United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 1, 1999 No. 131

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. EWING).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 1, 1999.

I hereby appoint the Honorable THOMAS W. EWING to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Reverend James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray using the words of Psalm 117:

Praise the Lord, all you nations!
Extol Him, all you peoples!
For great is His steadfast love toward us, and the faithfulness of the Lord endures forever.
Praise the Lord!

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. VITTER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. McDevitt, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1606. An act to extend for 9 additional months the period for which chapter 12 of title 11, United States Code, is reenacted.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain one minutes at the end of business.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2084, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 318 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 318

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2084) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 318 provides for the consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2084, the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 2000.

The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration. The rule also provides the conference report will be considered as read.

Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000. The legislation before the House this morning is vitally important to both the safety and the efficiency of travel and transportation in the United States.

The bill provides for the necessary resources for America's highways and airports, our railroads and public transportation facilities, and safety in all forms of transportation.

Mr. Speaker, ensuring the safety of American motorists, fliers, and travelers is this Government's highest responsibility, and clearly this bill addresses those needs and concerns. Indeed, the underlying legislation represents an increase in safety measures and resources in every area of America's transportation system, from the Coast Guard, to the Federal Aviation Administration, to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

And even while we ensure adequate and appropriate financial resources to meet those needs, our conferees have met the challenge, while practicing fiscal responsibility and bipartisan cooperation, maintaining the fiscal restraints adopted in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997.

I commend my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), the chairman of the Committee

Printed on recycled paper.

on Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), for their hard work in crafting a responsible bipartisan bill.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I do not oppose the rule, the transportation appropriations conference report for fiscal year 2000, but the conference report itself should be the subject of vigorous debate today as members of the authorizing committee and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure express their serious concerns about provisions added to the conference report by the other body. There are also issues which will be discussed on the floor today relating to unfunded mandates and numerous legislative provisions which appear in the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question but that the transportation system of this Nation helps us to maintain our competitive edge worldwide. There is no question but that the very same system must be maintained, repaired, and upgraded constantly for that competitive edge to remain. This is a goal shared by both the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Subcommittee on Transportation of the Committee on Appropriations. This debate might be described as a difference not of where we are going, but how we get there.

I wish to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF), and the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee on Appropriations, for sharing strong support of and commitment to our transportation system for the people of America, unmatched anywhere in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 318, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2084) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the conference report.

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

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of September 30, 1999, at page H9077).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report to accompany H.R. 2084, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring before the House an excellent conference report on the transportation appropriations bill for the coming fiscal year. We have worked long and hard in truly a bipartisan fashion, and I want to thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) for that, with the Senate conferees to hammer out a conference agreement which hopefully will easily pass this body.

We said earlier that this House would pass individual appropriation bills in a timely manner and send them to the President for signature. We have fallen a little bit behind, but here is a way to get us back on track.

This is a bill which provides funding increases for all our vital transportation systems and infrastructure and gives the President another bill he can sign just as the new fiscal year begins.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following for the RECORD.

H.R. 2084 - TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION						
Office of the Secretary						
Salaries and expenses:						
Immediate Office of the Secretary	1,624	1,967	1,867	1,900	1,867	+243
Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary	585	612	612	600	600	+15
Office of the General Counsel	8,750	9,150	9,000	9,000	9,000	+250
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Policy	2,808	2,924	.....	2,900	2,824	+16
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Aviation and International Affairs	7,650	7,732	7,632	7,700	7,650	.....
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs	6,349	6,790	6,770	6,870	6,870	+521
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs	1,941	2,039	2,039	2,000	2,039	+98
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration	19,722	18,847	17,767	18,600	17,767	-1,955
Office of Public Affairs	1,565	1,836	1,836	1,800	1,800	+235
Executive Secretariat	1,047	1,102	1,102	1,110	1,102	+55
Board of Contract Appeals	561	520	520	560	520	-41
Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization	1,020	1,222	1,222	1,222	1,222	+202
Office of Intelligence and Security	1,036	1,574	1,454	.....	1,454	+418
Office of the Chief Information Officer	4,875	5,075	5,000	5,100	5,075	+200
Office of Intermodalism	957	1,187	.....	.....	1,062	+105
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Transportation Policy & Intermodalism	.....	.....	3,781	.....	.....	.....
Subtotal	60,490	62,577	60,602	59,362	60,852	+362
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	(7,754)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-7,754)
Office of civil rights	6,966	7,742	7,742	7,200	7,200	+234
Transportation planning, research, and development	9,000	6,275	2,950	3,300	3,300	-5,700
Transportation Administrative Service Center	(124,124)	.....	(157,965)	(169,953)	(148,673)	(+24,549)
Minority business resource center program	1,900	1,900	1,900	1,900	1,900	.....
(Limitation on direct loans)	(13,775)	(13,775)	(13,775)	(13,775)	(13,775)	.....
Minority business outreach	2,900	2,900	2,900	2,900	2,900	.....
Payments to air carriers (Airport and Airway Trust Fund) (rescission of contract authorization)	(-815)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(+815)
Total, Office of the Secretary	81,256	81,394	76,094	74,662	76,152	-5,104
Coast Guard						
Operating expenses	2,400,000	2,607,039	2,491,000	2,238,000	2,481,000	+81,000
Defense function	300,000	334,000	300,000	534,000	300,000	.....
Title I - Readiness (emergency funding)	(100,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-100,000)
Title IV - Counterdrug (emergency funding)	(16,300)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-16,300)
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	(27,715)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-27,715)
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	(4,058)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-4,058)
Emergency funding (P.L. 106-31)	(200,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-200,000)
Acquisition, construction, and improvements:						
Vessels	219,923	165,760	205,560	123,560	134,560	-85,363
Aircraft	35,700	22,110	38,310	33,210	44,210	+8,510
Other equipment	36,569	53,726	59,400	52,726	51,626	+15,057
Shore facilities & aids to navigation facilities	54,823	55,800	55,800	63,800	63,800	+8,977
Personnel and related support	48,450	52,930	50,930	52,930	50,930	+2,480
Deepwater replacement project revolving fund	.....	.....	.....	44,200	.....	.....
Integrated Deepwater Systems	.....	.....	.....	.....	44,200	+44,200
Subtotal, A C & I appropriations	395,465	350,326	410,000	370,426	389,326	-6,139
Offsetting collections (user fees)	.....	-41,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
Title I - Counterdrug (emergency funding)	(100,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-100,000)
Hurricane Georges (emergency funding)	(12,600)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-12,600)
Title IV - Counterdrug (emergency funding)	(117,400)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-117,400)
Environmental compliance and restoration	21,000	19,500	18,000	12,450	17,000	-4,000
Alteration of bridges	14,000	.....	15,000	14,000	15,000	+1,000
Retired pay	684,000	721,000	721,000	730,327	730,327	+46,327
Reserve training	69,000	72,000	72,000	72,000	72,000	+3,000
Title I - Readiness (emergency funding)	(5,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-5,000)
Research, development, test, and evaluation	12,000	21,709	21,039	17,000	19,000	+7,000
Title I - Readiness (emergency funding)	(5,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-5,000)
Total, Coast Guard	3,895,465	4,084,574	4,048,039	3,988,203	4,023,653	+128,188
Federal Aviation Administration						
Operations (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)	5,562,558	6,039,000	.....	5,857,450	5,900,000	+337,442
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	(14,946)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-14,946)
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	(13,852)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-13,852)
Facilities & equipment (Airport & Airway Trust Fund)	1,900,000	2,319,000	2,200,000	2,045,652	2,075,000	+175,000
Title II - Antiterrorism (emergency funding)	(100,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-100,000)
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	(106,612)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-106,612)
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	(15,521)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-15,521)
Rescission	.....	.....	.....	-299,500	-30,000	-30,000
Research, engineering, and development (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)	150,000	173,000	173,000	150,000	156,495	+6,495
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	(147)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-147)
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	(220)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-220)

H.R. 2084 - TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
Grants-in-aid for airports (Airport and Airway Trust Fund):						
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(1,600,000)	(1,750,000)	(1,867,000)	(1,750,000)	(1,750,000)	(+150,000)
(Limitation on obligations)	(1,950,000)	(1,600,000)	(2,250,000)	(2,000,000)	(1,950,000)	.....
(Obligation limitation reduction) (P.L. 105-277)	.....	.....	.....	(-290,000)	.....	.....
Rescission of contract authority	.....	.....	-300,000	.....	.....	.....
Total, Federal Aviation Administration	7,612,558	8,531,000	2,373,000	8,053,102	8,131,495	+518,937
(Limitations on obligations)	(1,950,000)	(1,600,000)	(2,250,000)	(1,710,000)	(1,950,000)	.....
Total budgetary resources	(9,562,558)	(10,131,000)	(4,623,000)	(9,763,102)	(10,081,495)	(+518,937)
Rescission	.....	.....	-300,000	-299,500	-30,000	-30,000
Net total	(9,562,558)	(10,131,000)	(4,323,000)	(9,463,602)	(10,051,495)	(+488,937)
Federal Highway Administration						
Limitation on administrative expenses	(327,413)	(350,432)	(356,380)	(370,000)	(376,072)	(+48,659)
Limitation on transportation research	.....	.....	(422,450)	.....	.....	.....
Federal-aid highways (Highway Trust Fund):						
(Limitation on obligations)	(25,511,000)	(26,245,000)	(26,245,000)	(26,245,000)	(26,245,000)	(+734,000)
(Revenue aligned budget authority) (RABA)	.....	(1,456,350)	(1,456,350)	(1,456,350)	(1,456,350)	(+1,456,350)
(RABA transfer under Title III)	.....	(-502,120)	.....	.....	.....	.....
(Adjustment)	.....	(63,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....
Domestic Discretionary	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Highway safety initiative (transfer to NHTSA)	.....	.....	.....	(-14,500)	.....	.....
Section 405(b) grant (transfer to NHTSA)	.....	.....	.....	(-7,500)	.....	.....
Subtotal, limitation on obligations	(25,511,000)	(27,262,230)	(27,701,350)	(27,679,350)	(27,701,350)	(+2,190,350)
(Exempt obligations)	(1,424,047)	(1,132,116)	(1,132,116)	(1,132,116)	(1,132,116)	(-291,931)
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(24,000,000)	(26,000,000)	(26,125,000)	(26,300,000)	(26,000,000)	(+2,000,000)
Motor carrier safety grants (Highway Trust Fund):						
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(100,000)	(155,000)	(105,000)	(105,000)	(105,000)	(+5,000)
(Limitation on obligations)	(100,000)	(105,000)	(105,000)	(105,000)	(105,000)	(+5,000)
(RABA transfer under Title III)	.....	(50,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....
National motor carrier safety program (highway trust fund)	.....	.....	.....	50,000	.....	.....
Additional provisions - Division A P.L. 105-277:						
Surface transportation projects, Massachusetts	100,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-100,000
Surface transportation projects, Arkansas	100,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-100,000
Appalachian development highway system, Alabama	100,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-100,000
Appalachian development highway system, West Va	32,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-32,000
State infrastructure banks (rescission)	(-6,500)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(+6,500)
Total, Federal Highway Administration	332,000	.....	.....	50,000	.....	-332,000
(Limitations on obligations)	(25,611,000)	(27,417,230)	(27,806,350)	(27,784,350)	(27,806,350)	(+2,195,350)
(Exempt obligations)	(1,424,047)	(1,132,116)	(1,132,116)	(1,132,116)	(1,132,116)	(-291,931)
Total budgetary resources	(27,367,047)	(28,549,346)	(28,938,466)	(28,966,466)	(28,938,466)	(+1,571,419)
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration						
Operations and research	.....	.....	87,400	.....	87,400	+87,400
Operations and research (Highway Trust Fund)	87,400	.....	.....	72,900	.....	-87,400
Subtotal	87,400	.....	87,400	72,900	87,400	.....
Operations and research (highway trust fund):						
(Limitation on obligations)	(72,000)	(72,000)	(72,000)	(72,000)	(72,000)	.....
(RABA transfer under Title III)	.....	(125,450)	.....	.....	.....	.....
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(72,000)	(197,450)	(72,000)	(72,000)	(72,000)	.....
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	(752)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-752)
(Transfer from FHA)	.....	.....	.....	(14,500)	.....	.....
National Driver Register (highway trust fund)	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	.....
Subtotal, Operations and research	(161,400)	(199,450)	(161,400)	(161,400)	(161,400)	.....
Highway traffic safety grants (Highway Trust Fund):						
(Liquidation of contract authorization)	(200,000)	(206,800)	(206,800)	(206,800)	(206,800)	(+6,800)
(Limitation on obligations):						
Highway safety programs (Sec. 402)	(150,000)	(152,800)	(152,800)	(152,800)	(152,800)	(+2,800)
Occupant protection incentive grants (Sec. 405)	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	.....
Alcohol-impaired driving countermeasures grants (Sec. 410)	(35,000)	(36,000)	(36,000)	(36,000)	(36,000)	(+1,000)
State Highway safety data grants (Sec. 411)	(5,000)	(8,000)	(8,000)	(8,000)	(8,000)	(+3,000)
Child passenger protection education grants (transfer from FHWA)	.....	.....	.....	(7,500)	.....	.....
Total, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration	89,400	2,000	89,400	74,900	89,400	.....
(Limitations on obligations)	(272,000)	(404,250)	(278,800)	(300,800)	(278,800)	(+6,800)
Total budgetary resources	(361,400)	(406,250)	(368,200)	(375,700)	(368,200)	(+6,800)

