

with no family left, said she needs subsidized health care.

"I don't have anything else," she said. "It's bad to do us that way."

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

#### NATURALIZATION REMARKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California, [Mr. FARR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the 4th of July celebrating our citizenship and the good fortune to live in a country where people can elect a government that derives its strength from the faith of the government, let us take this moment during the 4th of July recess to reflect on a lot of people who will be citizens of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I am talking about the many of us who recognize that there are decent, productive, legal immigrants trying to become good and productive American citizens. Sometimes there is one thing in the way, a backlogged naturalization process.

As a Member of this Congress, I have worked with the administration towards eliminating the long backlogs and improving the naturalization process for many hard-working immigrants who wait as long as a year and a half to get naturalized after they have qualified to be naturalized.

Recently I supported the INS request to pour more funds into improving our naturalization system. This successful effort allows the INS to spend \$76.6 million to make progress, processing "adjustment of status applications" and "naturalization applications" much easier.

These critical funds will allow the INS to hire more than 1,000 much-needed additional staff and utilize newly improved technology to more efficiently process the surging backlogs.

It will help also in the INS efforts to improve customer service. It is very important to point out that the money for naturalization is not taxpayer money. It is from the immigrants themselves and from the application fees that they pay into the system.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see that this unprecedented commitment by the INS to improve the naturalization process and eliminate many of the backlogs will allow many people to become citizens this next year. I ask my colleagues to join me in making the 4th of July a day in which our communities do their own swearing-in ceremonies, to welcome our newest citizens on board.

I will be performing such ceremonies in Watsonville, CA, on July 7. I hope a year from now that the President will

offer the lawn of the White House for the national 4th of July swearing-in ceremony and that every Member of this Congress will sponsor residents in their district to participate in such a swearing-in ceremony.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 5 minutes

[Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. JACKSON-LEE addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FOLEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. FOLEY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. GOSS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. RIGGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. HOKE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### FARM PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to speak briefly about one of the amendments we had today in the full Committee on Appropriations that had to do with some of the farm programs that are coming up.

This particular amendment had to do with the peanut program. The peanut program, like all of the agriculture programs, frankly are somewhat hard to describe and explain and they are very complicated. But one of the things that I think people need to keep in mind when we discuss agriculture is that, number one, the agriculture programs that we have were designed to give the American consumers an abundant supply of food and a steady supply, steady variety at reasonable prices. That has been achieved. American consumers spend 11 percent of their income on food compared to 20 percent in other countries and 33 percent in countries like the Soviet Union.

So when we talk about farm subsidies and farm programs and so forth, we need to keep in mind that the people who are being subsidized are not necessarily the farmers. They are the American consumers. Eleven percent of our income, again, Mr. Speaker, goes to groceries. Compared to other countries, America is favorably ahead.

□ 2130

Number two, farm programs have been reduced from a \$26 billion level in 1987 to \$10.6 billion today, in 1995. If all the Federal Government programs had been reduced as much as agriculture programs, we would not have the deficit. We would be paying down the debt. No other agencies, with the exception of Defense, can claim that kind of cut in the last 8-year period of time.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, every time I pick up the newspapers, the big problem with the Federal budget seems to be agriculture. People do not keep that in mind.

Finally, let me say this. The farm bill is coming up. Every year we have a farm bill, and all these programs are up for negotiation right now. There are many, many Members who are moving these programs to a more traditional capitalist system. We are changing the status quo. We are moving towards no net cost programs.

I have noticed that the gentleman from central Georgia, SAXBY CHAMBLISS, has come down here. He is on the Committee on Agriculture. He is involved. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Georgia. I know he has been involved in changing the peanut program to a no net cost program, and I know he is doing the same with many other programs.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, he is exactly right. We in the Committee on Agriculture have been involved in trying to rewrite every single title of the agriculture programs in preparation for the 1995 farm bill, which is, without a doubt, going to be the most crucial farm bill that we have ever written in Congress. The reason it is going to be so crucial is that it is going to dictate how our agriculture community operates from now into the 21st century.

Irrespective of what any segment of our country thinks, the agriculture community is still the backbone of the economy of this country. The reason they are is that we feed more people in this country than anybody else in the world does. We not only feed folks in this country, we feed folks all over the world. We grow the finest quality agricultural products of anybody in the world.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I think the average American farmer feeds something like 187 people, and 126 people outside of America, so the production is unbelievable. I did not want to break down the gentleman's train of thought there.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. The gentleman is exactly right. Let me tell the Members what we have been thinking about in the Committee on Agriculture, as far as the 1995 farm bill is concerned. We have in place now two agreements, the GATT agreement as well as the NAFTA agreements. Those two agreements are going to dictate certain requirements on the agriculture community from a subsidy standpoint.

