop insurance corporation fund .....	710,857	1,727,671	1,727,671	1,727,671	1,727,671	+1,016,814
<b>Commodity Credit Corporation Fund:</b>						
Reimbursement for net realized losses.....	30,037,136	27,771,007	27,771,007	27,771,007	27,771,007	-2,266,129
Operations and maintenance for hazardous waste management (limitation on administrative expenses).....	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	.....
Total, Corporations.....	30,747,993	29,498,678	29,498,678	29,498,678	29,498,678	-1,249,315

**AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES**  
**APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001 (H.R. 4461) — continued**  
 (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
Total, title I, Agricultural Programs .....	35,436,305	34,740,299	34,483,961	34,506,850	34,690,867	-745,438
(By transfer) .....	(211,265)	(266,719)	(266,719)	(266,719)	(266,719)	(+55,454)
(Loan authorization) .....	(3,083,292)	(4,557,938)	(4,557,938)	(3,083,243)	(3,097,747)	(+14,455)
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(108,287)	(108,287)	(108,287)	(108,287)	(108,287)	
<b>TITLE II - CONSERVATION PROGRAMS</b>						
Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment .....	693	711		711	711	+18
Natural Resources Conservation Service:						
Conservation operations .....	660,812	747,243	676,812	714,116	714,116	+53,304
Watershed surveys and planning.....	10,368	10,368	10,868	10,705	10,868	+500
Watershed and flood prevention operations.....	91,643	83,423	83,423	99,443	99,443	+7,800
Resource conservation and development.....	35,265	36,265	41,708	36,265	42,015	+6,750
Forestry incentives program .....	5,377			6,325	6,325	+948
Total, Natural Resources Conservation Service .....	803,465	877,299	812,811	866,854	872,767	+69,302
Total, title II, Conservation Programs.....	804,158	878,010	812,811	867,565	873,478	+69,320
<b>TITLE III - RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS</b>						
Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development.....	588	605	588	605	605	+17
Rural Development:						
Rural community advancement program .....	693,637	762,542	775,837	759,284	762,542	+68,905
RD expenses:						
Salaries and expenses .....		130,371	120,270	130,371	130,371	+130,371
(Transfer from RHIF) .....		(409,233)	(375,879)	(409,233)	(409,233)	(+409,233)
(Transfer from RDLFP) .....		(3,640)	(3,337)	(3,640)	(3,640)	(+3,640)
(Transfer from RETLP) .....		(34,716)	(31,046)	(34,716)	(34,716)	(+34,716)
(Transfer from RTP).....		(3,000)	(3,000)	(3,000)	(3,000)	(+3,000)
Total, RD expenses.....		(580,960)	(533,532)	(580,960)	(580,960)	(+580,960)
Total, Rural Development .....	693,637	892,913	896,107	889,655	892,913	+199,276
Rural Housing Service:						
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account:						
Loan authorizations:						
Single family (sec. 502) .....	(1,100,000)	(1,300,000)	(1,100,000)	(1,100,000)	(1,100,000)	
Unsubsidized guaranteed .....	(3,200,000)	(3,700,000)	(3,700,000)	(3,200,000)	(3,700,000)	(+500,000)
Housing repair (sec. 504) .....	(32,396)	(40,000)	(32,396)	(32,396)	(32,396)	
Farm labor (sec. 514).....	(25,001)					(-25,001)
Rental housing (sec. 515).....	(114,321)	(120,000)	(114,321)	(114,321)	(114,321)	
Multifamily housing guarantees (sec. 538) .....	(100,000)	(200,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	
Site loans (sec. 524) .....	(5,152)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,152)	(5,152)	
Multifamily housing credit sales .....	(1,250)	(5,000)	(1,780)	(1,250)	(1,780)	(+530)
Single family housing credit sales.....	(6,253)	(10,000)	(15,000)	(6,253)	(10,000)	(+3,747)
Self-help housing land development fund.....	(5,000)	(5,009)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	
Total, Loan authorizations .....	(4,589,373)	(5,385,009)	(5,073,497)	(4,564,372)	(5,068,649)	(+479,276)
Loan subsidies:						
Single family (sec. 502) .....	93,830	208,780	176,760	176,680	176,760	+82,930
Unsubsidized guaranteed .....	19,520	44,400	7,400	38,400	7,400	-12,120
Housing repair (sec. 504) .....	9,900	14,176	11,481	11,481	11,481	+1,581
Farm labor (sec. 514).....	11,308					-11,308
Rental housing (sec. 515).....	45,363	59,124	56,326	56,326	56,326	+10,963
Multifamily housing guarantees (sec. 538) .....	480	3,040	1,520	1,520	1,520	+1,040
Site loans (sec. 524) .....	4					-4
Multifamily housing credit sales .....	494	2,452	874	613	874	+380
Single family housing credit sales.....	380					-380
Self-help housing land development fund.....	281	279	279	279	279	-2
Total, Loan subsidies.....	181,560	332,251	254,640	285,279	254,640	+73,080
RHIF administrative expenses (transfer to RHS) .....	375,879					-375,879
RHIF administrative expenses (transfer to RD).....		409,233	375,879	409,233	409,233	+409,233
Rental assistance program:						
(Sec. 521) .....	634,100	674,100	650,000	674,100	674,100	+40,000
(Sec. 502(c)(5)(D)) .....	5,900	5,900	5,900	5,900	5,900	
Total, Rental assistance program.....	640,000	680,000	655,900	680,000	680,000	+40,000
Total, Rural Housing Insurance Fund .....	1,197,439	1,421,484	1,286,419	1,374,512	1,343,873	+146,434
(Loan authorization) .....	(4,589,373)	(5,385,009)	(5,073,497)	(4,564,372)	(5,068,649)	(+479,276)
Mutual and self-help housing grants .....	28,000	40,000	28,000	34,000	34,000	+6,000
Rural housing assistance grants .....	45,000	39,000	39,000	44,000	44,000	-1,000

**AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES  
 APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001 (H.R. 4461) — continued  
 (Amounts in thousands)**

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
Farm labor program account .....		35,777	30,000	28,750	30,000	+ 30,000
Subtotal, grants and payments .....	73,000	114,777	97,000	106,750	108,000	+35,000
RHS expenses:						
Salaries and expenses .....	61,551					-61,551
(Transfer from RHIF) .....	(375,879)					(-375,879)
Total, RHS expenses .....	(437,430)					(-437,430)
Total, Rural Housing Service .....	1,331,990	1,536,261	1,383,419	1,481,262	1,451,873	+119,883
(Loan authorization) .....	(4,589,373)	(5,385,009)	(5,073,497)	(4,564,372)	(5,088,649)	(+ 479,276)
Rural Business-Cooperative Service:						
Rural Development Loan Fund Program Account:						
(Loan authorization) .....	(38,256)	(64,495)	(38,256)	(38,256)	(38,256)	
Loan subsidy .....	16,615	32,834	19,476	19,476	19,476	+2,861
Administrative expenses (transfer to RBCS) .....	3,337					-3,337
Administrative expenses (transfer to RD) .....		3,640	3,337	3,640	3,640	+3,640
Total, Rural Development Loan Fund .....	19,952	36,474	22,813	23,116	23,116	+3,164
Rural Economic Development Loans Program Account:						
(Loan authorization) .....	(15,000)	(15,000)	(15,000)	(15,000)	(15,000)	
Direct subsidy .....	3,453	3,911	3,911	3,911	3,911	+458
Rural cooperative development grants .....	6,000	11,500	6,500	6,000	6,500	+500
National sheep industry improvement center revolving fund .....		5,000	5,000			
RBCS expenses:						
Salaries and expenses .....	24,612					-24,612
(Transfer from RDLFP) .....	(3,337)					(-3,337)
Total, RBCS expenses .....	(27,949)					(-27,949)
Total, Rural Business-Cooperative Service .....	54,017	56,885	38,224	33,027	33,527	-20,490
(By transfer) .....	(3,337)					(-3,337)
(Loan authorization) .....	(53,256)	(79,495)	(53,256)	(53,256)	(53,256)	
Rural Utilities Service:						
Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account:						
Loan authorizations:						
Electric:						
Direct, 5% .....	(121,500)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(121,500)	(121,500)	
Direct, Municipal rate .....	(295,000)	(300,000)	(295,000)	(295,000)	(295,000)	
Direct, FFB .....	(1,700,000)	(800,000)	(800,000)	(1,700,000)	(1,700,000)	
Direct, Treasury rate .....				(500,000)	(500,000)	(+ 500,000)
Guaranteed .....		(400,000)	(400,000)			
Subtotal .....	(2,116,500)	(1,550,000)	(1,545,000)	(2,616,500)	(2,616,500)	(+ 500,000)
Telecommunications:						
Direct, 5% .....	(75,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)	
Direct, Treasury rate .....	(300,000)	(300,000)	(300,000)	(300,000)	(300,000)	
Direct, FFB .....	(120,000)	(120,000)	(120,000)	(120,000)	(120,000)	
Subtotal .....	(495,000)	(495,000)	(495,000)	(495,000)	(495,000)	
Total, Loan authorizations .....	(2,611,500)	(2,045,000)	(2,040,000)	(3,111,500)	(3,111,500)	(+ 500,000)
Loan subsidies:						
Electric:						
Direct, 5% .....	1,095	4,980	4,980	12,101	12,101	+11,006
Direct, Municipal rate .....	10,827	20,850	20,480	20,503	20,503	+9,676
Direct, FFB .....						
Direct, Treasury rate .....						
Guaranteed .....		40	40			
Subtotal .....	11,922	25,870	25,500	32,604	32,604	+20,682
Telecommunications:						
Direct, 5% .....	840	7,770	7,770	7,770	7,770	+6,930
Direct, Treasury rate .....	2,370					-2,370
Direct, FFB .....						
Subtotal .....	3,210	7,770	7,770	7,770	7,770	+4,560
Total, Loan subsidies .....	15,132	33,640	33,270	40,374	40,374	+25,242

**AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES  
 APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001 (H.R. 4461) — continued  
 (Amounts in thousands)**

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
RETLP administrative expenses (transfer to RUS)	31,046					-31,046
RETLP administrative expenses (transfer to RD)		34,716	31,046	34,716	34,716	+34,716
<b>Total, Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans</b>						
Program Account.....	46,178	68,356	64,316	75,090	75,090	+28,912
(Loan authorization) .....	(2,611,500)	(2,045,000)	(2,040,000)	(3,111,500)	(3,111,500)	(+500,000)
<b>Rural Telephone Bank Program Account:</b>						
(Loan authorization) .....	(175,000)	(175,000)	(175,000)	(175,000)	(175,000)	
Direct loan subsidy .....	3,290	2,590	2,590	2,590	2,590	-700
RTP administrative expenses (transfer to RUS).....	3,000					-3,000
RTP administrative expenses (transfer to RD).....		3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	+3,000
Total .....	6,290	5,590	5,590	5,590	5,590	-700
<b>Distance learning and telemedicine program:</b>						
(Loan authorization) .....	(200,000)	(400,000)	(400,000)	(400,000)	(400,000)	(+200,000)
Direct loan subsidy .....	700					-700
Grants .....	20,000	27,000	19,500	27,000	27,000	+7,000
Total .....	20,700	27,000	19,500	27,000	27,000	+6,300
<b>RUS expenses:</b>						
Salaries and expenses .....	34,107					-34,107
(Transfer from RETLP) .....	(31,046)					(-31,046)
(Transfer from RTP).....	(3,000)					(-3,000)
Total, RUS expenses .....	(68,153)					(-68,153)
<b>Total, Rural Utilities Service</b>						
(By transfer) .....	107,275	100,946	89,406	107,680	107,680	+405
(Loan authorization) .....	(34,046)					(-34,046)
(Loan authorization) .....	(2,986,500)	(2,620,000)	(2,615,000)	(3,686,500)	(3,686,500)	(+700,000)
<b>Total, title III, Rural Economic and Community Development</b>						
Programs .....	2,187,507	2,587,610	2,407,744	2,512,229	2,486,598	+289,091
(By transfer) .....	(413,262)	(450,589)	(413,262)	(450,589)	(450,589)	(+37,327)
(Loan authorization) .....	(7,629,129)	(8,084,504)	(7,741,753)	(8,304,128)	(8,808,405)	(+1,179,276)
<b>TITLE IV - DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS</b>						
<b>Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition and Consumer</b>						
Services.....	554	570	554	570	570	+16
<b>Food and Nutrition Service:</b>						
Child nutrition programs.....	4,611,829	4,570,465	4,407,460	4,407,460	4,407,460	-204,369
Transfer from section 32.....	4,935,199	4,967,574	5,127,579	5,127,579	5,127,579	+192,380
Discretionary spending.....	7,000	8,017		6,500	6,500	-500
Total, Child nutrition programs.....	9,554,028	9,546,056	9,535,039	9,541,539	9,541,539	-12,489
Special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children (WIC).....	4,032,000	4,089,100	4,067,000	4,052,000	4,052,000	+20,000
<b>Food stamp program:</b>						
Expenses .....	19,605,751	19,730,993	19,730,993	19,720,293	18,613,293	-992,458
Reserve .....	100,000	1,000,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	
Nutrition assistance for Puerto Rico .....	1,268,000	1,301,000	1,301,000	1,301,000	1,301,000	+33,000
The emergency food assistance program .....	98,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	+2,000
Total, Food stamp program.....	21,071,751	22,131,993	21,231,993	21,221,293	20,114,293	-957,458
Commodity assistance program .....	133,300	158,300	138,300	140,300	140,300	+7,000
<b>Food donations programs:</b>						
Needy family program.....	1,081	1,081	1,081	1,081	1,081	
Elderly feeding program.....	140,000	150,000	160,000	140,000	150,000	+10,000
Total, Food donations programs.....	141,081	151,081	161,081	141,081	151,081	+10,000
Food program administration.....	111,392	128,558	118,392	116,807	116,807	+5,415
Total, Food and Nutrition Service.....	35,043,552	36,205,088	35,249,805	35,213,020	34,116,020	-927,532
Total, title IV, Domestic Food Programs.....	35,044,106	36,205,658	35,250,359	35,213,590	34,116,590	-927,516

**AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES  
 APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001 (H.R. 4461) — continued  
 (Amounts in thousands)**

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
<b>TITLE V - FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS</b>						
<b>Foreign Agricultural Service:</b>						
Direct appropriation.....	109,186	113,587	109,186	113,424	115,424	+6,238
(Transfer from export loans).....	(3,231)	(3,231)	(3,231)	(3,231)	(3,231)	.....
(Transfer from P.L. 480).....	(1,035)	(1,035)	(1,035)	(1,035)	(1,035)	.....
<b>Total, Program level.....</b>	<b>(113,452)</b>	<b>(117,853)</b>	<b>(113,452)</b>	<b>(117,690)</b>	<b>(119,690)</b>	<b>(+6,238)</b>
<b>Public Law 480 Program and Grant Accounts:</b>						
<b>Title i - Credit sales:</b>						
Program level.....	(176,000)	(180,000)	(180,000)	(180,000)	(180,000)	(+4,000)
Direct loans.....	(145,298)	(159,678)	(159,678)	(159,678)	(159,678)	(+14,380)
Ocean freight differential.....	21,000	20,322	20,322	20,322	20,322	-678
<b>Title II - Commodities for disposition abroad:</b>						
Program level.....	(800,000)	(837,000)	(770,000)	(837,000)	(837,000)	(+37,000)
Appropriation.....	800,000	837,000	770,000	837,000	837,000	+37,000
Loan subsidies.....	119,813	114,186	114,186	114,186	114,186	-5,627
<b>Salaries and expenses:</b>						
General Sales Manager (transfer to FAS).....	1,035	1,035	1,035	1,035	1,035	.....
Farm Service Agency (transfer to FSA).....	815	815	815	815	815	.....
<b>Subtotal.....</b>	<b>1,850</b>	<b>1,850</b>	<b>1,850</b>	<b>1,850</b>	<b>1,850</b>	.....
<b>Total, Public Law 480:</b>						
Program level.....	(976,000)	(1,017,000)	(950,000)	(1,017,000)	(1,017,000)	(+41,000)
Appropriation.....	942,683	973,358	906,358	973,358	973,358	+30,695
<b>CCC Export Loans Program Account (administrative expenses):</b>						
<b>Salaries and expenses (Export Loans):</b>						
General Sales Manager (transfer to FAS).....	3,231	3,231	3,231	3,231	3,231	.....
Farm Service Agency (transfer to FSA).....	589	589	589	589	589	.....
<b>Total, CCC Export Loans Program Account.....</b>	<b>3,820</b>	<b>3,820</b>	<b>3,820</b>	<b>3,820</b>	<b>3,820</b>	.....
<b>Total, title V, Foreign Assistance and Related Programs.....</b>	<b>1,055,669</b>	<b>1,090,765</b>	<b>1,019,364</b>	<b>1,090,602</b>	<b>1,092,602</b>	<b>+36,933</b>
(By transfer).....	(4,266)	(4,266)	(4,266)	(4,266)	(4,266)	.....
<b>TITLE VI - FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES</b>						
<b>DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES</b>						
<b>Food and Drug Administration</b>						
Salaries and expenses, direct appropriation.....	1,037,661	1,156,905	1,117,905	1,067,523	1,068,524	+30,863
Prescription drug user fee act.....	(145,434)	(149,273)	(149,273)	(149,273)	(149,273)	(+3,839)
<b>Subtotal.....</b>	<b>(1,183,095)</b>	<b>(1,306,178)</b>	<b>(1,267,178)</b>	<b>(1,216,796)</b>	<b>(1,217,797)</b>	<b>(+34,702)</b>
Rescission.....			-27,000			.....
<b>Total, Salaries and expenses (net).....</b>	<b>(1,183,095)</b>	<b>(1,306,178)</b>	<b>(1,240,178)</b>	<b>(1,216,796)</b>	<b>(1,217,797)</b>	<b>(+34,702)</b>
Export and certification.....	(4,907)	(5,992)	(5,992)	(5,992)	(5,992)	(+1,085)
Limitation on payments to GSA.....	(99,954)	(104,954)	(104,954)	(104,954)	(104,954)	(+5,000)
Buildings and facilities.....	11,350	31,350	11,350	31,350	31,350	+20,000
Advance appropriations, FY 2002.....		23,000				.....
<b>Total, Food and Drug Administration.....</b>	<b>1,049,011</b>	<b>1,211,255</b>	<b>1,102,255</b>	<b>1,098,873</b>	<b>1,099,874</b>	<b>+50,863</b>
<b>INDEPENDENT AGENCIES</b>						
Commodity Futures Trading Commission.....	63,000	72,000	69,000	67,100	68,000	+5,000
Farm Credit Administration (limitation on administrative expenses).....	(35,800)		(36,800)	(36,800)	(36,800)	(+1,000)
<b>Total, title VI, Related Agencies and Food and Drug Administration.....</b>	<b>1,112,011</b>	<b>1,283,255</b>	<b>1,171,255</b>	<b>1,165,973</b>	<b>1,167,874</b>	<b>+55,863</b>
<b>TITLE VII - GENERAL PROVISIONS</b>						
Hunger fellowships.....	2,000		4,000		2,000	.....
Loss assistance for apples and potatoes (contingent emergency appropriations).....			115,000			.....
Sec. 388 Fair Act - NH.....	250					-250
National Sheep Industry Improvement Center revolving fund.....					5,000	+5,000
FDA Drug reimportation (sec. 745).....					23,000	+23,000
<b>Total, title VII, General provisions.....</b>	<b>2,250</b>		<b>119,000</b>		<b>30,000</b>	<b>+27,750</b>

**AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES  
 APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001 (H.R. 4461) — continued  
 (Amounts in thousands)**

