



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 4, 1999

No. 113

Senate

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

(Continued)

AMENDMENT NO. 1530

(Purpose: To redesignate the National School Lunch Act as the "Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act")

At the end of the bill, insert the following:

SEC. ____ REDESIGNATION OF NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT AS RICHARD B. RUSSELL NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT.—(a) IN GENERAL.—The first section of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 note) is amended by striking "National School Lunch Act" and inserting "Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act".

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The following provisions of law are amended by striking "National School Lunch Act" each place it appears and inserting "Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act":

(1) Sections 3 and 13(3)(A) of the Commodity Distribution Reform Act and WIC Amendments of 1987 (7 U.S.C. 612c note; Public Law 100-237).

(2) Section 404 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1424).

(3) Section 201(a) of the Act entitled "An Act to extend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, and for other purposes", approved September 21, 1959 (7 U.S.C. 1431c(a); 73 Stat. 610).

(4) Section 211(a) of the Agricultural Trade Suspension Adjustment Act of 1980 (7 U.S.C. 4004(a)).

(5) Section 245A(h)(4)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1255a(h)(4)(A)).

(6) Sections 403(c)(2)(C), 422(b)(3), 423(d)(3), 741(a)(1), and 742 of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1613(c)(2)(C), 1632(b)(3), 1183a note, 42 U.S.C. 1751 note, 8 U.S.C. 1615; Public Law 104-193).

(7) Section 2243(b) of title 10, United States Code.

(8) Sections 404B(g)(1)(A), 404D(c)(2), and 404F(a)(2) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070a-22(g)(1)(A), 1070a-24(c)(2), 1070a-26(a)(2); Public Law 105-244).

(9) Section 231(d)(3)(A)(i) of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act (20 U.S.C. 2341(d)(3)(A)(i)).

(10) Section 1113(a)(5) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6313(a)(5)).

(11) Section 1397E(d)(4)(A)(iv)(II) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(12) Sections 254(b)(2)(B) and 263(a)(2)(C) of the Job Training Partnership Act (29 U.S.C. 1633(b)(2)(B), 1643(a)(2)(C)).

(13) Section 3803(c)(2)(C)(xiii) of title 31, United States Code.

(14) Section 602(d)(9)(A) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 474(d)(9)(A)).

(15) Sections 2(4), 3(1), and 301 of the Healthy Meals for Healthy Americans Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 1751 note; Public Law 103-448).

(16) Sections 3, 4, 7, 10, 13, 16(b), 17, and 19(d) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1772, 1773, 1776, 1779, 1782, 1785(b), 1786, 1788(d)).

(17) Section 658O(b)(3) of the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 9858m(b)(3)).

(18) Subsection (b) of the first section of Public Law 87-688 (48 U.S.C. 1666(b)).

(19) Section 10405(a)(2)(H) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1989 (Public Law 101-239; 103 Stat. 2489).

AMENDMENT NO. 1531

(Purpose: To provide additional funding for the Watershed and Flood Preventions and earmark funds for financial and technical assistance for pilot rehabilitation projects in Mississippi)

On page 33, line 15 after the period, insert the following: "Provided further, That of the funds available for Emergency Watershed Protection activities, \$5,000,000 shall be available for Mississippi and Wisconsin for financial and technical assistance for pilot rehabilitation projects of small, upstream dams built under the Watershed and Flood Prevention Act (16 U.S.C. 1001 et seq., Section 13 of the Act of December 22, 1994) Public Law 78-534; 58 Stat. 905, and the pilot watershed program authorized under the heading 'FLOOD PREVENTION' of the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1954, (Public Law 156; 67 Stat 214)".

AMENDMENT NO. 1532

(Purpose: To increase the fee on guaranteed business and industry loans thereby reducing the subsidy costs)

On page 41, line 6, insert the following before the period: "Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated under this

paragraph shall be available unless the Department of Agriculture proposes a revised regulation to allow leaders to be charged a fee of up to 3% on guaranteed business and industry loans".

AMENDMENT NO. 1533

(Purpose: To provide at least twenty five percent of the appropriated funds to small minority farmers for cooperatives)

On page 42, line 7, insert the following before the period: "Provided, That at least twenty-five percent of the total amount appropriated shall be made available to cooperatives or associations of cooperatives that assist small minority producers".

AMENDMENT NO. 1534

(Purpose: To amend the National Drought Policy Act of 1998, to make a technical correction)

At the appropriate place in the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. . . Public Law 105-199 (112 Stat. 641) is amended in section 3(b)(1)(G) by striking "persons", and inserting in lieu thereof "governors, who may be represented on the Commission by their respective designees,".

AMENDMENT NO. 1535

(Purpose: To require the expenditure of appropriated funds for certain enforcement activities)

On page 55, line 5, strike the semicolon and insert the following: ", of which \$1,000,000 shall be for premarket review, enforcement and oversight activities related to users and manufacturers of all reprocessed medical devices as authorized by the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321 et seq.), and of which no less than \$55,500,000 and 522 full-time equivalent positions shall be for premarket application review activities to meet statutory review times;".

AMENDMENT NO. 1536

(Purpose: Expressing the sense of the Senate concerning the United States Action Plan on Food Security)

On page 76, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

SEC. 7. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING ACTION PLAN ON FOOD SECURITY.

It is the sense of the Senate that the President should include in the fiscal year 2001 budget request funding to implement the United States Action Plan on Food Security.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S10201

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this Saturday, August 7 will mark the tenth anniversary of the death of Congressman Mickey Leland, who was an extraordinarily effective advocate for the hungry people here at home and throughout the world. In remembering his tireless work for the hungry, I think it is fitting to redouble our own efforts to fight hunger and malnutrition.

The United States recently released its plan to reduce hunger. I am offering an amendment today to ask that the President include in his budget request next year specific proposals to implement the U.S. plan.

In November 1996 the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization convened a World Food Summit in Rome. The goal of the conference was to "renew the commitment of world leaders at the highest level to the eradication of hunger and malnutrition and the achievement of food security for all, through the adoption of concerted policies and actions at global, regional, and national levels." Summit participants pledged to cut the number of undernourished people in half by 2015. Each participating country was to decide independently how it could contribute to the goal of food security for all.

This March of this year, the U.S. Department of Agriculture published the U.S. government's plan to meet the goals of the 1996 World Food Summit, entitled U.S. Action Plan on Food Security, Solutions to Hunger. The plan outlines how the United States will fight hunger both at home and abroad. The plan is broad and involves a number of U.S. agencies and policies. It aims to reduce both U.S. and world hunger by addressing the "policy environment," promoting trade and investment, strengthening food security research and educational capacity, integrating environmental concerns into food security efforts, improving the "safety net," better identifying "food insecure" individuals and populations, and addressing food and water safety issues.

The USDA report was issued after the President had already submitted his budget. Many of the recommendations in the report are policies already in place and so already addressed in the President's budget. The report has some specific recommendations, but many are broad principles that need to be fleshed out to lead to specific actions.

I want to be sure that this report does not become one of the many government reports that leads nowhere, that fulfills the requirements of an international conference with lofty goals but little follow-through.

I am offering this amendment today, which simply says that it is the sense of the Senate that the President should include in the fiscal year 2001 budget request funding to implement this plan, to encourage the Administration to submit specific proposals and budget

requests to follow through on our fight against hunger.

AMENDMENT NO. 1537

(Purpose: To require the Farm Service Agency to review programs that provide assistance to apple farmers and report to Congress)

On page 76, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

SEC. 7. FINANCIAL HARDSHIPS FACING APPLE FARMERS.—The Farm Service Agency—

(1) in view of the financial hardship facing United States apple farmers as a result of a loss of markets and excessive imports of apple juice concentrate, shall review all programs that assist apple growers in time of need;

(2) in view of the increased operating costs associated with tree fruit production, shall review the limits currently set on operating loan programs used by apple growers to determine whether the current limits are insufficient to cover those costs; and

(3) shall report to Congress its findings not later than January 1, 2000.

AMENDMENT NO. 1538

(Purpose: To provide additional funding for fruit fly exclusion and detection, with an offset)

On page 18, line 12, strike "\$437,445,000" and insert "\$439,445,000".

On page 18, line 19, after the colon, insert the following "Provided further, That, of the amounts made available under this heading, not less than \$24,970,000 shall be used for fruit fly exclusion and detection (including at least \$6,000,000 for fruit fly exclusion and detection in the state of Florida):".

On page 20, line 16, strike \$7,200,000" and insert "\$5,200,000".

AMENDMENT NO. 1539

On page 36 of S. 1233, line 3 after the word "systems:" insert the following: "Provided further, That of the total amount appropriated, not to exceed \$1,500,000 shall be available to the Grassroots project:".

AMENDMENT NO. 1540

(Purpose: To provide funding for sustainable agriculture research and a research program on improved fruit practices in the State of Michigan, with an offset)

On page 13, line 13, strike "\$54,476,000" and insert "\$54,951,000".

On page 13, line 16, strike "\$117,100,000" and insert "\$116,625,000".

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I am pleased the managers have accepted the amendment that I introduced adding funds for existing research programs under the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service (CSREES) to help identify and develop alternatives for pesticides that are currently necessary for fruit production and whose use is likely to be restricted under the Food Quality Protection Act. This research program has provided much needed support to Michigan's fruit producers, and I thank the managers for allowing it to continue. It is my understanding that the full amount of the cost of this program will come from the "Markets, trade, and policy" section of the CSREES research grants, which currently is undersubscribed. It is also my hope that the additional research funds that I sought for another ongoing CSREES

research project to help farmers reduce their use of fertilizer and pesticide inputs can be secured in conference.

AMENDMENT NO. 1541

At the end of the bill insert:
SEC. . Section 889 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 is amended—

(1) in the heading, by inserting "HARRY K. DUPREE" before "STUTTGART";

(2) in subsection (b)(1)—
(A) in the heading, by inserting "HARRY K. DUPREE" before "STUTTGART"; and
(B) in subparagraphs (A) and (B), by inserting "Harry K. Dupree" before "Stuttgart National Aquaculture Research Center" each place it appears.

AMENDMENT NO. 1542

(Purpose: To provide \$300,000 for climate change research at the Florida Center for Climate Prediction at Florida State University, the University of Florida and the University of Miami with an offset)

On Page 13, Line 16, strike "\$116,625,000" and insert "\$116,325,000".

On Page 14, Line 19, strike "\$13,666,000" and insert "\$13,966,000".

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of the amendment my colleague from Florida, Senator GRAHAM, and I have offered on behalf of the Florida Center for Climate Prediction.

The Center is a consortium between the University of Florida, Florida State University and the University of Miami to study climate variability in the Southeast region. The objective of this unique partnership is to explore the potential value and practical application for long-term climate data and science to the agricultural community in my state and throughout the Southeast.