H.R. 2084 - TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
Federal Railroad Administration						
Office of the administrator	21,215					-21,215
Railroad safety	61,488					-61,488
Safety and operations		95,462	94,448	91,789	94,288	+94,288
Offsetting collections (user fees)		-66,461				
Subtotal	82,703	29,001	94,448	91,789	94,288	+11,585
Railroad research and development	22,364	21,800	21,300	22,364	22,464	+100
Offsetting collections (user fees)		-21,300				
Pennsylvania Station Redevelopment project (advance approp, FY 2001)		20,000		20,000		
Next generation high-speed rail	20,494	12,000	22,000	20,500	27,200	+6,706
Alaska Railroad rehabilitation	10,000			14,000	10,000	
Alaska Railroad capital improvements (Division A)	28,000					-28,000
Rhode Island Rail Development	5,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	+5,000
Capital grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation	609,230	570,976	570,976	571,000	571,000	-38,230
Rail initiative trust fund (Highway Trust Fund) (RABA transfer under Title III):						
(Liquidation of contract authorization)		(35,400)				
(Limitation on obligations)		(35,400)				
Total, Federal Railroad Administration	777,791	642,477	718,724	749,653	734,952	-42,839
(Limitations on obligations)		(35,400)				
Total budgetary resources	(777,791)	(677,877)	(718,724)	(749,653)	(734,952)	(-42,839)
Federal Transit Administration						
Administrative expenses	10,800	12,000	12,000	12,000	12,000	+1,200
Administrative expenses (Highway Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account) (limitation on obligations)	(43,200)	(48,000)	(48,000)	(48,000)	(48,000)	(+4,800)
Subtotal, Administrative expenses	(54,000)	(60,000)	(60,000)	(60,000)	(60,000)	(+6,000)
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	(250)					(-250)
Formula grants	570,000	619,600	619,600	619,600	619,600	+49,600
Formula grants (Highway Trust Fund):						
(Limitation on obligations)	(2,280,000)	(2,478,400)	(2,478,400)	(2,478,400)	(2,478,400)	(+198,400)
(RABA transfer under Title III)		(212,270)				
Subtotal, Formula grants	(2,850,000)	(3,310,270)	(3,098,000)	(3,098,000)	(3,098,000)	(+248,000)
University transportation research	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	
University transportation research (Highway Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account) (limitation on obligations)	(4,800)	(4,800)	(4,800)	(4,800)	(4,800)	
Subtotal, University transportation research	(6,000)	(6,000)	(6,000)	(6,000)	(6,000)	
Transit planning and research (general fund)	19,800	21,000	21,000	21,000	21,000	+1,200
Transit planning and research (Highway Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account):						
(Limitation on obligations)	(78,200)	(86,000)	(86,000)	(86,000)	(86,000)	(+7,800)
(RABA transfer under Title III)		(4,000)				
Subtotal, Transit planning and research	(98,000)	(111,000)	(107,000)	(107,000)	(107,000)	(+9,000)
Rural transportation assistance	(5,250)	(5,250)	(5,250)	(5,250)	(5,250)	
National transit institute	(4,000)	(4,000)	(4,000)	(4,000)	(4,000)	
Transit cooperative research	(8,250)	(8,250)	(8,250)	(8,250)	(8,250)	
Metropolitan planning	(43,842)	(49,632)	(49,632)	(49,632)	(49,632)	(+5,790)
State planning and research	(9,158)	(10,368)	(10,368)	(10,368)	(10,368)	(+1,210)
National planning and research	(27,500)	(33,500)	(29,500)	(29,500)	(29,500)	(+2,000)
Subtotal	(98,000)	(111,000)	(107,000)	(107,000)	(107,000)	(+9,000)
Trust fund share of expenses (Highway Trust Fund) (liquidation of contract authorization)	(4,251,800)	(4,929,270)	(4,638,000)	(4,638,000)	(4,929,270)	(+677,470)
Capital investment grants (general fund)	451,400	490,200	490,200	490,200	490,200	+38,800
Capital investment grants (Highway Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account) (limitation on obligations)	(1,805,600)	(1,960,800)	(1,960,800)	(1,960,800)	(1,960,800)	(+155,200)
Subtotal, Capital investment grants	(2,257,000)	(2,451,000)	(2,451,000)	(2,451,000)	(2,451,000)	(+194,000)
(Fixed guideway modernization)	(902,800)	(980,400)	(980,400)	(980,400)	(980,400)	(+77,600)
(Buses and bus-related facilities)	(451,400)	(490,200)	(490,200)	(490,200)	(490,200)	(+38,800)
(New starts)	(902,800)	(980,400)	(980,400)	(980,400)	(980,400)	(+77,600)
Subtotal	(2,257,000)	(2,451,000)	(2,451,000)	(2,451,000)	(2,451,000)	(+194,000)
Mass transit capital fund (Highway Trust Fund) (liquidation of contract authorization)	(2,000,000)					(-2,000,000)
Discretionary grants (Highway Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account) (liquidation of contract authorization)		(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(+1,500,000)

H.R. 2084 - TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
Job access and reverse commute grants (general fund)	35,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	-20,000
(Highway Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account) (limitation on obligations)	(40,000)	(60,000)	(60,000)	(60,000)	(60,000)	(+20,000)
(RABA transfer under Title III)	.....	(75,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....
Subtotal, Job access and reverse commute grants	(75,000)	(150,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)	.....
Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (general fund)	50,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-50,000
Trust fund share of transit programs (Highway Trust Fund) (rescission of contract authorization)	(-665)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(+665)
Interstate transfer grants - transit (rescission)	(-600)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(+600)
Total, Federal Transit Administration	1,138,200	1,159,000	1,159,000	1,159,000	1,159,000	+20,800
(Limitations on obligations)	(4,251,800)	(4,929,270)	(4,638,000)	(4,638,000)	(4,638,000)	(+386,200)
Total budgetary resources	(5,390,000)	(6,088,270)	(5,797,000)	(5,797,000)	(5,797,000)	(+407,000)
Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation						
Operations and maintenance (Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund)	11,496	.....	12,042	11,496	12,042	+546
Mandatory proposal	.....	(12,042)	.....	.....	.....	.....
Subtotal	(11,496)	(12,042)	(12,042)	(11,496)	(12,042)	(+546)
Research and Special Programs Administration						
Research and special programs	.....	33,340	.....	.....	32,061	+32,061
Hazardous materials safety	16,063	.....	17,813	16,960	.....	-16,063
Emergency transportation	997	.....	1,459	1,275	.....	-997
Research and technology	3,676	.....	3,547	3,297	.....	-3,676
Program and administrative support	8,544	.....	9,542	9,220	.....	-8,544
Subtotal, research and special programs	29,280	33,340	32,361	30,752	32,061	+2,781
Offsetting collections (user fees)	.....	-4,575	.....	.....	.....	.....
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	(182)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-182)
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	(100)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-100)
Pipeline safety:						
Pipeline Safety Fund	29,000	33,939	30,598	30,000	30,000	+1,000
Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund	4,248	4,248	5,494	4,704	5,479	+1,231
Pipeline safety reserve	(1,400)	.....	(1,300)	(1,400)	(1,400)	.....
Subtotal, Pipeline safety program (incl reserve)	(34,648)	(38,187)	(37,392)	(36,104)	(36,879)	(+2,231)
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	(150)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-150)
Emergency preparedness grants:						
Emergency preparedness fund	200	200	200	200	200	.....
(Limitation on obligations)	(11,000)	.....	(14,300)	(11,000)	.....	(-11,000)
Total, Research and Special Programs Administration	62,728	67,152	68,653	65,656	67,740	+5,012
(Limitations on obligations)	(11,000)	.....	(14,300)	(11,000)	.....	(-11,000)
Total budgetary resources	(73,728)	(67,152)	(82,953)	(76,656)	(67,740)	(-5,988)
Office of Inspector General						
Salaries and expenses	43,495	44,840	44,840	5,000	44,840	+1,345
Surface Transportation Board						
Salaries and expenses	16,000	17,000	17,000	15,400	17,000	+1,000
User fees	.....	-2,600	.....	.....	.....	.....
Offsetting collections	-2,600	-14,400	-1,600	.....	-1,600	+1,000
General Provisions						
Transportation Administrative Service Center reduction	-15,000	.....	-11,000	-60,000	-15,000	.....
Transit discretionary grants (rescission of contract authorization)	(-392,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(+392,000)
National Aviation Review Commission (rescission)	(-849)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(+849)
Amtrak Reform Council	450	750	450	950	750	+300
Urban discretionary grants (rescission)	(-4,026)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(+4,026)
Net total, title I, Department of Transportation	14,486,343	14,613,187	8,294,642	13,888,522	14,310,424	-175,919
Current year, FY 2000	(14,486,343)	(14,593,187)	(8,294,642)	(13,868,522)	(14,310,424)	(-175,919)
Appropriations	(14,043,239)	(14,593,187)	(8,594,642)	(14,168,022)	(14,340,424)	(+297,185)
Rescissions	(-405,455)	.....	(-300,000)	(-299,500)	(-30,000)	(+375,455)
Emergency appropriations	(848,559)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-848,559)
Advance appropriation, FY 2001	.....	(20,000)	.....	(20,000)	.....	.....
(Limitations on obligations)	(32,095,800)	(34,386,150)	(34,987,450)	(34,444,150)	(34,673,150)	(+2,577,350)
(Exempt obligations)	(1,424,047)	(1,132,116)	(1,132,116)	(1,132,116)	(1,132,116)	(-291,931)
Net total budgetary resources	(48,006,190)	(50,131,453)	(44,414,208)	(49,464,788)	(50,115,690)	(+2,109,500)

H.R. 2084 - TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
TITLE II - RELATED AGENCIES						
Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board						
Salaries and expenses	3,847	4,633	4,633	4,500	4,633	+786
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	(60)					(-60)
National Transportation Safety Board						
Salaries and expenses	53,473	57,000	57,000	51,500	57,000	+3,527
Rental payments (supplemental P.L. 160-31)	2,300					-2,300
Offsetting collections		-10,000				
Emergency fund	1,000			1,000		-1,000
Total, National Transportation Safety Board	56,773	47,000	57,000	52,500	57,000	+227
Total, title II, Related Agencies	60,680	51,633	61,633	57,000	61,633	+953
Appropriations	(60,620)	(51,633)	(61,633)	(57,000)	(61,633)	(+1,013)
Emergency appropriations	(60)					(-60)
Grand total	14,547,023	14,664,820	8,356,275	13,945,522	14,372,057	-174,966
Current year, FY 2000	(14,547,023)	(14,644,820)	(8,356,275)	(13,925,522)	(14,372,057)	(-174,966)
Appropriations	(14,103,859)	(14,644,820)	(8,656,275)	(14,225,022)	(14,402,057)	(+298,198)
Rescissions	(-405,455)		(-300,000)	(-299,500)	(-30,000)	(+375,455)
Emergency appropriations	(848,619)					(-848,619)
Advance appropriation, FY 2001		(20,000)		(20,000)		
(Limitation on obligations)	(32,095,800)	(34,386,150)	(34,987,450)	(34,444,150)	(34,673,150)	(+2,577,350)
(Exempt obligations)	(1,424,047)	(1,132,116)	(1,132,116)	(1,132,116)	(1,132,116)	(-291,931)
Net total budgetary resources	(48,066,870)	(50,183,086)	(44,475,841)	(49,521,788)	(50,177,323)	(+2,110,453)
Scorekeeping adjustments:						
Pipeline safety (OSLTF)	1,400	-5,000	-3,000	-2,000	-3,000	-4,400
General Provision (Sec. 329)	4,000					-4,000
FTA: Job access (mass transit category)	-25,000					+25,000
FTA: Job access (non-defense discretionary)	25,000					-25,000
Emergency funding	-848,619					+848,619
FY 1999 adjustments to CBO rescissions	205					-205
Trans Admin Service Center adjustment			1,000			
Advance appropriations		-20,000		-20,000		
Total, adjustments	-843,014	-25,000	-2,000	-22,000	-3,000	+840,014
Net grand total (including scorekeeping)	13,704,009	14,639,820	8,354,275	13,923,522	14,369,057	+665,048
Appropriations	(14,109,464)	(14,639,820)	(8,654,275)	(14,223,022)	(14,399,057)	(+289,593)
Rescissions	(-405,455)		(-300,000)	(-299,500)	(-30,000)	(+375,455)
(Limitations on obligations)	(32,095,800)	(34,386,150)	(34,987,450)	(34,444,150)	(34,673,150)	(+2,577,350)
(Exempt obligations)	(1,424,047)	(1,132,116)	(1,132,116)	(1,132,116)	(1,132,116)	(-291,931)
Net grand total budgetary resources	(47,223,856)	(50,158,086)	(44,473,841)	(49,499,788)	(50,174,323)	(+2,950,467)
RECAP BY FUNCTION						
Mandatory	684,000	721,000	721,000	730,327	730,327	+46,327
Discretionary:						
Highway category: (Limitation on obligations)	(25,883,000)	(27,821,480)	(28,085,150)	(28,085,150)	(28,085,150)	(+2,202,150)
Mass Transit category	721,200	1,159,000	1,159,000	1,159,000	1,159,000	+437,800
(Limitation on obligations)	(4,251,800)	(4,929,270)	(4,638,000)	(4,638,000)	(4,638,000)	(+386,200)
Total, Mass Transit category	4,973,000	6,088,270	5,797,000	5,797,000	5,797,000	+824,000
General purpose discretionary:						
Defense discretionary	300,000	334,000	300,000	534,000	300,000	
Nondefense discretionary	11,998,809	12,425,820	6,174,275	11,500,195	12,179,730	+180,921
Total, General purpose discretionary	12,298,809	12,759,820	6,474,275	12,034,195	12,479,730	+180,921
Total, Discretionary	12,298,809	12,759,820	6,474,275	12,034,195	12,479,730	+180,921

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

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

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

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. I hope we pass it. As always, a bill does not reflect everything each of us might want or what either the House or the Senate might want, but is a compromise. This is a reasonable bill within the money available. I think it treats the various programs fairly. It treats the huge array of requests we had for funding fairly on a bipartisan basis, and I urge support of the conference report.