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
<b>TITLE VIII - FY 2000</b>						
<b>DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE</b>						
<b>Commodity Credit Corporation</b>						
Crop loss (contingent emergency appropriations) .....	1,200,000					-1,200,000
Market loss (contingent emergency appropriations) .....	5,520,351					-5,520,351
<b>Specialty Crops:</b>						
Peanuts (contingent emergency appropriations) .....	42,000					-42,000
Suspend sugar assessments (contingent emergency appropriations) .....	42,000					-42,000
Tobacco (contingent emergency appropriations) .....	326,601					-326,601
Subtotal, Specialty crops.....	410,601					-410,601
Oilseeds (contingent emergency appropriations).....	467,974					-467,974
Livestock and dairy (contingent emergency appropriations).....	320,614					-320,614
Upland cotton competitiveness (contingent emergency appropriations) .....	201,000					-201,000
Extend milk price supports (contingent emergency appropriations) .....	-102,000					+102,000
Crop insurance (contingent emergency appropriations).....	400,000					-400,000
Crop insurance discount associated costs (contingent emergency appropriations) .....	250,000					-250,000
Water and waste loan forgiveness (contingent emergency appropriations) ....	2,000					-2,000
Trade sanctions reform and export enhancement.....						
<b>Total, title VIII, FY 2000 .....</b>	<b>8,670,540</b>					<b>-8,670,540</b>
<b>TITLE VIII - FY 2001</b>						
<b>NATURAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE AND OTHER</b>						
<b>EMERGENCY APPROPRIATIONS</b>						
<b>CHAPTER 1</b>						
<b>DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE</b>						
<b>Office of the Chief Information Officer:</b>						
Common computing environment (contingent emergency appropriations) .....					19,500	+19,500
Departmental administration (contingent emergency appropriations) .....					200	+200
<b>Farm Service Agency</b>						
Salaries and expenses (contingent emergency appropriations).....					50,000	+50,000
Emergency conservation program (contingent emergency appropriations)...					80,000	+80,000
<b>Federal Crop Insurance Corporation</b>						
Federal crop insurance corporation fund (emergency appropriations) .....					13,000	+13,000
<b>Natural Resources Conservation Service</b>						
Watershed and flood prevention operations (contingent emergency appropriations) .....					110,000	+110,000
<b>Rural Development</b>						
Rural community advancement program (contingent emergency appropriations) .....					200,000	+200,000
<b>Total, Department of Agriculture .....</b>					<b>472,700</b>	<b>+472,700</b>
<b>General Provisions</b>						
Conservation technical assistance (contingent emergency appropriations)...					35,000	+35,000
CCC Disease loss compensation (contingent emergency appropriations) .....					19,000	+19,000
Dairy assistance (contingent emergency appropriations) .....					473,000	+473,000
CCC Livestock assistance program (contingent emergency appropriations)...					490,000	+490,000
WRP Additional acreage enrollments (contingent emergency appropriations) .....					117,000	+117,000
CCC Sheep loss assistance (contingent emergency appropriations).....					2,400	+2,400
CCC Citrus canker compensation (contingent emergency appropriations) ....					58,000	+58,000
CCC Apple/potatoes market loss and quality (contingent emergency appropriations) .....					138,000	+138,000
CCC Honey assistance (contingent emergency appropriations) .....					20,000	+20,000
CCC Livestock indemnity program (contingent emergency appropriations)...					10,000	+10,000
CCC Wool/mohair assistance (contingent emergency appropriations) .....					20,000	+20,000
CCC Crop loss disaster assistance (contingent emergency appropriations)...					1,627,000	+1,627,000
CCC Cranberry assistance (contingent emergency appropriations).....					20,000	+20,000
Shared appreciation loan arrangements (contingent emergency appropriations) .....					2,000	+2,000
SC grain dealer's guarantee fund (contingent emergency appropriations).....					2,500	+2,500
Puerto Rico food stamp block grant.....					-5,000	-5,000
Hawaii sugar transportation cost assistance (contingent emergency appropriations) .....					7,200	+7,200
Business and industry grants (contingent emergency appropriations) .....					10,000	+10,000
Business and industry guaranteed loans (contingent emergency appropriations) .....					10,000	+10,000



**AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES  
 APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001 (H.R. 4461) — continued  
 (Amounts in thousands)**

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
CCC Tobacco quota compensation (contingent emergency appropriations) .....					3,000	+3,000
CCC Cooperative assistance (contingent emergency appropriations) .....					20,000	+20,000
CCC Burley tobacco (contingent emergency appropriations) .....					50,000	+50,000
CCC LDP delinquent borrower (contingent emergency appropriations) .....					5,000	+5,000
Food stamp excess shelter allowance (contingent emergency appropriations) .....					15,000	+15,000
Food stamp vehicle allowance (contingent emergency appropriations) .....					25,000	+25,000
<b>Total, General Provisions.....</b>					<b>3,174,100</b>	<b>+3,174,100</b>
<b>Total, title VIII, FY 2001 .....</b>					<b>3,646,800</b>	<b>+3,646,800</b>
<b>TITLE X - ANTI-DUMPING</b>						
Anti-dumping .....					40,000	+40,000
<b>Grand total:</b>						
New budget (obligational) authority .....	84,312,546	76,785,597	75,264,494	75,356,809	78,144,809	-6,167,737
Appropriations .....	(75,642,006)	(76,762,597)	(75,176,494)	(75,356,809)	(74,493,009)	(-1,148,997)
Rescission .....			(-27,000)			
Emergency appropriations .....					(13,000)	(+13,000)
Contingent emergency appropriations .....	(8,670,540)		(115,000)		(3,638,800)	(-5,031,740)
Advance appropriations .....		(23,000)				
(By transfer) .....	(628,793)	(721,574)	(684,247)	(721,574)	(721,574)	(+92,781)
(Loan authorization) .....	(10,712,421)	(12,642,442)	(12,299,691)	(11,387,371)	(11,906,152)	(+1,193,731)
(Limitation on administrative expenses) .....	(144,087)	(108,287)	(145,087)	(145,087)	(145,087)	(+1,000)

1/ In addition to appropriation.

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

1530

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report as a significant improvement over the measure that originally moved through this body. Before I get into the details, let me just say that I particularly this afternoon rise with great respect and true admiration for the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), our chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies, who under current Republican caucus rules is serving his last year as a fair, caring and truly outstanding chairman.

I will say that I know that as a regular committee member, the gentleman will continue to be exemplary in his service, but I will miss him in his current position.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to express genuine support and thanks to our subcommittee staff, Hank Moore, Martin Delgado, John Ziolkowski, Joanne Orndorff and our detailees Anne DuBey and Maureen Holohan, and also our minority staff, David Reich, and on my own staff, Roger Szmraj for doing such a tremendous job in shepherding this major legislation through the Congress.

I also want to say to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, he kept his word on both sides of the aisle, so that our conferees could meet and fully engage in debate as we did in every single line item of this bill. I say thanks to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), who is our ranking member on the full committee who participated in every single meeting. I actually do not know how he does it, so tirelessly, and I want to thank the people of Wisconsin for sending him here for service to the Nation.

I want to thank the Members on our side of the aisle, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY), the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD). We thank them for yeoman's service in the construction of this very important measure.

Mr. Speaker, overall the conference report spends over \$78.5 billion. A little over three-quarters of that is in what we call mandatory spending for programs, especially our food programs, breakfast programs, lunch programs, elderly feeding programs, surplus commodity programs, that are used from coast to coast. \$28 billion dollars, nearly half of that, goes to the Commodity Credit Corporation for net realized losses as we move product around the world and here at home.

Mr. Speaker, another \$1.7 billion goes for crop insurance. The base bill in addition to this has \$15 billion in discretionary spending in important areas,

such as new research for fuels of the future, the extension service to bring the latest in research right down to the farm and the ranch, conservation programs—so much a part of America's rich natural heritage and essential to sustainability of the future, food safety programs, rural housing and development, all of our feeding programs, international assistance and certainly the Food and Drug Administration.

In this bill, also, and this is of critical interest to those who tie their livelihoods to the rural countryside, we have more than \$3.6 billion for disaster, farm assistance, and rural development programs.

I will say more about that in a moment, but we were also able to incorporate into this measure portions of the Hunger Relief Act. We know as welfare reform really kicks in in every State across this country, thousands of people go to work for minimum wage without health benefits.

In this bill, we have provided housing and vehicle allowances and the right to food for those workers and their children to help them transition to the marketplace off of welfare. We are very, very pleased to be able to do that on this particular committee.

Mr. Speaker, I also have to say, of course, we were not able to defeat the rule and bring a real prescription drug reimportation provision before the Congress. That is truly sad, and every one of us will have to account for that before the voters this fall. In addition to that, the sanctions language in this bill is absolutely unworkable; even the Cuban Government has said that the provisions may be worse than the status quo, and we really will not be able to sell product in Cuba because of the restrictions in this measure.

However, the needs of the country outweigh any one of those provisions, and we have to vote on the overall bill based on its merits.

I will quickly tick off key provisions of the bill: we do provide additional funds for market concentration investigation in our Grain Inspectors, Packers and Stockyards Administration; food safety, full funding in that program; additional funds for our Farm Service Agency operations, including extra funds to administer the disaster program so essential across this country this year; for our conservation programs, a decent level of support; research, which is key to the future; in APHIS, while the Animal Plant Health and Inspection Service, it has been funded in a manner that dedicates an inordinate amount of funds to the boll weevil program. We have so many other invasive species such as Asian longhorn beetle and others where we do not have equal levels of support. That is unfortunate. We were not able to work out fair apportionment of these funds completely.

In rural development, we do provide an increase over last year; in food donations, in the PL480 provisions and in title 2, an increase there to help move

surplus product into the international market so as to help farm prices here at home; and then in the Food and Drug Administration, some additional assistance there, but certainly not what the agency was looking for.

I wanted to spend my final few minutes here talking about the emergency funding provisions in more detail, because this is so important across the country. For crop losses due to disasters, during the 2000 crop year, including those losses due to quality losses, we have funded what is necessary. We estimate across America that will require over \$1.6 billion in funding.

There is funding in this bill for dairy producers to compensate for their low prices. There is livestock assistance. We had many questions on that from people representing ranching communities. Also there is targeted assistance for our apple and potato producers, cranberry producers, honey producers as well as wool and mohair. There is no reason just because you are not a row crop producer that you should not have some type of assistance if you are going to lose your operations.

There is authority in this bill to enroll an additional 100,000 acres in the Wetlands Reserve Program, and \$35 million for the Natural Resource and Conservation Service for technical assistance in relation to that program, as well as the Conservation Reserve Program.

There is an additional \$20 million in this program for cooperative development, for new co-ops to help farmers and ranchers reposition to meet the market in this very difficult period for them. Also there are additional funds for water and sewer across our country. We just cannot meet the entire need; the line of applicants is much longer than we are able to accommodate. We have done the very best we could in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would just ask the Members, in spite of the loopholes—and they are significant in the prescription drug provision and the sanctions portions of the bill—to vote for this bill. Overall the other provisions require our support.

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

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for her kind remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT).

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I also want to commend the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies, and join with the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) in her praise for the chairman's activity on this subcommittee.

He has been a great chairman and a great friend and has really worked hard to balance the interests and needs of all the Members. I rise in support of

this conference report, because it may be that this subcommittee has produced maybe one of the most valuable appropriations bills that would come before the House of Representatives, because it meets the needs of human beings, their hunger needs, their food needs, and their medicine needs.

It all comes under the jurisdiction of this subcommittee. I especially appreciate that this is a further implementation of the Freedom to Farm Act that we passed back in 1996, which the President signed, and all of the Members of the House and Senate who cared deeply about agriculture have needed to have this next step taken in the area of lifting sanctions on food and medicine.

In that respect, I have been proud to work with the chairman and some of my colleagues on the subcommittee on both sides of the aisle, most importantly, the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON), certainly the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. DICKEY), the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM), the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA), and on the other side of the aisle, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. OBEY), and the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO). We have all worked hard.

We do not have a product that satisfies each of us and all of us, but it is a great step forward as we lift sanctions on food and medicine and establish a new policy for our country as it relates to the imposition of sanctions unilaterally.

The President in the future, assuming he signs this bill, and I hope that he will, will have the Congress as a partner in decisions that are made about whether or not to impose sanctions on food and medicine unilaterally by our country.

Helping in this effort have been other Members of the House of Representatives on both sides of the aisle. The gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) has been a great supporter; the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN); the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) has been a leader in this effort.

Mr. Speaker, I just want my colleagues to know that this is a new day for trade sanctions. It is a new day for agriculture and trade policy that says food and medicine should not be used as weapons of foreign policy. This is workable, notwithstanding the people who might say nay about it. This is going to work to benefit American agriculture. It is going to work for Iran, Libya, Sudan, North Korea, and Cuba.

I certainly respect my friends on the other side of this issue relating to Cuba, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN). They

are very patriotic, good Americans who care deeply about the current sanctions policy in our country.

I happen to disagree with their policy position; but they fervently believe in it, and I respect that. We have tried to craft a measure that would work for their needs and their particular positions and policy decisions and those of us who care about the free trade side of American agriculture. Mostly, I would say to my colleagues that I have had a great staff that has helped get through this process, Rob Neal and Jack Silzel, and as imperfect as the legislative process might be, this is a good package. I hope it passes this House.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), the very distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. Kaptur) for yielding the time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report. I want to begin by complimenting the work of the gentleman from New Mexico (Chairman SKEEN) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the ranking minority member, as well as the full committee chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking minority member. They have done a tremendous job. In addition to facing the obstacle of unrealistic budget restraints, they have once again had to struggle against a leadership that is bent on subverting the expressed will of this House.

It is my fond hope that some day soon we will have an honest conference on an agricultural bill with input from the administration and from this side of the aisle in a true bipartisan result, but not today.

As a direct result of the leadership's involvement, we have lost key opportunities to move our country forward in both its trade relations and with regard to the availability of affordable prescription drugs.

Mr. Speaker, the agriculture embargo on U.S. sales to Cuba has done little to change the behavior of this island nation. In fact, U.S. sanctions have given Cuba an excuse for the failed policies of a communist regime. With complete normalization of trade relations, Cuba could become a \$1 billion market for U.S. agriculture producers within 5 years, making it our second largest market in Latin America after Mexico.

On July 20 of this year, the House by a vote of 301-116 overwhelmingly expressed its will to end our unilateral trade embargo, and yet the provision inserted by the House leadership includes a travel ban and restrictions on finance that will continue to undercut the ability of U.S. farmers and ranchers to take full advantage of Cuba's market potential.

The compromise in this bill gets us 5 percent of where we need to be. Mr.

Speaker, I am also concerned about the implications of the provision included in the conference report regarding trade sanctions. While I am sympathetic to the goal of this provision, it should have been withheld until we had a thorough analysis of all of its trade effects and, particularly, its effect on agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, despite these inadequacies, this conference report includes many good and important provisions, including funding, conservation, research, rural development. It provides much-needed assistance to agriculture producers affected by natural disasters. It addresses the drinking water emergencies in rural areas brought about by drought, and it will enact portions of the Hunger Relief Act that will be crucial to ensuring that our neediest citizens are adequately nourished.

Mr. Speaker, I support the conference report; and I thank my friend, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that this conference report includes two important provisions from the bipartisan Hunger Relief Act, of which I am a proud co-sponsor. One of these would increase and then index the cap on the excess shelter deduction. This arbitrary cap can result in families with children having money they spend on their rent, mortgage, and utilities being counted as if it was available to buy food. I hope that in reauthorization, we can eliminate this cap altogether so that families with children are treated in the same manner as elderly and disabled households are now.

The other provision would give states broad flexibility to increase or eliminate limits on the value of vehicles they may own and still receive food stamps. For many low-income families, having a dependable car is essential to their ability to find and keep employment. Denying food assistance to a household based on the value of a vehicle makes no sense: if the household sold the vehicle, it would become eligible for food stamps but then would have a much harder time becoming more self-sufficient. This provision allows states to adopt rules from any program that receives TANF or TANF maintenance of effort funds as long as that program provides benefits that could meet the definition of "assistance" in the TANF rules. This could include, for example, any child care program since child care can count as assistance under certain circumstances. States would not be required to determine whether any particular individual received assistance from the TANF- or MOE-funded program since that would impose administrative burdens and whatever standards the state adopted would apply statewide. Where a household has more than one vehicle, a state electing the option would evaluate each under whichever rules would result in the lower attribution of resources, whether the regular food stamp rules or the rules borrowed from the other state program. Of course, if the state TANF- or MOE-funded program excluded cars completely, or did not apply resources rules, those rules would prevail.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH).

1545

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), chairman of the subcommittee, for the excellent work that he did in working through these very difficult issues.

It has been said that politics is the art of the possible. What we accomplished on this bill, especially as it relates to our trade policies, is exactly what is possible, no more, no less. But what we have done, Mr. Speaker, is we made a historic change in our foreign policy.

Hopefully never again will the United States use food and drug as a weapon. Our farmers need all the markets that they can get. We should never be putting ourselves in a position where we are cutting off markets, because American farmers are the best in the world, the most productive in the world, and we need to help them to get to the markets.

The issue of reimportation of drugs, there has been an awful lot of demagoguery about this on the other side. The fact of the matter is we address it. For the first time, it is being addressed. I suppose if we had not addressed it, we would have heard about that, too.

We have improved on the food stamps regulations for poor Americans. Welfare reform did more for this country and its people than maybe any other reform that has been passed in the last 25 years. More Americans are productive. Fewer kids are in poverty. More Americans are healthy because of that reform. But we had some minor changes to make in the Hunger Relief Act, that will help States to address the issues of moving people from welfare to work.

Disaster relief, disaster assistance for farmers, apple farmers, dairy farmers, crop farmers, I think the Congress did a good job in a bipartisan way of addressing disaster relief issues.

We have made major strides in improving the environment through the Agriculture bill, primarily in the CRP program and also in agriculture research. This is a broad bill, it is an expansive bill, it is an important bill, and we need not focus on the warts and the scabs within the overall legislation. We need to focus on what is good about this bill and the commitment that we have made to the American farmer.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), a Member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I regretfully have to rise in opposition to the conference report, with great respect to the gentleman from New Mexico (Chairman SKEEN) and the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the ranking member of the subcommittee, who I know have done their best to put together an attractive proposal. But I believe we pay too high a price in this legislation.

Several months ago, the House passed the Sanford amendment to the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill by a vote of 232 to 186, prohibiting the use of any funds to enforce the travel restrictions on Cuba, now we see, as the price paid to allow our farmers to export the codification of restrictions which work against the very goals that the proponents of those restrictions constantly proclaim they want.

The whole history of the downfall of tyranny comes from contact with people from democracies, with human rights crusaders, with people who want to establish people-to-people programs. Instead of allowing the flexibility to move ahead and advance these kinds of programs and other kinds of useful contacts, we codify a policy that, for 40 years, has failed to achieve its primary goal.

That is a terrible mistake. It is a violation of the civil liberties of the Americans and Americans right to travel. It undermines the very goal we seek in our Cuba policy. For the life of me, I would love to hear the explanation which prohibits export financing to Cuba but gives waiver authority and discretion to the executive branch when we talk about export financing of our exports to both Libya and to Iran.

Mr. Speaker, I would love to hear the gentleman from Washington or someone else defend that distinction.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. DICKEY).

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in favor of this bill from several different standpoints: the standpoint of what the Nation is benefiting and how my State of Arkansas is benefiting.

First of all, we have the importation of drugs that is going to be a significant event in our Nation's battle against high drug prices. We have got in this bill a \$3 million appropriation that will help in the construction for the National Center of Toxicological Research in my district that will handle the imports and examinations. The FDA will be in charge of this, and they will handle the inspections on the drugs as well as inspections on all other imports. It is a very significant thing, and that bill is coming along and is going to be in place soon.