The consortium's purpose is to develop and evaluate a useful set of tools and methodologies for assessing the regional agricultural consequences of the El Nino/La Nina phenomenon and applying these forecasts to agricultural decision-making. This is a truly innovative project and I am pleased this partnership is making good progress on these important agricultural issues.

Our amendment will provide \$300,000 in funding for the Center in the Federal administration section of the Cooperative State Research and Education, and extension Service [CSREES]—Research and Education Activities section of the bill before us today. I appreciate the support my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee provided this important research initiative.

AMENDMENT NO. 1543

(Purpose: To provide that certain cross-county leasing provisions apply to Kentucky and to release and protect the release of tobacco production and marketing information)

On page 76, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

SEC. 7. TOBACCO LEASING AND INFORMATION.—(a) CROSS-COUNTY LEASING.—Section 319(l) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1314e(l)) is amended in the second sentence by inserting ", Kentucky," after "Tennessee".

(b) TOBACCO PRODUCTION AND MARKETING INFORMATION.—Part I of subtitle B of title III

of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U.S.C. 1311 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 320D. TOBACCO PRODUCTION AND MARKETING INFORMATION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may, subject to subsection (b), release marketing information submitted by persons relating to the production and marketing of tobacco to State trusts or similar organizations engaged in the distribution of national trust funds to tobacco producers and other persons with interests associated with the production of tobacco, as determined by the Secretary.

“(b) LIMITATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Information may be released under subsection (a) only to the extent that—

“(A) the release is in the interest of tobacco producers, as determined by the Secretary; and

“(B) the information is released to a State trust or other organization that is created to, or charged with, distributing funds to tobacco producers or other parties with an interest in tobacco production or tobacco farms under a national or State trust or settlement.

“(2) EXEMPTION FROM RELEASE.—The Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, in advance of making a release of information under subsection (a), allow, by announcement, a period of at least 15 days for persons whose consent would otherwise be required by law to effectuate the release, to elect to be exempt from the release.

“(c) ASSISTANCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In making a release under subsection (a), the Secretary may provide such other assistance with respect to information released under subsection (a) as will facilitate the interest of producers in receiving the funds that are the subject of a trust described in subsection (a).

“(2) FUNDS.—The Secretary shall use amounts made available for salaries and expenses of the Department to carry out paragraph (1).

“(d) RECORDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A person that obtains information described in subsection (a) shall maintain records that are consistent with the purposes of the release and shall not use the records for any purpose not authorized under this section.

“(2) PENALTY.—A person that knowingly violates this subsection shall be fined not more than \$10,000, imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

“(e) APPLICATION.—This section shall not apply to—

“(1) records submitted by cigarette manufacturers with respect to the production of cigarettes;

“(2) records that were submitted as expected purchase intentions in connection with the establishment of national tobacco quotas; or

“(3) records that aggregate the purchases of particular buyers.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 1544

(Purpose: To modify Section 739 of the bill)

On page 70, strike lines 3 through 10, and insert in lieu thereof:

“SEC. 739. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to declare excess or surplus all or part of the lands and facilities owned by the federal government and administered by the Secretary of Agriculture at Fort Reno, Oklahoma, or to transfer or convey such lands or facilities, without the specific authorization of Congress.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 1545

(Purpose: To appropriate \$500,000 for the Nevada Arid Rangelands Initiative to develop research and educational programs to manage healthy and productive rangelands, provide abundant renewable natural resources, and support the economic development of the rangelands in a sustainable manner)

On page 13, line 16, strike the figure “\$116,325,000” and insert in lieu thereof the figure “\$115,825,000” and on page 13, line 13, strike the figure “\$54,951,000” and insert in lieu thereof the figure “\$55,451,000”.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to seek amendment to the allocation for special grants for agricultural research under the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service, Research and Education Activities. I respectfully request that \$500,000 be added to this activity to fund the Nevada Arid Rangelands Initiative at the University of Nevada, Reno. This program is critical to Nevada, which has a higher percentage of its lands classified as arid rangeland than any other state in the union.

The mission of the Nevada Arid Rangelands Initiative is to develop research, management, and educational programs to promote healthy and productive rangelands and to support economic development of these rangelands in a sustainable manner. Healthy, productive rangelands are critical to the support of many rural families and communities and important to Nevada's quality of life.

The rangelands of Nevada are at risk from many factors including competing demands for water, loss of scarce riparian vegetation, invasive weeds, and wildfire. The Nevada Arid Rangelands Initiative will seek to develop innovative strategies for such items as simplified methods to assess rangeland health, the development of watershed grazing strategies, control of invasive weeds and the use of vegetative management strategies to control wildfire.

This money should be included in the following account: “Competitive Research Grants, Natural Resources and the Environment.”

AMENDMENT NO. 1546

On page 13, line 13, increase the dollar amount by \$750,000; and

On page 13, line 16, decrease the dollar amount by \$750,000.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I thank my good friend from Mississippi, the chairman of the Agriculture Appropriations committee, for his leadership on this bill and for his accepting this amendment.

This amendment reduces funding from the National Research Initiative Competitive Grants Program (NRI) on Nutrition, Food Quality and Health in order to target \$750,000 for the continuation of Next Generation Detection and Information Systems for food pathogens and toxins at Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama.

AMENDMENT NO. 1547

(Purpose: To promote eligibility to Berlin, New Hampshire for a rural utilities grant or loan under the Rural Community Advancement Program)

At the end of the bill, add the following:

“SEC. . That notwithstanding section 306(a)(7) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1926 (a)(7)), the city of Berlin, New Hampshire, shall be eligible during fiscal year 2000 for a rural utilities grant or loan under the Rural Community Advancement Program.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 1548

(Purpose: To authorize the Cranberry Marketing Committee to conduct paid advertising for cranberries and cranberry products and to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture and the Committee to collect cranberry inventory data)

On page 76, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

SEC. 7. CRANBERRY MARKETING ORDERS.—(a) PAID ADVERTISING FOR CRANBERRIES AND CRANBERRY PRODUCTS.—Section 8c(6)(I) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (7 U.S.C. 608c(6)(I)), reenacted with amendments by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, is amended in the first proviso—

(1) by striking “or Florida grown strawberries” and inserting “, Florida grown strawberries, or cranberries”; and

(2) by striking “and Florida Indian River grapefruit” and inserting “Florida Indian River grapefruit, and cranberries”.

(b) COLLECTION OF CRANBERRY INVENTORY DATA.—Section 8d of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (7 U.S.C. 608d), reenacted with amendments by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) COLLECTION OF CRANBERRY INVENTORY DATA.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If an order is in effect with respect to cranberries, the Secretary of Agriculture may require persons engaged in the handling or importation of cranberries or cranberry products (including producer-handlers, second handlers, processors, brokers, and importers) to provide such information as the Secretary considers necessary to effectuate the declared policy of this title, including information on acquisitions, inventories, and dispositions of cranberries and cranberry products.

“(B) DELEGATION TO COMMITTEE.—The Secretary may delegate the authority to carry out subparagraph (A) to any committee that is responsible for administering an order covering cranberries.

“(C) CONFIDENTIALITY.—Paragraph (2) shall apply to information provided under this paragraph.

“(D) VIOLATIONS.—Any person that violates this paragraph shall be subject to the penalties provided under section 8c(14).”.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, this amendment, cosponsored by my colleague from Oregon and others from cranberry producing states, amends the Agriculture Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, giving cranberry producers the tools they need to meet the challenges of a rapidly changing marketplace. Cranberry growers in my state produce a fruit that is an important portion of our state's agriculture economy. Despite their economic significance, cranberry marshes or bogs are often small and multi-generational family farms. In fact, it is not uncommon to find a grower who is a third, or fourth generation farmer, working the same ten-acre

bog that is or her grandparents or great-grandparents worked in the twenties or thirties. They have a strong tradition of independence and stewardship and have been marvels of ingenuity and productivity for a long time.

However, today they are suffering. Prices are down by forty to sixty percent over the levels of only a year ago. In some cases the cost of production exceeds the current value of the harvest crop. While cranberry growers tend to be resilient, many are having difficulties dealing with these extreme market conditions.

Our amendment will not solve all of the problems this industry faces in the near-term, but we believe it will help the industry in the long-term. It does not provide any money or increase the regulatory controls on industry. However, the amendment before us today addresses the problems in the cranberry industry in two ways:

First, our amendment would expand the information-gathering authority of the Cranberry Marketing Committee beyond the traditional production states outlined in the original Cranberry Marketing Order. When the order was first conceived, cranberries were largely used only as fresh fruit for the Thanksgiving and Christmas holidays. As I am sure many of my colleagues are aware, decades of innovation and creative marketing by the cranberry industry has led to a tremendous expansion of this commodity—mainly through its use in juices and other products that are consumed year-round. Unfortunately, the commodity reporting mechanisms provided under the current Cranberry Marketing Order have not kept up with the growth and evolution of the industry. Today, vast amounts of cranberry supplies are imported and processed outside of production states that are subject to the Cranberry Marketing Order. This handicaps our cranberry growers, who are unable to obtain accurate information about the available supply, and therefore cannot make the optimum planting decisions. Our legislation would correct this by expanding the Cranberry marketing Committee authority, ultimately enabling growers to make better production decisions.

A second component of our amendment would add cranberries to the list of commodities eligible to use funds raised from domestic procedures for overseas advertising as part of a generic marketing promotion program. Like all other agriculture producers, cranberry growers know the ability to effectively market products in the global marketplace is critical to maintaining growth and increasing price stability. Although it is my understanding that the Cranberry Marketing Committee does not currently plan to initiate such a campaign at this time, our legislation gives them the flexibility to do so.

Much has been said in recent months on this floor about the plight of agriculture and an ongoing farm crisis brought about by record low com-

modity prices. This problem is real and cranberry producers in small Oregon coastal towns like Bandon and Coos Bay have felt it as well. I would like to urge the Secretary of Agriculture to get directly involved with the leadership of the industry to try and find meaningful initiatives that can help them weather this difficult time and ensure a healthy industry for a healthy product.

Mr. President, cranberry growers know global competition will become increasingly fierce in the next century, yet they also know that their future prosperity will be built upon effective marketing and production innovation—not expensive safety nets or reactive trade barriers. I thank my colleagues for joining me in support of this amendment to give cranberry growers in my state and throughout the nation the freedom to address the current farm crisis and pro-actively meet the challenges of the new century.

AMENDMENT NO. 1549

(Purpose: To authorize Alaska Native tribes for payment of certain administrative costs for the Food Stamp Program)

On page 76, line 6, please add the following: "Beginning in fiscal year 2001 and thereafter:

"SEC. . The Food Stamp Act (P.L. 95-113, section 16(a)) is amended by inserting after the phrase 'Indian reservation under section 11(d) of this Act' the following new phrase: 'or in a Native village within the State of Alaska identified in section 11(b) of Public Law 92-203, as amended.'"