I just want to take a moment to express my thanks to my staff, the minority staff, Cheryl Smith and Marge Duske from my personal office, and the majority staff, John Blazey, Rich Efford, Stephanie Gupta, Linda Muir, and David Whitestone. They do outstanding work on behalf of us.

I rise in strong support of the conference report on the FY2000 Transportation Appropriations conference report. I want to commend the gentleman from Virginia for his tireless work in hammering out fair and sensible compromises on the many difficult and controversial issues that the transportation conferees were faced with this year.

One of the most difficult issues we faced concerned driver privacy and the release of photographs and personal information contained on driver records. I am not convinced that we arrived at the best solution, but there was strong interest in the conference in restricting the release of sensitive, information such as social security numbers that are included on these records.

The gentleman from Virginia has touched on the significant funding provisions in the bill. I would just reiterate that this conference report includes $4.0 billion for the Coast Guard, an increase of $129 million over 1999, and funds the Coast Guard's highest priorities.

It provides $5.9 billion for FAA air traffic control and other operations, an increase of $337 million over 1999. While we were not able to provide as much as the Administration wanted for FAA operations due to severe budget constraints, I am satisfied that we have fully provided for safety of the travelling public and have addressed some of the concerns that the air traffic controllers have had regarding funding for this account.

The conference report funds both highways and transit at the guaranteed amounts specified in TEA21 and includes all the projects identified in TEA21. The conference report also includes the additional $1.456 billion gas taxes for the highway program—the so-called Revenue Aligned Budget Authority. This conference report ensures that every state will receive additional highway dollars under the highway funding formula allocation in TEA21, while protecting an additional $90 million in revenue aligned budget authority for the highway demonstration projects in TEA21.

I know that members of the California and New York delegations have had concerns about provisions in the Senate conference report capping the amount of transit funds those states would receive. This conference report maintains the House position and does not include those provisions.

With regard to truck safety, I believe the approach developed by the gentleman from Virginia will contribute greatly to making our highways safer. The conference report provides funding for motor carrier safety operations as provided in the House-passed conference report, but leaves the judgment of where this office should be relocated within DOT to the Secretary.

Amtrak is also fully funded at its budget request of $571 million in the conference agreement. This will enable Amtrak to continue its critical investments in its infrastructure and improve passenger rail service in the Northeast and other parts of the country where there is strong support for retaining and improving rail service.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to again commend the chairman of the Subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia, for the way he has handled the transportation subcommittee's business this year. He has been fair and open to suggestions as to how we could improve this bill and develop a final product that we all could support.

I also want to thank the majority staff—John Blazey, Rich Efford, Stephanie Gupta, Linda Muir and David Whitestone. They do a great job in attending to all the tedious detail and legwork that goes into this conference report.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, this is a fair and balanced conference report. I strongly urge a ''yes'' vote.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, before I close, let me just also again thank all the Members for their help and their support in working on this very important bill. We had emphasized safety, which I think has been addressed very, very well.

I again want to thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), and I want to thank the staff members. John Blazey, who did an outstanding job; along with Rich Efford, Stephanie Gupta; Linda Muir; and David Whitestone from my office; Cheryl Smith from Mr. SABO's side; Marjorie Duske. Also from the Senate side, because we worked with them, Wally Burnett, Joyce Rose, Paul Doerrer, Peter Rogoff, and Denise Matthews. I just want to thank all of them. It has been a long, hard effort.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the conference report for H.R. 2084, the Fiscal Year 2000 Department of Transportation Appropriations Act. There are many, many reasons why I oppose this conference report, not the least of which is the fact that most Members, including myself, have not even seen the report. Other Members have merely been able to glance at it, making it nearly impossible for my colleagues and I to make an informed decision on how to vote for this conference report. However, what I do know about the details of this conference report, I do not like.

One of the main reasons why I oppose this conference report is the fact that the conferees have decided to eliminate the general fund contribution to aviation funding. Historically, approximately 30 percent of the Federal Aviation Administration's funding has come from the general fund, rather than the aviation trust fund. The general fund payment is used to fund a variety of FAA services that benefit society as a whole. In fact, every American, whether he or she knows it or not, benefits from our national aviation system. The safe and efficient operation of a strong national aviation system allows our economy to grow and thrive. Therefore, the general fund contribution to aviation is more than justified. That is why, on June 15, 1999, the House of Representatives voted two-to-one in favor of retaining the general fund contribution in AIR 21, the Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century. However, with this conference report, the appropriators have decided to ignore this decisive vote and eliminate the general fund contribution to aviation funding in Fiscal Year 2000.

Another reason why I am opposed to this conference report is the inadequate and shameful level of funding for the Chicago Transit Authority. The CTA, one of the oldest transit systems in the United States, needs significant New Start funding to complete two important projects—reconstruction of the 102-year-old Douglas Branch on the Blue Line and capacity expansion of the Ravenswood Line. Both projects are critical to Chicago's transit system and cannot be completed without federal New Start funding, despite the substantial investments already made by the City of Chicago and the State of Illinois.

The Chicago region is currently the third most congested metropolitan area in the United States. Each day the CTA serves a population of approximately 3.7 million in Chicago and 38 of its surrounding suburbs. In fact, ridership on the CTA has reached new levels, increasing system-wide for the first time in more than a decade. Yet, at least 12 cities with much lower congestion, smaller transit systems and vastly lower ridership than the Chicago region are provided substantially more—most more than double—than Chicago's allocation of new start funds in this conference report. This is just not right.

This conference report virtually ignores the capital needs of the CTA. It ignores the outstanding needs of our national aviation system by eliminating the general fund contribution. And, these are just two examples of what is—or, more accurately, what is not—in this conference report. I cannot even imagine what else this conference report might contain. As a result, I must vote against this conference report and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of the FY 2000 Conference Report on Transportation Appropriations. I would like to commend the work of my Chairman, Mr. WOLF and My Ranking Member, Mr. SABO, as well as all of the other members of the Subcommittee and staff who worked extremely hard to make this a good bill.

THE FY 2000 TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATIONS CONFERENCE REPORT ADDRESSES THE NEEDS OF THE NATION

As members of Congress and this Subcommittee it is our job to focus on the present and future transportation needs of the country. Today our communities face old and deteriorating transit systems. Our green spaces shrink in the shadow of urban sprawl, and massive commuter traffic flows have turned

our freeways and highways into rolling parking lots. As our economy continues to grow there is more and more pressure on our highways, skyways, roads and railways. Increased trade with our neighbors in Canada and Mexico means that we in Congress will have to work harder to maintain the quality and safety of our roads, highways and borders.

We have worked hard in Subcommittee to address these problems. This bill increases funding for the Coast Guard by $129 million dollars to $4 billion. The job of defending our coastline from the creative tactics used by drug smugglers has become more and more difficult. I will personally seek to find funding that allows the Coast Guard to address these difficulties and prevent drugs from reaching our neighborhoods.

The Conference Report provides over $20 billion for highway obligations for TEA 21 guaranteed levels. These funds will go to important highway projects aimed at upgrading deteriorating highways and eliminating gridlock.

THE FY 2000 TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATIONS CONFERENCE REPORT ADDRESSES THE NEEDS OF THE CITY OF DETROIT AND THE STATE OF MICHIGAN

The state of Michigan will receive an outstanding $27.5 million dollars in funding for buses and bus facilities. In Detroit, the city I represent, these funds will go to projects like Time Transfer Centers to help those transitioning from welfare to work. By providing child care, retail, training, government and other needed services, these Centers will give people the tools they need to successfully empower themselves.

In 1999, Detroit was hit by paralyzing snow storms that shut down city streets for days on end. This bill provides funding that will help efficiently deal with weather emergencies. Funding provided in this measure will aid in the Development of Intelligent Transit Systems that use computer aided technology.

I have also secured funding to aid in the development of High Speed Rail between the City of Detroit and Chicago. High Speed Rail will give the citizens of Michigan an added choice in travel along this vital national corridor.

During the debate on the Transportation Appropriations Conference Report of FY 1998 I voiced my dissatisfaction with the level of funding provided the state of Michigan. Today, as a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, I stand poised to rectify this situation.

I strongly support the passage of H.R. 2084.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on the conference report will be postponed until later today.

The pending business is the question of agreeing to the conference report on the bill, H.R. 2084, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the conference report.

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

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 304, nays 91, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 466]

YEAS—304

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Becerra
Bentsen
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dixon
Dooley
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holt
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kilpatrick
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaFalce
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McGovern
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (PA)
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Saxton
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Vento
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (FL)

NAYS—91

Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Bereuter
Berkley
Berry
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Borski
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Cardin
Coble
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Cubin
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Duncan
Filner
Frost
Gilchrest
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Herger
Hoeffel
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Hutchinson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Kasich
Kelly
Kildee
Kind (WI)
Klink
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
LaTourette
Lipinski
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
McDermott
Metcalf
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Moran (KS)
Nadler
Oberstar
Paul
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Phelps
Rahall
Royce
Salmon
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sanford
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Sensenbrenner
Shows
Shuster
Slaughter
Snyder
Stearns
Sweeney
Terry
Thune
Traficant
Waters
Weiner
Wise

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Bateman

NOT VOTING—37

Ackerman
Barton
Berman
Brown (FL)
Burton
Chenoweth
Clay
Cummings
Delahunt
Ehrlich
Fattah
Ford
Fossella
Gejdenson
Goodling
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hooley
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kleczka
Levin
McHugh
Meeks (NY)
Mollohan
Northup
Pickering
Porter
Quinn
Rush
Scarborough
Velazquez
Waxman
Wu
Young (AK)

☐ 0957

Mr. BEREUTER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Messrs. SHOWS, KUCINICH, BOEHLERT, Ms. BERKLEY, Messrs. LAHOOD, JOHN, HALL of Texas, SNYDER, GREEN of Texas, and Mrs. KELLY changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. WATT of North Carolina, BACHUS, ENGLISH, UDALL of Colorado, and HOYER changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote 466, I was unavoidably detained and unable to be on the House floor during that time. Had I been here I would have voted ''yea.''

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 466, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 466, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

Ms. VELÁQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained during rollcall vote No. 466, which provided for consideration of H.R. 2084, Conference Report for FY 2000 Transportation Appropriations. If I had been present I would have voted ''yes.''

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, I am not recorded on rollcall No. 466 for the Conference Report accompanying H.R. 2084, making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000. I was unavoidably detained and therefore, could not vote for this conference report. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on rollcall No. 466.

Stated against:

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 466, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained during rollcall vote No. 466. Had I been present, I would have voted ''nay.''

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1906, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 317 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 317

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1906) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BEREUTER). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. DIAZ-BALART asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

□ 1000

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 317 is the standard rule waiving points of order for the conference report to accompany H.R. 1906, the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 2000.

The rule waives points of order against the conference report and its consideration and provides that the conference report shall be considered as read.

I strongly support the rule. I also strongly support the underlying conference report. There are many important programs which are being funded. I commend the conferees for their dedication to their work and to the American farmer.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD an editorial from the Miami Herald.

The document referred to is as follows:

[From the Miami Herald, Sept. 24, 1999]

FOOD SALES TO CUBA—WILL BENEFIT ONLY THE REPRESSIVE REGIME

The idea of allowing U.S. firms freely to sell food and medicine to Cuba seems unassailable from afar, a humanitarian gesture toward deprived people, as well as good business for American farmers.