There is some education initiatives concerning timber. In our Forest Service areas, we have a serious problem of how to manage that. We will have a study of that in our University of Arkansas at Monticello.

We also have a seven-State program called Delta Teachers Academy that will have a learning center in the UAPB campus in Pine Bluff, Arkansas that will teach teachers how to teach. It will help them in doing that in the Delta.

We have net catfish initiatives. The National Aquaculture Research Center in Stuttgart, which is not in my district, but serves the Nation in studying catfish yields, improving yields, food

quality, disease control and stress tolerance. We also have a specific appropriation for an Aquaculture/Fisheries Center at UAPB, again, in Pine Bluff, Arkansas that concerns itself with the control of the commorants as they are attacking the fish industry.

We have several different provisions also that will help catfish farmers in that the Secretary of Agriculture is prohibited from denying loans for catfish farmers in Arkansas for being in the floodplain.

All of these things plus others are the reasons why I am for this bill.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON), a member of the Agriculture authorizing committee.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, like many conference agreements, this one has a provision that I am pleased with, and it has provisions that are not in it that I am not pleased with.

Nonetheless, I intend to vote for the conference report because it has many national priorities and local priorities that are important to the Nation's constituents and my constituents.

Among the provisions that are in this agreement is funding for modular housing for elderly North Carolinians who are flood victims, funding for a critically needed drainage project in flood-ravaged Princeville, North Carolina, and funding for the innovative agrimedecine project designed to combat farm injuries and illness in East Carolina University.

I am pleased to say that this agreement also includes very important language to combat hunger. Important food stamp modifications are made on the shelter cap and to the automobile cap.

While the WIC program did not receive all the funding it should have or that was requested, nevertheless, \$4.1 billion is vitally needed and certainly will be used in this highly successful program.

This agreement includes significant funding for the emergency disaster relief for farmers, for crop losses, restoration projects. The agreement continues funding for agricultural research, education extension, service activity.

I am, however, disappointed that the agreement only includes \$3 million of the \$6.8 million approved by the House funding going for research to the Historically Black Colleges and Universities. Nonetheless, this agreement does offer some limited hope through this limited increase. Hopefully, we would do better the next time.

The overall agreement is comprehensive and does include important national priorities that deserve our support, and I urge its passage.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA).

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this agriculture appropriations bill. I think we all have to be reminded constantly that this is a bill that helps agriculture first and foremost.

But before I mention a couple of specifics, Mr. Speaker, I think for the record this Member at least has considered it a tremendous honor to work under the leadership of the gentleman from New Mexico (Chairman SKEEN) in this process. He is a person who sets the highest standard of integrity and brings to work every day the highest commitment. The character and the determination that he brings every day to work for the betterment of agriculture in America is something that I will always, always remember.

He is not going anywhere. But I think I speak for many of us on the subcommittee who just cherished the time that we have had working under his leadership on this subcommittee.

I want to specifically mention that this bill, again, does deal with a lot of important aspects of agriculture assistance and relief, drought, other natural disasters. Commodity prices over the years have dealt a bad hand to many of our producers in this country. There is a lot of assistance in this bill for that; \$3.5 billion in economic assistance that does not need to be held up in Washington any longer.

I know that there are Members who do not like that certain commodities have received assistance in this bill as well. We have attempted to do the right thing and address all commodities that have suffered. We should not sit here and pick and choose who we help and who we do not based on whether or not we like what we grow or the farm programs that they operate under. They did not set the programs. Congress did. Now we must help all areas of rural communities survive in this very difficult time.

The bill also goes the extra mile to support farmers and ranchers. Agriculture credit programs are increased by \$14 million over fiscal year 2000, and agriculture research has increased by \$86 million. The boll weevil eradication program is funded at \$79 million. These are just a few examples of how this bill will help our farmers and ranchers and all of us who have large rural agriculture communities.

The word ought to get out that there is a true commitment in a bipartisan way to help these folks who were really the salt of the Earth, the producers of this country who were trying to compete in international markets with other countries sometimes that subsidize their producers in unfair ways.

There is a tremendous commitment by many of us, again, in a bipartisan way to do what is right in this Agriculture appropriations bill. I stand in strong support and would urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL),

the incredibly hard working ranking member of the Committee on Commerce.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for her kindness, amongst many others, to me.

Mr. Speaker, an otherwise acceptable bill has been very much hurt in the conference report by the drug reimportation provisions. In a word, they protect users of reimported pharmaceuticals very poorly if at all. They put them at severe risk and hazard.

So I am going to tell my colleagues some of the things that are going to happen as a result of these provisions so poorly studied by the Congress and so ill attended to in committee.

Soon, Americans will be taking substandard, adulterated or counterfeited imported drugs because of these provisions. These provisions will do nothing to help lower the price of prescription medicines and are no substitute for prescription pharmaceuticals to senior citizens under Medicare.

Because FDA is already overwhelmed with inspecting foreign manufacturers, it will not be able to handle the vast new responsibilities being imposed upon it, and consumers will suffer and be at risk.

In the coming years, FDA is going to be pilloried by politicians for failing to protect Americans from bad prescription drugs which are reimported under these provisions, when in fact the blame should fall squarely upon the politicians in the 106th Congress.

Make no mistake. This reckless legislation never went through the committees with expertise or experience in these matters. It is going to lead to needless injuries and deaths.

The world pharmaceutical market is a dangerous place, far more so than my colleagues understand. Congressional investigations showed this in the 1980s, and I know because I conducted those investigations. They will show it now. My written statement will elaborate on this point.

My opposition to the drug reimportation provisions requires me to vote against an otherwise acceptable bill.

I would note the American people want a decent prescription, not a placebo, and they want one that is safe and one which will help their health. This particular proposal will not. It puts Americans at risk. I warn my colleagues what they are doing. I hope they will listen.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I do want to associate myself with his remarks. This is far more complicated than most people believe, as the gentleman from Michigan said. I am very familiar with his historical involvement in this area.

All of us want to relieve this problem, but I want to underscore the comments the gentleman from Michigan made, and I do want to associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California. I hope my colleagues will listen to what the gentleman just said because we are putting the Nation and the senior citizens and others at risk. Reimporting drugs is a dangerous and risky prospect. Doing so without adequate protections and controls for the protection of consumers is a still greater risk. I ask my colleagues to listen to what I say. There is danger here they are not observing.

Mr. Speaker, I must oppose this bill. Although there are many very good provisions addressing major agricultural needs, there is also a very dangerous provision that would allow for the reimportation of prescription drugs from foreign sources. That is something I cannot support.

During the 1980's, the House Energy and Commerce Committee conducted a lengthy investigation into the foreign drug market that ultimately led to enactment of the Prescription Drug Marketing Act (PDMA). That investigation discovered a potentially dangerous diversion market that prevented effective control over the true sources of drug products in a significant number of cases. The distribution system was vulnerable to the introduction and eventual retail sale of substandard, ineffective, or even counterfeit pharmaceuticals. As the resulting Committee report stated, "pharmaceuticals which have been mislabeled, misbranded, improperly stored or shipped, have exceeded their expiration dates, or are bald counterfeits are injected into the national distribution system for ultimate sale to consumers."

The PDMA was designed to restore needed integrity and control over the pharmaceutical market, eliminating actual and potential health and safety problems before injury to the consumer could occur. Again, the Committee report was clear on why the PDMA was needed:

[R]eimported pharmaceuticals threaten the public health in two ways. First, foreign counterfeits, falsely described as reimported U.S. produced drugs, have entered the distribution system. Second, proper storage and handling of legitimate pharmaceuticals cannot be guaranteed by U.S. law once the drugs have left the boundaries of the United States.

I find nothing today that suggests that the problem with misbranded, adulterated, or even counterfeit foreign drugs has been solved, and if anything, the problem may be getting worse. I am thus concerned that in our haste to find a way to bring cheaper drugs to seniors and other needy Americans—a clearly important and laudable goal—we risk making changes to key health and safety laws we may later regret.

On October 3, 2000, the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing that underscored that the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is already overwhelmed and underfunded, and thus unable to consistently undertake the many tasks now required to protect the U.S. drug supply. At that hearing, FDA Commissioner Jane Henney testified that FDA has insufficient post-market surveillance resources to keep pace with its current

mandate. Consequently, the agency is lagging in conducting inspections of firms that ship drug products to the U.S., and this burden is only going to worsen in the future.

The legislation in question today only exacerbates this already-serious problem. As envisioned by this proposal, FDA will newly be responsible for inspecting the entire custody chain between all parties and processes involved in the shipment of drugs back to the U.S. market. This could include repackaging and relabeling facilities, as well as the many storage firms that might be used in this process. This proposal would also ultimately require FDA to oversee the formation of new testing facilities, and develop regulations to address numerous safety concerns ignored by this proposal. In short, the reimport legislation will inundate an already overburdened FDA with new responsibilities. Worse, it will do so without any assurances that the agency will ever see the approximately \$92 million it claims it needs to fully implement this plan. Instead, the bill only gives \$23 million for a single year, or one-fourth of what the plan will ultimately require. Given the fact that the agency is already significantly underfunded, I see almost no chance it will see this money.

But even if Congress were to provide the additional resources, I remain skeptical that FDA could even construct a global regulatory framework as safe as what is now in place. FDA was unsuccessful in preventing counterfeit and substandard drugs from entering the U.S. before the Prescription Drug Marketing Act (PDMA) went into effect, and so I doubt it will be successful once many of its protections are undermined by this legislation.

Moreover, it is particularly troubling that drug prices may not even be significantly lowered as a result of this proposal. There is nothing that guarantees that in this process of undermining our current regulatory system, lower priced drugs will become available to needy Americans. Wholesalers may not pass on any accrued savings to the public, nor is it clear that they will necessarily be able to access a steady supply for resale. In fact, this bill is riddled with numerous loopholes that will allow manufacturers to label or produce their products in a form that makes them either impossible or cost-prohibitive to reimport. The notion that this bill will create an abundance of cheap, properly labeled, and properly repackaged drugs, easily available to reimporters, is simply false.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this bill makes long-term changes to the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, without the benefit of even a single legislative hearing. During the 1980's, the Energy and Commerce Committee conducted a lengthy multi-year investigation resulting in numerous hearings before any related legislation was drafted. There have been no public hearings regarding this legislation, as most of this process has involved closed-door proceedings. With the many implications this legislation will have on public health and safety, this process has ill-served the public and is indefensible.

In conclusion, this provision represents the flawed implementation of a risky concept. Many of the Members supporting this legislation believe they are doing the right thing by helping Americans get access to cheaper medicine, and assume that medicine will, in fact, be safe. I agree that medicine needs to be cheaper, but disagree that reimported med-

icine will be as safe. We know too much about the kinds of drug manufacturing and distribution shenanigans that take place in other parts of the world to allow our system to be jeopardized by the legislation contained in this spending bill. It is flawed legislation that will, if passed in its present form, result in significant harm to the very persons we are trying to help. Thus, I cannot support this bill.

1600

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM).

Mr. LATHAM. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I just want to publicly say how much I appreciate the great work of our chairman. This will be his last bill as chairman of the subcommittee. It has been just an absolute pleasure and an honor to work with the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN).

I know the gentleman is staying here next year and everything; but because of the rules, he will no longer be chairman of this subcommittee; and I just want to tell him on a personal level how much I appreciate all his hard work and what a great job he has done for New Mexico and for the rest of the country.

And to the ranking member, Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), it is a real pleasure and it is fun to work with her with the interest we all have in agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, this, I think, is an excellent appropriations bill. We have been through a very long process throughout the entire year with hearings, listening to the concerns of the people and the agencies, their proposals, expressing concerns at the way management in some of the agencies has taken place and trying to do the best job possible in this bill to address those concerns. The one major concern we have, as far as delivering services in Iowa, and I think throughout the country, is with the FSA offices. This bill increases funding for those people who are at the ground level doing the work out there, actually in contact with the farmers themselves; and these people are working their hearts out in the countryside.

There is increased funding in the bill to the tune of \$34 million in addition to the \$50 million additional to take care of the emergency disaster programs that are also stated in this bill. Mr. Speaker, there is an increase as far as our credit programs so that we can continue to use that tool for exports and to make sure that we do try and have opportunities for our farmers to sell their products overseas.

Conservation is a huge issue as far as we are concerned in Iowa and throughout the country, and those activities are increased by \$53 million in the bill. Food safety is increased by \$47.5 million. Funding for the Food and Drug Administration is almost \$35 million more than what it was last year, and \$89 million basically, with some savings with the President.

We are continuing our commitment as far as food and nutrition for our peo-

ple here, increasing funding for WIC. A very, very important issue for Iowa is the lifting of sanctions in the bill with Cuba, Iran, Libya, North Korea, and the Sudan. With the Cuban issue, it is a major breakthrough for us to finally have that door at least cracked open so that we have an opportunity to sell into that market, and to also look to these other new markets that we have and be able to use credit here in the U.S. to go into highly populated countries, like North Korea, Iran, and these other countries that offer so much potential for us.

I am not totally comfortable with all the provisions in here. I would like to see opening of travel and things like that, but we at least have a breakthrough as far as this issue is concerned. I think we can advance the idea that through openness, through trade, we can change countries and have them come into the democracy, which we all very, very much want.

Again, I congratulate the chairman and the ranking member.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire as to the remaining time on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUSSLE). The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) has 13 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) has 10 minutes remaining.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), the very able member of the Committee on International Relations.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 4461 in its current form, but in strong support of ending the embargo on the sale of food and medicine to Cuba. Our current policy toward Cuba was created in the early 1960s, at the height of the Cold War. The Berlin Wall has now crumbled, the Soviet Union has vanished, but this archaic policy is still here.

For 40 years, 40 years, we have maintained a blockade on trade and food and medicine with Cuba, and we have put severe restrictions on travel by American citizens. We must lift that blockade without imposing new barriers. However, this bill codifies current restrictions on Americans travel to Cuba. What, I must ask, is our country afraid of? How can it be against our interests for our citizens, our most effective ambassadors, to travel to Cuba?

How can we live in the greatest democracy in the world and restrict the travel of our own citizens? Americans should have the right to see Cuba for themselves. They should have the right to form their own judgments about this Afro-Hispanic island 90 miles away from our shores.

I have led and participated in many delegations to Cuba in an effort to promote education, understanding and cultural exchange between our countries. I have seen a child with kidney

disease in grave danger because the embargo prevented the importation of a U.S.-made part for a dialysis machine at this hospital. And I have seen Cuba's health care system, which guarantees its own citizens universal health care, which we still cannot figure out how to do.

We should allow anyone and everyone who wants to travel to Cuba to do so without fear of breaking the law and going to jail. I urge my colleagues to oppose restrictions on travel to Cuba in this bill and vote "no" on H.R. 4461.

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

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to say that I rise in support of this legislation, and I want to thank the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) for the tremendous leadership he has given all of us over the last several years, fighting hard for our producers, helping us deliver emergency and disaster aid. I do not know anyone who has worked as forthrightly and on a consensus basis as the gentleman from New Mexico has, and I want to thank him. We will miss him tremendously as our leader next year, but I do thank him.

I also want to thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for the excellent work she does and for her dedication to supporting American agriculture as well.

I want to say that this is a great bill. I wish in a couple of instances we could have done more, particularly on the issue of agriculture embargoes, which the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) has championed so well. But even though it does not go quite as far with regard to Cuba, let us not forget that we are also dealing with four other countries against whom we have had sanctions on food and medicine, and this represents a \$6 billion market potential for our producers.

We are all so caught up in the emotion of Cuba that we forget, quite frankly, that it is the other countries that present the biggest opportunity for our producers, and I did not want to let that go without mentioning it.

I also am very pleased that we have included in the emergency assistance package a piece that is very similar to the stand-alone legislation that the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) and I introduced, doubling the loan deficiency payment, particularly when our farmers and ranchers are in such dire straits for the third year in a row.

But let me end by addressing the entire issue of reimportation once again, and say that all of the loopholes that have been recognized on the part of my colleagues on the other side are loopholes that really will not exist if in fact we are determined to work closely with the Food and Drug Administration to make this legislation work.

Number one, dealing with the issue of labeling. Let me reiterate again that the President said he liked the language in the Jeffords bill that passed

the Senate. This is the exact language on labeling which is in the Jeffords bill. The President urged the Senate to send him the legislation so he could sign it, as long as the appropriate money was there to implement it. We have, in fact, included \$23 million that the FDA requested for this year to do just that.

On the issue of contracts. Let me say once again that while we have not included the exact language that the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) wanted, we have in fact included language that does prevent a manufacturer from limiting or entering into any kind of contractor or agreement that prevents the sale or distribution of covered products for reimportation purposes.

So all in all I think this is an excellent bill and I urge a "yes" vote, and I again thank the chairman for the great job that he has done.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume in order to place in the RECORD language from the New York Times this morning refuting what my very dear colleague, the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON), has indicated.

It says Dr. Jane Henney, the Commissioner of Food and Drug, said, "Nothing in the bill requires a manufacturer to give the approved label to an importer or to allow use of the label by an importer, which means that it is not enforceable."

And then today we receive from the Office of the President, the Office of Management and Budget, the following. And I enter the direct language in the RECORD because in the future we will have to repair the damage that is going to be done when this bill is passed today. It says, "The administration is disappointed that the prescription drug reimportation provision in this bill will fail to achieve its goal of providing needed relief from the high costs of prescription drugs. The majority leadership chose to end bipartisan negotiations and, instead, produced a provision in the conference report that leaves numerous loopholes that will render this provision meaningless. Specifically, it allows drug manufacturers to deny importers access to FDA-approved labeling required for reimportation so that any and all drug companies could, and probably would, block reimportation of their medications. Second, a sunset was added that ends the importation system 5 years after it goes into effect. This will limit private and public sector interest in investing in this system."

And I would just depart from that to say to my colleague that sunset was not in the Jeffords bill, as the gentlewoman indicated earlier today.

And, finally, third, this letter says, "The conference language permits the drug industry to use contracts or agreements to provide financial disincentives for foreign distributors to reimport to U.S. importers. It is wrong that U.S. citizens pay the highest

prices in the world for medications, leaving many with no option than to go abroad to obtain affordable prescription drugs. But it is also wrong to provide false hope that this provision will work to address the problem. Moreover, Congress has thus far failed to pass a meaningful Medicare prescription drug benefit that will not only provide price discounts but will ensure seniors and people with disabilities against the catastrophic costs of medications."

That is a direct quote from the Executive Office of the President. And, Mr. Speaker, the full content of the statement is as follows:

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY  
(This statement has been coordinated by  
OMB with the concerned agencies.)

H.R. 4461—AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT,  
FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RE-  
LATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL FY  
2001

(Sponsors: Skeen (R), New Mexico; Cochran  
(R) Mississippi)

This Statement of Administration Policy provides the Administration's views on the conference version of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2001.

The conference report includes support for a number of important priorities for the Nation. In particular, the bill includes full funding for the President's Food Safety Initiative, significant increases in rural development programs to help rural communities and residents take part in the national economic expansion, provisions that will enable food stamp recipients to own dependable cars and have better shelter without losing their eligibility, and relief to farmers and ranchers who suffered losses from natural disasters. While the Administration continues to support a range of conservation efforts, such as the Farmland Protection Wetlands Reserve, and Environmental Quality Incentives Programs, and is disappointed that this bill did not provide full funding for these efforts, we do appreciate the increases that were provided including funds for conservation technical assistance. However, while the Administration supports this conference report, it has concerns with several provisions in the bill.