AMENDMENT NO. 1550

(Purpose: To amend S. 1233 to require the Secretary review food packages periodically and consider including other nutritious foods under the food package program for Women, Children and Infants)

At the appropriate place insert the following new section:

"SEC. . It is the Sense of the Senate that the Secretary of Agriculture shall periodically review the Food Packages listed at 7 CFR 246.10(c) (1996) and consider including additional nutritious foods for women, infants and children."

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I would like to make a brief statement concerning my amendment to the fiscal year 2000 Agriculture Appropriations bill regarding the Women, Infants, and Children nutrition program. My reading of the regulations implementing this program indicate that they provide women and their children with a very limited range of food options. For example, the only non-dried vegetable they may chose from is carrots. They may eat canned carrots, raw carrots, and frozen carrots, but no other non-dried vegetable is permitted. Likewise the only meat or fish they allow is tuna. Salmon, the most heart-healthy protein source available, is essentially banned along with beef, poultry, pork, and other protein sources.

My amendment directs the Secretary to review the WIC food packages currently available to pregnant and lactating women and their children and consider adding new, but nutritious foods to the list. It is ridiculous to expect children to eat foods from such a limited list. Anyone with a picky tod-

dlar knows that a varied diet is critical to developing healthy eating habits.

Several years ago there was a controversy concerning Congress deciding which foods should be included in the WIC package, substituting its judgment for that of nutrition experts at USDA. This amendment does not mandate that salmon or any other food be included on the list. It gives complete and full discretion to the Secretary to determine which foods should be included. It simply directs him to periodically update the list.

I have worked for years with Dr. William Castelli at the Framington Heart Study in Massachusetts and know firsthand the health benefits of salmon. The omega 3 oils within salmon actually reduce cholesterol levels, I eat salmon at least twice a week. I am confident that salmon will meet any standard that USDA applies without any additional help from me. When the nutrition experts see what a wonderful protein source salmon is, they will wonder why they didn't put it on the list in the first place.

AMENDMENT NO. 1551

(Purpose: To amend S. 1233 to provide for education grants to Alaska Native serving institutions and Native Hawaiian serving institutions)

Amend Title VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS by inserting a new section as follows:

"SEC. . EDUCATION GRANTS TO ALASKA NATIVE SERVING INSTITUTIONS AND NATIVE HAWAIIAN SERVING INSTITUTIONS.

"(a) EDUCATION GRANTS PROGRAM FOR ALASKA NATIVE SERVING INSTITUTIONS.—(1) GRANT AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Agriculture may make competitive grants (or grants without regard to any requirement for competition) to Alaska Native serving institutions for the purpose of promoting and strengthening the ability of Alaska Native serving institutions to carry out education, applied research, and related community development programs.

(2) USE OF GRANT FUNDS. Grants made under this section shall be used—

(A) to support the activities of consortia of Alaska Native serving institutions to enhance education equity for under represented students:

(B) to strengthen institutional educational capacities, including libraries, curriculum, faculty, scientific instrumentation, instruction delivery systems, and student recruitment and retention, in order to respond to identified State, regional, national, or international educational needs in the food and agriculture sciences:

(C) to attract and support undergraduate and graduate students from under represented groups in order to prepare them for careers related to the food, agricultural, and natural resource systems of the United States, beginning with the mentoring of students at the high school level including by village elders and continuing with the provision of financial support for students through their attainment of a doctoral degree; and

(D) to facilitate cooperative initiatives between two or more Alaska Native serving institutions, or between Alaska Native serving institutions and units of State government or the private sector, to maximize the development and use of resources, such as faculty,

facilities, and equipment, to improve food and agricultural sciences teaching programs.

(2) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.** There are authorized to be appropriated to make grants under this subsection \$10,000,000 in fiscal years 2001 through 2006.

“(b) **EDUCATION GRANTS PROGRAM FOR NATIVE HAWAIIAN SERVING INSTITUTIONS.**—(1) **GRANT AUTHORITY.**—The Secretary of Agriculture may make competitive grants (or grants without regard to any requirement for competition) to Native Hawaiian serving institutions for the purpose of promoting and strengthening the ability of Native Hawaiian serving institutions to carry our education, applied research, and related community development programs.

(2) **USE OF GRANT FUNDS.** Grants made under this section shall be used—

(A) to support the activities of consortia of Native Hawaiian serving institutions to enhance educational equity for under represented students:

(B) to strengthen institutional educational capacities, including libraries, curriculum, faculty, scientific instrumentation, instruction deliver systems, and student recruitment and retention, in order to respond to identified State, regional, national, or international educational needs in the food and agriculture sciences:

(C) to attract and support undergraduate and graduate students from under represented groups in order to prepare them for careers related to the food, agricultural, and natural resources systems of the United States, beginning with the mentoring of students at the high school level and continuing with the provision of financial support for students through their attainment of a doctoral degree; and

(D) to facilitate cooperative initiatives between two or more Native Hawaiian serving institutions, or between Native Hawaiian serving institutions and units of State government or the private sector, to maximize the development and use of resources, such as a faculty, facilities, and equipment, to improve food and agricultural sciences teaching programs.

(2) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.** There are authorized to be appropriated to make grants under this subsection \$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2006.

AMENDMENT NO. 1552

(Purpose: To amend S. 1233 to provide a minimum allocation of Smith Lever Act funds to States subject to a special statutory cost of living adjustment)

At the appropriate place in the bill insert the following new section:

“**SEC. . SMITH-LEVER ACT ALLOCATIONS IN STATES WITH CONGRESSIONALLY-AUTHORIZED COST OF LIVING ADJUSTMENTS.**

“Beginning in fiscal year 2001 and thereafter, a state in which federal employees receive a special allowance because of the high cost of living or conditions of environment which differ substantially from conditions in other parts of the country as provided under section 1 of title IV of Public Law 102-141 (105 Stat. 861) shall receive an allotment of no less than \$2,000,000 under the Smith Lever Act of 1914, as amended (7 U.S.C. 343).”

AMENDMENT NO. 1553

(Purpose: To amend S. 1233 to provide a minimum allocation of Hatch Act funds to States subject to a special statutory cost of living adjustment)

At the appropriate place in the bill insert the following new section:

“**SEC. . HATCH ACT ALLOCATIONS IN STATES WITH CONGRESSIONALLY-AUTHORIZED COST OF LIVING ADJUSTMENTS.**

“Beginning in fiscal year 2001 and thereafter, a state in which federal employees receive a special allowance because of the high cost of living or conditions of environment which differ substantially from conditions in other parts of the country as provided under section 1 of title IV of Public Law 102-141 (105 Stat. 861) shall receive an allotment of no less than \$2,000,000 under 7 U.S.C. 361(c).”

AMENDMENT NO. 1554

(Purpose: To set aside certain funds for programs and activities of the Livestock Marketing Information Center in Lakewood, Colorado, with an offset)

On page 13, line 16, strike “\$115,075,000” and insert “\$114,825,000”.

On page 14, line 19, strike “\$13,966,000” and insert “\$14,216,000”.

On page 14, line 22, before the period at the end, insert the following: “, of which not less than \$250,000 shall be provided to carry out market analysis programs at the Livestock Marketing Information Center in Lakewood, Colorado”.

AMENDMENT NO. 1555

(Purpose: To require the use of certain funds transferred to the Economic Research Service to conduct a study of reasons for the decline in participation in the food stamp program and any problems that households with eligible children have experienced in obtaining food stamps)

On page 9, line 9, strike “\$2,000,000” and insert “\$2,500,000”.

On page 9, line 12, after “tions:”, insert the following: “: *Provided further*, That not more than \$500,000 of the amount transferred under the preceding proviso shall be available to conduct, not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, a study based on all available administrative data and on-site inspections conducted by the Secretary of Agriculture of local food stamp offices in each State, of (1) reasons for the decline in participation in the food stamp program, and (2) any problems that households with eligible children have experienced in obtaining food stamps, and to report the results of the study to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate:”.

AMENDMENT NO. 1556

On page 13, line 19, strike “\$56,201,000” and insert “\$6,401,000”.

On page 13, on line 13 strike “\$114,825,000” and insert “114,625,000”.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. President, I rise to elaborate on my amendment that would provide \$200,000 in funding under the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service (CSREES) to a research project in North Carolina to improve early detection of crop diseases. This funding boost is accomplished through an offset in NRI.

This funding would go to North Carolina State which will work in conjunction with the University of North Carolina at Greensboro to create an innovative early warning system for crop failure.

Mr. President, more than 30% of crop failures could be prevented if farmers had an early warning of disease or insect damage. However, by the time

most diseases and insect infestations are visible to the naked eye, they are too far advanced for effective treatment.

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro has been conducting a series of experiments that would introduce a color-change gene into crops such as soybeans and cranberries. These crops could be genetically engineered to change color when under stress, insect attack or diseased. A farmer could then shine a black light on the leaves and see the damage long before it is visible to the naked eye. Armed with this early warning, he could begin dealing with the problem long before it becomes fatal to the crop.

This is an important project to support. The research will help bring crop management into the 21st century and could help farmers avert needless disasters. And it could yield enormous benefits soon.

AMENDMENT NO. 1557

(Purpose: To ensure timely testing of imports under the President's Food Safety Initiative)

At the appropriate place insert the following:

SEC. . It is the sense of the Senate that the Food and Drug Administration, to the maximum extent possible, when conducting Food Safety Initiative, ensure timely testing of produce imports by conducting survey tests at the USDA or FDA laboratory closest to the port of entry if testing result are not provided within twenty-four hours of collection.

AMENDMENT NO. 1558

(Purpose: To provide that the price of milk received by producers in Clark County, Nevada, shall not be subject to any Federal milk marketing order or any other regulation by the Secretary of Agriculture and shall solely be regulated by the State of Nevada and the Nevada State Dairy Commission)

On page 76, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

SEC. 7. DEREGULATION OF PRODUCER MILK PRICES IN CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA.—Effective October 1, 1999, section 8c(11) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (7 U.S.C. 608c(11)), reenacted with amendments by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(D) PRODUCER MILK PRICES IN CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA.—The price of milk received by producers located in Clark County, Nevada—

“(i) shall not be subject to any order issued under this section or any other regulation by the Secretary; and

“(ii) shall solely be regulated by the State of Nevada and the Nevada State Dairy Commission.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 1559

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate concerning actions by the World Trade Organization relating to trade in agricultural commodities)

On page 76, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

SEC. . The Senate finds that—

(1) agricultural producers in the United States compete effectively when world markets are not distorted by government intervention;

(2) the elimination of barriers to competition in world markets for agricultural commodities is in the interest of producers and consumers in the United States;

(3) the United States must provide leadership on the opening of the agricultural markets in upcoming multilateral World Trade Organization negotiations;

(4) countries that import agricultural commodities are more likely to liberalize practices if they are confident that their trading partners will not curtail the availability of agricultural commodities on world markets for foreign policy purposes; and

(5) a multilateral commitment to use the open market, rather than government intervention, to guarantee food security would advance the interests of the farm community of the United States.