But that's a huckster's pitch being promulgated by U.S. business interests that either misunderstand the way Cuba's politically regimented economy works, or that are trying to break the U.S. trade embargo. Congress shouldn't fall for the pitch to legalize unrestricted food and medicine sales to Cuba.

This isn't about humanitarianism: Selling supplies to the totalitarian regime responsible for so much human misery in no way ensures that any benefits would trickle down to the people of Cuba. This is about money—including money for the regime's repressive machinery.

In Washington this week, the U.S. farm lobby is bringing to a climax its orchestrated campaign against trade sanctions in general and to open Cuba to grain sales specifically. Dreaming about yearly sales that they think could reach $2 billion within five years, farm groups appear eager to extend plenty of credits and take Cuban sugar or rum in barter. Listen to David Frey, the Kansas Wheat Commission administrator: ''With Cuba's stressed economic situation, we are talking about a long-term deal before they are paying cash for a lot of wheat. There will be a time when they will be able . . . to pay cash.''

Mr. Frey and his allies are deluding themselves if they believe that selling wheat to a government with no hard currency and a history of stiffing business partners is going to save America's farmers. Equally deluded are those well meaning people who think that selling such materials will alleviate the suffering of the average Cuban.

Remember that this is the regime that ruined Cuban agriculture and other industry in the first place. While Cuba's fertile soil and waters no longer produce enough to feed its ration-card weary people, the regime serves lobster to tourists. While Cuban children can't get asthma medication on any given night, foreigners paying for surgery get first-world medicines.

Measures to allow licensed sales of food and medicine were attached to an agriculture appropriations bill by the Senate last month. U.S. Reps. Lincoln Diaz-Balart and Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, both from Miami, helped kill the deal by attaching a provision that would make such sales contingent on Cuba having free elections.

That should end it. Better access to food and medicine isn't going to solve Cuba's biggest problem. Ridding itself of an odious state will.

Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues will recall, this was the first appropriations bill to come to the House floor for the fiscal year 2000 cycle. It passed the House in June. I think it is important and appropriate that we commend the subcommittee chairman the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) and the ranking member the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) and all the conferees and those who worked so hard along with them to move this process along. They have done an extraordinary job. They have worked extremely hard to produce legislation which provides approximately $60 billion in total budget authority for agriculture. We know that spending levels are tight, but I believe the conferees did a very good job of working within their limits.

The agriculture appropriations bill funds programs that help benefit each of us each and every day. From improving nutrition, to helping ensure safe and nutritious food to put on our tables, to fund in this bill so many programs. The reality is that less than 2 percent of the American population provide food that is safe and nutritious and affordable for the over 270 million Americans as well as for countless millions of others abroad.

Much of the funding in this conference report goes towards food stamps, over $21 billion; child nutrition programs, almost $10 billion; farm assistance programs, $1.2 billion; the supplemental nutrition program for women, infants and children, known as WIC, over $4 billion.

I have consistently supported agriculture, Mr. Speaker, and I commend the hard work of the conferees. Again, I think it is so just and proper that we thank the gentleman from New Mexico for his hard work on this conference report. There are many, many programs that are being brought forth that are important. It is important that this legislation be acted on as soon as possible.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of both this rule bringing forth this conference report and of the conference report itself.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) for yielding me the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This rule makes in order consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 1906 which is the agriculture appropriations bill for fiscal year 2000. The rule waives all points of order against the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report was not written by the members of the conference committee. It was pretty much written by the House and the Senate leadership. Frustration among Democrats is running so high that a few days ago, the ranking Democrat on

the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), took out a special order to detail this process for the record.

The conference report contains many shortcomings. The measure fails to include a Senate provision exempting food and medicine from unilateral embargoes. This policy, I think, hurts the weakest and most needy people in foreign countries, and we should never use food as a weapon.

Leaving out this exemption also hurts the American farmers whom we are trying to help through this bill. The $1.2 billion in natural disaster assistance is inadequate for drought-stricken farmers and victims of Hurricane Floyd. The drought was particularly hard hitting for farmers in the Midwest and Northeast.

I am afraid the conferees, or whoever wrote this bill, missed a wonderful opportunity to assist farmers and help the needy at the same time. There is a natural link between support for farmers and the food safety net, and this measure does little to strengthen it. By buying commodities for humanitarian aid, we would boost prices for farmers, provide new markets for America's agriculture industry, and help the hungry here and abroad.

Despite my concerns about this bill, I think that the rule is in good shape. It is a standard rule for conference reports. I urge adoption of the rule.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me this time. I am opposed to the agriculture appropriations bill. This is a difficult issue for me as a member of the Committee on Appropriations to stand before this body and advocate opposition to an appropriation bill. Unfortunately, I have such great respect for our chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) and the chairman of the full committee is my colleague from Florida who is just across the Skyway Bridge from me. But unfortunately this conference report when we sent it over to the Senate, it was a total of $60.7 billion. It has now grown to over $69 billion. There have not been any hearings on this. $8 billion. We are trying to live with a budget that was agreed to back in 1997 with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) to live within some constraints. What are we doing but spending $8 billion more without the hearings? They are saying it is the disaster. I am not opposed to supporting disasters in agriculture, if we have floods, if we have drought. I think we have a responsibility to step forward. But that is not most of this money. Most of this $8 billion in more spending is going to help destroy what Freedom to Farm created, which was the marketplace. That is what is unfortunate about this bill. It was approved last night, they got the signatures, we really have not had a chance to really look at the details in the bill, and that is unfortunate and disappointing. I supported the Freedom to Farm back in 1996 because it was a giant step in the right direction, so that the farmers were freed up from growing for the government but growing for the marketplace. The idea was we were going to have declining subsidies over the years to allow the farmers to free up and address the marketplace. We are only talking about approximately a third of the farmers in this country, because over two-thirds of the farmers are not dealing with these issues.

For example, in my area, I have a lot of agriculture in my area, a lot of citrus, Tropicana is headquartered in my area, we have lots of citrus groves in my area, we are the largest tomato grower in the State of Florida. We have two tomato crops a year in my area, November and December and again in April and May. These crops do not get help from the Federal Government. Two-thirds, as I say, of the farmers do not get help. So what is happening is for the one-third, they are getting dependent on the Federal Government when we try to develop a plan to get them not dependent on the Federal Government. In theory it was a good idea, but what we are doing now is we are just locking people in to dependency on these programs. There are over 400 major crop products in the Federal Government and only a few dozen get this subsidy.

Now, when this bill got into conference, it became a Christmas tree, and everybody said, ''I want something of that pie.'' Let me give my colleagues one illustration. Sugar. Sugar is the sugar daddy of all corporate welfare. It is costing consumers over $1 billion a year. What do they get? $80 million. Sugar, $80 million. They are the ones making the most money. These sugar plantations in Florida are rolling in the money and we give them $80 million. Because everybody deserves a piece of this pie once the conference, which is a small group of people on both sides of the aisle came together with.

It is unfortunate this bill was allowed to be brought to the floor today especially so quickly. For those of us opposed to it we just found out early this morning that it was going to be on the floor. I plan to seek time in opposition to the bill when it comes up. I will not be calling for a vote on the rule even though I will be voting against it. I look forward to further debate on the appropriation bill.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 13 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), who is the ranking minority member on the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio for yielding me this time. I would say to my colleagues that I rise in opposition to the rule and I urge my colleagues to vote against the bill. For me, this is a very sad day personally, I think it is a sad day for our committee, it is a sad day for this institution, and it is really a sad day for the people that this bill is meant to assist, the farmers in rural communities across this country that are being pounded by the lowest prices in the last decade and a half, and by horrendous weather conditions.

Now, why do I ask my colleagues to vote against the rule and this bill? I believe that if we do this, the leadership of this institution—that should feel very bad about what it has done in this bill—the President of the United States, and the rest of the membership of this institution will do what is necessary to meet the needs of the farmers and rural dwellers of this country.

Let me tell my colleagues what the process has done over the last week and a half. I have been here 17 years. This has never happened in a committee on which I have served. Twice last week we were recessed because the majority could not reach agreement on some of the amendments that our committee was duly debating. And so we were sent out into the woods, and we were never called back. And all of a sudden the deal began to be brokered in the offices of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) and Speaker HASTERT. There were a lot of special interests that were accommodated as these discussions ensued, but the truth is that the needs of the American people were shelved as people took care of their regional interests.

I do not have a problem with milk. I do not have a problem with citrus. I do not have a problem with hogs or specialty crops or corn or wheat or beans. But the issue is really bigger than that. The issue really is, will all interests of this country get a fair hearing in the normal committee process? That has not happened. This rule and bill were discussed after midnight last night up in the chambers here. Who was really present to hear that? And members of our committees never even had the text of the bill. Now, at some point, somebody has to say, stop, this game ought to be over.

Members of our committee were appointed in good faith by the members of this institution to discharge our duties. We have a crisis situation in rural America where today the suicide rate is three times as great as it is in urban America. The pain is really deep. So we have even more of an obligation to produce a bill that meets the needs of our country. I do not have a bone to pick with our chairman, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), because his members were divested of their power, too, and that is not how this institution should work. Who is really

afraid of open debate? Who is really afraid of that, and letting the normal committee process work?

Let me just say, what are some of the issues that should have been brought up, that cannot be brought up under the process under this tourniquet rule and narrow-focused process that we have been forced to go through? We should be talking about targeting this assistance to the people that really need the help. At least 20 percent of the assistance that is in this bill is going to go to people that really do not need it. And people who really need it are not going to be able to get it because we have not had an opportunity to amend. People who serve on the Committee on the Budget ought to be concerned about that. Somebody ought to be taking a look at these formulas. We never had a chance to debate that in our committee.

□ 1015

Now, what about adequate financing for victims of hurricanes and natural disasters across our country? This bill is a fig leaf for them. Yesterday in the Labor HHS appropriations the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) whose district is devastated was able to tuck in an additional $500 million in a Labor, Health, and Human Services appropriation bill to try to make up for what is not in this bill. Procedurally we cannot wed those two bills on this floor today, but that was just another sign of how inadequate this bill really is.

The question really is, is it just North Carolina that needs help? What about the bill's inadequacies in terms of covering those who raise apples or specialty crops or vegetables or happen to be in the livestock industry like up in my part of the country, in the hog industry where they are on their knees? Are they second class producers, that they do not get in this bill? They did not get in the room with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT)? Somehow they were not in the line? Should we close our eyes to their needs? Are we really going to take care of the fundamental problem here, which is low prices and bad weather? There are not provisions in this bill really to clear our markets and to lift commodities off these markets through humanitarian shipments and monetized sales to other countries at the level that is necessary to begin to give some easing in prices in the markets here at home.

So, this bill will not meet the needs of our country. We do not have any measure before us that will prevent the very same kind of chaos today next year in the market. If I look at the numbers, in the Commodity Credit Corporation over the last few years, we have spent more in this year trying to plug holes in Freedom to Farm. Rather, we should be going back and altering that, adding to it, changing it so we are not hemorrhaging in terms of the budget next year in trying to plug the holes in the dike in rural America.

Just in this year alone, 1999, we will spend $18.4 billion to try to make up for the insufficiencies of Freedom to Farm. People are worried about Social Security and everything else, and Mr. Speaker, I can tell my colleagues the bill before us today is not going to do a thing to change the fundamentals.

There were a host of other provisions that Members wanted us to debate and, on the merits, vote up or down in the committee. We never had a chance to do that. On economic sanctions relative to countries like Cuba and others in the Middle East, in Africa, there was a royal debate. And it should have continued, and we should have had a right to vote. That did not happen. The democratic process was squelched by the leadership of this institution.

In addition to that, we had Members who wanted to offer provisions dealing with protection of the American people on imported meats, making sure they were inspected and that plants were licensed in other places. Guess what? They never had a chance to bring those provisions up.

What about poultry inspections and all the outbreaks that we have had across this country in salmonella and trying to get amendments in here to deal with the health and safety of the American people? Could not do it. Those were squelched too. Those Members left the committee room as we were asked to leave.

Again I want to say we have no criticism of the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN). And I do not have any criticism of our subcommittee staff because they were poised to do a good job, but they were disposed of their duties. In many ways they are victims like the rest of us.

My parents always said to do good, do not ignore the needs of others if you hope that some day they will respond when you have needs of your own. This vital life lesson got lost in this whole process.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Members are listening to what the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) was saying about process, and I hope that regardless of our political philosophy, we will oppose this bill if for no other reason than we think the Committee on Appropriations itself should be making the decisions and not a hand full of people in the House leadership.

I would like to ask the gentlewoman a question. I am concerned about dairy. All Members know that last week by a vote of 285 to 140, the Members of this body overwhelmingly defeated the administration's market reform proposal and voted for option 1 A. I wonder if the gentlewoman will tell me how much time the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations spent in debating and discussing the bill that was passed on the floor of the House by two to one; was it 5 hours? Was it 10 hours? I wonder if the gentlewoman could inform our Members on this issue?