The Administration is disappointed that the prescription drug reimportation provision in this bill will fail to achieve its goal of providing needed relief from the high costs of prescription drugs. The majority leadership chose to end bipartisan negotiations and instead produced a provision in the conference report that leaves numerous loopholes that will render this provision meaningless. Specifically, it allows drug manufacturers to deny importers access to the Food and Drug Administration (FDA)-approved labeling required for reimportation so that any and all drug companies could—and probably would—block reimportation of their medications. Second, a "sunset" was added that ends the importation system five years after it goes into effect. This will limit private and public sector interest in investing in this system. Third, the conference language permits the drug industry to use contracts or agreements to provide financial disincentives for foreign distributors to reimport to U.S. importers. Finally, despite the Administration's repeated requests, the conference requires FDA to pay for the costs associated with this provision from within resources needed to perform its other important public



health activities. It is wrong that U.S. citizens pay the highest prices in the world for medications, leaving many with no other option than to go abroad to obtain affordable prescription drugs. But it is also wrong to provide false hope that this provision will work to address this problem. Moreover, Congress has thus far failed to pass a meaningful Medicare prescription drug benefit that will not only provide price discounts but will insure seniors and people with disabilities against the catastrophic costs of medications.

On the "Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000," which is included in the conference report, there are two major concerns to the Administration. First, the restrictions on the ability of the President to initiate new sanctions and maintain old ones are overly stringent. This effectively disarms the President's ability to conduct foreign policy while providing potential targets of U.S. actions with the time to take countermeasures. Second, the provisions of the bill affecting travel to Cuba would significantly set back our people-to-people exchanges that are in the interest of opening up Cuban society. They also would preclude travel by technicians and others needed to conduct normal business by the U.S. Interests Section in Havana, as well as travel for humanitarian purposes.

With respect to the provision, "Continued Dumping and Subsidy Offset Act of 2000," the Administration agrees with the findings that state that unfair trade laws have as their purpose the restoration of conditions of fair trade. However, that is the purpose of the anti-dumping and counter-vailing duties themselves, which accomplish that purpose. By raising the price of imports they shield domestic producers from import competition and allow domestic manufacturers to raise prices, increase production, and improve revenues. Consequently, distribution of the tariffs themselves to producers is not necessary to the restoration of conditions of fair trade. In addition, there are significant concerns regarding administrative feasibility and consistency with our trade policy objectives, including the potential for trading partners to adopt similar mechanisms. Such concerns were raised and examined with regard to a similar proposal considered during passage of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act. That proposal was ultimately rejected.

In addition, the Administration believes the provision removing the authority of USDA's Undersecretary for Natural Resources and the Environment has no justification, will interfere with the agency's ability to manage itself effectively, and sets a highly undesirable precedent.

The Administration is also disappointed that the bill prohibits the Secretary of Agriculture from designating any part of a USDA research lab in Ft. Reno, Oklahoma, as surplus land, thereby preventing any consideration of returning land to the Cheyenne-Arapaho tribe. The Secretary should retain his authority to effectively manage USDA property and consider its alternative uses.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, who is so very passionate and committed and intelligent.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this conference report because it includes language that is against the will of this body.

Mr. Speaker, there is a United States embargo against Cuba. The blockade

serves no real purpose but to satisfy the Florida anti-Fidel Castro Cubans who wish to direct the will of this House.

The people of Cuba need food and medicine. The children are in desperate need of these supplies that we could easily sell to Cuba.

1615

The United States Chamber of Commerce has been to Cuba, the Farm Bureau has been to Cuba, and many members of the agriculture caucus of this body have been down to Cuba, and they are all desirous of lifting this embargo, at least to be able to sell food and medicine.

However, some Members of this House are captives of those Cubans in Florida who have not only tried everything that they can to keep this embargo intact but they have also influenced certain Members of this body to get involved with placing further travel restrictions in this bill.

We have done very well with travel to Cuba. Many Americans go there. We have academic exchange. We have cultural exchange. And it is working very well.

If people are desirous of seeing Cuba, the Cuba that they think it should be, it is only because there is people-to-people contact. But having codified these travel restrictions, we have now placed this in jeopardy.

Well, this meager, little attempt to sell to Cuba without having any financial infrastructure to do so, no credit from the United States financial institutions or government, is not going to work. We are undermining the very efforts of those who would like to sell agricultural products and food and medicine to Cuba.

I would ask for a no vote. This is a wrong-headed policy.

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

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to address the issue that the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) spoke about and say I brought this up earlier.

Yesterday the Supreme Court refused to grant certiorari to Smith Kline Beecham on an appeal because they were concerned that FDA was allowing a generic drug company to copy their labels. The Supreme Court would not take the issue.

Basically, I will read the judge's ruling. It says, "We hold that Hatch-Waxman amendments to the existing Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act require generic drug sellers to use labeling that may infringe the copyright in the label of the pioneer drug. We further hold that, as a result, copyright liability cannot attach to Watson's use of Smith Kline's label."

Therefore, allowing the copying of the label. And in the language that we have in the legislation, there is broad enough language giving the Secretary and the FDA the discretion to require this.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. EMERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to some of this debate today about importation and reimportation. I would like to talk for a minute about how I got involved in this debate. It was because our own Food and Drug Administration has been and even to this day is sending out threatening letters to senior citizens who try to save a few bucks on prescription drugs. That is how I got into this debate.

Now, some people are saying, well, it does not go far enough; and some people are saying it goes too far. I am reminded of what Winston Churchill said the day after the invasion at Normandy. He said, "This is not the end. This is not even the beginning of the end. This is simply the end of the beginning."

This debate on opening up the market and creating more competition for prescription drugs is not over. This is the beginning.

But, at least, for the first time in 8 years, the Congress is sending a clear message that the threatening letters to seniors for trying to save a few bucks on prescription drugs is going to end. And if it does not end, by the grace of the voters in my district, I will be back and I will be working with people from all sides of the aisle.

I do not like some of the restrictions that were put on in the conference committee. But I know this, we have made more progress in the last 3 weeks on this issue than this administration has made in 8 years. And I think it is good progress, and I think we are going to see prescription drug prices coming down.

Let me just show my colleagues this chart again. Look at what people pay in the United States compared to the rest of the world.

Why are we sending threatening letters to seniors?

This bill may not be perfect, but it is a giant step in the right direction. I congratulate the gentlewoman from Missouri and those of my colleagues who had the courage to stand by and fight for this issue because I think, in the years to come, we are going to see prescription drug prices in the United States come down dramatically.

I would hope we will do this on a bipartisan basis. I do not think saving money for seniors is a partisan issue.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the very distinguished gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACCI).

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

First of all, let me just say there is a lot of good things in this bill for agriculture. I commend the gentleman from New Mexico (Chairman SKEEN) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for their hard work in the committee.



Second of all, I would like to say that the reimportation issue that we have worked on is not a long-term solution to the problem but it certainly moves forward. It is not perfect but it certainly is going to enhance the ability of Americans and Mainers to be accessing low-cost, affordable prescription medicine.

Now, maybe there is a better way to do it. Maybe there is an easier way to do it. And that probably is by being able to amend Medicare to be able to have this part of the program universally offered. But that is not the issue we have before us. Our seniors need relief.

I want to commend the gentlewoman for working together on this issue, recognizing that there have been differences and it is not a perfect piece of legislation. But I do think it is going to go a long way. We have 325,000 seniors in Maine that do not have access to low-cost, affordable prescription medicine or insurance. This will afford the State an opportunity to negotiate to be able to have access to this pricing so we can do better for its seniors, and that is something that we should be supporting.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds only to say that the reason, I say to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) that we do not have prescription drug legislation is because this Congress did not pass it. And this is our only chance, and, unfortunately, a flawed bill is being presented as the only option that a few people here negotiated on their own, not in a bipartisan way.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE).

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for this bill. But I think before we be too self-congratulatory, we should be modest, particularly in regards to the provisions on the Cuba agricultural trade issue and on the reimportation issue. There are many areas in both of those provisions that we should strengthen. And we will be back next year I predict and we are going to strengthen those.

I consider this a small step forward on both of those. And so, I am going to vote for the bill. But just one of the provisions on the reimportation says that first an importer must get the drug tested and then get the manufacturer to supply the paperwork to the pharmacist.

What will happen then? The manufacturers will know every pharmacist that is reimporting drugs. Maybe the next time that pharmacist needs to have a drug from that pharmaceutical company they will find that the pharmaceutical company does not have enough drugs to provide them.

These are the types of things that we should have debated more fully and had some amendments on. But I do think the bill should move forward and I will vote for it, and I encourage a yes vote from all of our colleagues.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) a very outspoken Member and a very able Member.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, first let me thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for her persistence and consistent work dealing with agriculture in the United States. And I thank the chairman of the committee.

I am from Texas. And there is a lot of agricultural business and work in Texas. There are also a lot of issues dealing with the needs of hungry people in the agriculture bill.

But it disturbs me greatly and I have expressed my consternation and opposition in voting against the previous question how we would ignore the thousands of seniors in my congressional district who are already aware that they cannot finance food and rent and prescription drugs, and then to ignore a bipartisan effort on the question of drug reimportation seems to be the height of hypocrisy.

This bill claims to have a drug reimportation provision, but it allows drug companies and their intermediaries to price discriminate against U.S. pharmacies and importers. It sunsets the legislation so we cannot even put in a reasonable infrastructure to encourage our pharmaceuticals and others to engage in this program. It allows drug manufacturers to block the importation of drugs through labeling because it does not allow the use of FDA-approved labeling. And we have gotten our consumers very label conscious.

And so, this is a death knell for the legislation. And it does not guarantee American consumers access to the best world market price because it restricts the countries eligible for importation even though the FDA agrees that safety standards for imported drugs are high enough to allow access to the entire world market.

Our neighbor in Texas, of which many of my constituents go to, Mexico, has been excluded, one of the largest countries in the southern hemisphere where thousands of seniors are already busying themselves to get cheaper drugs.

This is a poor statement on a crisis in America. It is a tragedy that we be so hypocritical. I am sorry we have used the agricultural vehicle for such a legislative initiative. I hope, Mr. Speaker, we can fix this problem.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer mixed sentiments regarding the consideration of the conference report for our Nation's Agriculture appropriations. First and foremost this legislative effort represents our plans for our Nation's food source for the next year, but this bill is much more because it touches prescription drug reimportation into the United States.

The measure appropriates \$78.5 billion—\$3.0 billion (4 percent more than the House bill, 4 percent more than the Senate measure and 2 percent more than requested by the administration. The agreement includes \$3.6 bil-

lion in emergency funding to aid farmers hurt by disasters and low commodity prices; the House bill had provided only \$115 million in emergency aid to apple and potato growers, while the Senate measure had \$2 billion in disaster relief.

Over 75 percent (\$59.8 billion) of the total budget authority provided by the agreement in FY 2001 is mandatory spending for entitlement programs, including \$20.1 billion for the food stamp program. The remainder (\$18.7 billion) is for discretionary programs. The discretionary spending in the bill is \$4.7 billion more than the FY 2000 appropriation and \$3.2 billion more than the administration's request.

As has been the case with the last couple of agriculture appropriations bills, this year's measure broke with a tradition of easy passage and has been complicated by various issues. At the top of the list of things stalling the measure has been a proposal to relax trade sanctions against food and medicine sales to Cuba and other so-called rogue nations. In addition, proposals to ease Food and Drug Administration (FDA) rules for importing drugs and address rising prescription drug prices slowed the measure's progress dramatically. Finally, settling on emergency funding levels to aid farmers recovering from disasters and struggling with low commodity prices also proved difficult. Negotiators developed compromise language on each of these contentious issues during conference action.

This bill also makes an historic step toward removing the last vestiges of the cold-war era by instituting conditions for trade with Cuba. The agreement lifts current economic sanctions to allow shipments of food and medicine to Cuba among other nations. In the case of Cuba, the measure bars public and private United States financing of Cuban agricultural purchases. It also codifies restrictions (currently implemented by executive order) on Americans traveling to Cuba. This is an unfortunate result and this Congress should work to change this stifling action that will impair efforts to help the Cuban people.

The agreement purports to allow pharmacies and wholesalers to buy American-made prescription drugs abroad and reimport them into the United States. Unfortunately there is a loophole in this legislation, which may allow drug manufacturers to continue charging higher prices for medicine to our Nation's elderly who so desperately need relief. Under this legislation the drug companies will be allowed to continue to market the same drugs that Americans have to pay higher prices for under different names in Mexico and Canada. Further, there is language in this bill, which will allow drug companies to restrict the marketing of these drugs under their cheaper names back here in the United States. Once again the American public is being told that Congress is responding to the problem of the high cost of prescription drugs in this country, but yet again there is a loophole for the consumer to fall through. This Congress should not abdicate its responsibility to offer financial relief to the millions of elderly Americans who have to choose each month between paying their bills, purchasing food, paying rent, or buying vital medicine.

I would like to acknowledge that this conference does include as much as \$3.4 million of the \$6.8 million I requested be set aside for the 1890 Land Grant Colleges, which also includes many of our Nation's Historically Black

Colleges and Universities, for research activity. Historically these institutions of higher learning received marginal increases and have been level funded for the last 5 years. The amendment will increase research activities by \$4 million and extension activities by \$2.8 million for the 1890's land grant institutions. This \$6.8 million increase will be deducted from the Agricultural Research Service (ARS) funding included in the bill.

I had hoped that the conference committee members would have deemed it more than reasonable to fund this area to the full \$6.8 million that was requested. Given the fact that the minority 1890 Land Grant Colleges did not receive any land-grant funding from the United States, unlike other land grant colleges, prior to 1967 with formulary funding not beginning until 1972. Since 1988 Federal funding for agriculture programs has declined by 8 percent and the base funding that supports agricultural scientists and extension educators has eroded by 16 percent. This has obviously had a devastating negative impact on the 1890's. Federal support for basic research in the decades since the 1950's has decreased from an annual growth rate of 22.9 percent in the 1950's to 2 percent in the current decade. Flat support for food and agricultural sciences compounded by the lack of adequate state matching funds have created an alarming erosion in the conduct of 1890 research and extension services. Although the Congress encouraged States to provide a 30-percent match for 1890 landgrant programs in FY2000, several 1890's are facing nearly insurmountable barriers in getting states to comply.

I hope that the actions taken in this bill to provide additional dollars to 1890 Land Grant Colleges will mark a new era of Federal support to these Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

Within the measure's \$34.1 billion for domestic food programs is \$4.1 billion (\$37 million less than requested) for the women, infants and children (WIC) program. The bill appropriates \$873 million (\$5 million less than requested) for conservation programs; \$973 million (\$39 million more than requested) for the Agricultural Research Service; and \$1.5 billion (\$84 million less than requested) for the Rural Housing Service. It also provides the administration's request of \$973 million for the PL-480 Food for Peace Program.

In addition, the measure modifies the eligibility rules regarding automobile ownership and monthly housing costs for food stamp recipients. Current law prohibits food stamp recipients from owning a car worth more than \$4,650 or paying monthly housing costs of more than \$275. Under the agreement, States could set their own caps for the vehicle allowance and gradually raise the housing cap over 5 years to \$340 per month.

I would like to thank the conferees that worked on this conference report. However, I will vote "no" on the rule because of several failings in the bill and I will reluctantly vote "yes" on the legislation.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) the sponsor of the key amendment that would have prevented drug companies from discriminating against U.S. importers and would have ensured that U.S. import-

ers could purchase drugs on the same terms and conditions as foreign purchasers.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to express my profound appreciation to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), the chairman of the subcommittee, for the work that he has done and the leadership that he has provided on this initiative, along with the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the ranking minority member. It has been a profound pleasure to serve on the subcommittee with both of these Members.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill in many respects. The agriculture bill here contains increases in farm conservation and rural development programs. It contains important increases in rural housing, business, and utilities programs that are critical to small communities across the country.

In addition, it contains important recognition for the Rural Economic Area Partnership Zone Program. It also includes funding for important agricultural research initiatives.

In addition, it contains a little more than \$3 billion in critical emergency assistance for farmers and ranchers who have suffered through another year of bad weather and low prices.

There is also \$138 million for apple farmers struggling to overcome loss of markets and devastating weather that have occurred over the last 3 years.

I want to make it clear, that particular provision for specialty crops was originated in this House in the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations and nowhere else. So, for the first time, apple farmers and other growers of specialty crops are going to get recognition for the difficult circumstances under which they operate.

This bill is a good bill. It provides assistance for dairy farmers, \$1.6 billion in crop losses for all farms all across the country. All farmers are going to benefit from it.

So if my colleagues are going to vote for this bill, as I am, vote for it for the agriculture and the rural development provisions in the bill, all of which are exemplary and good. Do not vote for it for the provision on prescription drugs. Because the prescription drug provision in this bill is a shell, it is a fake, it is a sham. It will not provide prescription drugs at reduced prices for any American anywhere. It is designed precisely in that way, to prevent any consideration to reduce prices of pharmaceuticals imported from Canada or anywhere else because the bill fails to recognize the ability of the pharmaceutical companies to insert language that will prevent that from happening.

1630

This is a good bill in many respects. However, it leaves to the next Congress the necessity to deal with the issue of the high cost of prescription drugs in America.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I just wanted to end by pointing out an important clarification here. The gentlewoman from Missouri indicated there was a Supreme Court case or an appeals court case and inferred that it supported her point of view.

Let me say that the Supreme Court declined to review the SmithKline case so the appeals court stands. If the law requires you to use labels, you must. And that is exactly what the Democratic amendment required, exactly what the Waxman amendment required, exactly what the DeLauro amendment required in the subcommittee markup.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON).

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, the judge said that they hold that the Hatch-Waxman amendments that already exist to the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act require the labeling be used, be given by the drug manufacturer to the generic which means then, or to the reimporter in our particular case, and that it is not an infringement of copyright liability and, therefore, the drug company will have to provide the labeling under the discretion of the FDA. The FDA has broad discretion in this area and, therefore, all of that is covered in the language that exists in the bill that we are about to vote to pass.

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

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a good deal about what the bill does do and does not do in terms of two provisions, prescription drug reimportation and trade sanctions. I would like to remind my colleagues that both of these issues more properly belong in an authorization bill, not appropriations. But they are here in our bill and represent some progress in helping our senior citizens get affordable medicines and helping our farmers and ranchers sell more of their products. That is a great marriage.

If Members want to criticize this bill for what is not there, then I would remind them that this bill also does not have campaign finance reform, it does not have managed health care reform, and it does not guarantee peace in the Middle East. What this bill does, among other things, is improve our environmental and water resources, provide food and nutrition for the vulnerable in our society, protect our food and medical supplies, and keep our system of agriculture the best and the strongest in the world.

Oddly enough, that is what this appropriations bill is supposed to do. That is why every Member of this body should recognize the good that this bill will do for their constituents and vote "aye."

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, while I am troubled by the failure of this measure to include funding for the disaster that befell our onion farmers in 1999, I will support this measure because it provides vitally important assistance to many farmers, growers of specialty

crops and dairy farmers as well as the agricultural communities in my district.

I would also like to express my concerns over provisions in this bill in the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Title relating to Iran and other nations on the list of terrorist nations. We should, in my view, not be modifying our present policies toward Iran and Libya where we have in place a de facto prohibition against government credit for our exports to those countries.

The waiver on the prohibition on financing for commercial exports to Iran, Libya, North Korea or Sudan for national security purposes is, in my view, overly broad. Next year, we need to revisit this issue so we can ensure that the U.S. Taxpayer is not supporting commercial exports to terrorist countries, unless there are urgent humanitarian reasons to do so.

We also need to clarify that in providing licenses for the export of goods or services to countries promoting international terrorism under the current guidelines of the Department of the Treasury, we should keep the procedures in place for the denial of each and every license for any export to a person or group found to be promoting acts of international terrorism.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I believe overall that the Agriculture Appropriations Conference report is a very good bill. It contains many admirable provisions including language that would allow the reimportation of prescription drugs. Data shows that a single dose of a drug that costs a senior citizen \$1 in the United States only cost 64 cents in Canada, while in Italy the same drug costs only 51 cents. I support drug reimportation—I am convinced this is one way to reduce the cost of prescription drug prices without imposing price controls or burdensome regulations on drug manufacturers. Indeed, I voted in favor of these provisions when the Agriculture Appropriations bill first passed the House and I am a cosponsor of H.R. 1885, the International Prescription Drug Parity Act, which contains many similar provisions.