(b) It is the sense of the Senate that members of the World Trade Organization should undertake multilateral negotiations to eliminate policies and programs that distort world markets for agricultural commodities.

AMENDMENT NO. 1560

(Purpose: To provide additional funding to existing research programs)

On page 13, line 13, strike "\$56,401,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$56,901,000".

On page 13, line 16, strike "\$114,625,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$114,125,000".

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, the amendment I introduce will increase the University of Wisconsin's Babcock Institute's Special Research Grant to \$800,000, with \$300,000 being appropriated from the Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service's (CSREES) Competitive Research Grant Market, Trade and Policy account.

This amendment will also increase funding for the University's Food System Research Group Special Research Grant to \$700,000, with \$200,000 appropriated from the Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service's (CSREES) Competitive Research Grant Nutrition, Food Quality and Health account.

AMENDMENT NO. 1561

(Purpose: To provide an additional \$2,000,000 for the Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, offset from the Economic Research Service)

Amend page 22, line 26 by increasing the dollar figure by \$2,000,000.

Amend page 9, line 8 by reducing the dollar figure by \$2,000,000.

Amend page 9, line 15 by striking the line and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "2225); *Provided further*, That university research shall be reduced below the fiscal year 1999 level by \$2,000,000."

GIPSA AMENDMENT

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, this amendment is offered on behalf of Senators DASCHLE, WELLSTONE, and myself to provide an additional \$2 million for the Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, known as GIPSA. This agency performs a critical role in ensuring open markets and fair trade practices for the livestock market. These are issues of great concern to livestock producers, especially in recent years as low prices have raised questions about decreasing competition, inadequate price information and possible abuses of market power.

The Packers and Stockyards Program at GIPSA already has large demands placed on its investigative, analytical and legal resources. Congress and others are putting pressure on GIPSA to conduct more and more sophisticated investigations under significant time pressure.

One of the strongest needs is for rapid response teams which are sent out to specific areas where serious complaints are occurring to quickly determine what is happening and to quickly resolve the problems that are occurring so farmers can get real relief in a timely manner.

GIPSA continues to oversee contracting practices, which are the subject of increasing concern, scrutiny and debate.

In an ever-faster paced market, GIPSA must have the resources to meet its responsibilities. These additional funds are essential to ensuring that the nation's livestock markets remain fair and open to all producers.

The amendment is paid for by reducing the funding for the Economic Research Service. The reduction will be from academic research contracted out by that agency.

CHILE AS SPECIALTY CROP

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I would like to address the distinguished chairman of the Agriculture Appropriations Committee on an issue associated with the emergency agriculture disaster aid package.

The amendment adopted by the Senate to provide emergency agriculture disaster aid includes a provision to assist the producers of specialty crops. May I enquire of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi if chile crops in New Mexico would be eligible for emergency aid under the specialty crop provision?

Mr. COCHRAN. I respond to my friend from New Mexico that he has requested the assistance of the appropriations subcommittee in addressing the serious situation of New Mexico's chile farmers, and it is the intention of the subcommittee that the chile crop would be eligible for assistance under the specialty crop provision of the bill.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the distinguished Subcommittee Chairman for clarifying his understanding and mine that New Mexico's chile producers would be eligible for assistance through the specialty crop provisions of the pending Agriculture appropriations bill.

I appreciate his assistance on this important matter.

COLD WAR AQUACULTURE RESEARCH CENTER

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, as the distinguished Senator from Mississippi is aware, at the present time, the United States has no capability for the culture of cold-water, marine finfish, and the industry continues to need a consistent supply of high quality eggs or juvenile organisms. At the same time, I am especially aware as Chair of the Oceans and Fisheries Subcommittee, that many important wild

fish stocks in the United States, including the Gulf of Maine, as well as around the world, are suffering from overharvesting. This has the potential to greatly diminish the food supply of many nations whose greatest source of protein is from the fish they catch. The opportunity for cold water aquaculture research is immense and the rewards great for U.S. salmon farming in particular, which is a strategic industry in my State of Maine, especially in the rural area of Downeast Maine.

It is important for the committee to know that representatives of the Maine Atlantic salmon industry and the University of Maine have been working with USDA's Agricultural Research Service and have defined the need to study the feasibility of a research center concept, program criteria and site criteria, site identification and evaluation. Once this has been completed, I hope we can look forward to the committee's future consideration for establishing a cold-water, marine aquaculture research center in an appropriate State such as Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, there is no question that cold-water marine aquaculture holds enormous exciting potential that remains untapped by the Federal Government. Despite its cryptic name, cold-water marine aquaculture is the lifeblood of a very tangible important industry. Each year millions of Atlantic salmon are raised in the cold quick-moving coastal water off the coast of Downeast Maine. The strong tides and rocky coast combined with many sheltering islands provide the perfect environment for a commercially viable finfish aquaculture industry. My discussions with the Agricultural Resources Service, experienced aquaculturalists, and researchers at the University of Maine have confirmed that the coast of Maine would, indeed, be an excellent location for Federal research into marine aquaculture.

I understand that language included in the Agricultural appropriations bill requires ARS to study all of its current aquacultural activities. Is it the chairman's understanding that the study referenced in this bill will focus on, among other things, the feasibility of marine cold-water research program?

Mr. COCHRAN. I understand that my colleagues from Maine have a deep interest in furthering cold-water aquaculture research on marine species, especially since cold water aquaculture is an important industry in their State. In marking up the FY2000 appropriations, the committee considered the need for the Agricultural Research Service to update warmwater aquaculture research activities and in our report language, directed the ARS to submit to the committee by January 31, 2000, a report that will not only update warmwater aquaculture research

activities but also to include all aquaculture research currently being conducted by the agency. The report language also requires the agency to address the agency's current capacity and requirements for additional resources to meet future needs and issues confronting the Nation's aquaculture farmers, including opportunities in rural America. I agree that cold water aquaculture research needs are included in the overall mandate of the report language. I also believe the ARS report will be helpful in establishing the need for coldwater aquaculture research for marine species.

Ms. COLLINS. I appreciate the further clarification and would like to ask one additional question if I may. Could the study called for in the report address the feasibility and desirability of establishing a cold-water aquaculture research program in the State of Maine?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes, that will be added to the report mandate.

Ms. COLLINS. My colleague and friend from Mississippi is clearly dedicated to the well-being of rural citizens from across the Nation. I thank him for his clarification of this matter of great importance to rural, coastal Maine and look forward to enacting this important legislation.

Ms. SNOWE. I thank my colleague from Mississippi not only for recognizing the importance of cold water aquaculture research for marine species but also for his continued fine work as Chair of the Senate agricultural appropriations process where he continues to be a strong advocate for numerous facets of agricultural research throughout the country.

HUMAN NUTRITION RESEARCH

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Chairman for his longstanding support of agricultural research and, more specifically, of the human nutrition research programs of the Agricultural Research Service.

Emphasis in human nutrition research at the USDA is designed to maintain a healthy populace and avoid the problems and substantial costs of diseases linked to poor dietary choices. Many diseases such as diabetes, cancer, osteoporosis, cataracts, and others, could be nearly eliminated with improved nutrition research and education.

The President's budget requested \$20.25 million for the Human Nutrition Initiative, but because of significant constraints resulting from the allocation, the bill provides only \$1.5 million. Of the \$53 million originally requested for the program, \$48.5 million is still needed.

These funds would reconcile production agriculture, which provides America the most abundant and safest food supply in the world, with consumer demands for a wholesome diet to enhance health, reduce illness, and improve the quality of life.

Does the Chairman agree that because of the critical nature of funding

for the program the Human Nutrition Initiative is a subject that should be evaluated in greater detail during conference on this bill?

Mr. KOHL. I concur in my colleague's comments that funding for this program should be an item of discussion and greater support during conference with the House on this bill, and will work with him to that end.

GMO ACCESS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I and the several members of this Subcommittee have spent a considerable amount of time working to ensure that other nations do not unfairly discriminate against genetically modified crops grown by American farmers. These crops hold great promise for eliminating hunger in the developing nations of the world. In addition, advances in biotechnology will lead to a reduction in the use of pesticides, improvements in soil quality and many GMO (Genetically Modified Organisms) crops have documented health benefits. It would truly be a disaster for the people of those nations—as well as for farm families in this country—if the benefits of these products are lost because of unsound science or straight up protectionism.

We are all aware of the problems that we face in opening markets for these products in Europe and many of my colleagues are aware that we face new labeling requirements in Japan. What many of my colleagues may not realize is that the same groups that are fighting these products in Europe are funding similar efforts to stop the introduction and consumption of GMO products in developing countries around the world—some of the very countries that stand to benefit the most from these products. The opponents are now turning their attention to a key U.S. market—Southeast Asia. This area of the world is home to a half billion consumers and the income levels are well above those in countries such as India or China. Unfortunately, the GMO opponents are busy at work to keep us from competing fairly in the markets of Southeast Asia.

In Thailand, Malaysia, the Philippines and other countries in the region, American producers are facing a real threat of closed markets due to the efforts of non-governmental groups based mostly in Europe. This is a very important time in the region as a number of governments are studying how to and whether to regulate genetically modified organisms. As governments are reviewing the issues, it would be a tremendous mistake to allow the GMO opponents to go unanswered. As a government, we should be making every effort to assist our farmers and producers in educating government officials in these countries as to the sound scientific reviews that have been conducted on these products and the extensive regulatory approval process that the products are subjected to in the United States. Unfortunately, it appears that our federal government

resources are completely tied up in fighting what some consider to be more pressing battles around the globe.

My staff and I have been in contact with the Administrator of the Foreign Agriculture Service, Tim Galvin, several times in the past few months urging him to dedicate a relatively modest amount of funding—\$80,000—for the FAS to take internationally-respected scientists to countries throughout Southeast Asia so that they may meet with government officials and scientists who are working to address the GMO regulation issue. It is essential that we move forward with such education efforts to counter the rhetoric and the scare tactics of the NGOs. Several of the countries in this region are proceeding towards implementing regulatory schemes; if we do not take affirmative action on this front we stand to lose valuable markets. Despite the critical need for moving forward with such a program now, I have been unable to get Mr. Galvin to agree to this important program.

I also understand that there is a plan to eliminate the regional FAS position in Singapore, which is dedicated to working for biotechnology acceptance throughout Southeast Asia. Such a move would be a terrible mistake. Singapore is in many ways the gateway to the ASEAN region—which will overtake Japan as the second largest market for U.S. products and services by the year 2005. The Agricultural Trade Office's work with the ASEAN Secretariat towards establishing an ASEAN regional trade regime based on sound science and its work with the Singapore regional traders must continue if U.S. agriculture is successfully to realize this region's market potential. We should be focusing on improving and bolstering this office rather than eliminating it at a time when these countries are beginning to work on these important issues.