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I would just have to say that on the issue of milk, the committee was dismissed. A private meeting was held somewhere; I was not invited to that, and a decision was made. Do not ask me what they did, but of course the issue never came before our committee.

Mr. SANDERS. So what the gentlewoman is saying, that despite the fact that 285 Members of this body, Democrats, Republicans, Independent, voted overwhelmingly to reform our milk marketing order. The Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Subcommittee did not spend 1 minute in discussing that issue, and of course what we voted for is not part of the bill that we are supposed to be voting on now.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that comment.

I thank the gentleman, and I apologize for taking this many minutes, but it is the only time I have been able to be unmuzzled through this whole process, so it feels sort of good.

I just want to also want to state for the RECORD that in terms of the way this committee functions, when I first got to Congress, and I used to go to Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Subcommittee meetings, there would be people that would come in and testify from around the country. They would talk about the country's needs. In addition to that we heard from Members of Congress, and they would come in, and they would talk to us about how they view the situation, whatever it might be in their area. And then we heard from people from the Executive Branch, and they would come in and they would make their plea. I always thought that the Committee on Appropriations ought to leave Washington and go out into the country and hold some hearings out there too. We never did that.

But in the last 3 years, what has happened is all outside witnesses have been asked not to come to our committee, and so we began to hear from the narrower band of people. And then this year, even the Members of Congress were not brought into our committee; they were told we will just send a letter. And so we were left only, Mr. Speaker, with dealing with people from the administration.

But the point is, whether it is the way this bill was handled or whether it is the way we are receiving information about the needs of rural America and agriculture in our country the viewing lens has gotten extremely myopic, Mr. Speaker, and that affects the way a bill looks when it comes forward here onto the floor of Congress.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would beg my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the rule based on the way we have been treated. This is an emergency situation. If the leadership hears us, we can produce a bill that meets the needs of our country. We have had no conference report to look at. Members on our side, and I would daresay I would guess Members on the other side on our committee, have had no materials to really review. Then late last night after midnight, the Rules Committee met and then we were directed to come to the floor first thing in this morning. Members are saying to us, ''Jeez, are you really up at 10 o'clock in the morning with the agriculture appropriation?''

But yes, we are, and yet we have not had the opportunity even for an orderly briefing by our own conferees. Then some members ask us to put in the $500 million for natural disaster in that was inserted in the Labor, Health, and Human Services bill yesterday into this bill, but procedurally we cannot do it. So we are asking the Members to help us produce a good bill.

We can do this. Give us the chance to do this. Please vote no on the rule. Please vote no on the bill when it comes before the membership.

Mr. Speaker, with the crisis in rural America, the country knows we need to do the right job here. Give us the chance to do it.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we have just seen in the last two distinguished speakers a beautiful example of democracy genuinely at work. The first speaker that we heard said that he was opposing this legislation because he feels that it is spending approximately $10 billion too much; a very distinguished Member of this House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER).

We then heard another very distinguished Member of this House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) explain in detail why she is opposing this legislation, one of the reasons being why, it is, in her estimate, not spending billions enough.

There is obviously a disagreement, but that is democracy. Some feel too much is being spent, others feel too little is being spent.

I think it is appropriate at this time, if I may, if I could take just a few minutes to explain what the bill is doing. It has been on line since we finished meeting in the Committee on Rules last night and has been available for reading.

Thirteen, almost 14, billion dollars, $13.988 billion, are in this conference committee report for agriculture; $8.7 billion to provide emergency aid to help farmers, including 1.2 billion for natural disasters; 5.5 billion for market loss payments, including 125 million for dairy producers; 650 million for crop insurance premium subsidy and for crop insurance associated costs.

With regard to supporting farmers in rural America, the Farm Service Agency, salaries and expenses are increased by $80 million over last year to continue the delivery of the farm ownership, farm operating, and disaster loan programs. Total funding is $796.8 million, which is the same as the President's request. Total loan authorization levels for agricultural credit programs are increased by $798.3 million over last year. Total loan authorization funding is $3.083 billion which is 74.6 million above the President's request. Rural housing loan authorizations are increased by $337.7 million over last year, including 334.7 million for single family housing. Total loan authorization funding is $4.589 billion which is $14.3 million above the President's request. Rental assistance programs are restored to the fiscal 1999 level of 640 million, an increase of 200 million over the President's request. The rural electric and telephone loans are 1.05 billion above the fiscal year 1999 levels. Total loan authorization funding is $2.612 billion, which is 1.54 billion above the President's request. The Distance Learning and Telemedicine Program loan authorization is increased by $50 million over last year, bringing fiscal year 2000 loan level to $200 million, which is the same as the President's request. Agricultural research activities are increased by $76 million over last year. Total funding is 1.837 billion, which is 12 million over the President's request.

Conservation operations activities are increased by $20 million over last year, bringing them to 661 million, 19 million below the President's request. Protecting human health and safety, the Food Safety Inspection Services, increased by $32 million over fiscal year 1999 for a total of 649 million, approximately the same as the President's request. The Food and Drug Administration is funded at $1.186 billion, $83 million more than fiscal year 1999, $69 million below the President's request.

Fulfilling commitments to important food and nutrition programs, the child nutrition programs are funded at almost $10 billion, an increase of $377 million over fiscal 1999, 11 million below the President's request. The special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children, WIC, is funded at $4.032 billion, an increase of $108 million, 73 million below the President's request. The Food Stamp Program is funded at $21.073 billion. The Food For Peace Program is funded at 976 million, an increase of 38.7 million above the President's request, and yet a decrease of 105 million below the fiscal year 1999.

□ 1030

Title IX of the bill provides provisions regarding mandatory livestock price reporting which will provide information regarding the marketing of cattle, swine, lamb, and livestock prices that can be easily understood by packers and will encourage competition.

My colleagues saw I had not mentioned the issue of sanctions, and I feel very strongly about that issue. The authorizing committee feels very strongly. The chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), sent a letter saying that if there is one issue that should not be dealt with in the Committee on Appropriations as a rider but that should be dealt with by the authorizing committee, it is an issue as sensitive as authorizing and financing sales to terrorist states. Yet the issue has been brought up. I just want to make one point with regard to Cuba, because the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) mentioned it.

One word to those interests who feel that it is appropriate now to sell to and finance to the Cuban dictatorship: irrespective and over and above the ethical questions, which obviously are important, it is not good business practice to do business, to make sales and finance them, with the jailers of the Vaclav Havels and Lech Walesas of that imprisoned island. They will be the future leaders of Cuba that will be making the decisions that are of so much import, that are so important, to so many interests.

If you do not want to base yourselves on ethics, base yourselves on the fact that the future leaders of democratic Cuba, many of them are in prison today, and it is not good business practice to be cozying up and financing sales with their jailers. I bring that point up because it was brought up previously; secondly, because the authorizing committee made its views known very clearly; and, thirdly, because the Committee on Appropriations as well voted earlier in the summer on that issue and rejected it. So I wanted to bring that out on the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and also for the great leadership that he has shown on the Committee on Rules.

I rise in support of the rule, Mr. Speaker, to the conference report on the agriculture appropriations bill. I applaud the work of the conferees in submitting a clean bill and one which upholds U.S. law and furthers U.S. domestic and humanitarian priorities.

As the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) pointed out, the lifting of sanctions would not have really helped American farmers, but would have helped to extend the suffering of people by providing a lifeline to their oppressor.

As it stands now, the bill before us strengthens the position of human rights dissidents and the expanding political opposition by telling them that the world's remaining superpower supports their struggle for freedom and that it stands firm in its commitment to see democracy flourish; that it defends the human, political and civil rights of all oppressed people, and that

dictators should not use food as weapons.

This bill underscores the humanitarian concerns enshrined in U.S. law which allows for the donations of food and medicine, rather than promoting the perception of greed at the expense of slave labor.

We look forward to the day when freedom reigns eternal and a democratic government is in power everywhere. Then we will be proud to trade and have relations with those in leadership.

This bill promotes America's interests, it helps America's farmers, it helps the poor who are on food stamps, and I am proud to support it.

I thank the gentleman for his leadership. I especially thank the gentleman from New Mexico (Chairman SKEEN), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), and so many who have worked in the conference committee to bring this agriculture appropriations rule and bill to the floor.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by concurring with much of what the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) had to say a few minutes ago about the process that we undertook.

I am very glad that our friend from Florida informed us about some of what was in the bill. It is good to know some of the things that are in the bill, because there is not a Member of the House who has yet seen the bill.

Here is the bill. This bill is hundreds and hundreds of pages, and it ended up on our desks this morning. I dare say that there is not one Member of the House who has a deep understanding of what is in the bill, and yet we are asked this morning to vote for it, which is why I strongly oppose the rule and even more strongly oppose the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, there are two main issues involved: one is process and one is content. In terms of process, I would hope that every Member of this body, progressive, conservative, Democrat, Republican, believes that there should be full and free discussion in a committee on appropriations, a consensus reached, and the bill come back to the floor for a serious vote by the Members.

That did not happen in the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Committee on Appropriations. This bill was dictated by the Republican leadership, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT). They are the ones who called the tune, and it was not the members of the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Committee on Appropriations, whether they were Republicans or Democrats. Deals were made in the back room; and at a time when the American people are more and more cynical about the political process, that is not the type of legislation we should be bringing before them today.

Mr. Speaker, my particular concern, coming from the State of Vermont and coming from New England, is dairy. In the State of Vermont and throughout the northeast, in fact, throughout this country, our dairy farmers are going out of business because the price that has been paid to them in recent years in real dollars is going down and down and down while their expenses and their costs go up. The bottom line is that the total number of dairy operations dropped by almost 26 percent in the last 6 or 7 years.

Now, last week on the floor of this House we spent an entire day, six or seven amendments came up. There was a major debate on dairy; and at the end of the day, by an overwhelming vote of 285 to 140 the Members of this House rejected the Agricultural Department's option 1–B, which the Members believed would be a disaster for farmers in almost every region of this country. And we said no, we do not want that. We want to see the price that farmers get for their milk go up, we want stability, we want to protect the family farmers.

All over, liberals, conservatives, people voted for that bill. I would ask the gentleman from Florida, I would ask the gentleman from Florida, after a full debate on dairy on the floor of the House, would the gentleman tell the Members how much time was spent in the conference committee discussing the 285 to 140 vote? My understanding is not one minute was spent discussing that. I hear no response, so I am assuming that the gentleman from Florida concurs. Of course he does; he is an honest man.

I ask my friends on the Democratic side, how much time was spent discussing the dairy issue that passed the House 285 to 140 that had the votes to pass the Senate? Is anyone going to tell me that 1 minute was spent discussing that issue? I am listening. I do not hear it.

So I say to all of my friends in this House, Republicans, Democrats, those of you who believe in a fair process, those of you who voted for option 1–A, reject this legislation. The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) was right. Let us send a loud signal to the leadership and say that is not the way we want to do business.

Now, all over this country family farmers are crying out for help. We are seeing a tragedy of utmost proportions. From one end of this country to the other we are seeing the struggling family farmers who are maintaining rural America, who are maintaining our rural economies, working 60, 70, 80 hours a week, they are going out of business. And what does this legislation do for them? It does nothing.

Mr. Speaker, let me simply conclude by saying this: for those Members of the body, Republicans, Democrats, who are concerned about the family farmer, vote no on this bill. Send it back, and let us develop legislation that can save the family farm and help rural America.

For those Members of this body who are concerned about the democratic process, honest debate, real discussion, I urge you to vote ''no'' on this legislation. Send it back and let us have a real debate, an honest debate, as to how we can save family farmers.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD).

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, if you want to save the family farm, I suggest that you vote for this rule and vote for this bill. This bill helps family farms.

I represent one of the largest agricultural districts in the country, 14 counties in central Illinois, hog producers, corn producers, soybean producers, people who have made their living for years and years and years on the good black soil of central Illinois.

What I have been doing is traveling around my district throughout the summer and the fall, and what I found is there are two economies in America. There is the booming economy, where you drive around your district and every fast-food restaurant says ''hiring for all positions.'' Americans are doing well; they are investing in the stock market. That is the one economy.

The other economy is the agriculture economy, which is in a recession; and if you are a hog producer, you are in a depression. Many of the hog producers in my districts have gone out of business, and many of the corn and soybean producers in my district are hurting very badly.

This bill helps them. Just because you feel you were shut out or you were not a part of the final negotiations, why should we sell short then those people who badly need this assistance? I say to all of you who represent agriculture, all of you who represent hard-hit farmers, this is the time to step up and vote for a bill that provides the needed assistance.

Now, you can say all you want about Freedom to Farm. You can criticize it. Many people have. I have not heard any criticism of Freedom to Farm for the first 3 years that it was in existence. Not one word have I heard.

This year we have. You know why? Because we got lousy markets. The Asia market is lousy, Russia is a mess, we never passed Fast Track. That is the reason behind Freedom to Farm.

One of the successes of Freedom to Farm is you have to have markets. We do not have the markets. Every time I have met with Secretary Glickman, Secretary Bill Daley, they ask, when are we going to pass Fast Track to open up the South American market? We need trade. We need markets in order for our farmers to survive.