Also included is funding for a number of initiatives which I strongly favor, including \$1.5 million for pink bollworm control programs, \$500,000 for aflatoxin research in Arizona. \$5 million for the Water conservation and Western Cotton Laboratory move from Phoenix to the University of Arizona's Maricopa Agriculture Center (MAC), \$495,000 for the International Arid Lands Consortium (administered by UA), \$369,000 for the Southwest Consortium for Plant Genetics and Water Resources, \$200,000 for hesperaloe and other natural products from desert plants research (conducted by UA), and \$4,177,000 for shrimp aquaculture research. And I voted for a bill which contains these provisions when it passed the House on July 11, 2000.

However, during conference deliberations on the Agriculture Appropriations bill, an amendment was inserted into the bill that was not considered by a committee in either the House or Senate. This provision has serious repercussions for U.S. industry. Because of my strong opposition to this provision, I will reluctantly vote against this bill today.

Under the amendment adopted in the Agriculture Appropriations conference report, antidumping and countervailing duties which are currently paid by the importing industry would be transferred from the U.S. Treasury Depart-

ment directly in the petitioning company. This is a major change in our current antidumping and countervailing duty laws with potentially disastrous consequences. Under current law, antidumping or countervailing duties are assessed to offset the dumping or subsidy and paid to the U.S. Treasury. Payment of the duties readjusts the market to replicate conditions as if dumping or subsidization had not occurred. The theory behind this law is to level the playing field between U.S. producers and foreign importers so that each may compete fairly for access to U.S. consumers. The provision inserted into the Agriculture Appropriations bill does much more—it double compensates the petitioner by not only offsetting the alleged injury, but also providing a windfall subsidy to the petitioner.

This provision will encourage other countries to adopt a similar industry subsidy. U.S. exporters facing dumping duties will end up directly subsidizing their competitors instead of paying duties to a foreign government. Because U.S. companies are the biggest targets of AD/CVD actions, this threatens our exports.

Subsidization of industry by any government which is a member of the World Trade Organization violates the WTO Agreement on Subsidies on Countervailing Measures. The U.S. Government supported this Agreement because we sought to eliminate foreign subsidies which undercut the ability of U.S. industry to compete abroad. Payment of AD/CVD duties violates the Agreement which could lead to retaliatory tariffs against innocent U.S. exporters.

The lure of a potential monetary windfall could spur additional litigation under our AD/CVD laws. In order to be eligible for the potential windfall, U.S. industry would be encouraged to join in the filing of AD/CVD petitions. Otherwise, they would not be eligible for any payments which might be made under this new provision. Furthermore, the promise of monetary compensation would take away any incentive to enter into "suspension agreements" or settlements whereby a foreign producer agrees not to sell below an agreed price in an antidumping case. More cases means more duties, on the backs of this U.S. industries which depend on steady supplies of products which may subject to AD/CVD.

Because of the serious implications of this ill-considered provision, I am reluctantly voting against the Agriculture Appropriations conference report.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly voted against this bill though there is much in it that merits support. However, the benefits accorded to farmers in this bill are disproportionately skewed to large operations, not to smaller-scale, family farms. If people want to step back and provide benefits for small farms, I will be the first to look at ways that we can do that in a cooperative fashion. But this bill is not targeted. We continue to pour unprecedented sums to agriculture without addressing the apparent failure of the so-called "Freedom to Farm" bill.

Several provisions illustrate the lost opportunities. We missed an opportunity with Cuba in this bill. We successfully trade with China. Why can't we pursue a rational trade policy with Cuba? Cuba trade will hasten the departure of Fidel Castro, leader of one of the last remaining bastions of communism.

There is a rider for the sugar industry buried in this conference report that subverts the reform the 1996 Freedom to Farm bill was sup-

posed to usher in. It will do nothing to change the \$352 million in loan defaults taxpayers are paying this year, no GAO's estimated \$1.9 billion cost of the sugar program to consumers.

As pointed out in an October 1 editorial in the Washington Post, the drug reimportation language in this bill is unlikely to do much to address the problem of affordability of prescription drugs. The five-year time limit on the bill will significantly minimize the effectiveness of this token effort to address the skyrocketing cost of pharmaceuticals. These narrow provisions won't have the impact for our seniors that real solutions to the prescription drug crisis world have.

This bill does not do enough to address the serious problem of hunger in the United States. Even in this time of unprecedented prosperity, many families are hungry. Oregon has one of the highest rates of hunger in the nation. Yet, the conference report provides less funding to food stamp programs, less funding to school breakfast and lunch programs, and less funding to the WIC programs than what was originally allocated in the House and Senate versions of this bill.

We can do better.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to being attention to one of the concerns I have with this bill. To be specific, I was very troubled to find that the conference report being considered today includes language which restricts funding for the American Heritage Rivers Initiative (AHRI).

When this bill first came to the floor in June, it included language which prohibited funding for the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) from being used for the American Heritage Rivers Initiative. I offered an amendment to strike this language out, and it was adopted with unanimous support from this body.

In light of this body's support for my amendment—and the fact that no such similar language was in the bill passed by the other body—it is difficult to understand why the conferees found it appropriate to include the restrictive language in the conference report. As I have noted on the floor in the past, I understand that some enmity exists for the American Heritage Rivers Initiative by those who feel that the initiative represents an intrusion of the federal government into local affairs. Though I'm confident that an examination of AHRI's record will show that their concerns are entirely unfounded, I will not attempt to dissuade my colleagues from their opinion.

These Members had the opportunity to protect their communities from this phantom threat when the initiative was implemented, having been given the power to veto the involvement of their districts in AHRI. I would like to remind my colleagues that the only communities which remain in the initiative are the ones which have actively chosen to participate, including communities in my district, and so I resent these actions undertaken by Members—behind closed doors—which certainly will have a negative effect only on communities other than their own.

I will support this bill only because so many important programs stand to benefit from its enactment, but I regret the failure of the conferees to abide by the will voted by this body in June. In the future, I hope they will be more respectful of the decisions made by communities in other Member's districts.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4461, to FY 2001 Agriculture Appropriations Conference Report. I oppose this bill for a few different reasons, but right now I would like to talk about just one. Interestingly, this reason has nothing to do with farming, but rather the issue of an American citizen's ability to travel to Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, I opposed today's bill because of the agreement regarding the sales of food and medicine to Cuba, Libya, North Korea, Iran, and Sudan. The agreement permits the sale of food and medicine, but also codifies the current restrictions regarding the American citizen's ability to travel to Cuba.

I oppose this agreement for three reasons. Number one is procedure. On July 20th of this year, I offered an amendment that would have prohibited funding for the enforcement of travel restrictions. Essentially, lifting the travel restrictions. The amendment passed the House by a vote of 232 to 186, but unfortunately the amendment was stripped out of the Treasury-Postal Appropriations bill. This agreement would do just the opposite of what the majority of the House supported. By codifying the present travel restrictions, it prohibits this President or any future President from making changes to the current travel regulations. Therefore making it more difficult for Americans to travel to Cuba in the future.

This point is significant, Mr. Speaker, because it has not historically been our nation's policy to restrict travel. Actually, our policy has been just the opposite. Whether it was South Africa during apartheid, the Soviet Union under Communism or the People's Republic of China today, our nation has consistently encouraged the notion that person to person diplomacy was in our national interest.

Number two, the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution protects an American citizen's right to travel. In 1956, the Supreme Court first affirmed this right in *Kent v. Dulles*. The court stated, "An American who has crossed the ocean is not obliged to form his opinion about our foreign policy merely from what he is told by officials of our government or by a few correspondents of American newspapers. Moreover, his views domestic questions are enriched by seeing how foreigners are trying to solve similar problems. In many different ways direct contact with other countries contributes to sounder decisions at home."

In 1965, the Supreme Court heard the case of *Zemel v. Rusk*. The case specifically addressed the question of travel to Cuba. In *Zemel v. Rusk*, the Court again ruled that the right to travel is guaranteed in the fifth amendment. But the Court went on to find that the restriction on travel to Cuba was constitutional because it was supported by the "weightiest consideration of national security." However, according to a U.S. Defense Intelligence Agency report issued on May 5, 1998, Cuba is no longer a military threat to the United States."

Number three, I believe we should look the issues of fairness and severity. Let me say that I do support the idea of permitting sales of U.S. foods and medicines to these nations. But, if you weight the pros and cons of the sales versus travel, I don't think this agreement passes the common sense test. Let's look at the four other nations this agreement permits sales to, North Korea, Iran, Sudan, and Libya.

American citizens are permitted to travel to North Korea and Sudan. North Korea is devel-

oping missiles believed to be capable of delivering nuclear warheads. After North Korea test fired a three stage rocket in 1998, U.S. intelligence estimates reported that such a missile would have the range to reach Alaska and Guam.

The State Department has reported that Sudan "continued to serve as a refuge, nexus, and training hub for a number of international terrorist organizations." Additionally, the Sudanese government continues to force its own citizens into slavery for opposing the government's "holy war."

Presently, State Department regulations prohibit U.S. citizens from traveling to Iran and Libya, but these two countries were still given preferential treatment compared to Cuba. Iran and Libya will be given access to U.S. credit programs, whereas Cuba will not.

Even though the Administration proliferation reports released this August assert that Iran is "one of the most active countries seeking to acquire weapons of mass destruction and advanced conventional weapons," assisted primarily by Russia, China, and North Korea. And Libya was early this year accused by the United Kingdom of smuggling Chinese Scud missile parts through Gatwick airport, and who the U.S. Department of Defense accused of receiving missile technology training from China.

After reviewing these facts, I have to ask does it make sense for this Congress to support doing business with these nations at the cost of infringing on the rights of American citizens to travel? I don't think it does. Therefore, Mr. Speaker I will be voting against today's bill.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4461, the FY2001 Agriculture Appropriations Act. I would like to thank Chairman SKEEN and the members of the Subcommittee for their leadership in drafting this legislation and I rise in strong support of its passage.

Included in this bill is significant funding for the boll weevil eradication program. Boll weevil eradication has been a federally sponsored initiative for the last twenty-five years which has successfully eradicated the cotton pest from many states. The remaining states with on-going eradication programs include New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas, Louisiana, Arkansas, Mississippi and Tennessee. While all these states do receive some direct federal grants, it is nowhere near the percentage received by those states where the eradication program has already been completed. Instead, our states are required to call upon cotton growers in the State to self-finance the cost of most of the eradication program. The federal government's percentage of support for these programs has steadily declined over the last few years and today, the federal contribution is only a few percentage points of the cost of the overall program. In lieu of direct federal grants, the Congress has provided these remaining states with access to low interest USDA loans, some grant money, and "in-kind" federal assistance. In most instances, the state governments have been required to "step up to the plate" and provide significant financial support to replace the lost federal aid.

In Oklahoma, our state legislature created the Oklahoma Boll Weevil Eradication Organization, or OBWEO, as a state agency in 1993 to coordinate the state-wide effort. In 1995,

the legislature amended the powers of the OBWEO to enhance its financial capabilities so that OBWEO could apply for and receive USDA low-interest loans, as well as issuing state bonds, the interest from which would be exempt from federal income tax. Shortly thereafter, OBWEO organized the State's growers and began its eradication efforts.

Unfortunately, neither of the two financial tools with which OBWEO was equipped proved to be useful. Due to quirks in USDA loan regulations, OBWEO has never been eligible for USDA loans. Moreover, OBWEO has not been able to issue federal tax-exempt bonds because of a restriction in the Internal Revenue Code regarding "private activity bonds". The inability of OBWEO to use the tax-exempt feature has resulted in additional interest costs as well. All told, OBWEO has seen its financing costs increase by almost \$2 million, which is a tremendous amount in light of a total program cost of just under \$17 million. In other words, OBWEO is experiencing a more than 15% program cost over-run because it cannot get access to loan programs available to other states.

This bill takes the necessary steps to get the eradication program in Oklahoma back on track with that in other states. Furthermore, it provides the necessary resources for the cotton producers nationwide to implement aggressive, successful eradication programs to rid their crops of these destructive pests. Other benefits for the cotton producers across the country include an increase in the limitation on Loan Deficiency Payments (LDPs) and Market Loan Gains (MLGs) to \$150,000 for 2000 crops of cotton, grains and oilseeds, \$78 million for the federal cost share contribution to boll weevil eradication, and \$100 million in lending authority for the eradication program.

Also included in this bill is funding for the Retired Educators for Agricultural Programs, or REAP. REAP is an organization which was established in 1994 to address the diminishing numbers of African American agricultural education teachers in Oklahoma and the scarcity of African American youth enrolled in vocational agriculture and programs such as the Future Farmers of America. Initially, REAP was operating in five counties in Oklahoma. It has since begun to operate in other areas throughout the State.

The mission of REAP is to build a foundation that promotes personal and economic opportunities in agriculture for African American youth through project development and partnerships with educational and other community resources. One of the primary goals of REAP is to emphasize citizenship, economic development, leadership and scholarship to the African American youth involved in the program.

REAP extends its outreach to the parents and community members by means of programs, forums and opportunities to chaperone student activities. The program encourages this participation in the hope that the adults will become better informed, more involved and more supportive of the reasonable and achievable aspirations of their young people.

REAP exemplifies a model that can be easily replicated. It is a program of vision, partnerships and commitment that is timeless in focus and limited only by the parameters of the imagination. Field trips to areas in my district in Southwest Oklahoma have ignited great interest in expanding the program into this area

of our state. Parents and teachers in Lawton, Altus, Frederick and Tipton, assure me that there is a great need for REAP in our area of the State where limited financial resources have precluded service.

Mr. Speaker, REAP is an important program which could be used as a model for similar programs in other states. This program is vital to the further development of rural America. I am honored to have the opportunity to play a role in furthering the efforts of this very important program.

The bill also includes \$3.5 billion for emergency assistance to farmers and ranchers who have suffered economic losses associated with weather-related yield and/or quality losses. This alone will not address all the disaster assistance needs of our producers. For instance, in Oklahoma alone, the damage from the summer drought and wildfires is estimated at over \$1 billion. However, this is a step in the right direction to providing much-needed assistance for our farmers and ranchers.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this bill and ask my colleagues to join me in supporting our nation's farmers and ranchers by casting their vote in favor of H.R. 4461.

Mr. BURR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that many of the agriculture needs of the U.S. are covered in this legislation, yet I need to express my concerns with the reimportation provision.

It is important to remember why the Prescription Drug Marketing Act of 1988 (PDMA) was enacted in the first place. At the time, there was considerable evidence that counterfeit and otherwise adulterated drugs were entering U.S. commerce from abroad. After a lengthy investigation, the Commerce Committee concluded that greater restrictions on pharmaceutical imports into the U.S. were essential to protect the safety of American patients and the integrity of the U.S. drug supply. In response, a bipartisan Congress enacted PDMA.

PDMA was designed to (1) prevent the introduction of prescription drugs that may have been improperly stored, handled, and shipped overseas, and (2) reduce the opportunities for importation of counterfeit and unapproved prescription drugs.

As Vice Chairman of the Commerce Oversight and Investigations (O&I) Subcommittee, I have participated in two hearings on the importation of counterfeit bulk drugs. Currently, even with PDMA, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), Department of Justice, and U.S. Customs Service are having a very difficult time inspecting overseas drug manufacturing facilities and confiscating counterfeit bulk drugs that enter the U.S. According to a DEA agent, 25% of the drugs coming across the U.S./Mexico border are counterfeit and a majority of the remaining 75% are not from FDA approved sources. If those agencies are having a difficult time with PDMA in place, I dread to see what will happen after Congress destroys PDMA with this reimportation language.

The bottom line in this issue is consumer safety. When my constituents in the 5th District of North Carolina go to their neighborhood pharmacy to pick up their prescriptions, they should not have to think about the quality of the drugs they are purchasing. I did not spend two years modernizing the Food and Drug Administration to sit back and allow my constituents to worry about counterfeit drugs entering the U.S.

There is also an issue of cost within this reimportation debate. Members of Congress who support reimportation believe that this change in law will provide Americans with cheaper pharmaceutical drugs. Unfortunately, there is no guarantee that reimportation will save Americans money.

First of all, the FDA is asking for at least \$23 million to start implementing the reimportation provision. Most likely that \$23 million will grow to \$60 or \$90 million very quickly. A witness from the U.S. Customs Service testified at the most recent Commerce O&I Subcommittee hearing that the Customs Service would also need additional money to patrol the reimported drug shipments.

Second, there is no mandate in this legislation that wholesalers and pharmacists have to pass the savings from reimported drugs onto U.S. consumers. Various middlemen, both in the U.S. and abroad, will take in the profits, while consumers will bear the risk. Today, Internet sales remove the middlemen, but not the risk.

The Energy and Commerce Committee lead by Chairman DINGELL pointed out that reimportation may not always translate into lower priced drugs for consumers. On July 10, 1985, Chairman DINGELL said, "To those of you who would have us believe that prescription drug diversion is just another way to give the consumer a price break, I say, look about you. These are not counterfeit tee shirts or counterfeit Gucci handbags. No consumer can possibly weigh the risk involved in the purchase of medicine which has not been properly stored, or which has been shipped outside channels of commerce where it is properly protected with law."

Americans' trust of Congress will quickly erode when cost savings are not found through reimportation and people become ill and possibly die due to imported and reimported drugs that are counterfeit or adulterated.

The reimportation language contained in this legislation not only affects the quality of drugs entering the U.S. but it also poses a large threat to international commerce. At the last minute, several members of Congress pushed for language that interferes with contracts between American manufacturers and foreign countries/wholesalers. That language is unconstitutional based on the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution: "nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation." There have been several court decisions that uphold the rights of patent owners and manufacturers to decide to whom they sell their products. The contract language contained in this legislation clearly contradicts those court decisions.

On June 28, 2000, the House passed H.R. 4680, legislation that would provide Medicare beneficiaries with comprehensive, high quality, and affordable drug coverage. I am pleased to be an author of that legislation. I agree that American consumers should have access to low priced pharmaceuticals, but the best way to that access is through drug coverage, not reimportation.

Dr. Jere Goyan, former FDA Commissioner under Jimmy Carter, summarized this issue well: "I respect the motivation of the members of Congress who support this [reimportation] legislation. They are reading, as am I, stories about high prescription drug prices and people who are unable to pay for the drugs they

need. But the solution to this problem lies in better insurance coverage for people who need prescription drugs, not in threatening the quality of medicines for all of us."

I am pleased that adherence to the FDA's gold standard, Section 505 of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, has been placed into the reimportation language. Initially, some members of Congress wanted to create a second, less-restrictive standard for pharmaceuticals entering the U.S. By specifically mandating that all drugs imported and reimported into the U.S. must pass Section 505 standards, Congress is establishing an important hurdle for wholesalers and pharmacists to overcome.

Unfortunately, I do not think that the FDA and Customs will be able to check all of the paperwork to ensure that the drugs have been tested and that they passed Section 505 standards. Counterfeit paperwork is easier to produce than counterfeit drugs.

Although I have used the term "reimportation" throughout this statement, please understand that Congress is not just talking about reimporting drugs. We are also talking about importing drugs. "Reimported drugs" are manufactured in U.S. quality controlled facilities, shipped for sale overseas, and imported back into the U.S. "Imported drugs" are made overseas in manufacturing plants that may never be inspected by the FDA, shipped to a foreign county with pill colors, shapes, and labeling for that country, and then imported into the U.S. by U.S. wholesalers and pharmacists. This language will allow imported drugs into the U.S.