I know that the chairman of the Subcommittee shares my concern about these issues. I urge him to join me in calling on Mr. Galvin and other officials at USDA to move to address the need for the U.S. to become engaged on this issue in Southeast Asia and to fund these important programs.

Mr. COCHRAN. I thank the Senator for his comments and I assure him that I share his concern that we must fight to ensure that our commodities are not unfairly discriminated against in markets around the world. We cannot allow our soybean farmers, cotton farmers, corn farmers and others to have their exports put at risk by unfair regulation. We cannot cede any markets to GMO opponents. I share his desire to see USDA put the necessary resources into ensuring our interests are adequately represented as the nations of Southeast Asia consider regulation. I assure him that I will look into the status of these activities and seek to have them adequately funded.

Mr. BOND. I thank the chairman for his remarks, and I look forward to working with him to address this issue.

ANIMAL WELFARE ENFORCEMENT

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to make a few points about the increase included in this bill for enforcement of the Animal Welfare Act and certain language which appears in the Senate Report to accompany the appropriations bill now before the Senate.

Under the Animal Welfare Act, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to promulgate standards and other requirements governing the humane handling, housing, care, treatment, and transportation of certain animals by dealers and other regulated businesses. The Secretary has delegated the authority for enforcing this Act to the Administrator of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) whose budget is included in the pending appropriations bill.

For a number of years, the appropriated level for APHIS's enforcement activities of the Animal Welfare Act has held stagnant in the area of \$9 million annually. The level of funding has allowed for employment of approximately 69 field inspectors to monitor activities in all fifty states plus the District of Columbia, Guam, and the Virgin Islands. Obviously, this number of inspectors, responsible for such a vast geographical area, is totally insufficient to investigate and control all inappropriate and illegal mistreatment of animals where it occurs within the regulated community. For many people, their pets are essentially members of their families and too often we learn of tragedies that occur during commercial transportation where pets are injured or killed. In other instances, we learn of inhumane treatment of animals in settings often referred to as "puppy mills" where conditions include disease, pests, poor feeding, and other forms of mistreatment that should and must be stopped.

Mr. COCHRAN. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for raising the issue of enforcement of the Animal Welfare Act and for pointing out many of the terrible conditions for which this Act is designed to halt and efforts by USDA and this Congress to put an end to them. The Senator is correct that funding for this activity has remained constant over the past several years. The President included in his budget request for fiscal year 2000 an increase of \$515,000 for these activities.

The President's request would provide additional funds for enforcement of the Animal Welfare Act, but only to maintain current activities such as inspections at regulated facilities to ensure compliance with the Act. In addition, inspectors would receive much needed training to ensure uniform enforcement of the regulations and to stay current with industry advancements in methodologies of research and caring for animals. APHIS would continue to replace outdated and old equipment including vehicles and continue modernizing its computer databases program. In view of the needs

outlined in the budget request, and the overall problems outlined by the Senator from Wisconsin, this bill includes an increase of \$2 million above last years level, nearly four times the amount of increase requested by the President.

Mr. KOHL. I thank the Senator from Mississippi for his explanation of the activities included in the President's request for enforcement of the Animal Welfare Act and for the generous increase he was able to provide in this bill. I want to stress to all Senators that the increase in this bill is designed to allow better enforcement of currently regulated activities. I am aware that the President's budget explanation also included concern that pending litigation and potentially expanded jurisdiction for enforcement of the Animal Welfare Act would further strain the limited resources of the agency. It was, in part, for that reason that language is included in Senate Report to make clear that the increase in this bill is to improve ongoing activities of the agency and not for expansion of regulated activities.

Mr. COCHRAN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KOHL. The Senate report language expresses our concern, as does the President's budget justification, that a strain on existing resources could potentially negate the efforts taken in our bill to increase the number of inspections at regulated facilities by inadvertently increasing the caseload of inspectors. I have heard from numerous animal care advocates in Wisconsin who have told me we need more inspectors to make sure the work now going undone is taken care of. For that reason, and not for expansion of authorities, the increase is included in this bill.

However, I also want to note that while the language in the Senate report expressly limits the increased funding to currently authorized activities and also expresses our concern that expansion of agency programs at this time may strain resources past the breaking point, it is not intended to chill the efforts by advocacy groups to pursue their interests through either the rulemaking process or through the courts. It is not our intention for the Senate report language to sway, in one way or the other, upcoming decisions of the courts or to infringe on the Department's proper exercise of rule-making authority. For those who may read the report language and be concerned that we are stepping too far into the realm of agency or court activities, we may wish to consider some modifications to this language for purposes of inclusion in the statement of managers to accompany the conference report to this appropriations bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. I thank the Senator for his concerns and I will work with him in the conference to consider whether modifications to this language are in order.

GREATER YELLOWSTONE INTERAGENCY BRUCELLOSIS COMMITTEE

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, first I would like to thank Chairman COCHRAN and Senator KOHL for the hard work they have put into the Fiscal Year 2000 Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations bill. It is a challenging process, and they have done an excellent job balancing competing interests within the confines of a balanced budget.

I wish to engage in a colloquy with the distinguished Chairman of the Subcommittee regarding funding for the Greater Yellowstone Interagency Brucellosis Committee (GYIBC). There is currently a Cooperative State Federal Brucellosis Eradication Program to eliminate the brucellosis from the country. States are designated brucellosis free when none of their cattle or bison are found to be infected for 12 consecutive months. As of March 31, 1998, 42 States, plus Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands, are free of brucellosis. The presence of brucellosis in free-ranging bison in Yellowstone National Park threatens the brucellosis status of Idaho, Wyoming, and Montana, as well as the health of their livestock herds, which are free of the disease. Reintroduction of the disease into a brucellosis-free State could have a serious economic impact on domestic livestock markets and potentially threaten export markets.

The Committee saw fit to allocate \$610,000 for the coordination of Federal, state and private actions aimed at eliminating brucellosis from wildlife in the Greater Yellowstone Area. I would like to clarify how this money is to be allocated. Of the funds appropriated for the GYIBC, \$400,000 is for the States of Idaho, Wyoming, and Montana to participate in the GYIBC, with the understanding that 50 percent goes to the state that chairs the committee and 25 percent goes to each of the other states. The remaining \$210,000 is for the State of Idaho to protect the State's brucellosis-free status and implement the Idaho Wildlife Brucellosis plan. Is it the intent of the Committee to use these funds as I have described?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes, it is the intent of the Committee to use the allocated funds as the Senator from Idaho stated.

Mr. CRAIG. I thank the Chairman.

APHIS PLANT PROTECTION COLLOQUY

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, first I would like to thank Chairman COCHRAN and Senator KOHL for the hard work they have put into the Fiscal Year 2000 Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations bill. It is a challenging process, and they have done an excellent job balancing competing interests within the confines of a balanced budget.

I wish to engage in a colloquy with the distinguished Chairman and Ranking Member of the Subcommittee regarding the appropriation for the Department of Agriculture's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service plant protection programs and regulations.

The funds this bill makes available for plant protection are critical to protecting American agriculture from diseases, pests, and invasive plants. My own state of Idaho struggles greatly with noxious weeds, such as leafy spurge, which compete with the native grasses so essential for the raising of cattle.

Researchers at the University of Idaho and around the country are working diligently to develop mechanisms to use biological controls for weeds and to manage diseases of important agriculture plants. It is my understanding that current APHIS regulations require a permit for interstate transfer of a pathogen or plant infected with a pathogen from one research location to another. However, research and education facilities routinely transfer plant materials from one research location to another using good management practices.

To facilitate researchers' work on behalf of American agriculture, I ask that the Committee clarify its intent that the appropriations contained in this bill for the Department of Agriculture's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service should be used to carry out plant protection programs and regulations that take into account the levels of risk presented by pathogens and to establish mechanisms to expedite or provide exemptions from any formal permit or certification processes for research and education facilities established under implementing regulations as the Secretary deems appropriate. Is it the intent of the Committee to use these funds as I have described?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes, it is the intent of the Committee to use the allocated funds as the Senator from Idaho stated. Use of these appropriations for plant protection purposes will indeed benefit American agriculture, including producers in Mississippi.

Mr. CRAIG. It is also the Committee's belief that the routine handling of a variety of pathogens by many research and education facilities, using good management practices, has occurred widely without their untoward release and establishment in the environment?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes. The Secretary of Agriculture should take this into account when establishing any regulatory processes for the movement and handling of pathogens. The Secretary should establish, to the extent possible, processes under which the facilities and their management practices are reviewed periodically, rather than requiring case-by-case approval for each use of a pathogen regardless of risk.

Mr. CRAIG. I understand from researchers in my state that pathogens that might be considered for exemption or expedited processes include: endemic and naturalized pathogens for which there is extensive information and handling experience and for which management strategies have been developed; pathogens intended for educational, re-

search, or reference use that are not to be released into the environment; or pathogens that present low risk because of their mode of survival, dissemination, or some other aspect of their biology. Is that the Committee's understanding?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes, the committee understands that certain types of pathogens present low risks and research education facilities should face minimal regulatory burden as deemed appropriate by the Secretary of Agriculture. The Committee would also urge APHIS to develop laboratory standards for facilities and management practices that will enable research and education facilities to handle higher-risk pathogens as well. These laboratory standards will help APHIS use its resources more efficiently and allow efficient use of research resources to combat plant diseases more effectively.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Chairman, is it the intent of the Committee that APHIS consult with relevant scientific societies as well as state regulators of plant pathogens and on-site reviewers of facilities where possible in modifying current regulations or developing future regulations regarding the movement of pathogens between research and education facilities?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes, that is the Committee's intent.

Mr. KOHL. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. In my home state of Wisconsin, a number of plant pathogens cause production losses for our producers. APHIS' implementation of plant protection programs using the appropriations in this bill, consistent with the Committee's intent, will assist researchers at many universities including the University of Wisconsin in their research efforts to combat plant disease and pests.

Mr. CRAIG. It is my understanding the APHIS is moving in this direction already. APHIS recently requested that the National Plant Board review its Plant Protection and Quarantine program to make recommendations for changes and improvements in the framework for regulations. This review, which included representatives of universities and industry as well as the state regulators, resulted in recommendations that will soon be presented in a report called "Safeguarding American Plant Resources: A Review of APHIS' Plant Protection and Quarantine's Pest Safeguarding System." This report will also recommend risk-based management of plant permits, including development of mechanisms to exempt from permitting or expedite permitting in certain low-risk cases. Thank you for your continued interest in this matter.