So I say to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman

from Texas (Mr. COMBEST), thank you for agreeing to hold hearings next year on Freedom to Farm. We are going to have a debate on that. But because you do not like Freedom to Farm, do not vote against the rule, do not vote against the bill.

We have farmers all over America, either because of a drought, which we have not experienced in central Illinois, or because of lousy prices because we do not have the markets which are in a recession, and this bill helps them. So if you want to help hard-hit farmers, this is your opportunity today to do it. Vote for the rule, vote for the bill, and we will help them get out of this recessionary period.

This is an opportunity for Congress and the government to step up and help those who need the help. I say vote for the rule, vote for the bill, and we will help our hard-hit farmers.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY).

□ 1045

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, if the previous speaker has not heard any criticism of Freedom to Farm, he has not been listening. The criticism has been loud and clear from the moment that bill came to the floor. In fact, so much so that over the past several years people in the farm belt are calling it no longer Freedom to Farm but freedom to starve, but that is not the issue before us today.

The issue before us right now is the rule governing the agricultural appropriations bill. There are good things in that agricultural appropriations bill, and they were put in there by the Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies in this House and the other body.

I want to say that I have the greatest respect for the chairman of our Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies. I do not think there is a man in this body who is held in greater affection than is the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), but the process was wrested from his hands just as it was wrested from the hands of all of the rest of us all who were members of that conference committee; and the result is disaster and this rule continues that disaster because it does not give us the opportunity to offer to the full body here, all the Members of this House, the opportunity to vote up or down on critical issues.

Ought we not open some of these markets? The market in Cuba alone represents $800 million a year for agricultural producers in this country. We are providing $5.5 billion of subsidies, some of it going to people telling them not to grow anything, while we are depriving them of an $800 million-a-year market right offshore. That is true of other markets as well that are closed to us, open to our allies but closed to us only because we adhere to an archaic principle founded in the Cold War that is no longer relevant to anyone anywhere on this planet, except for a narrow group of people in this country who are controlling this process. It is the height of absurdity.

Furthermore, we are deprived from having the opportunity to vote up or down on a dairy provision which will save dairy farms in New England, in New York, in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and the coastal Atlantic States. We are deprived of that because this is a bad rule. Vote ''no'' on this rule.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER), in the spirit of democracy.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) for yielding me this additional time.

Mr. Speaker, since I am not going to be able to get time under the general debate on the conference report, I appreciate the opportunity to speak once again. I think the process, I have to agree with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, it is very limited and everybody gets what they want within that small group. I do not agree with my colleagues on everything because I think one of the good things in the bill is they did not put a dairy provision in there. That is the utter nonsense of the whole agriculture program is dairy, and I am delighted that that was not included in that.

I am also glad that the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies will be having hearings on Freedom to Farm and I will be able to bring up issues of sugar and peanuts and such.

One of the problems about this whole agricultural subsidy program is that only one-third of the farmers in this country get to benefit from this. I am not advocating that the other two-thirds get it. I think we should open up to the free market.

Let me give some numbers we have here. The third that get benefit out of this receive an average subsidy of $24,000 a crop year. Now they are going to get $35,000 a year in subsidies, $35,000 a year per farmer for just those one-third of the farmers.

Now, we had a debate under Labor-HHS and on the welfare issue that the average welfare family of three gets $12,000 a year, but we are going to give $35,000 a year to the farmer and the statistics will show only 57 percent of it goes to families of limited resource and small family farms; 43 percent of it goes to these big corporate farms, retirement farmers, residential life-style, the hobby farmer.

So it is not really helping the small farmer as much because we are just providing $8 billion. That is what is frustrating about this bill. I voted for it, I believe, when it came originally on the floor of the House, keeping the process moving forward; but we had $8 billion added without any hearing, without any participation, getting it in the middle of the night, and it is very frustrating.

So for fiscal conservatives, I urge their opposition to this particular appropriation bill. I do this, as I say, with great reluctance.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACCI).

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

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. I rise in opposition to this conference report. There is not a Member on either side of this aisle that can go home and look their farmers in the eye and say that we brought home a fair deal. There is not enough money in this conference agreement to take care of all of the natural disasters across the United States.

I know that some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle think that they have the power to add an additional month to the calendar year and in some cases have even invoked Scottish law in terms of U.S. law. I know there has even been an attempt to try to change the Constitution and say that the census is an emergency, but the fact of the matter is that there are disasters and droughts that are going on throughout this country that cannot be controlled, even though some think that they can control the weather.

The drought and those disasters are impacting throughout this country even to today, and just in the Northeast alone we are talking about $2.5 billion in crop losses; Pennsylvania, $700 million, less than $3 million being allowed for in this bill; New York, $370 million. How much money is in this bill to help New York? Maine, $31 million. Less than $1 million is available in this legislation. Virginia, $200 million; Ohio, $600 million. Disasters that have occurred on the East Coast in 13 East Coast States, very little, if any, assistance is being provided or available to them. Those are natural disasters.

Those pigs that are floating in the waters in North Carolina are real. We see them on our TV screens every night, and we talk to our friends here in the House that have been impacted, not to say anything of the toxic waste and the underground piles that are floating throughout the country both in North Carolina and in the South.

We do not have enough assistance, and a promise that $500 million additional in a Labor-HHS bill is going to be available for disaster assistance is not good enough.

I am encouraging Members to vote against the rule, vote against the conference report, and send this back.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking minority member on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, in the end I will be voting for the bill and the rule, but before I do I would like to get some things off of my chest about what I think the real problems are.

I do not think that the committee was wrong not to include dairy in this bill because there were no provisions on dairy, and they would have been not germane to the bill to begin with. I think the committee made the proper decision.

I think a number of things happened in the conference that should not have happened. Example: we had a serious debate on the issue of sanctions. I think this country's sanctions policy is deeply flawed. I think it makes no sense to use farmers as pawns in foreign policy. I did not agree with the Senate language on sanctions because I thought it was open sesame and I thought it was carelessly applied; and it could have made available to a number of dictatorial regimes around the world items which they could use to build their own foreign exchange, and we do not want to do that.

I think we could have, if we had had the opportunity in conference, worked out a recalibrated sanction program to meet the national interests of the country without making farmers be the infantrymen in every argument we have with a foreign power, but we did not get the chance because the conference was shut down.

I think that the distribution of money under the emergency bill should have been along the lines of the suggestions by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), because that would have guaranteed that the aid would go to people who are actually farming; but we did not get a chance to deal with that issue because the conference was shut down before we were able to offer amendments.

I agree, there is not enough money in this bill for disasters, for the Carolina region and for other areas. I think the basic problem in this bill is not the Committee on Appropriations. All we can do is deal with funding issues. The basic problem is that we are dealing with an underlying law that makes no sense because it is based on ideology rather than real-world economics.

Somebody said once that economists are people who spend their time worrying about whether what works in real life could actually work in theory, and that certainly is the case when we are dealing with agricultural economics.

We have a law right now, the Freedom to Farm Act, which basically says we are going to let the market work, but there is no true market in agriculture for the most part. There is not a country on this globe that does not play games with trade to the detriment of somebody else's farmers.

Processors have a fundamental advantage in dealing with farmers in the exchange of most commodities. Markets need to recognize that there are weather problems, there are pest problems, there are disease problems, and we need to try to use government to even out what happens to farmers when they get hit with those problems. Otherwise, we are not going to have family farmers left to produce any commodities in this country.

What ought to happen is that the Freedom to Farm bill, which in my opinion has become the freedom-to-lose-your-shirt bill, that bill ought to be tossed out and we ought to start over and produce a bill that makes long-term sense for American farmers.

Until that is done, the Committee on Appropriations cannot fix up the problem.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we saw a magnificent, as I said before, demonstration of the clash of views in a democratic process. Again and again, we saw the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) feeling so strongly about the fact that in his view the bill spends too much money; and despite the fact that it breaks usual tradition, I allowed him time to speak twice with regard to that point of view. He believes it spends too much money, and we had a number of speakers on the other side of the aisle say that this bill spends too little money. That is a clash. That is what democracy is about.

We had some allegations made which I think deserve reference, some of which because I believe they were incorrect. For example, one of the speakers mentioned that with regard to the Cuban market a billion dollars of sales are possible there.

Let us remember that a few years ago, even after the Cuban dictator had destroyed that economy, he was receiving $6 billion a year in subsidies from the Soviet Union, and that is why he could maintain his tyranny functioning and purchasing things. He does not have that subsidy anymore. How could he now have a billion dollars from American farmers? It would seem that any intelligent analysis would see how illusory that is and how patently absurd that is, and yet we hear it.

Now, the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) made one point which was very important, and I disagree with his conclusion; yet I think it is important to mention it. He said that while he disagrees with our sanctions policy, the Senate language, the Senate rider which was on this legislation, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) mentioned, I think correctly, it was very sloppily drafted and overly broad and it would have facilitated terrorist states obtaining hard currency.

That points to the fact of why the authorizing committee, the Committee on International Relations that has hearings on this issue, was so adamant, as made clear through a letter by its chairman, that this rider-way of legislating on appropriations bills on such delicate issues is not the appropriate way to proceed.

□ 1100

So wisely I believe because of the point brought out by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the sloppiness of the Senate language and the underlying seriousness of the issue as brought out by the authorizing committee why it was wise that legislating through a rider was not permitted by the conference committee.

So I now close and urge support for this rule because of the importance of the underlying legislation, Mr. Speaker. My colleagues know very well that this legislation is needed by American farmers, that there are a myriad of critical programs in this legislation that are going to be funded; that there are many families that will benefit directly and immediately in our country from this legislation.

That is why we need to bring it to the floor, and that is why we need to vote for the rule, and that is why we need to vote for this underlying legislation, and that is why I support it, and that is why I urge my colleagues to vote for it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BEREUTER). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 188, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 467]

YEAS—230

Aderholt	Bono	Coburn
Archer	Boswell	Collins
Armey	Brady (TX)	Combest
Baker	Bryant	Cook
Ballenger	Burr	Cox
Barr	Burton	Cramer
Barrett (NE)	Buyer	Crane
Barton	Callahan	Cubin
Bateman	Calvert	Cunningham
Bereuter	Campbell	Danner
Berry	Canady	Davis (VA)
Biggert	Cannon	Deal
Bilbray	Capps	DeLay
Bilirakis	Capuano	DeMint
Bishop	Castle	Diaz-Balart
Bliley	Chabot	Dickey
Blunt	Chambliss	Dingell
Boehner	Clyburn	Dooley
Bonilla	Coble	Doolittle

Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Fowler
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kasich
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCollum
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller, Gary
Minge
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pastor
Paul
Pease
Petri
Phelps
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sanford
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traficant
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—188

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Bachus
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Camp
Cardin
Carson
Clayton
Clement
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Coyne
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Doyle
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hinchey
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hoyer
Hutchinson
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Lazio
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Mink
Moakley
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Price (NC)
Quinn
Rangel
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sawyer
Saxton
Schakowsky
Scott
Sherman
Sherwood
Shows
Shuster
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Stabenow
Stark
Strickland
Sweeney
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Vitter
Walsh
Waters
Watt (NC)
Weiner
Wexler
Weygand
Woolsey
Wynn

NOT VOTING—16

Bass
Berman
Chenoweth
Clay
Ford
Goodling
Hinojosa
Hooley
Jefferson
Levin
Meeks (NY)
Pomeroy
Rush
Scarborough
Waxman
Wu

□ 1122

Mrs. CLAYTON, and Messrs. COYNE, CAMP, SHOWS and COOKSEY changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. MCINNIS and Mr. MINGE changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, regrettably I was unavoidably detained for rollcall votes 466 and 467. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on rollcall vote 466 and "no" on rollcall vote 467.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. RES. 298

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SAWYER) be removed as a cosponsor of H. Res. 298.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BEREUTER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1906, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 317, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 1906), making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 317, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of Thursday, September 30, 1999, at page H9141.)

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report to accompany H.R. 1906, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I feel somewhat like Mrs. Custer, and how she would have felt about Indian relief, after we have gone through this exercise earlier. But I am pleased to bring before the House today the conference report on H.R. 1906, providing appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, the Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies.

This bill does a lot of good for important nutrition, research, and rural development programs and still meets our conference allocations on discretionary and mandatory spending.

Basic research on agriculture, food safety and nutrition has been increased by $80 million. The Farm Service Agency budget is also increased by $80 million, and this will be especially important to farms affected by the drought, the floods and the low prices.

Loan authorizations for the Rural Housing Service are increased by $330 million. The program to provide loans and grants for rural schools and medical facilities, to allow them to access the resources of large urban institutions, is increased by two-thirds to $20.7 million.

Our feeding and nutrition programs are all increased or maintained at the 1999 levels. This report has $108 million for the WIC program over last year, and the direct appropriation for Food and Drug Administration is $70 million over last year.

We were able to make these increases by cutting administrative and management costs and by benefiting from lower loan costs in our farm and rural development programs.