I hope that both national and international AIDS groups realize that this language will stop pharmaceutical companies from selling AIDS medications to foreign countries at greatly reduced prices because the bill does not prevent those medications from re-entering the stream of commerce with great financial gain to foreign countries and huge financial losses to pharmaceutical companies.

The last section of the reimportation language is a bill by Representative GUTKNECHT. The FDA reviewed this legislation and, in a letter to Representative DINGELL, expressed opposition to the vagueness of the bill's language. Because the term "warning notice" is so poorly defined, the bill will cripple the FDA's ability to contact any importer that has suspicious drugs at a U.S. port of entry. In the letter, the FDA reassures Congress that they could internally address the issue of personal use letters to seniors. There is no good reason why Representative GUTKNECHT's bill is attached to this legislation.

In conclusion, I am deeply concerned about the safety and efficacy of the drugs that will fill Americans' medicine cabinets if this legislation passes. For decades, the U.S. has set the highest standard in the world for quality prescription drugs. Because of this high standard, the U.S. is home to the discovery and manufacturing of the most innovative new therapies in this world. If Congress passes this legislation, we will be destroying the safety and efficacy of drugs consumed by our constituents. We will also be giving pharmaceutical companies every reason to pull their headquarters and manufacturing plants out of the U.S. and into countries with lower labor and manufacturing costs. Why some members of Congress want to both expose Americans to counterfeit and adulterated drugs and drive industry out of the U.S. is truly beyond me. It is for these

reasons that I would vote against the Agriculture Appropriations Conference Report.

I submit the following items to be entered into the RECORD.

1. Letters opposing reimportation from the Chamber of Commerce, National Association of Manufacturers, National Mental Health Association, National Multiple Sclerosis Society, ALS Association, Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, Kidney Cancer Association, Log Cabin AIDS Policy Institute, National Prostrate Cancer Coalition, Pancreatic Cancer Action Network, Pulmonary Hypertension Association, Society for Women's Health Research, Allergy and Asthma Network Mothers of Asthmatics, and

2. A Sept. 20, 2000 letter from Representative BURR, Representative TAUZIN, Representative GREENWOOD, Representative OXLEY, REPRESENTATIVE PICKERING, and Representative EHRlich to Members of the House and Senate Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittees.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
Washington, DC, October 4, 2000.

Hon. TRENT LOTT,  
Majority Leader,

U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. MAJORITY LEADER: The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the world's largest business federation, representing more than three million businesses and organizations of every size, sector and region, strongly opposes legislation that would require American manufacturers to sell unlimited quantities of prescription drug products to any foreign wholesaler. I urge your personal intervention in this very serious matter.

I urge you to reject these so-called "non-discrimination" provisions proposed by Congressman HENRY WAXMAN which have been slightly modified for inclusion in the agricultural appropriations conference report as they would set a harmful precedent for all U.S. businesses and industries.

These modified "non-discrimination" provisions would pose a significant threat to current commerce and international business practices by attacking manufacturers' ability to freely contract. Furthermore, there has not been a single hearing to study the total impact of these provisions on business operations including the creation of jobs, as well as the U.S. economy.

Finally, permitting the importation to the U.S. of products sold abroad where prices are not determined by market forces sets a terrible precedent. Again, I urge your timely intervention and I urge you and your colleagues to reject the drug reimportation provisions generally and the modified Waxman proposal particularly.

Sincerely,

TOM.

—  
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION  
OF MANUFACTURERS,  
October 4, 2000.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,  
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I write to urgently draw your attention to a pending amendment offered by Rep. Henry Waxman to the prescription drug reimportation language contained in the Agriculture Appropriations bill (H.R. 4461) currently in conference. The NAM strenuously opposes this amendment, which should be promptly rejected.

The NAM has been greatly concerned by the drug reimportation provisions that previously passed the House and Senate—seeing a great threat to consumer safety. These provisions have been improved by their emphasis on the Senate-passed provisions and

with the addition of greater consumer safeguards. The resulting language—though still more than the NAM can support—is a more reasonable approach to this popular issue.

The Waxman "non-discrimination" amendment is wholly inconsistent with the revised reimportation language and far more dangerous in its own right. What precedent would Congress set for other industries by requiring American pharmaceutical manufacturers to sell to any foreign wholesaler? Patient safety would be compromised by the diminution of domestic supplies and endangered by the prospect of sales to unscrupulous or fly-by-night foreign wholesalers.

We are also troubled that the Waxman language would criminalize manufacturers' failure to sell to any foreign wholesaler. The criminal provisions in the reimportation language are appropriately intended to deter counterfeiting and were never intended to address the business decision of a manufacturer determining where to sell its products.

Again, the NAM urgently requests your assistance in defeating the Waxman amendment.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL E. BAROODY.

—  
NATIONAL MENTAL HEALTH  
ASSOCIATION,

Alexandria, VA, August 31, 2000.

Hon. THAD COCHRAN,

Chairman, Senate Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN COCHRAN: As head of the nation's largest and oldest advocacy organization representing millions of individuals with mental illness across the country, I am writing to you regarding the need to maintain meaningful safety standards for pharmaceutical products. This past session of Congress has witnessed unprecedented interest in prescription medicines. I wish to express my concern regarding a couple of the measures that have been advanced in the House and Senate Agriculture Appropriations Bills.

In the House, the Crowley and the Coburn amendments, restricting funds for use in enforcement of the importation and re-importation provisions of the Prescription Drug Marketing Act (PDMA), section 801(d)(1), could substantially increase risks to Americans who rely on prescription medicines. Similarly, the Jeffords amendment, permanently restricting the Food and Drug Administration's ability to regulate pharmaceutical importation, could also place American consumers at risk. While our organization is supportive of affordable pharmaceuticals for all Americans, we are troubled by the potential risks that come with the assumed savings, especially since there are no guarantees provided in these amendments that the savings would even be passed on to the consumers.

In its statement regarding the impact of these amendments on prescription drug safety, the Food and Drug Administration issued this caution:

"These amendments will likely encourage the very sources of adulterated, misbranded and unapproved drugs that were cut off by section 801(d)(1), to begin shipping again. FDA, with its limited resources, would be extremely hard-pressed to do the investigative work necessary to discover and stop these new sources of potential harmful products."

As the Conference Committee proceeds with its final deliberations on the Agriculture Appropriations Bill, I ask that you carefully weigh these risks that the American public might be incurring compared to the real dollar savings that might be realized. On behalf of our 340 affiliates nationwide, I want to thank you for addressing the

delicate issues of prescription drug pricing and safety regulation. I look forward to working with you in the future as Congress continues this debate.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL M. FAENZA, M.S.S.W.,  
President & CEO.

—  
NATIONAL MULTIPLE  
SCLEROSIS SOCIETY,

New York, NY, September 27, 2000.

Hon. JOE SKEEN,

U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SKEEN: I am writing to express the National Multiple Sclerosis Society's concern about legislation that could lead to the importation of unsafe drugs into our country. Earlier this year the House and Senate approved provisions that would weaken the Food and Drug Administration's (FDA) ability to ensure the safety and reliability of drugs entering the United States from foreign countries. For instance, the FY2001 Agriculture Appropriations bill included the Crowley and Coburn amendments that would prohibit the FDA from spending money on any enforcement actions, including testing for safety, that restrict the importation of drugs approved for sale in the United States. We believe the authors of these amendments are genuinely committed to helping reduce the high cost of prescription drugs. However, their approach could jeopardize the health of countless Americans by making them rely upon potentially mislabeled, adulterated, counterfeit, expired or improperly stored medication to treat their conditions. Please ensure that the final Agriculture Appropriations bill does not include any provisions that would hamper the FDA in its commitments to consumer safety.

Eleven former FDA commissioners have said that allowing the importation of drugs would weaken the Prescription Drug Marketing Act (PDMA), which for the past 12 years has helped the FDA protect American consumers from unsafe drugs. The Clinton Administration has called these amendments "unacceptably flawed" and said they would "severely restrict the (FDA's) authority to enforce the law that allows only manufacturers to re-import drugs." When asked to comment on the effect of these amendments, the FDA replied:

"These amendments will likely encourage the very sources of adulterated, misbranded and unapproved drugs that were cut off by section 801(d)(1) (of PDMA), to begin shipping again. FDA, with its limited resources, would be extremely hard-pressed to do the investigative work necessary to discover and stop these new sources of potentially harmful products."

People with multiple sclerosis, as well as people with other chronic diseases, rely heavily upon pharmaceutical products, including highly complex biological medications, to fight their diseases and continue to lead active lives. These products must be carefully monitored for safety and consistency throughout their production, storage and delivery to the patient to ensure safety and full efficacy.

The National Multiple Sclerosis Society, established in 1946, is dedicated to ending the devastating effects of multiple sclerosis. Multiple sclerosis is an often progressive, degenerative disease of the central nervous system that affects one-third of a million Americans. Multiple sclerosis is unpredictable in its course, and can have a devastating medical, personal and financial impact on the people it affects. With over 600,000 members, National Multiple Sclerosis Society is the world's largest voluntary health agency devoted to the concerns of those affected by multiple sclerosis.



If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact our Public Policy Office at (202) 408-1500.

Sincerely,

MIKE DUGAN,  
General, USAF, Ret., President and CEO.

SEPTEMBER 5, 2000.

To: Members of the House-Senate Conference Committee on the Agriculture Appropriations Bill:

We, the undersigned patient and survivor organizations, are writing to urge you to oppose any drug importation or reimportation proposals, such as the Crowley Amendment and the Coburn Amendment (in the House-passed bill) and the Jeffords Amendment (in the Senate-passed bill).

While we appreciate the concerns of Congress to make prescription drugs more accessible, we are deeply concerned that overturning the Prescription Drug Marketing Act, landmark bipartisan legislation intended to protect consumers from counterfeit, adulterated or impotent medicines, or lowering standards under the Federal Food Drug and Cosmetic Act for imported drugs, will put all people in danger.

We believe these amendments will have a significant impact on FDA's ability to protect the public health and are not an appropriate or acceptable solution to prescription drug access concerns. Access to medication which poses a risk to the individual is worse than no access at all.

Our groups, representing millions of Americans with diseases such as cancer, cardiovascular disease and AIDS, believe that full and open hearings involving all stakeholders must be held prior to adoption of any policy which puts the integrity of medications taken by the American people at risk. Let us not forget that you and your families, as well as we and ours, will all be faced with this risk. It is not worth the price.

Respectfully submitted,

Stevan Gibson, The ALS Association; Suzanne Pattee, JD, Cystic Fibrosis Foundation; Carl F. Dixon, Kidney Cancer Association; James Driscoll, Log Cabin AIDS Policy Institute; Richard N. Atkins, MD, National Prostate Cancer Coalition; Julie Fleshman, Pancreatic Cancer Action Network; Rino Aldrighetti, Pulmonary Hypertension Association; and Phyllis Greenberger, Society for Women's Health Research.

ALLERGY AND ASTHMA NETWORK,  
MOTHERS OF ASTHMATICS INC.,  
Fairfax, VA, September 20, 2000.

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

DEAR CHAIRMAN COCHRAN: I am writing to you to advise you of our opposition to drug importation schemes, such as those commonly known as "The Coburn Amendment" and "The Crowley Amendment" (both in the U.S. House of Representatives) and "The Jeffords Amendment" (in the U.S. Senate).

We fear that these amendments will undermine FDA safety protections which could greatly increase risks to American patients who will be exposed to counterfeit, mismeasured or adulterated pharmaceuticals.

Allergy and Asthma Network—Mothers of Asthmatics, Inc. believe that full and open public hearings involving all the stakeholders, must be held prior to adoption of any scheme which puts the integrity of the U.S. pharmaceutical supply at risk.

I respectfully request that any action on these proposals be deferred until full and complete hearings are held.

Sincerely,

NANCY SANDER,  
President.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
Washington, DC, September 20, 2000.

DEAR MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEES: As Members of the House Commerce Committee, we are writing to express our concern over the amendments relating to pharmaceutical imports that were attached to the Agriculture Appropriations legislation on the House floor. While we share Congress' deep desire to increase patients' access to reasonably priced pharmaceuticals, we believe such a fundamental change in current U.S. law should not be enacted without more thorough consideration of its full potential impact on public health and safety.

In floor debate, the Crowley and Coburn amendments were characterized as simply providing for the personal importation of pharmaceuticals for personal use, primarily from Canada and Mexico. Many thought that the amendments were identical in concept to Representative Gutknecht's legislation that passed the House on June 29, 2000. In reality, the statutory language of the amendments will result in a complete reversal of current U.S. law and policy, as set forth, in part, by the Prescription Drug Marketing Act (PDMA) of 1987, a statute clearly within the jurisdiction of the Commerce Committee.

It is important to remember why PDMA was enacted in the first place. At the time, there was considerable evidence that counterfeit and otherwise adulterated drugs were entering U.S. commerce from abroad. After a lengthy investigation, the Commerce Committee concluded that greater restrictions on pharmaceutical imports into the U.S. were essential to protect the safety of American patients and the integrity of the U.S. drug supply. In response, a bipartisan Congress enacted PDMA.

PDMA and related restrictions in the Food Drug & Cosmetic Act have served their purpose well. While estimates of counterfeit or substandard drugs approach 10 or even 20 percent abroad, the incidence in the U.S. is negligible. Any change in current U.S. law that goes beyond a very narrowly drawn personal use exemption will likely expose Americans to the rates of pharmaceutical counterfeiting found abroad.

The drug importation amendments raise far more complex issues than were properly discussed when the Crowley and Coburn amendments were adopted on the House floor. After closer examination of the amendments and despite our strong desire to address the pharmaceutical access and coverage issue, we do not believe such changes to PDMA represent sound policy or process. Instead of taking such ill-advised legislative action, it is our hope that we can work together on real and workable solutions to the problem at hand without exposing Americans to unnecessary risk.

To strengthen our argument, we have enclosed (1) a booklet that contains letters from 11 FDA commissioners who agree that reimportation is dangerous for U.S. patients and, (2) a list of counterfeit pharmaceuticals recently confiscated in the U.S. Please read these items for a better understanding of the danger U.S. patients will face if the amendments are included in the conference report as passed by the House.

Sincerely,

RICHARD BURR,  
W.J. "BILLY" TAUZIN,  
JAMES GREENWOOD,  
MICHAEL OXLEY.

CHARLES PICKERING,  
ROBERT EHRLICH.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report for H.R. 4461, the Agriculture Appropriations bill for Fiscal Year 2001. This bill provides \$78.5 billion for agriculture programs, including \$3.6 billion for emergency spending to help farmers hurt by disasters and low commodity prices. In the state of Texas, farmers have been enduring drought conditions which make farming more difficult. This legislation will provide the assistance that these farmers need to continue to produce our nation's food supply.

I am also pleased that this legislation includes vital funding for nutritional health research through the human nutrition research service program which is part of the Agriculture Research Service at the United States Department of Agriculture. This bill provides an additional \$750,000 to provide a total of \$12.9 million for the Children's Nutrition Research Center (CNRC) at Baylor College of Medicine in cooperation with Texas Children's Hospital, located in Houston, Texas. The CNRC is dedicated to defining the nutrient needs of mothers and their children in a controlled environment.

Since its inception in November 1978, the CNRC has focused on critical questions relating to pregnant women and their infants. More than 8,500 volunteers have participated in studies to determine optimal prenatal development, including which nutrients positively impact infant health and human development. These studies have also helped to identify the regulatory controls of body weight and body composition during infancy and childhood. Studies have also shown how dietary habits can contribute to long-term health and the diet-related chronic diseases such as osteoporosis, obesity, hypertension, diabetes, cardiovascular disease, and cancer.

I would like to highlight two recent discoveries made at the CNRC that will help children live healthier, longer lives. A recent study by Dr. Theresa Nicklas at the CNRC demonstrates that few teens have eating habits that mirror the U.S. dietary recommendations for fat and fiber. This study found that only one-third of the 319 teens whose diets were analyzed had a low-fat-high fiber diet. Clearly, parents need to know more about this study so they can provide healthier food for their children. Another CNRC study found how much calcium is needed to help children to grow. This calcium reference data is used by many health care professionals to make recommendations to parents about the appropriate calcium intake for their children. With more information, parents will have the knowledge they need to provide a healthy diet for their children.

With this additional funding, the CRNC can continue its vital work to improve our children's health. I am committed to providing maximum funding for agriculture research programs and am pleased that the Appropriations Committee has increased funding for the human nutrition research. Under the guidance of Baylor College of Medicine, I am certain CNRC will continue to lead the way in the field on nutritional research.

I also want to highlight that I am concerned about one provision in this bill related to reimportation of Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approved prescription drugs for America's consumers. This conference report allows pharmacies and wholesalers to buy

American-made prescription drugs abroad and reimport them into the United States. Since many American-made drugs are sold at lower prices abroad, I strongly support this effort to reduce prescription drug costs for all Americans. However, I am disappointed to learn this bill also includes a provision that allows drug manufacturers to restrict access to their American-made products for those wholesalers and pharmacies which import their drugs. As a result, I am concerned that there will be no reimportation of prescription drugs and consumers will continue to pay high prices for the prescription drugs that they need.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation that provides funding for important agriculture programs.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member support's the conference report for H.R. 4461, the FY2001 Agriculture Appropriations bill. In particular, this Member commends the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), Chairman of the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee and the distinguished gentlelady from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), Ranking Member of the Subcommittee for their hard work on this critically important bill.

This conference report contains \$3.5 billion in critical emergency disaster relief for agriculture producers. This, of course, is in addition to the \$7.1 billion in economic assistance for agriculture producers including \$5.5 billion in higher Agricultural Market Transition Act (AMTA) payments as part of the crop insurance reform legislation signed into law earlier this year on June 22, 2000.

The emergency funds in the conference report we are considering today are particularly important to Nebraska farmers, because drought conditions in the Great Plains have substantially lowered production at a time when we have low commodity prices. Included in the \$3.5 billion funding amount is \$1.6 billion for crop loss disaster assistance, \$490 million for livestock assistance, \$473 million for dairy assistance and \$80 million for the Emergency Conservation Program. Also, the crop loss disaster assistance includes the following three areas: general crop assistance, quality loss assistance, and a category for severe economic disaster assistance. These funds should provide much needed additional help for Nebraska producers.

This Member is pleased that the conference report for H.R. 4461 provides \$462,000 for the Midwest Advanced Food Manufacturing Alliance (MAFMA). 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 MAFMA awards grants for research projects on a peer review basis. These awards must be supported by an industry partner willing to provide matching funds. In the first six years of funding, MAFMA has directed \$2,142,317 toward a research competition at the 12 universities. Projects must receive matching funds. Over the first six years, matching funds of \$2,666,129 plus in-kind contributions of \$625,407 were received for MAFMA funded projects from 105 companies or organizations. These figures convincingly demonstrate how successful the Alliance has been in leveraging support from the food manufacturing and processing industries.

Mr. Speaker, the future viability and competitiveness of the U.S. agricultural industry

depends on its ability to adapt to 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 the conference report includes \$200,000 to fund the National Drought Mitigation Center (NDMC) at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. This project is in its fourth year and has assisted numerous states and cities in developing drought plans and developing drought response teams. Given the nearly unprecedented levels of drought in several parts of our country, this effort is obviously important.

As the drought continues, the NDMC will play an increasingly important role in helping people and institutions develop and implement measures to reduce societal vulnerability to this danger. Most of the NDMC's services are 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 before marketing. 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 the conference report includes \$200,000 to fund the National Drought Mitigation Center (NDMC) at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. This project is in its fourth year and has assisted numerous states and cities in developing drought plans and developing drought response teams. Given the nearly unprecedented levels of drought in several parts of our country, this effort is obviously important.

