

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.