CLARIFICATIONS TO THE SENATE COMMITTEE
REPORT NO. 106-80

Mr. COCHRAN. I note for the record the following technical clarifications to the Senate committee report (Senate Report 106-80) on S. 1233, the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and

Drug Administration, and Related Agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 2000:

On page 96 of the report, the chart regarding the rural economic development loans program account should not footnote the Committee recommendation. The Committee's recommendation for the direct loan subsidy is not offset by a rescission from interest on the cushion of credit payments, as authorized by section 313 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936.

On page 133 of the report, Bill Emerson and Mickey Leland Hunger Fellowships should be added to the list of programs which currently lack authorization for fiscal year 2000.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, this agriculture appropriations bill provides annual funding for our nation's farmers, producers and the agency supporting our agricultural industry, the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The chairman and his colleagues on the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee deserve much credit for their work on this bill, which ensures funding for fundamental programs to support agricultural, rural development and nutrition programs. Unfortunately, the process by which appropriators continue to add wasteful and unnecessary spending to this important funding measure is unacceptable.

Each year, I am amazed by arbitrary fashion in which the appropriations committees choose to allocate the strict federal dollars that we should reserve for important and necessary federal programs. At the expense of our American taxpayers, this bill and its accompanying report are riddled with unrequested, low-priority earmarks, representing \$170 million in additional spending.

The agriculture appropriations bill is a haven for members to tack on unrequested and unauthorized funding for special interest projects, particularly in sections of the accompanying Senate report dealing with the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service. For example, 114 out of a total 118 projects funded under the section for special research grants are either unrequested or received additional funding above the budget request. Over 90 projects under the Agriculture Research Service were targeted for termination by the administration, yet a majority of these projects continue to receive funding in this bill.

These actions lead me to ask a fundamental question. What is the purpose of conducting a formal budget process when the Appropriations Committee exhibits such carte blanche authority to fund projects which have not been considered in our established authorization and funding process? I review all of the annual appropriations bills, yet I have rarely seen such flagrant examples of egregious spending as those included in this bill.

In the Senate report, the appropriations committee state their commitment to only fund priority projects,

yet earmarks are approved for such projects as \$300,000 for cereal rust research in St. Paul, MN. No information is provided for members to determine what kind of project deals with "cereal rust" and why this project deserves a specific earmark of nearly a third of a million dollars.

Other earmarks include \$500,000 for swine waste management in North Carolina, \$100,000 to reduce damages and manage populations of fish-eating birds which prey on farm-raised cattle in the Mid-south area, and an increase of \$452,000 to support the sterile fly release in San Joaquin Valley. It is incredible to me, and no doubt to the American people, that we speak of fiscal responsibility and budget constraints in one manner, and yet act in a diametrically opposite manner wasting enormous amounts of funding for projects that appear to have little relationship to improving the agricultural economy.

Some projects may be meritorious, such as potato research and weed control, but are these problems specific only to certain states like Washington and North Dakota? Enough to receive not only an earmark, but an increase above the requested levels? I am certain that my constituents in Arizona can attest to the need for funding to monitor certain crops and deal with problems of weed control, yet they are unable to compete for funding to address these issues when decisions are based more on parochial interests rather than national priority.

This bill goes beyond the traditional earmarking process by selecting particular sites across the country to receive additional spending for extra staff and personnel. Why are these facilities receiving direct funding for additional staff at a time when each agency is required to abide by the mandate of the Government Performance and Results Act to operate more efficiently with less bureaucracy? Even if these positions are critical, why are they not prioritized in the normal administrative process?

In various parts of the bill and report, the committee includes express language which all but provides direct earmarks for certain projects and grantees and effectively intervenes in what is supposed to be a competitive grant process outside the realm of political influences. For example, in the Senate report, language is included which states the committee's expectation that the Administration give full consideration to an application for funds to construct a new facility for the St. Paul Island Health Clinic in Alaska and other language which urges the Administration to consider applications from the State of Alabama for projects benefitting Montgomery, State Farmer's Market and other farmers in the State.

We are invested with the responsibility to fully consider and debate the appropriate expenditure of federal funds. I commend Senator COCHRAN,

chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations, for his floor statement in which he stated that the committee sought to apply funding in a "reasonable and thoughtful way." Unfortunately, the pork in this bill and report prove that the Appropriations Committee is still unable to curb its appetite for unnecessary and wasteful spending.

I have compiled a list of objectionable provisions, totalling \$170 million, to S. 1233 and its accompanying Senate report, which, due to its length, cannot be printed in the RECORD. The list of objectionable provisions will be available on my Senate web page.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I would like to indicate my strong support for two related research and technology initiatives in the U.S. Department of Agriculture's FY2000 budget—initiatives that were in the President's request, but which have not received any increases in this budget being debated today. The USDA Global Change Research Program and the Climate Change Technology Initiative are two very important programs that deserve additional attention and funding. I recognize that this Congress is faced with many competing funding needs, particularly with the dire situation faced by much of the agriculture community today, but I submit also that we cannot ignore the needs of potential future disasters, especially when the means to avoiding such disaster will benefit U.S. farmers and U.S. agriculture while also benefiting the entire nation.

I am referring to the potential effects of global climate change, and the potential for the agriculture sector to cost-effectively and efficiently help us to mitigate against increased concentrations of atmospheric greenhouse gases.

Like many policymakers and many of my colleagues, I am convinced by the data international scientists have amassed that indicates climate change is a phenomenon to be dealt with in order to avoid calamitous effects. I agree with the assessment of the scientific community that we must insure against potentially devastating effects of climate change by taking action now. We are certain that greenhouse gas concentrations have been substantially increasing in the atmosphere, and as those concentrations have increased, global surface temperatures have risen. While we are not sure of the exact nature or extent of the resulting climatic and weather-related disruptions that may occur as the greenhouse effect is intensified, we do know that we should act now. Acting now will benefit the global climate, and the health of our citizens.

A significant body of research indicates that there is great potential for U.S. agriculture—for cropland, rangeland, and pastureland, as well as for forests—to sequester carbon at particularly low costs to society. Scientists have shown that with selected management practices, agricultural soils can

effectively absorb a large proportion of the annual increases in atmospheric CO₂ that are attributed to the greenhouse effect of global climate change.

What this means for the U.S. is that we have a cheap, effective sink—a means to sequester a large amount of the carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases that are being emitted from fossil fuel emissions. The sequestration of carbon in soils is a benefit to agriculture, in addition to society. Increased carbon in soils leads to reduced soil erosion, increased soil tilth and fertility, increased water absorption and retention, and most notably for agriculture, increased productivity. As noted recently by Dr. Rattan Lal, an international soil carbon research scientist—carbon is the basis for all life—including in agricultural soils. Carbon absorption by soils helps agriculture, and helps to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions.

While we understand a great deal about the means by which carbon is absorbed and retained in soils—for instance through minimal or no-till practices—there is still much that needs to be learned about the entire carbon cycle in nature, and how it moves from one pool, such as soils, to others, such as the atmosphere. We need to better understand the balance of land management and tillage techniques that sequester and retain carbon in soils, and to insure that agricultural policies are supportive of and encourage these activities. Additionally, research is needed to more accurately identify how carbon is lost from soils, either to the atmosphere or elsewhere—and to then identify how best to preserve and retain carbon in the soil sink.

What we are looking at is a win-win situation—a win for society, a win for the climate, and a win for agriculture. But we must invest now in this future, not only because it will help us to bridge the gap, as we move in the direction of reducing our dependence on fossil fuels and practices that emit greenhouse gases, but it will help us to soften the blow on all other impacted sectors. Using agriculture as a carbon sink helps not only agriculture—it gives all other sectors breathing room to technologically or otherwise adapt to reduced fossil fuel dependence. It will help this country to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions sooner, cheaper, and without the disruptions to businesses and the economy that some sectors have forecast.

Mr. President, that is why I want to voice my support for funding the USDA Carbon Cycle Research Program and the Climate Change Technology Initiative. Funding for these important programs is essential to optimize the potential for agriculture and for the climate. I urge that the Senate consider additional funding for these programs.

Mr. President, I ask that my full statement be included in the record during the debate on the Agriculture Appropriations Bill.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I'm proud to represent a state that produces a wide variety of the highest quality agricultural products, from dairy products to cranberries, ginseng, corn, wheat—the list goes on, and it is as varied as Wisconsin itself.

Agriculture is the lifeblood of my state, so when a bill like Agriculture Appropriations comes to the floor, I feel it's vitally important that every aspect of the legislation—including the interests attempting to influence this debate—be discussed and examined.

Earlier this year when I gave remarks on this floor, I promised that from time to time when I participate in debates on legislation I would point out the role of special interest money in our legislative process, an effort I am calling *The Calling of the Bankroll*.

That's why today I want to briefly highlight some of the political contributions that have been made by the agriculture industry—money spent to influence the way we approach agriculture appropriations on this floor, in the other body, and at the White House.

Agriculture interests have donated nearly \$3 million in soft money during the last election cycle, and \$15.6 million in PAC money. That's well over \$18 million overall—and again that's during just a two-year period.

The soft money numbers are particularly interesting, Mr. President, because they reflect a pattern that a number of special interests follow, known as “double giving” or “switch hitting.” It means that a donor doesn't just give soft money to one party, the party whose political views the donor might favor. Instead double givers amass political clout by donating generously to both parties.

Examples of these soft money double givers in the agriculture industry during the last cycle include the Archer Daniels Midland Company, which donated \$263,000 to the Democrats and \$255,000 to the Republicans; United States Sugar Corp, which donated \$157,500 to the Democrats and almost \$250,000 to the Republicans; and Ocean Spray Cranberries Incorporated, which donated \$156,060 to the Democrats and \$117,600 to the Republicans.

Those are just a handful of examples, Mr. President, but I think they give my colleagues an idea of how the double-giving game is played.

Of course not everyone is a double giver. The top agribusiness soft money donor to the Democratic party, crop producer Connell Company, gave \$435,000, all to the Democratic party committees. Dole Food Company gave more than \$200,000 in soft money in 1997 and 1998, all to Republican party committees.

And in the interest of fairness, Mr. President, I also should mention an agribusiness donor that shares my position against the extension of the Northeast Dairy Compact: The International Dairy Foods Association, which gave more than \$71,000 in soft

money during 1997 and 1998 all to the Republican party committees.

There are many interests that will be affected by what we do here on this floor with regard to agriculture appropriations, Mr. President, and some have more resources to influence this debate than others. It is in the spirit of providing a fuller picture of the debate over agricultural issues—and the wealthy interests that seek to influence the debate's outcome—that I have presented this information, both for the benefit of the public and my colleagues.

I thank the chair and I yield the floor.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, like many in the Nation, Washington's agriculture communities have fallen on extremely tough times. For example, a combination of adverse economic circumstances has caused apple prices to fall to their lowest level in over a decade, while the price for soft winter wheat has plummeted to below \$2.50 a bushel.