We know that when NAFTA and GATT are fully implemented, that we are going to have to transition into a true free world market, and we in the Committee on Agriculture are preparing to do that. We are working very diligently towards modifying and changing programs to ensure that our folks involved in agriculture are able to compete in the world market when those treaties are fully implemented.

Mr. KINGSTON. I would ask the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, is it not true that France subsidizes their farmers? Most European countries subsidize their farmers. Is it not true that American farmers cannot even sell rice in Japan because of the tariff agreement?

So even as we look at GATT, and look at NAFTA, it is not a perfect world. We are not going out there on a free world basis, because of still existing trade barriers and still existing subsidies by foreign governments to their farmers who are competing with our American farmers. Is that not the case?

Mr. CHAMBLISS. If the gentleman will yield, he is absolutely right. Not only France but countries like Spain highly subsidize their farmers. They compete against us in the world market. We simply cannot do that and be able to make a profit in our agriculture community.

#### A NEW FARM POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DIAZ-BALART). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CHAMBLISS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, we will continue the same dialog with the gentleman from the First District of Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON].

Mr. Speaker, one way that we look at the farm programs is not from the standpoint of is it a subsidy, because it really is not. The United States government makes an investment into our agriculture community, and a good example of it is with the peanut program.

The peanut program is a highly criticized program, but the reason it is criticized is because most folks just do not understand it. What we do in the United States is we have invested over the last 10 years an average of \$15 million a year into the peanut program. That program in Georgia alone last year was a \$2.5 billion industry. I do not know how many jobs it created, just in the State of Georgia alone. Peanuts are grown from Texas all the way to Georgia, up the seaboard, all the way into Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, really what our farm programs are are investments by the U.S. Government into our agriculture community, into our States, that create jobs, they provide an income for people, and we get a significant return off of those programs from the standpoint of income to our farmers, as well as providing crops.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, one of the things we are telling farmers from the gentleman's district and my district and all over the country is despite the fact that we have gone from \$26 billion in a government investment to \$10 billion over a net year period of time, they are still going to have to change if we are going to have a program. We are moving these programs into no net cost programs. We are transforming them. If people want status quo, they lose out in 1995. That is not what the taxpayers want. They want a balanced budget, which means we are going to have to all do more.

What we try to do, Mr. Speaker, is measure agriculture with the same yardstick that we measure social programs. When we are looking at social programs, if we are going to vote to cut them, then we need to be able to say we are going to do the same thing to agriculture.

What the farmers are saying to us is "We realize that, as long as you are fair and across the board, and do not balance the budget on the back of farmers." In fact, we could not, because even if we eliminate all farm spending, it constitutes three-fifths of 1 percent of the entire budget. It will not balance the budget if we eliminate it completely.

What we are trying to get across to folks, Mr. Speaker, even still, we have to change the program in order to be in

this game. I am glad to say that most of the farmers I have talked to, and I think Mr. CHAMBLISS as well, are saying "Do what you can to balance the budget. Make that the number one priority, but remember, you have to feed people and you have to have farmers to do that, so do not eliminate all your agricultural investments."

Mr. CHAMBLISS. One interesting thing about agriculture, Mr. Speaker, is that our farmers are generally conservative individuals. They fully believe the main thing we need to do in this country is balance the budget. I have not met a single farmer in my district who does not give that a high priority.

At the same time, as the gentleman says, we simply cannot single out the agricultural community to balance the budget. One thing that our chairman of the Committee on Agriculture is committed to do is to ensure that all cuts that are made are taken in a proportionate, on an equal basis with other programs, and agriculture is not singled out.

Let me just address one other point that is very crucial, Mr. Speaker, and it is something that folks who are opposed to the farm programs continually point out. That is that there is a myth out there if agriculture programs are cut out, that the housewife will see a difference in the price at the retail store. That simply is not true.

We have had testimony after testimony in the Committee on Agriculture from individuals who are involved in manufacturing who will tell us that even if we take a price cut, or even if there is a price cut in the support price, there will not be a reflection of that cut in the retail price. They will use that money either to add to their bottom line, to show their stockholders that they have made more money, or they will take that money and put it in promotion to advertise their products. Therefore, there is not going to be a change in the price at the retail store if there are cuts in price supports. That myth simply does not exist.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman has summed it up.

#### A MESSAGE FROM CARDINAL O'CONNOR TO CONGRESS, REMEMBERING APRIL 16, 1995, AND CLARIFYING THE MEANING OF THE WORD "COVENANT"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I hope an average C-SPAN audience is here for an exciting special order I guess to follow, but also because I have a message from a very important prelate of the Holy Roman Catholic Church.

Mr. Speaker, when the Los Angeles Times wrote about my presidential announcement week in New Hampshire and New York, their traveling reporter left out the high point of our whole