As the drought continues, the NDMC will play an increasingly important role in helping people and institutions develop and implement measures to reduce societal vulnerability to this danger. Most of the NDMC's services are directed to state, Federal, regional and tribal governments that are involved in drought and water supply planning.

In addition, the conference report provides funds for the following ongoing Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service (CSREES) projects at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln:

Food Processing Center .....	\$24,000
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) .....	822,000

Also, this Member is pleased that the conference report for H.R. 4461 includes \$100 million to cover any defaults for the Section 538, a rural rental multi-family housing loan guarantee program initiated by legislation written by this Member. 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 percent 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 Section 538 Guarantee Program will be for administrative costs and potential defaults.

Mr. Speaker, this Member especially appreciates the Conference Committee's support for the Department of Agriculture's 502 very successful and rapidly expanding Unsubsidized Loan Guarantee Program with a \$3.7 billion loan authorization support. The program, also initiated by legislation authored by this Member, 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.

Additionally, this Member supports the provision allowing for the reimportation of prescription drugs. I have long been a supporter of legislation that would inject competition into the prescription drug market and believe that this language is an important first step in providing my constituents with the relief they seek in their prescription drug prices. There has been massive international cost-shifting by pharmaceutical companies onto the backs of the American consumer. It is not reasonable that the same Federal Drug Administration (FDA)-approved drug, produced by the same drug company, should cost 30 percent, 40 percent, 60 percent or even 80 percent less in foreign countries than it costs American consumers. This legislative initiative, with consumer safety an important consideration, undoubtedly will need refinement before the lengthy FDA regulatory process is completed to implement these provisions, but this is an important and necessary change.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, this Member urges his colleagues to support the Agriculture appropriations conference report.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the progress we have made this year in our effort to lift unilateral food and medicine sanctions. Title IX of the Fiscal Year 2001 Agriculture Appropriations Conference Report, the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act, will open up significant new export markets for American farmers. This provision is the result of hard work by many Members and the unflinching support of a broad coalition that refused to let this issue fade into obscurity in the waning days of this session.

The overall purpose of this title is unmistakable—unilateral food and medicine sanctions are eliminated and new procedures are established for the future consideration of such sanctions. As the author of this provision, I would like to briefly outline Congressional intent, to ensure that agencies charged with implementing this legislation fully appreciate the expectations of the Agriculture Appropriations conferees.

In drafting this provision, it was not our intention to derogate from current law or the flexibility provided for in present regulations which do permit limited exports to some unilaterally sanctioned states. Similarly, the intent of conferees is to expand export opportunities for food and medicine beyond that currently provided in law or regulations. We expect that



regulations implementing this provision will liberalize the current administrative procedures for the export of food and medicine.

A section by section explanation follows:

*Section 901—Title*

This section contains the title of the Act.

*Section 902—Definitions*

Definitions in the section are broadly drawn to allow maximum benefit to exporters of agricultural commodities and medicine and medical products. Non-food commodities are included in the definition of "agricultural commodities" and as Section 775 further clarifies, for purposes of administering Title IX of this Act, the term "agricultural commodity" shall also include fertilizer and organic fertilizer. "Medical device" and "medicine" should be interpreted reasonably to mean all products commonly understood to be within these categories, as explicitly recognized by the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, and including products such as crutches, bandages and other medical supplies.

*Section 903—Restriction*

This section prohibits the President from imposing unilateral agricultural or medical sanctions without the concurrence of Congress in the form of a joint resolution. The President shall terminate any unilateral agricultural and medical sanction that is in effect as of the date of enactment, though Section 911 provides a 120 day waiting period to allow the implementation of appropriate regulations.

*Section 904—Exceptions*

This section provides a number of exceptions to Section 903 to ensure that the Administration has sufficient flexibility to impose or continue to impose sanctions in unusual instances. While seven particular exceptions are provided, they are narrowly drawn, in recognition of the conferees' expectation that food and medicine sanctions should only be used in extraordinary circumstances. Further, these exceptions should not be used to impose sanctions permanently, consistent with Section 905. Conferees expect that the President will abide by the spirit of the language and submit for Congressional review all sanctions to be imposed under this section, unless extraordinary circumstances require extremely timely action.

*Section 905—Termination of Sanctions*

This section provides for a sunset of any food or medicine sanctions imposed under Section 903, not later than 2 years after the date the sanction become effective. Sanctions may be maintained only if the President recommends to Congress a continuation of not more than 2 years, and a joint resolution is enacted in support of this recommendation.

*Section 906—State Sponsors of International Terrorism*

This section requires licenses for the export of agricultural commodities, medicine or medical devices to Cuba or to the government of a country that has been determined to be a state sponsor of international terrorism, or any other entity in such country. These licenses shall be provided for a period of not less than 12 months and shall be no more restrictive than license exceptions administered by the Department of Commerce or general licenses administered by the Department of Treasury. While this section provides the Administration with flexibility to determine licensing requirements, it is the expectation of conferees that presumption in favor of sales will fall on the side of exporters, consistent with the title of the act, to support enhanced exports. Consistent

with this expectation, it is the understanding of the author that the Department of Commerce would be the lead agency for all exports and related transactions under this title, all of which would be subject to a general licensing arrangement. In the case of exports to Cuba, it is the understanding of author that current restrictions on shipping to Cuba will continue to be waived for licensed exports. Exports to the Government of Syria and the Government of North Korea are expected from the licensing requirements of this section, and to the extent a private sector emerges in either country, these entities should receive the same treatment.

The section also requires that procedures be in place to deny exports to any entity within such country promoting international terrorism. This language is only intended to give the Administration narrow discretion in the granting of licenses for exports to specific sub-entities that are directly involved in the promotion of terrorism.

Finally, the section requires quarterly and biennial reports on licensing activities to determine the effectiveness of licensing arrangements.

*Section 907—Congressional Procedures*

This section requires that a report submitted by the President under Section 903 or 905 shall be submitted to the appropriate committee or committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate. A joint resolution in support of this report may not be reported before the eighth session day of Congress after the introduction of the joint resolution.

*Section 908—Prohibition on United States Assistance and Financing*

Section 908(a)(1) prohibits the use of United States government assistance and financing for exports to Cuba. However, consistent with the overall intent of the measure, this prohibition is not intended to modify any provision of law relating to assistance to Cuba. The provision also restricts the use of government assistance for commercial exports to Iran, Libya, North Korea, and Sudan, unless the President waives the restrictions for national security or humanitarian reasons. In recent months, the Administration has taken several steps to liberalize these and other restrictions on agricultural trade with Iran, Libya, North Korea, and Sudan. As such, it will be in the best interest of U.S. agricultural producers and our balance of trade if the President uses the waiver authority in subsection (a)(3) to promptly waive these restrictions before the current sanctions are lifted 120 days after enactment of this bill. If the President's waiver authority is not so promptly exercised, the restrictions in subsection (a)(1) could act to restrict exports of agricultural commodities, medicines, and medical devices to these countries more than under current law. This is certainly not the intent of this legislation.

Specifically with regard to Cuba, subsection (b) of section 908 prohibits the financing of U.S. agricultural exports to Cuba by any United States person. However, in order to accommodate sales of agricultural commodities to Cuba, subsection (b) specifically authorizes Cuban buyers to pay U.S. sellers by cash in advance, or by utilizing financing through third country financial institutions.

While they cannot extend financing to Cuban buyers, U.S. financial institutions are specifically authorized to confirm or advise letters of credit related to the sale that are issued by third country financial institutions. Under this procedure, third country financial institutions can assume the Cuban risk associated with these transactions and issue letters of credit free of Cuban risk to be confirmed by U.S. banks. The provision of

such a "firewall" against sanctioned country risk is consistent with the role played by third country banks in transactions with other countries subject to U.S. sanctions.

U.S. financial institutions may act as exporters' collection and payment agents, confirm the third country letters of credit, and guarantee payment to the U.S. exporter. The provision of such export-related financial services by U.S. financial institutions (commercial banks, cooperatives, and others) will allow U.S. farmers, their cooperatives, and exporters to be assured that they will be paid for exported commodities.

Subsection (b)(3) of section 908 requires the President to issue such regulations as are necessary to carry out this section. In addition to waiving the restrictions on assistance as appropriate under subsection (a)(3), these regulations need to facilitate the export of agricultural commodities, medicine, and medical devices. In particular, the regulations need to accommodate these specifically authorized exports by waiving the restrictions with respect to vessels engaged in trade with Cuba found at 31 C.F.R. 515.207.

*Section 909—Prohibition on Additional Imports from Cuba*

Section 909 reiterates 31 C.F.R. 515.204 prohibiting from entry into the United States any merchandise that is of Cuban origin, has been transported through Cuba, or is derived from any article produced in Cuba.

*Section 910—Requirements Relating to Certain Travel-Related Transactions With Cuba*

This section requires the Secretary of Treasury to promulgate regulations to authorize travel to, from, or within Cuba for the commercial export sale of agricultural commodities. Aside from this expansion in permissible travel transactions, tourist activities in Cuba are not authorized.

*Section 911—Effective Date*

This title shall take effect on the date of enactment and apply thereafter in any fiscal year. Unilateral agricultural or medical sanctions in effect as of the date of enactment shall be lifted 120 days after enactment.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support the FY 01 Department of Defense bill. Passage of this legislation is vital to our military readiness and security. I want to extend my utmost appreciation to our Chairman for his work on this legislation and to the staff that contributed countless hours to ensure its completion. In addition to the crucial ongoing military operations included in this bill, there is a provision that will significantly aid the Moab, Utah community in my district of southeastern Utah.

We have our colleagues speak on this provision and I just want to add my support to its inclusion. For years, the Grand County Council and the people of Moab, Utah have been working to get the federal government to clean up the ten and a half million ton pile of uranium mill tailings that was the byproduct of our extensive military buildup during the Cold War.

With the help of many of our colleagues from downstream states, including members of this Committee such as JIM HANSEN, DUNCAN HUNTER, and BOB STUMP, we were able to include language to ensure that clean up and removal of this pile will begin and be completed in a timely, safe and scientific manner. This committee has done an excellent job in addressing concerns of the many stakeholders and I know that my constituents are anxious to see the long awaited clean up begin.

Again, I want to thank Mr. SPENCE for his work and I wish I had the opportunity to personally thank Mr. Bateman. Utah shall forever

be indebted to the gentleman from Virginia for his commitment to help preserve, protect and clean up one of our most beautiful areas of the country.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss for a moment the provisions in the Conference Report on the Agriculture Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2001 that deal with "drug reimportation."

First and foremost, I want the record to reflect that I, like my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, support a comprehensive plan to provide prescription medicines at more affordable prices to our senior citizens under Medicare. When Medicare was first created in 1965, prescription medicines were not a major part of our health care delivery system. Thanks to all the incredible medical breakthroughs over the past decades since the inception of the Medicare program, we now have medicines that can successfully treat thousands of the most serious illnesses and provide relief to millions of citizens suffering from illness. It is time to modernize Medicare to reflect the fact that prescription medicines are a major part of health care for all of our citizens, especially older men and women.

This hastily written legislation that will open our borders to imported drugs, however well intentioned, cannot be considered an adequate substitute for a comprehensive prescription drug coverage for our seniors under Medicare. These reimportation provisions are bad public policy: potentially endangering U.S. citizens by exposing them to "reimported" medicines that may be bogus or fake, outdated and untested. Secondly, it should be clear that nothing in these provisions change existing patent laws. In fact, the United States led the negotiations of the WTO Agreement on Trade-Related Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPs), which gives a patent owner of a product exclusive rights to make, use or import a patented product. No one else can do so without permission for the term of the patent and nothing in this bill should be construed otherwise.

Most important, I remain particularly concerned that this legislation might very well undermine our nation's Food and Drug Administration "gold standard" for ensuring the quality and safety of all medicines used by U.S. citizens and other consumers around the world.

In that respect, I am pleased by the fact that the FDA must overcome necessary safety hurdles before this legislation is implemented. For instance, the drug reimportation provisions of this conference report, specifically section 745, will not go into effect until two important actions are taken. First, the Secretary of Health and Human Services must demonstrate to the Congress that loosening current regulation of reimportation of prescription drugs will not place American consumers at risk. I want to emphasize that the demonstration of safety by the Secretary should be no "pro forma" paper exercise, but a real showing, with facts and figures, in the form of a report to Congress, that the kind of importation envisioned by these provisions is safe for consumers. If the Secretary cannot make this demonstration, these provisions cannot be implemented. Second, the Secretary must also demonstrate that individual consumers will realize a significant cost reduction from this legislation, making their drug purchases significantly more affordable for them, before it can be implemented.

Now that Congress has acted, it is up to the FDA and the next Administration to ensure

this policy can save consumers money, without threatening the world's highest standard of safety of America's medicines for our consumers.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise to add my voice to those who will be speaking about this rule and the Agriculture Appropriations bill. But unfortunately there will be many voices that are not heard today—the voices of the 31 million Americans who are threatened by hunger even in the midst of our unprecedented prosperity.

I wish I did not have to bother my colleagues by talking about hunger again. I wish that I could be here announcing that we had mustered the political and spiritual will and finally eradicated hunger. I wish that we could turn our collective attention to other pressing problems. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I have to stand on this floor yet again to urge this body to do better on issues of hunger.

That said, I want to thank my colleagues, Representatives YOUNG, SKEEN, OBEY, WALSH, DELAURO and HINCHEY for their work in the conference committee to make sure that the hungry were not forgotten. Specifically, they worked to include provisions of the Hunger Relief Act in this bill. I especially want to thank Ranking Member KAPTUR and Representative EMERSON for their efforts on behalf of the hungry.

It is a triumph that food stamp recipients will now be able to own a reliable car and pay high shelter costs. I want to particularly commend the coalition of anti-hunger groups that came together in gathering support for this bill—Bread For the World, RESULTS, FRAC, America's Second Harvest, the Food Policy Working Group, the National Immigration Law Center and the other 1,400 groups that endorsed the Hunger Relief Act. I especially want to thank Lynette Engelhardt Stott and Barbara Howell of Bread For the World, Ellen Teller and Ellen Vollinger of FRAC and Derek Miller of RESULTS for their tireless efforts in bringing us to this point.

While I am happy that these provisions are included, I am disappointed that we did not include the other titles of the bill that would have restored food stamp eligibility to legal immigrants and provided additional resources for our country's food banks through the TEFAP program. TEFAP provides the network of feeding programs around the nation with a reliable supply of nutritious commodities. It also directly benefits our farmers and food processors by providing them with an additional market for their products. I am still hopeful that those items will be included in our final omnibus bill.

This bill also provides \$34.1 billion for domestic nutrition programs including food stamps, the school lunch and breakfast programs, WIC, Meals on Wheels and other commodity assistance programs. This is \$2 billion less than the president requested and almost \$1 billion less than what we provided last year. While most of that savings is due to a drop in food stamp participation, that does not mean that there has been a corresponding drop in hunger and food insecurity.

Additionally, the underlying bill provides almost \$1 billion in humanitarian food aid for those in need overseas. While this equals the request and exceeds last year's total, it is still woefully inadequate in meeting the needs of the hungry around the world. I am proud that the United States, through the Food for Peace

Program, was able to help avert famine in Ethiopia. I just visited the Horn of Africa last month and was glad I did not see as many children starving as would have without our timely assistance. I am also pleased to report that our food aid has prevented more people from dying of famine in North Korea and that Japan and South Korea are finally acting to assist their neighbor in need.

As we all know, this measure also provides for the sale of food and medicine to Cuba and other rogue nations. I am thrilled that Congress is reaffirming the belief that food should never be used as a weapon. President Reagan said it best, "a hungry child knows no politics." We should continue to uphold that principle and this provision moves us closer to that goal.

The other controversial measure in this bill involves the reimportation of prescription drugs. Many of my colleagues will address our sides' specific concerns with this provision. But allow me to conclude with a couple of stories that I have shared before but that illustrate the importance of this issue and all that I have said today.

A few months ago, I met Darryl and Martha Wagner in Appalachian Ohio. They depend on Social Security and retirement for their meager \$1,000 per month. She has cancer and her treatment and medication consume much of their income. Her doctor was concerned about whether she was getting enough to eat. By the time a food pantry outreach worker reached them, neither had eaten anything for three days. They had tried to do everything by the book and they were still hungry.

Another woman from southeastern Ohio, Priscilla Stevens, has lupus and MS and is required to take 26 medications every day. She receives only \$258 each month and relies on Medicaid for her very life. I never got a chance to meet Tom Nelson in West Virginia. He died from a heart attack last year. You see, he had high blood pressure and needed medication to keep it under control. He had to choose between filling his refrigerator and filling his prescription. Sadly, he made the wrong choice when he decided to skip his drugs and eat instead.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I have to keep talking about issues of hunger. This bill makes some strides toward fighting hunger. But we could do so much more, especially now. I look forward to the day when Congress makes ending hunger a top priority.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the reimportation provisions of the FY 2001 agriculture appropriations legislation that is before the House today. In recent weeks, these provisions have been the subject of considerable controversy: Some Members have asserted that allowing wholesalers to reimport FDA-approved pharmaceuticals will essentially solve the problem of overpricing, while others say the practice will expose U.S. consumers to unsafe products. Some argue that the legislation is so riddled with loopholes as to be useless, while others believe the final compromise is workable.

The bill is an attempt to address obscenely high drug prices. But it is far too limited in its approach, because it assumes that wholesalers reimporting prescription drugs will do so at prices that are affordable for the 15 million seniors and disabled Americans who do not have any form of insurance to cover the cost of their medications.

This is a flawed assumption. There is no guarantee that the "middlemen" in this bill will actually pass along substantial drug discounts to consumers who need them. And the bill's loopholes will allow pharmaceutical companies to keep drug prices inflated through restrictive contracts and control of FDA-required labels.

What seniors clearly need above all else is a Medicare drug benefit. Democrats support legislation, H.R. 4770, to guarantee comprehensive drug coverage to any senior who wants to sign up. It guarantees that all prescriptions written by any qualified physician can be filled at any pharmacy of the beneficiary's choice at a price that is affordable. We can pass such a bill this year. It is a travesty that the Republican leadership refuses to do so.

In fact, Republicans have gone to enormous lengths to block efforts to enact a Medicare drug benefit. Instead, they push a temporary state program that would help only the poorest, and private "drug-only" plans that insurers say they will never sell to seniors.

Meanwhile, the pharmaceutical industry and its phony front groups are spending millions to try to ensure that no legislation providing affordable prescription drugs to seniors is seriously considered. Regrettably, these efforts have served to seriously weaken the reimportation provisions in H.R. 4461 that we are voting on today.

If all we're going to accomplish is a relaxation of reimportation restrictions, there is still a better solution than the one before us today. I introduced last month, the Medicare Prescription Drug Internet Access Act of 2000 (H.R. 5142). It would allow beneficiaries to purchase safe, FDA-approved medications from U.S. and international suppliers at the lowest possible prices through an Internet site administered by Medicare. This means that Medicare beneficiaries would have guaranteed access to lower drug prices from a safe, certified-reliable source.

Here's how it works: All a beneficiary, doctor, or a pharmacy serving a beneficiary would need to do is click on Medicare's home page and type in a prescription. The result would be a display of the five lowest prices for the medicine in question and its availability from domestic and international suppliers. Beneficiaries would choose one and submit their prescription to the Internet pharmacy, receiving their medicine at the price selected through the mail, by express delivery, or at their local retail pharmacy.

The only medicine that Internet pharmacies contracting with Medicare would be able to sell is FDA-approved medicine manufactured in FDA-approved facilities. Internet pharmacies, under this bill, would only be able to import prescription medicine from approved companies that have been inspected by the FDA.

As an added precaution, Internet pharmacies would be required to display a Medicare Seal of Approval, which serves to authenticate the website. The seal would directly link to a secure webpage operated by the Medicare contractor to verify the Internet pharmacy's legitimacy.