During the debate on the Fiscal Year 2000 Agriculture Appropriations bill, we have been discussing what to most growers is in the forefront of their mind—their bankbook and their bottom line. Without question, this issue deserves our time and attention.

While crumbling commodity prices have taken their toll on far too many proud and previously profitable agricultural producers and their families, they also are eroding the very foundation upon which much of my State's rural economy is built. Simply put, many of my state's farmers and their communities are suffering.

Washington State produces half the Nation's apples from orchards that start at the base of the Cascade mountains and stretch from the Canadian border in the north, to the Columbia River in the south. Aided by volcanic soil rich in nutrients, irrigation, cool nights and warm sunny days, Washington's apples are the envy of the world's other apple producing countries.

Where my State's apple orchards end, Washington's lush fields of wheat begin. Spanning the eastern third of my State, Washington's wheat farms produce the most sought after wheat in Asia. And yet, being the best and producing such high quality products does not always equate to success.

The Asian financial crisis and world wide overproduction have taken their toll on Washington's wheat farmers. At the same time, a record crop coupled with a decline in export opportunities and a flood of cheap apple-juice concentrate imports from China have imperiled many of my State's apple growers.

Still, Washington's agricultural producers are fiercely independent and not ones to look for a handout from the Federal Government. Rather, in all my discussions with members Washington's agricultural community and its leaders, what I am told my State's farmers need and want most from the

Federal Government is a fair shake. Specifically, their list of demands includes trade, access to the tools necessary for quality production, regulatory relief, tax relief a dependable labor force, and Federal participation in agriculture research.

Growers have rightfully insisted upon fair and unfettered access to the world's consumers, which can only be achieved by insisting that there will be no trade deals until an acceptable agricultural agreement is reached during the upcoming round of multilateral trade negotiations slated to commence this fall in Seattle. I thoroughly support this demand, recognizing that Washington's producers export more than 25 percent of their harvest, with at least one third of the apples grown in Washington being shipped, and nine in ten bushels of wheat being exported.

Unfortunately, far too many countries still restrict or prohibit the importation of Washington's cornucopia of commodities. That is why I have expressed to administration trade officials the importance and significance of agriculture negotiations during the Ministerial. We must work to pry open these markets and, if need be, deny another country's goods access to our market until the doors of trade swing freely in both directions.

For example, just recently the Government of Taiwan agreed to delay implementation of pesticide tolerance tests that would have seriously hampered the U.S. apple and cherry trade with that country. Recognizing Taiwan is the apple industry's largest export market, I took the lead among my colleagues in the Senate to ensure that these tests would not be implemented until further scientific discovery had occurred.

Farmers face not only bogus phytosanitary trade barriers, but unfair trade practices by other countries. In early June, I sent a letter of support to the International Trade Commission regarding the dumping case brought by the U.S. apple industry against China. The ITC recently unanimously agreed that dumping had occurred and will announce potential duties in the near future. The case brought by the industry was terribly justified, recognizing the price paid for U.S. apples for juice concentrate plummeted to nearly a penny a pound.

Unilateral trade sanctions, as a result of the convincing messages sent by Washington farmers, have been at the center of nearly every agriculture discussion in the U.S. Senate. In response to the cries for relief from farmers, I have supported nearly every agriculture trade sanctions relief bill that has been introduced in the Senate. With nearly 60% of the world's population under U.S. sanction, the time to discuss the impact of these sanctions on the American family farm could not be more timely. It is without question that these sanctions do more harm to our agriculture communities than to the regimes on which they are imposed.

In addition to all the various trade conditions facing the producer, farmers in Washington have also demanded access to affordable and effective crop protection tools, which can only be achieved through science-based implementation of the Food Quality Protection Act. That's why I am an original cosponsor of the Regulatory Openness and Fairness Act to ensure that decisions regarding health risks are informed and not hasty, that the intent of the FQPA is carried out with the use of sound science and practical application, that a dose of common sense is applied, and that adequate time is available to make certain all decisions and tolerance standards are healthy and equitable.

Continued availability of water for irrigation, electrical generation and the transportation of bulk commodities from field to port, which can only be achieved through a balanced and scientifically-sound salmon recovery effort in the Pacific Northwest is a demand that resonates throughout Washington's orchards and fields. This is a demand I not only respect, but as most producers will know, continues to be one of my most important priorities as a U.S. Senator. I have gone to great lengths to ensure the solvency of the Snake and Columbia River hydroelectric systems with one key user in mind—farmers.

Washington produces a wide array of minor crops, many that are very labor intensive and require special attention during harvest. Washington's agriculture community demands a dependable and legal workforce to harvest and process their crops, which can only be achieved by reforming the H2A labor program to provide agricultural employers with an affordable and workable system for securing temporary foreign labor. I have testified with my colleagues and introduced bills in the Senate that would provide such reforms.

Farmers in Washington demand meaningful tax relief. Just last week, the tax bill passed in the Senate included the much sought after Farm and Ranch Risk Management accounts. These set-aside accounts will provide the savings mechanism growers have requested in order to secure financial longevity. In addition, I am a strong proponent for the elimination of the estate tax, one the most onerous financial burdens placed on a livelihood that is passed from generation to generation.

And finally, with passage of the 1996 Freedom to Farm bill, growers demanded federal participation in agriculture research. My role as a member of the Senate Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee provides the mechanism necessary to ensure that the Pacific Northwest is adequately represented, and that science based research is utilized to assist growers in producing some of the most demanded, nutritional, and safest food supplies in the world.

All of the aforementioned demands are intended to provide Washington's agricultural producers the tools they need to cultivate a profitable future. I remain convinced of their merit and committed to the task of securing their achievement. Unfortunately, this administration has yet to recognize their importance and, in most cases, actually opposes their adoption.

And now the Senate is in the midst of a debate not only over the livelihood and longevity of the American farm, but to some extent, the policy that drives our nation's combines and tractors. I am unwilling to condone the approach being advocated by some of my colleagues, who are seeking to turn back the hands of time and to undermine the free-market principles embodied in the Freedom to Farm Act. Instead, I support an approach that provides the resources to those programs already in place to assist producers to overcome these difficult times.

Meanwhile, as the Senate debates the issue of farm economy and financial assistance, the White House remains silent. Recognizing the bottom line for many in the agriculture sector is slowly dropping, my colleagues and I sent a letter to the President, requesting his active participation in the establishment of a financial relief package for farmers. This letter was in addition to a request included in the fiscal year 1999 supplemental appropriations bill for administration involvement. As we debate this sensitive issue today, the Administration's inactivity and silence is deafening.

Recognizing the bleak financial future facing Washington's minor crops, I have during the past few days fought tirelessly to ensure that funding is provided in the Republican farm assistance package for fruits and vegetables. I have undertaken this endeavor very seriously and have engaged in extremely frank discussions with my colleagues over my support for an amendment that includes such a provision.

During the debate on the original Cochran financial relief package, I was successful in negotiating the inclusion of \$50 million for the fruit and vegetable industries. Because of my desire to provide additional funds for fruits and vegetables, I worked with Senator Roberts to include in his amendment \$300 million for specialty crops. While the entire Roberts amendment failed in the Senate, I am pleased that our tree fruit and vegetable industries have a \$50 million starting point. As a member of the Senate Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, I will have the opportunity to work to increase this funding during conference on the bill.

I also responded to the calls for assistance from those in orchard country by including an amendment in the bill directing the Farm Service Agency to review all programs that assist apple growers in time of need. Specifically, I requested that FSA review the limits placed on operating loans utilized by apple farmers, and report back to Con-

gress what the agency perceives is a workable remedy.

Rest assured, whatever the final outcome of the Fiscal Year 2000 Agriculture Appropriations bill, I will send two important messages to my agriculture constituency back home. First, I will continue working tirelessly to make certain all commodities produced from Washington's fertile soil will have a fair shake at receiving some form of assistance. I am poised and prepared to continue this challenge. And second, I will continue working on agriculture's list of demands, pushing to ensure that from trade to labor, and from taxes to environment, the livelihood that has made agriculture the career choice for so many will remain just that.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise today to express my concern that S. 1233, the Agriculture Appropriations bill for FY2000 does not include adequate funding for carbon cycle or carbon sequestration research. The Administration has proposed approximately \$22 million for these programs at the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) and the Agriculture Research Service (ARS). With that money, scientists can develop a better understanding of the potential for agricultural lands to serve as carbon sinks. These programs are priorities in the U.S. Global Change Research Program and the Administration's Climate Change Technology Initiative.

Once we more thoroughly understand how our soils capture and store carbon, we can use that knowledge to improve our management practices and yields. We can also cost-effectively use soils to offset carbon emissions that might lead to global warming. Failure to provide these funds is short-sighted and may prevent farmers and ranchers from reaping profits through storing carbon on their land in the near future.

Agricultural lands in the U.S. have a huge potential to store carbon that would otherwise be released into the atmosphere. Each year, the U.S. emits about 1.5 billion metric tons of carbon equivalent (MMTC) or gases that contribute to the greenhouse effect. According to USDA experts, properly managed U.S. croplands could be major sinks or reservoirs of carbon. They could sequester, or store, 85-200 MMTC more per year than the agriculture sector does now. If a coordinated program to manage carbon in agricultural soils were implemented worldwide, some experts project that carbon sequestration could increase to the rate of 3000 MMTC per year. This rate is equal to the world's net annual increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide.

Mr. President, about 25-30% of our nation's farmers, growers and ranchers are already employing best management practices which will effectively store carbon, so farmers and ranchers would not need to adopt radically new production techniques to store carbon. Most find these practices very cost-effective for their bottom-line because

the land rewards them for their attention. There are higher yields with increased carbon storage, less erosion, and improved soil and water quality. As an example, adoption of conservation tillage and residue management practices could lock up about .2 metric tons of carbon per acre every year.

Eventually, as actions by some of our major trading partners are now demonstrating, there is likely to be a worldwide market in carbon credit trading, regardless of what happens to the Kyoto Treaty in this country. This is a terrific economic opportunity. As we discuss the sorry state of American agriculture and the family farm in the context of this bill, we should keep in mind that soil carbon storage could become a very lucrative opportunity to maintain income levels. Experts are projecting that carbon credits will sell for somewhere between \$10-\$50 per ton and maybe higher. So, a farmer using best management practices on his 1000 acres could possibly get payments of \$2,000-\$10,000 or more per year for storing carbon.

Mr. President, the very modest sums that the Administration is seeking for these programs are not to implement Kyoto through some back-door method. There are legitimate scientific questions that need to be answered whether or not one believes Kyoto is necessary. Understanding soil science better will improve crop yields, make range management more efficient, and provide a host of environmental quality benefits. This knowledge will benefit all those who produce food and fiber.