Finally, this bill carries an additional title this year that provides about $8.7 billion in emergency assistance, including $1.2 billion for farm losses caused by natural disaster.

OMB Director Lew has promised an assessment of Hurricane Floyd damage

but indicated it may be some time before the assessment is completed. I expect we will be dealing with additional disaster needs in a future bill.

Once again I would like to thank all the members of our subcommittee and their staffs for their hard work and cooperation on this bill, which began with the budget presentation back in February.

I want to offer special thanks to the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), for his support, and a special thanks also to my good friend, the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR). I know she has strong concerns regarding the conference report, but I want to make clear to every Member that she is a strong supporter of rural America and that she deserves a share of the credit for the good that this bill will do.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that benefits every American every day, no matter where they live, whether it is FDA protecting the safety of our foods and medicines, or the nutrition programs for children and the elderly, or creating economic development in rural America. This bill is for urban and suburban Americans just as much as it is for the farmer and the rancher.

And, by the way, I think that everybody, every member of the United States, is a farmer by acquisition, because everybody I know knows more about farming than most farmers do.

I know some of our colleagues are concerned for what is not in the bill, particularly dairy policy and the relaxation of export sanctions to certain countries.

□ 1130

But if we all voted on the basis of what is not in a bill, I am not sure any legislation would ever get passed here. I would say to my colleagues that this is a good bipartisan bill, and it will benefit every one of their constituents.

This is the first day of the new fiscal year, and we need to put this bill to work immediately. Please support the good that is in this bill today and vote aye on the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following for the RECORD:

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 1906)

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
TITLE I - AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS						
Production, Processing, and Marketing						
Office of the Secretary	2,836	2,942	2,836	2,836	15,436	+12,600
Executive Operations:						
Chief Economist	5,620	6,622	5,620	6,411	6,411	+791
National Appeals Division	11,718	12,699	11,718	11,718	11,718	.....
Office of Budget and Program Analysis	6,120	6,583	6,583	6,583	6,583	+463
Office of the Chief Information Officer	5,551	7,998	5,551	5,551	6,051	+500
Y2K conversion (emergency appropriations)	46,168	.....	.....	.....	.....	-46,168
Office of the Chief Financial Officer	4,283	6,288	4,283	5,283	4,783	+500
Total, Executive Operations	79,460	40,190	33,755	35,546	35,546	-43,914
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration	613	636	613	613	613	.....
Agriculture buildings and facilities and rental payments	137,184	166,364	140,364	145,364	140,364	+3,180
Payments to GSA	(108,057)	(115,542)	(115,542)	(115,542)	(115,542)	(+7,485)
Building operations and maintenance	(24,127)	(24,822)	(24,822)	(24,822)	(24,822)	(+695)
Repairs, renovations, and construction	(5,000)	(26,000)	.....	(5,000)	.....	(-5,000)
Hazardous waste management	15,700	22,700	15,700	15,700	15,700	.....
Departmental administration	32,168	36,117	36,117	34,738	34,738	+2,570
Outreach for socially disadvantaged farmers	3,000	10,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	.....
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations	3,668	3,805	3,668	3,668	3,568	-100
Office of Communications	8,138	9,300	8,138	8,138	8,138	.....
Office of the Inspector General	65,128	68,246	65,128	65,128	65,128	.....
Office of the General Counsel	29,194	32,675	29,194	30,094	29,194	.....
Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education and Economics	540	2,061	940	540	540	.....
Economic Research Service	65,757	55,628	70,266	62,919	65,419	-338
National Agricultural Statistics Service	103,964	100,559	100,559	99,355	99,405	-4,559
Census of Agriculture	(23,599)	(16,490)	(16,490)	(16,490)	(16,490)	(-7,109)
Agricultural Research Service	785,518	836,868	823,381	809,499	834,322	+48,804
Buildings and facilities	56,437	44,500	.....	53,000	52,500	-3,937
Total, Agricultural Research Service	841,955	881,368	823,381	862,499	886,822	+44,867
Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service:						
Research and education activities	481,216	468,965	467,327	473,377	485,698	+4,482
Native American Institutions Endowment Fund	(4,600)	(4,600)	(4,600)	(4,600)	(4,600)	.....
Extension activities	437,987	401,603	438,987	422,620	424,922	-13,065
Integrated activities	.....	72,844	.....	35,541	39,541	+39,541
Total, Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service	919,203	943,412	906,314	931,538	950,161	+30,958
Office of the Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs	618	641	618	618	618	.....
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service:						
Salaries and expenses	425,803	435,445	444,000	439,445	441,263	+15,460
AQI user fees	(88,000)	(95,000)	(87,000)	(90,000)	(87,000)	(-1,000)
Buildings and facilities	7,700	7,200	7,200	5,200	5,200	-2,500
Total, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	433,503	442,645	451,200	444,645	446,463	+12,960
Agricultural Marketing Service:						
Marketing Services	48,831	60,182	49,152	51,229	51,625	+2,794
Standardization user fees	(4,000)	(4,000)	(4,000)	(4,000)	(4,000)	.....
(Limitation on administrative expenses, from fees collected)	(60,730)	(60,730)	(60,730)	(60,730)	(60,730)	.....
Funds for strengthening markets, income, and supply (transfer from section 32)	10,998	12,443	12,443	12,443	12,443	+1,445
Payments to states and possessions	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	.....
Total, Agricultural Marketing Service	61,029	73,825	62,795	64,872	65,268	+4,239
Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration:						
Salaries and expenses	26,787	26,448	26,448	26,287	26,448	-339
Limitation on inspection and weighing services	(42,557)	(42,557)	(42,557)	(42,557)	(42,557)	.....
Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety	446	469	446	446	446	.....
Food Safety and Inspection Service	616,986	652,955	652,955	638,404	649,411	+32,425
Lab accreditation fees 1/	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	.....
Total, Production, Processing, and Marketing	3,447,877	3,572,986	3,434,435	3,476,948	3,542,426	+94,549
Farm Assistance Programs						
Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services	572	595	572	572	572	.....

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 1906) — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
Farm Service Agency:						
Salaries and expenses	714,499	794,839	794,839	794,839	794,839	+80,340
(Transfer from export loans)	(589)	(672)	(672)	(589)	(589)	.....
(Transfer from P.L. 480)	(815)	(845)	(845)	(815)	(815)	.....
(Transfer from ACIF)	(209,861)	(209,861)	(209,861)	(209,861)	(209,861)	.....
Subtotal, Transfers from program accounts	(211,265)	(211,378)	(211,378)	(211,265)	(211,265)	.....
Total, salaries and expenses	(925,764)	(1,006,217)	(1,006,217)	(1,006,104)	(1,006,104)	(+80,340)
State mediation grants	2,000	4,000	4,000	2,000	3,000	+1,000
Dairy indemnity program	450	450	450	450	450	.....
Subtotal, Farm Service Agency	716,949	799,289	799,289	797,289	798,289	+81,340
Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account:						
Loan authorizations:						
Farm ownership loans:						
Direct	(85,651)	(128,049)	(128,049)	(128,049)	(128,049)	(+42,398)
Guaranteed	(425,031)	(431,373)	(431,373)	(431,373)	(431,373)	(+6,342)
Subtotal	(510,682)	(559,422)	(559,422)	(559,422)	(559,422)	(+48,740)
Farm operating loans:						
Direct	(500,000)	(500,000)	(500,000)	(500,000)	(500,000)	.....
Guaranteed unsubsidized	(948,276)	(1,697,842)	(1,697,842)	(1,697,842)	(1,697,842)	(+749,566)
Guaranteed subsidized	(200,000)	(97,442)	(97,442)	(200,000)	(200,000)	.....
Subtotal	(1,648,276)	(2,295,284)	(2,295,284)	(2,397,842)	(2,397,842)	(+749,566)
Indian tribe land acquisition loans	(1,000)	(1,028)	(1,028)	(1,028)	(1,028)	(+28)
Emergency disaster loans	(25,000)	(53,000)	(53,000)	(25,000)	(25,000)	.....
Boll weevil eradication loans	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	.....
Total, Loan authorizations	(2,284,958)	(3,008,734)	(3,008,734)	(3,083,292)	(3,083,292)	(+798,334)
Loan subsidies:						
Farm ownership loans:						
Direct	12,822	4,827	4,827	4,827	4,827	-7,995
Guaranteed	6,758	2,416	2,416	2,416	2,416	-4,342
Subtotal	19,580	7,243	7,243	7,243	7,243	-12,337
Farm operating loans:						
Direct	34,150	29,300	29,300	29,300	29,300	-4,850
Guaranteed unsubsidized	11,000	23,940	23,940	23,940	23,940	+12,940
Guaranteed subsidized	17,480	8,585	8,585	17,620	17,620	+140
Subtotal	62,630	61,825	61,825	70,860	70,860	+8,230
Indian tribe land acquisition	153	21	21	21	21	-132
Emergency disaster loans	5,900	8,231	8,231	3,882	3,882	-2,018
Boll weevil loans subsidy	1,440	.....	.....	.....	.....	-1,440
Total, Loan subsidies	89,703	77,320	77,320	82,006	82,006	-7,697
ACIF expenses:						
Salaries and expense (transfer to FSA)	209,861	209,861	209,861	209,861	209,861	.....
Administrative expenses	10,000	4,300	4,300	4,300	4,300	-5,700
Total, ACIF expenses	219,861	214,161	214,161	214,161	214,161	-5,700
Total, Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund	309,564	291,481	291,481	296,167	296,167	-13,397
(Loan authorization)	(2,284,958)	(3,008,734)	(3,008,734)	(3,083,292)	(3,083,292)	(+798,334)
Total, Farm Service Agency	1,026,513	1,090,770	1,090,770	1,093,456	1,094,456	+67,943
Risk Management Agency	64,000	70,716	70,716	64,000	64,000	.....
Support Services Bureau	.....	74,050	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total, Farm Assistance Programs	1,091,085	1,236,131	1,162,058	1,158,028	1,159,028	+67,943
Corporations						
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation:						
Federal crop insurance corporation fund	1,504,036	997,000	997,000	997,000	997,000	-507,036

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 1906) — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
Commodity Credit Corporation Fund:						
Reimbursement for net realized losses	8,439,000	14,368,000	14,368,000	14,368,000	14,368,000	+5,929,000
Operations and maintenance for hazardous waste management (limitation on administrative expenses)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	.....
Total, Corporations	9,943,036	15,365,000	15,365,000	15,365,000	15,365,000	+5,421,964
Total, title I, Agricultural Programs	14,481,998	20,174,117	19,961,493	19,999,976	20,066,454	+5,584,456
(By transfer)	(211,265)	(211,378)	(211,378)	(211,265)	(211,265)	.....
(Loan authorization)	(2,284,958)	(3,008,734)	(3,008,734)	(3,083,292)	(3,083,292)	(+798,334)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(108,287)	(108,287)	(108,287)	(108,287)	(108,287)	.....
TITLE II - CONSERVATION PROGRAMS						
Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment	693	721	693	693	693	.....
Natural Resources Conservation Service:						
Conservation operations	641,243	680,679	654,243	656,243	661,243	+20,000
(By transfer)	.....	(44,423)	.....	.....	.....	.....
Watershed surveys and planning	10,368	11,732	10,368	10,368	10,368	.....
Watershed and flood prevention operations	99,443	83,423	99,443	99,443	99,443	.....
Resource conservation and development	35,000	35,265	35,265	35,000	35,265	+265
Forestry incentives program	6,325	.....	.....	6,325	6,325	.....
Debt for nature	.....	5,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
Farmland protection program	.....	50,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total, Natural Resources Conservation Service	792,379	866,099	799,319	807,379	812,644	+20,265
Total, title II, Conservation Programs	793,072	866,820	800,012	808,072	813,337	+20,265
TITLE III - RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS						
Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development	588	612	588	588	588	.....
Rural community advancement program	722,686	670,103	669,103	718,006	718,837	-3,849
Rural Housing Service:						
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account:						
Loan authorizations:						
Single family (sec. 502)	(965,313)	(1,100,000)	(1,337,632)	(1,100,000)	(1,100,000)	(+134,687)
Unsubsidized guaranteed	(3,000,000)	(3,200,000)	(3,200,000)	(3,200,000)	(3,200,000)	(+200,000)
Housing repair (sec. 504)	(25,001)	(32,396)	(32,400)	(32,396)	(32,396)	(+7,395)
Farm labor (sec. 514)	(20,000)	(25,001)	(25,000)	(25,001)	(25,001)	(+5,001)
Rental housing (sec. 515)	(114,321)	(100,000)	(120,000)	(114,321)	(114,321)	.....
Multifamily housing guarantees (sec. 538)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	.....
Site loans (sec. 524)	(5,152)	(5,152)	(5,152)	(5,152)	(5,152)	.....
Credit sales of acquired property	(16,930)	(7,503)	(7,503)	(12,824)	(7,503)	(-9,427)
Self-help housing land development fund	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	.....
Total, Loan authorizations	(4,251,717)	(4,575,052)	(4,832,687)	(4,594,694)	(4,589,373)	(+337,656)
Loan subsidies:						
Single family (sec. 502)	114,100	93,830	114,100	93,830	93,830	-20,270
Unsubsidized guaranteed	2,700	19,520	19,520	19,520	19,520	+16,820
Housing repair (sec. 504)	8,808	9,900	9,900	9,900	9,900	+1,092
Multifamily housing guarantees (sec. 538)	2,320	480	480	480	480	-1,840
Farm labor (sec. 514)	10,406	11,308	11,308	11,308	11,308	+902
Rental housing (sec. 515)	55,160	39,680	47,616	45,363	45,363	-9,797
Site loans (sec. 524)	17	4	4	4	4	-13
Credit sales of acquired property	3,492	874	874	1,499	874	-2,618
Self-help housing land development fund	282	281	281	281	281	-1
Total, Loan subsidies	197,285	175,877	204,083	182,185	181,560	-15,725
RHIF administrative expenses (transfer to RHS)	360,785	383,879	375,879	360,785	375,879	+15,094
Rental assistance program:						
(Sec. 521)	577,497	434,100	577,500	634,100	634,100	+56,603
(Sec. 502(c)(5)(D))	5,900	5,900	5,900	5,900	5,900	.....
Subtotal	583,397	440,000	583,400	640,000	640,000	+56,603
Advance appropriation, FY 2001	.....	200,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total, Rental assistance program	583,397	640,000	583,400	640,000	640,000	+56,603
Total, Rural Housing Insurance Fund	1,141,467	1,199,756	1,163,362	1,182,970	1,197,439	+55,972
(Loan authorization)	(4,251,717)	(4,575,052)	(4,832,687)	(4,594,694)	(4,589,373)	(+337,656)
Mutual and self-help housing grants	26,000	30,000	28,000	26,000	28,000	+2,000
Rural housing assistance grants	41,000	54,000	50,000	41,000	45,000	+4,000
Subtotal, grants and payments	67,000	84,000	78,000	67,000	73,000	+6,000