These precautions would address problems that exist today with phony websites pawning counterfeit medicine to unsuspecting people. This bill addresses the issue of so-called "rogue" websites. It establishes a uniform set of criteria to which contracting Internet phar-

macies must adhere or face criminal and financial consequences. Among other criteria, Internet pharmacies would have to be licensed in all 50 states as a pharmacy, fully comply with State and Federal laws, and only dispense medicine with a valid prescription through a licensed practitioner.

The bill I have just described will not be enacted this year. Nor is it a full-blown solution for the problems created by eroding insurance coverage for prescription drugs and accelerating drug price increases. Again, revising reimportation rules is one way to make prescription drugs more widely available at affordable prices. But today's bill falls far short of what is necessary to attain that goal. And, it ignores the real need of America's seniors—a Medicare drug benefit that is available and affordable for all.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Agriculture Appropriations bill, but want to specifically address the provisions regarding reimportation of prescription drugs, section 745 and 746. As a Member of the Commerce Committee, which has jurisdiction over this issue, I am glad two provisions were included to ensure the safety of consumers, and that savings are passed along to customers.

First, we must be sure that nothing in these provisions compromises the health or safety of the American public in any way. Section 745 requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services to demonstrate in a written report to Congress that implementation of the amendment will pose no risk to the public, before the legislation can become effective. This demonstration requirement is no paper tiger. We expect the Secretary to make detailed factual findings and to submit a report supporting the demonstration, if indeed the Secretary can make it at all. The demonstration must be based on a detailed explanation that the Food and Drug Administration has the resources to enforce all of the requirements of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act against each and every one of these drug products as they arrive at our borders. If FDA cannot do this, the demonstration cannot be made, and these provisions cannot be implemented.

Through the hard work of the House Commerce Committee in previous Congresses, we have established a precedent for ensuring that Americans have access to safe and effective prescription drugs. Any attempt to undermine this system by lowering these standards is not acceptable.

Second, this legislation sets a condition that before it is implemented, the Secretary must demonstrate that it will result in a cost reduction to American consumers. If the result of reimportation profits only middlemen, and not individual consumers, we will have done little to extend affordable prescriptions to our constituents.

In my view, these two determinations are bare minimum essentials that must be in place before this legislation is implemented. We must be vigilant in ensuring that American consumers are not threatened or put at risk in any way by the prescription drugs that come into this country under these provisions.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Conference Report on the Agriculture Appropriations bill for Fiscal Year 2001. I would like to commend the conferees and all the appropriators for their hard work on this bill, and to thank them for funding several important projects in my district.

This legislation recognizes the threat bovine tuberculosis poses to Michigan and provides funds to begin eradicating the disease in Michigan and throughout the country. Bovine tuberculosis is wreaking havoc on dairy and beef cattle in my state. Already, 10 Michigan herds have tested positive for the disease as have several deer and other animals. To complicate matters, USDA responded by downgrading Michigan's bovine TB status. Because of this downgrade, Michigan's economy is expected to lose \$156 million during the next ten years.

While much work remains to be done, I am encouraged by the funding provided in this legislation to combat bovine TB in Michigan. It is my hope that this effort will begin the process of restoring Michigan to bovine TB-free status. I am committed to helping the farmers of my district and I hope that this research and reimbursement funding will bring them much-needed relief.

Secondly, I support this legislation because it provides funding for the Forestry Incentives Program. While this earmark is small, equaling the spending for Fiscal Year 2000, the Administration had not requested funds in its Fiscal Year 2001 budget nor had the House appropriated funds in its Agriculture spending bill. The Forestry Incentives Program provides cost-share funds to private landowners for tree planting and timber stand improvement. Through these efforts, we are able to keep our forests healthy and sustainable.

Finally, I am pleased that the conferees retained a portion of the important increase in funding to the USDA senior meal reimbursements that had been added by the Stupak-Boehlert amendment to the House Agriculture appropriations bill. Our amendment provided \$160 million for USDA's Nutrition Program for the Elderly, a \$20 million increase over the amount provided in the bill. Senior meal providers and the countless seniors that depend on senior meals will be greatly benefitted by the \$10 million increase that the conferees retained. This increase will halt the steady decline of the USDA meal reimbursements that have gone down to their current rate of \$.54 per meal for fiscal year 2000, a drop of eight cents since 1993.

The increase in USDA reimbursements is essential, and will benefit every senior meal provider in every town, city and state in the form of more money for each meal provided. I urge the House to continue in the future the effort to increase this crucial aid to senior meal providers. I am also submitting for the record letters in support of the increase in funding from the National Association of Nutrition and Aging Services Programs, the Meals on Wheels Association of America, and the Senior Citizens League. These organizations were invaluable in moving this issue forward. I would also like to thank National Council of Senior Citizens and the National Association of State Units on Aging for their work on promoting our amendment.

I submit the following letters into the RECORD.

MEALS ON WHEELS  
ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,  
*Alexandria, VA, October 11, 2000.*

Hon. BART STUPAK,  
*Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE STUPAK: On behalf of the Meals On Wheels Association of America's (MOWAA) nearly 900 member programs

nationwide and the hundreds of thousands of older Americans whom they serve, I want to thank and commend you and Representative Sherwood Boehlert for sponsoring an amendment to H.R. 4461, the Department of Agriculture Appropriations bill, to provide an additional \$20 million in funding for the Nutrition Program for the Elderly (NPE). We were delighted when the House passed your amendment, and we are pleased that the Conferees agreed to include \$10 million of that increase in the final Conference bill.

As you are aware, Congress appropriated \$150 million for the program in fiscal year 1996, but the appropriation was reduced by \$10 million to \$140 million in FY 1997, and it has remained at that level for several fiscal years. The Conferees' actions, when approved by both chambers, will bring funding for the program back to the FY 1996 level.

Few programs can boast the importance to the elderly, as well as the overwhelming success, that the Elderly Nutrition Program can. Senior nutrition programs have become the lifeline for millions of older Americans. There are few communities within the country where a senior nutrition program does not exist. These meal programs are as diverse as the communities in which they are located and the individuals they serve. At the same time, they share a common commitment to serving the nutritional needs of a growing number of older Americans. They also share a common problem—extremely limited resources. The funds and commodities furnished through the Department of Agriculture's NPE are vital to these programs. The \$10 million increase over current levels is critically important in enabling these programs to continue serving the needs of our frailest and neediest citizens.

As you are aware, USDA Nutrition Program for the Elderly funds are provided to meal programs according to a per meal reimbursement rate. The rate has dropped over the past years from \$.6206 in FY 1993 to \$.5404 in the current fiscal year. Without a substantial increase in the appropriation level, the rate can be expected to continue to drop.

To put the issue in perspective, let me furnish an example from one rural meal program. A rural program that served 225,000 meals annually, and which received 20 percent of its budget from USDA funds, lost funding for 2,000 meals as a result of the per meal reimbursement reduction of a mere \$.0007 in one fiscal year (from \$.5864 in FY 1996 to \$.5857 in FY 1997). Those 2,000 meals, of course, represent critical and life-sustaining nutrition for at-risk seniors. And the experience of that one meal program was multiplied thousands of times over across the nation. You can imagine the impact that the \$.0802 reduction from FY 1993 to FY 2000 has had on meal programs—and needy, hungry seniors—throughout the country.

Because America's elderly population continues to be fastest growing segment of the population, demands on nutrition programs for the elderly are increasing. The most comprehensive national study to be conducted in recent years found that 41 percent of home-delivered meal programs had waiting lists. The relatively small investment of an additional \$10 million that your amendment made possible will pay substantial dividends in helping target malnutrition and isolation in the elderly, improving their nutritional and health status and enabling many seniors to stay in their homes.

The Meals On Wheels Association of America urges the full House to approve conference bill, which will increase funding for the USDA Nutrition Program for the Elderly by \$10 million over the FY 2000 level. We thank you again on behalf of all our member programs and the many needy seniors for

whom this increase will mean a hot, nutritious meal, perhaps the only food of the day. Sincerely,

MARGOT L. CLARK,  
*President.*

SENIOR CITIZENS LEAGUE,  
*Alexandria, VA, October 11, 2000.*

Hon. BART STUPAK,  
*U.S. House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE STUPAK: On behalf of the 1.5 million members and supporters of The Senior Citizens League (TSCL), many whom are dependent on various senior meal programs for their livelihood, are grateful to you and Rep. SHERWOOD BOEHLERT for your efforts to increase the per-meal reimbursement rate. This action was absolutely necessary to insure the continued availability of nutritional and health programs for older Americans who desperately need them for survival.

Your actions have sent a strong message to America's elderly that Congress recognizes and reacts to their needs. TSCL doubts that without your persistence on the topic, the situation being faced by senior meal providers would have been recognized, much less acted upon. Many thanks from TSCL and, in particular, the 4,690 TSCL members who reside in Michigan's 1st Congressional District, for your personal efforts and the contributions of your outstanding staff.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL F. OUELLETTE,  
*Director of Legislative Affairs.*

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF NUTRITION AND AGING SERVICES PROGRAMS,  
*Washington, DC, October 11, 2000.*

Hon. BART STUPAK,  
*House of Representatives, RHOB, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STUPAK: The National Association of Nutrition and Aging Services Programs (NANASP), representing the interests of congregate and home delivered meal programs for the elderly in your state and across the nation, supports the Conference Report to accompany H.R. 4461.

We wish, in particular, to commend the Conference Committee for maintaining the provision to increase funding for the USDA's Elderly Feeding Program (NPE) by \$10 million. By increasing the funding for the program, you prevent disruption to meal programs that prove so vital to seniors and provide a little stability on the local level, which is important to the meal providers.

NANASP also commends you, Congressman Stupak, for taking leadership on this issue. We would have preferred the \$20 million increase offered by your amendment and hope we can work with you next year to revisit this matter. We know that you recognize this as a strong investment in maintaining the good health of this nation's seniors. Nutrition is a preventive service that keeps seniors in their homes and communities rather than facing more costly institutionalization.

We thank you and Conference Committee for recognizing the value and effectiveness of this program and hope it will be provided this modest increase for FY 2001.

Sincerely,

JAN BONINE,  
*President.*

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I support this conference agreement and its Continued Dumping Offset provision. The language in the amendment is the same as that in H.R. 842, a bill introduced by my distinguished colleague from Ohio, Mr. REGULA, and to which I and 63 other members of the House are currently cosponsors.

The rationale behind the amendment is simple: Where internationally recognized unfair trade practices cause harm to our producers and workers, effective relief is promised. The amendment included in the conference package would reduce the adverse effect of continued dumping or subsidization by distributing the monies finally assessed to the injured industry. It is hoped that the knowledge that continued unfair trade practices will result in monies going to the injured and encourage those engaging in the continued unfair trade practices to trade fairly.

In my district and my state, I have witnessed first-hand what can happen to companies and jobs when unfair trade practices distort the market conditions. In one important industry, bearings, continued dumping has gone on uninterrupted for more than a decade. Companies who operate under constant conditions of depressed prices are not able to maintain investments, employment levels or compensation levels even if they are highly competitive at the beginning of the process. Similar experiences exist for many other industries where continued dumping or subsidization has gone on.

I urge my Republican and Democratic colleagues to support this conference agreement and the Continued Dumping Offset provision.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUSSLE). All time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 340, nays 75, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 525]

YEAS—340

Abercrombie	Brady (TX)	Deutsch
Aderholt	Brown (FL)	Diaz-Balart
Allen	Brown (OH)	Dickey
Armey	Bryant	Dicks
Baca	Burton	Dixon
Bachus	Buyer	Dooley
Baird	Callahan	Doolittle
Baker	Calvert	Doyle
Baldacci	Camp	Dreier
Baldwin	Canady	Duncan
Ballenger	Cannon	Dunn
Barcia	Capps	Edwards
Barr	Capuano	Ehlers
Barrett (NE)	Cardin	Ehrlich
Barrett (WI)	Castle	Emerson
Bartlett	Chambliss	Engel
Barton	Clay	English
Bass	Clayton	Etheridge
Becerra	Clement	Evans
Bentsen	Collins	Everett
Bereuter	Combest	Ewing
Berry	Condit	Farr
Biggert	Cook	Fattah
Bilbray	Cooksey	Fletcher
Billirakis	Costello	Foley
Bishop	Coyne	Forbes
Blagojevich	Cramer	Ford
Bliley	Cubin	Fossella
Blunt	Cummings	Fowler
Boehlert	Cunningham	Frost
Bonilla	Danner	Gallely
Bonior	Davis (FL)	Ganske
Bono	Deal	Gekas
Borski	DeFazio	Gephardt
Boswell	DeGette	Gibbons
Boucher	Delahunt	Gilchrest
Boyd	DeLauro	Gillmor
Brady (PA)	DeLay	Gilman

Gonzalez	John	McGovern	Porter	Shaw	Thompson (CA)	Istook	Moran (VA)	Schakowsky
Goode	Johnson (CT)	McHugh	Portman	Sherwood	Thompson (MS)	Jackson (IL)	Nadler	Sensenbrenner
Goodlatte	Johnson, E. B.	McInnis	Price (NC)	Shimkus	Thornberry	Johnson, Sam	Napolitano	Shadegg
Goodling	Jones (NC)	McIntyre	Pryce (OH)	Shows	Thune	Kasich	Olver	Shays
Gordon	Jones (OH)	McKeon	Quinn	Shuster	Thurman	Kleczka	Owens	Sherman
Graham	Kanjorski	McNulty	Radanovich	Simpson	Tiahrt	Kolbe	Paul	Stark
Granger	Kaptur	Meek (FL)	Rahall	Sisisky	Trafficant	Lantos	Payne	Sununu
Green (TX)	Kelly	Meeks (NY)	Ramstad	Skeen	Turner	Largent	Pelosi	Tancredo
Green (WI)	Kennedy	Menendez	Regula	Skelton	Udall (CO)	Lee	Rangel	Tierney
Greenwood	Kildee	Mica	Reyes	Slaughter	Udall (NM)	Lofgren	Rohrabacher	Toomey
Gutierrez	Kilpatrick	Millender-	Reynolds	Smith (MI)	Velazquez	Markey	Roukema	Towns
Gutknecht	Kind (WI)	McDonald	Riley	Smith (NJ)	Visclosky	McCrery	Royce	Upton
Hall (OH)	King (NY)	Miller, Gary	Rivers	Smith (TX)	Vitter	McDermott	Salmon	Waters
Hall (TX)	Kingston	Minge	Rodriguez	Smith (WA)	Walden	McKinney	Sanford	Waxman
Hansen	Knollenberg	Mink	Roemer	Snyder	Walsh	Metcalf	Scarborough	Weiner
Hastert	Kucinich	Moakley	Rogan	Souder	Wamp	Miller, George	Schaffer	Weldon (FL)
Hastings (FL)	Kuykendall	Mollohan	Rogers	Spence	Watkins	NOT VOTING—18		
Hastings (WA)	LaFalce	Moore	Ros-Lehtinen	Stabenow	Watt (NC)	Archer	Franks (NJ)	Miller (FL)
Hayes	LaHood	Moran (KS)	Rothman	Stearns	Watts (OK)	Burr	Hunter	Myrick
Hayworth	Lampson	Morella	Roybal-Allard	Stenholm	Weldon (PA)	Campbell	Klink	Neal
Herger	Larson	Murtha	Rush	Strickland	Weller	Coble	McCollum	Pastor
Hill (IN)	Latham	Nethercutt	Ryan (WI)	Stump	Wexler	Eshoo	McIntosh	Spratt
Hill (MT)	LaTourette	Ney	Ryun (KS)	Stupak	Weygand	Frank (MA)	Meehan	Wise
Hilleary	Lazio	Northup	Sabo	Sweeney	Whitfield			
Hilliard	Leach	Norwood	Sanchez	Talent	Wicker			
Hinchee	Levin	Nussle	Sanders	Tanner	Wilson			
Hinojosa	Lewis (CA)	Oberstar	Sandlin	Tauscher	Wolf			
Hobson	Lewis (GA)	Obey	Sawyer	Tauzin	Wooolsey			
Hoeffel	Lewis (KY)	Ortiz	Saxton	Taylor (MS)	Wu			
Holden	Linder	Ose	Scott	Taylor (NC)	Wynn			
Holt	Lipinski	Oxley	Serrano	Terry	Young (AK)			
Hooley	LoBiondo	Packard	Sessions	Thomas	Young (FL)			
Horn	Lowey	Pallone	NAYS—75					
Houghton	Lucas (KY)	Pascrell	Ackerman	Clyburn	Dingell			
Hoyer	Lucas (OK)	Pease	Andrews	Coburn	Doggett			
Hulshof	Luther	Peterson (MN)	Berkley	Conyers	Filner			
Hutchinson	Maloney (CT)	Peterson (PA)	Berman	Cox	Frelinghuysen			
Hyde	Maloney (NY)	Petri	Blumenauer	Crane	Gejdenson			
Inslie	Manzullo	Phelps	Boehner	Crowley	Goss			
Isakson	Martinez	Pickering	Carson	Davis (IL)	Hefley			
Jackson-Lee	Mascara	Pickett	Chabot	Davis (VA)	Hoekstra			
(TX)	Matsui	Pitts	Chenoweth-Hage	DeMint	Hostettler			
Jefferson	McCarthy (MO)	Pombo						
Jenkins	McCarthy (NY)	Pomeroy						

1752

Messrs. MCDERMOTT, RANGEL, OLVER, CROWLEY and TIERNEY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. JONES of Ohio and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**NOTICE**

***Incomplete record of House proceedings. Except for concluding business which follows, today's House proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.***

**CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4392, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001**

Mr. GOSS submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 4392) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 106-969)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4392), to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the community Management Account and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and disability System, and for other purposes having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following:

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.**

(a) *SHORT TITLE.*—This Act may be cited as the "Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001".

(b) *TABLE OF CONTENTS.*—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

**TITLE I—INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES**

Sec. 101. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 102. Classified schedule of authorizations.

Sec. 103. Personnel ceiling adjustments.

Sec. 104. Community management account.

Sec. 105. Transfer authority of the Director of Central Intelligence.

**TITLE II—CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM**

Sec. 201. Authorization of appropriations.

**TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS**

**Subtitle A—Intelligence Community**

Sec. 301. Increase in employee compensation and benefits authorized by law.

Sec. 302. Restriction on conduct of intelligence activities.

Sec. 303. Sense of the Congress on intelligence community contracting.

Sec. 304. Prohibition on unauthorized disclosure of classified information.

Sec. 305. Authorization for travel on any common carrier for certain intelligence collection personnel.

Sec. 306. Update of report on effects of foreign espionage on United States trade secrets.

Sec. 307. POW/MIA analytic capability within the intelligence community.

Sec. 308. Applicability to lawful United States intelligence activities of Federal laws implementing international treaties and agreements.

Sec. 309. Limitation on handling, retention, and storage of certain classified materials by the Department of State.

Sec. 310. Designation of Daniel Patrick Moynihan Place.

Sec. 311. National Security Agency voluntary separation.

**Subtitle B—Diplomatic Telecommunications Service Program Office (DTS-PO)**

Sec. 321. Reorganization of Diplomatic Telecommunications Service Program Office.

Sec. 322. Personnel.

Sec. 323. Diplomatic Telecommunications Service Oversight Board.

Sec. 324. General provisions.

**TITLE IV—CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY**

Sec. 401. Modifications to Central Intelligence Agency's central services program.

Sec. 402. Technical corrections.

Sec. 403. Expansion of Inspector General actions requiring a report to Congress.

Sec. 404. Detail of employees to the National Reconnaissance Office.

Sec. 405. Transfers of funds to other agencies for acquisition of land.

Sec. 406. Eligibility of additional employees for reimbursement for professional liability insurance.