I should note for my colleagues that there will be a national conference to explore opportunities for carbon sequestration in Missoula, Montana, from October 26-28. The purpose of this conference is to provide information and education on carbon sequestration activities to mitigate carbon dioxide emissions through market-based conservation.

Many of the experts that will speak at this conference are scientists whose work would be furthered if Congress funds the Administration's request. The efforts of the Montana Carbon Offset Coalition to establish a pilot carbon trading program would also be helped along by funding these programs.

Mr. President, there are many pressing needs facing Congress and, in particular, the managers of the Agriculture Appropriations bill. I just think that we should make investing in our future a priority. Soils seem to be a great low-cost way for us to reduce the impact our country has on the global climate. Even for those who do not believe climate change is happening due to mankind's emissions, increasing soil carbon content has huge side benefits for the economy and the environment. I hope the managers will find a way to fund these important programs in conference.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, today the Senate passed the Cochran amend-

ment to the agriculture appropriations bill that provides emergency relief to the nation's rural communities. I voted for the Cochran plan and the assistance it will bring to suffering Minnesota farm families.

Earlier in the discussion of agriculture relief, I participated in efforts to find a compromise that could provide more relief than the Cochran proposal. Specifically, I believe Minnesota farmers would have been better served by the Grassley-Conrad amendment, which failed by a close margin. The Grassley-Conrad package provided some additional elements, such as flood and crop loss payments, as well as increased aid for dairy producers. It was an \$8.8 billion proposal that would have been particularly beneficial to our state's farmers.

The Cochran bill preserves the use of increased Agricultural Market Transition Act (AMTA) payments for income assistance to farmers, which is good for Minnesota producers. The Daschle-Harkin alternative package, while providing a higher amount of relief, tied income assistance to production levels. I am concerned that their proposal would have shortchanged some farmers, like wheat farmers in Northwestern Minnesota, who were unable to plant a crop this year due to severe weather. In one Northwestern county, only 10 percent of the normal acreage was planted. The Cochran proposal also provides needed relief to oilseed, livestock, dairy, and sugar producers. It also reduces the cost of crop insurance and increases the LDP payment limit to \$150,000. And it exempts food and medicine sales from unilateral sanctions which will help Minnesota farmers sell to Cuba and other countries.

I am also pleased that the Senate resisted the attempt to extend the life of the Northeast Compact and prevent enactment of the federal milk marketing order reforms during consideration of the emergency farm relief package. Considering the hardships that the rural areas are suffering, now is certainly not the time to be taking up controversial proposals which discriminate against Midwest dairy farmers. Dairy farmers in the Midwest are struggling to make a decent living for their families, and they should not have to shoulder the additional burden of dairy policies that prevent them from receiving a fair price. I urge the conferees on the agriculture appropriations bill to likewise reject extension of the dairy compacts, and restore market fairness for America's dairy producers.

There is a great deal of apprehension in the rural community over the future of farming, and I am certainly glad that we passed essential relief for farmers now, instead of waiting until after the August recess. I remain committed to Freedom to Farm and the opportunity that it promises. However, Freedom to Farm can only help our farmers if the political courage can be mustered to enact reforms in the areas of

taxation, sanctions and regulations, and if we can continue to expand our markets. In the short-term the nation's farmers need assistance to tide them over in these difficult times, and I'm pleased that the Senate took the necessary steps to get aid to them quickly.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2000.

The Senate-reported bill provides \$60.4 billion in new budget authority (BA) and \$40.2 billion in new outlays to fund most of the programs of the Department of Agriculture and other related agencies. All of the discretionary funding in this bill is nondefense spending.

When outlays from prior-year appropriations and other adjustments are taken into account, the Senate-reported bill totals \$64.3 billion in BA and \$47.3 billion in outlays for FY 2000. Including mandatory savings, the Subcommittee is at its 302(b) allocation in both BA and outlays.

The Senate Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee 302(b) allocation totals \$64.3 billion in BA and \$47.3 billion in outlays. Within this amount, \$14.0 billion in BA and \$14.3 billion in outlays is for nondefense discretionary spending.

For discretionary spending in the bill, and counting (scoring) all the mandatory savings in the bill, the Senate-reported bill is at the Subcommittee's 302(b) allocation in BA and outlays. It is \$22 million in BA below and \$161 million in outlays above the 1999 level for discretionary spending, and \$537 million in BA and \$577 million in outlays below the President's request for these programs.

I recognize the difficulty of bringing this bill to the floor at its 302(b) allocation. I appreciate the Committee's support for a number of ongoing projects and programs important to my home State of New Mexico as it has worked to keep this bill within its budget allocation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table displaying the Senate Budget Committee scoring of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

H.R. 1906, AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 2000;
SPENDING COMPARISONS—SENATE-REPORTED BILL
(Fiscal Year 2000 \$ millions)

<hr/>			
Senate-reported bill:			
Budget authority	13,983	50,295	64,278
Outlays	14,254	33,088	47,342
Senate 302(b) allocation:			
Budget authority	13,983	50,295	64,278
Outlays	14,254	33,088	47,342
1999 level:			
Budget authority	14,005	41,460	55,465
Outlays	14,093	33,429	47,522
President's request:			
Budget authority	14,520	50,295	64,815
Outlays	14,831	33,088	47,919
House-passed bill:			
Budget authority	13,882	50,295	64,177
Outlays	14,508	33,088	47,596

H.R. 1906, AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 2000; SPENDING COMPARISONS—SENATE-REPORTED BILL—Continued

(Fiscal Year 2000 \$ millions)

SENATE-REPORTED BILL COMPARED TO:			
Senate 302(b) allocation:			
Budget authority			
Outlays			
1999 level:			
Budget authority	(22)	8,835	8,813
Outlays	161	(341)	(180)
President's request:			
Budget authority	(537)		(537)
Outlays	(577)		(577)
House-passed bill:			
Budget authority	101		101
Outlays	(254)		(254)

Note: Details may not add to totals due to rounding. Totals adjusted for consistency with scorekeeping conventions.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I know of no other statements or amendments to be submitted.

I suggest that we are ready for third reading of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under order of the Senate, H.R. 1906 is discharged and the Senate will proceed to the bill. All after the enacting clause is stricken, and the text of S. 1233 is inserted, H.R. 1906 is read a third time and passed, the Senate insists on its amendment, requests a conference with the House, and the Chair appoints Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. BOND, Mr. GORTON, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. BURNS, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. KOHL, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. DORGAN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. BYRD conferees on the part of the Senate.

The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity to commend Senator COCHRAN for the great job he has done in handling this matter. There were a lot of interesting matters that came up and a lot of amendments that he had to consider. He has handled all of them skillfully and ably. We are very proud of the manner in which he has handled it. I also wish to commend the able Senator KOHL for working with him so well and doing such a fine job. We are very fortunate to have these fine men to handle this matter in such a skillful manner.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I thank very much the distinguished President pro tempore, the Senator from South Carolina, Mr. THURMOND, for his generous remarks and his assistance in the handling of this bill of the Senate. His leadership is legendary. His influence in this body continues to be very important. We are grateful for his continued service in the Senate.

I also want to commend members of our staffs who have been so diligent and so effective in the handling of the duties they have assumed in connec-

tion with the development of this legislation and the passage of the bill. I specifically want to commend: Mark Keenum, my chief of staff; Rebecca Davies, chief clerk of the subcommittee; Hunt Shipman, Martha Scott Poindexter, Les Spivey, and Buddy Allen. They have all been very helpful and very conscientious and discharged their responsibilities in a professional and very praiseworthy way. I am deeply grateful for their good help.

On the Democratic side of the aisle, my good friend and colleague from Wisconsin is serving as a manager of this bill for the first time. He has done a great job helping us sort through the requests and the amendments that have been suggested in helping guide this bill to passage. We have not agreed on everything, but we worked through our disagreements in a cordial way. I appreciate very much his leadership on the Democratic side and the way he has handled his responsibilities.

I also want to thank the staff members who have worked on the Democratic side on this bill: Paul Bock, who is the chief of staff of Senator KOHL; Kate Sparks, his legislative director; Galen Fountain, who is an experienced member of the subcommittee staff, having worked for Senator Bumpers and others since his time here as a member of the Senate staff; and Carole Geagley. We appreciate the opportunity to work with all these fine folks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I take this moment to thank Senator COCHRAN who has been an extremely fine and fair chairman. He has done a tremendous job in shepherding this bill through. I thank also Becky Davies of his subcommittee, and I express my appreciation to Galen Fountain, Paul Bock, and Kate Sparks of my side. They have done a tremendous job and been of great assistance to me. I couldn't have done my job without their help.

I am very pleased we have reached this point.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order of the Senate of June 30, having received H.R. 2606, the Senate will proceed to the bill, all after the enacting clause is stricken, and the text of S. 1234 is inserted. H.R. 2606, as amended, is read a third time and passed. The Senate insists on its amendment, requests a conference with the House, and the Chair appoints Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. GREGG, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. BOND, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. INOUE, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. HARKIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, and

Mr. BYRD conferees on the part of the Senate.

The bill (H.R. 2606), as amended, was passed.

(The text of S. 1234 was printed in the RECORD of July 1, 1999)

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WILLIE MORRIS, HONORING THE LIFE OF A GREAT SOUTHERN WRITER

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, earlier this week, author Willie Morris, a native of Mississippi, passed away from an apparent heart attack at the young age of 64. Mr. Morris was a writer and editor who painted a vivid picture of the Southern way of life unlike any literary figure since William Faulkner. Mr. Morris had the heart of a good ole country boy who grew up in Yazoo City, and the intellect of a Rhodes Scholar.

Mr. Morris later went on to become a major literary leader, becoming editor and chief of Harper's Magazine at the age of 32. He attained national prominence in his career as a journalist, non-fiction writer, novelist, editor, and essayist by writing more than a dozen books on subjects ranging from his childhood English fox terrier in "My Dog Skip" to the intersection of football and race in "The Courting of Marcus Dupree." Critics have characterized Mr. Morris's works as being "exquisite and lyrical rendering." He was particularly well known for the books and articles in which he compared his experiences and southern heritage to America's own history.

Rather than attend the University of Mississippi, his father had him go to the distant and alien environs of the University of Texas in Austin, but in 1980 he returned to Ole Miss to be the writer in residence. His class room has been described like being at an Ole Miss v. LSU football game, because the students were always so excited.

Mr. President, Mr. Morris has been described as being "a prolific author in his own life, defining moments of intimacy and compassion."

David Sansing, a retired University of Mississippi historian said this about Mr. Morris, "Willie was such an honest voice, clear, vivid, never ambiguous. He had to leave the South to really confirm his own Southernness. But of course, he came back."

Willie Morris's writing undoubtedly had a grave impact on the lives of Mississippians and Southerners alike. He is survived by his wife, JoAnne Prichard of Jackson, and his son David Rae of New Orleans.