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 1906) — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
RHS expenses:						
Salaries and expenses	60,978	61,979	61,979	60,978	61,979	+1,001
(Transfer from RHIF)	(360,785)	(383,879)	(375,879)	(360,785)	(375,879)	(+15,094)
Total, RHS expenses	(421,763)	(445,858)	(437,858)	(421,763)	(437,858)	(+16,095)
Total, Rural Housing Service	1,269,445	1,345,735	1,303,341	1,310,948	1,332,418	+62,973
(Loan authorization)	(4,251,717)	(4,575,052)	(4,832,687)	(4,594,694)	(4,589,373)	(+337,656)
Rural Business-Cooperative Service:						
Rural Development Loan Fund Program Account:						
(Loan authorization)	(33,000)	(52,495)	(52,495)	(38,256)	(38,256)	(+5,256)
Loan subsidy	16,615	22,799	22,799	16,615	16,615	.....
Administrative expenses (transfer to RBCS)	3,482	3,337	3,337	3,337	3,337	-145
Total, Rural Development Loan Fund	20,097	26,136	26,136	19,952	19,952	-145
Rural Economic Development Loans Program Account:						
(Loan authorization)	(15,000)	(15,000)	(15,000)	(15,000)	(15,000)	.....
Direct subsidy	3,783	3,453	3,453	3,453	3,453	-330
Rural cooperative development grants	3,300	9,000	6,000	5,500	6,000	+2,700
RBCS expenses:						
Salaries and expenses	25,680	24,612	24,612	25,680	24,612	-1,068
(Transfer from RDLFP)	(3,482)	(3,337)	(3,337)	(3,337)	(3,337)	(-145)
Total, RBCS expenses	(29,162)	(27,949)	(27,949)	(29,017)	(27,949)	(-1,213)
Total, Rural Business-Cooperative Service	52,860	63,201	60,201	54,585	54,017	+1,157
(By transfer)	(3,482)	(3,337)	(3,337)	(3,337)	(3,337)	(-145)
(Loan authorization)	(48,000)	(67,495)	(67,495)	(53,256)	(53,256)	(+5,256)
Alternative Agricultural Research and Commercialization Revolving Fund	3,500	10,000	.....	3,500	.....	-3,500
Rural Utilities Service:						
Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account:						
Loan authorizations:						
Direct loans:						
Electric 5%	(71,500)	(50,000)	(121,500)	(71,500)	(121,500)	(+50,000)
Telecommunications 5%	(75,000)	(50,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)	.....
Subtotal	(146,500)	(100,000)	(196,500)	(146,500)	(196,500)	(+50,000)
Treasury rates: Telecommunications	(300,000)	(300,000)	(300,000)	(300,000)	(300,000)	.....
Muni-rate: Electric	(295,000)	(250,000)	(295,000)	(295,000)	(295,000)	.....
FFB loans:						
Electric, regular	(700,000)	(300,000)	(1,500,000)	(700,000)	(1,700,000)	(+1,000,000)
Telecommunications	(120,000)	(120,000)	(120,000)	(120,000)	(120,000)	.....
Subtotal	(820,000)	(420,000)	(1,620,000)	(820,000)	(1,820,000)	(+1,000,000)
Total, Loan authorizations	(1,561,500)	(1,070,000)	(2,411,500)	(1,561,500)	(2,611,500)	(+1,050,000)
Loan subsidies:						
Direct loans:						
Electric 5%	9,325	450	1,095	643	1,095	-8,230
Telecommunications 5%	7,342	560	840	840	840	-6,502
Subtotal	16,667	1,010	1,935	1,483	1,935	-14,732
Treasury rates: Telecommunications	810	2,370	2,370	2,370	2,370	+1,560
Muni-rate: Electric	25,842	9,175	10,827	10,826	10,827	-15,015
Total, Loan subsidies	43,319	12,555	15,132	14,679	15,132	-28,187
RETLP administrative expenses (transfer to RUS)	29,982	31,046	31,046	29,982	31,046	+1,064
Total, Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account	73,301	43,601	46,178	44,661	46,178	-27,123
(Loan authorization)	(1,561,500)	(1,070,000)	(2,411,500)	(1,561,500)	(2,611,500)	(+1,050,000)
Rural Telephone Bank Program Account:						
(Loan authorization)	(157,509)	(175,000)	(175,000)	(157,509)	(175,000)	(+17,491)
Direct loan subsidy	4,174	3,290	3,290	2,961	3,290	-884
RTP administrative expenses (transfer to RUS)	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	.....
Total	7,174	6,290	6,290	5,961	6,290	-884

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 1906) — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
Distance learning and telemedicine program:						
(Loan authorization)	(150,000)	(200,000)	(200,000)	(200,000)	(200,000)	(+50,000)
Direct loan subsidy	180	700	700	700	700	+520
Grants	12,500	20,000	16,000	12,500	20,000	+7,500
Total	12,680	20,700	16,700	13,200	20,700	+8,020
RUS expenses:						
Salaries and expenses	33,000	34,107	34,107	33,000	34,107	+1,107
(Transfer from RETLP)	(29,982)	(31,046)	(31,046)	(29,982)	(31,046)	(+1,064)
(Transfer from RTP)	(3,000)	(3,000)	(3,000)	(3,000)	(3,000)	.....
Total, RUS expenses	(65,982)	(68,153)	(68,153)	(65,982)	(68,153)	(+2,171)
Total, Rural Utilities Service	126,155	104,698	103,275	96,822	107,275	-18,880
(By transfer)	(32,982)	(34,046)	(34,046)	(32,982)	(34,046)	(+1,064)
(Loan authorization)	(1,869,009)	(1,445,000)	(2,786,500)	(1,919,009)	(2,986,500)	(+1,117,491)
Total, title III, Rural Economic and Community Development Programs	2,175,234	2,194,349	2,136,508	2,184,449	2,213,135	+37,901
(By transfer)	(397,249)	(421,262)	(413,262)	(397,104)	(413,262)	(+16,013)
(Loan authorization)	(6,168,726)	(6,087,547)	(7,686,682)	(6,566,959)	(7,629,129)	(+1,460,403)
TITLE IV - DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS						
Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services	554	576	554	554	554	.....
Food and Nutrition Service:						
Child nutrition programs	4,128,747	4,620,768	4,611,829	4,611,829	4,611,829	+483,082
Transfer from section 32	5,048,150	4,929,268	4,935,199	4,935,199	4,935,199	-112,951
Discretionary spending	.....	15,000	.....	13,000	7,000	+7,000
Total, Child nutrition programs	9,176,897	9,565,036	9,547,028	9,560,028	9,554,028	+377,131
Special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children (WIC)	3,924,000	4,105,495	4,005,000	4,038,107	4,032,000	+108,000
Food stamp program:						
Expenses	19,909,106	20,109,444	20,109,444	20,098,744	19,605,751	-303,355
Reserve	100,000	1,000,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	.....
Nutrition assistance for Puerto Rico	1,236,000	1,268,000	1,268,000	1,268,000	1,268,000	+32,000
Discretionary spending	.....	7,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
The emergency food assistance program	90,000	100,000	100,000	97,000	98,000	+8,000
Advance appropriation, FY 2001	.....	4,800,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total, Food stamp program	21,335,106	27,284,444	21,577,444	21,563,744	21,071,751	-263,355
Commodity assistance program	131,000	155,215	151,000	131,000	133,300	+2,300
Food donations programs:						
Needy family program	1,081	1,081	1,081	1,081	1,081	.....
Elderly feeding program	140,000	150,000	140,000	140,000	140,000	.....
Total, Food donations programs	141,081	151,081	141,081	141,081	141,081	.....
Food program administration	108,561	119,841	108,561	111,561	111,561	+3,000
Total, Food and Nutrition Service	34,816,645	41,381,112	35,530,114	35,545,521	35,043,721	+227,076
Total, title IV, Domestic Food Programs	34,817,199	41,381,688	35,530,668	35,546,075	35,044,275	+227,076
TITLE V - FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS						
Foreign Agricultural Service and General Sales Manager:						
Direct appropriation	136,203	137,768	137,768	136,203	109,203	-27,000
(Transfer from export loans)	(3,231)	(3,413)	(3,413)	(3,231)	(3,231)	.....
(Transfer from P.L. 480)	(1,035)	(1,093)	(1,093)	(1,035)	(1,035)	.....
Total, Program level	(140,469)	(142,274)	(142,274)	(140,469)	(113,469)	(-27,000)
Public Law 480 Program and Grant Accounts:						
Title I - Credit sales:						
Program level	(219,724)	(150,324)	(214,582)	(159,089)	(176,000)	(-43,724)
Direct loans	(203,475)	(138,324)	(200,582)	(142,840)	(155,000)	(-48,475)
Ocean freight differential	16,249	12,000	11,000	16,249	21,000	+4,751
Title II - Commodities for disposition abroad:						
Program level	(837,000)	(787,000)	(837,000)	(787,000)	(800,000)	(-37,000)
Appropriation	837,000	787,000	837,000	787,000	800,000	-37,000
Title III - Commodity grants:						
Program level	(25,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-25,000)
Appropriation	25,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-25,000
Loan subsidies	176,596	114,062	165,400	117,786	127,813	-48,783

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 1906) — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
Salaries and expenses:						
General Sales Manager (transfer to FAS)	1,035	1,093	1,093	1,035	1,035	.....
Farm Service Agency (transfer to FSA)	815	845	845	815	815	.....
Subtotal	1,850	1,938	1,938	1,850	1,850	.....
Total, Public Law 480:						
Program level	(1,081,724)	(937,324)	(1,051,582)	(946,089)	(976,000)	(-105,724)
Appropriation	1,056,695	915,000	1,015,338	922,885	950,663	-106,032
CCC Export Loans Program Account (administrative expenses):						
Salaries and expenses (Export Loans):						
General Sales Manager (transfer to FAS)	3,231	3,413	3,413	3,231	3,231	.....
Farm Service Agency (transfer to FSA)	589	672	672	589	589	.....
Total, CCC Export Loans Program Account	3,820	4,085	4,085	3,820	3,820	.....
Total, title V, Foreign Assistance and Related Programs	1,196,718	1,056,853	1,157,191	1,062,908	1,063,686	-133,032
(By transfer)	(4,266)	(4,506)	(4,506)	(4,266)	(4,266)	.....
TITLE VI - FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES						
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES						
Food and Drug Administration						
Salaries and expenses, direct appropriation	970,867	1,109,950	1,052,950	1,035,538	1,040,638	+69,771
Prescription drug user fee act	(132,273)	(145,434)	(145,434)	(145,434)	(145,434)	(+13,161)
Subtotal	(1,103,140)	(1,255,384)	(1,198,384)	(1,180,972)	(1,186,072)	(+82,932)
Limitation on payments to GSA	(82,866)	(100,180)	(100,180)	(100,180)	(100,180)	(+17,314)
Buildings and facilities	11,350	31,750	31,750	8,350	11,350	.....
Total, Food and Drug Administration	982,217	1,141,700	1,084,700	1,043,888	1,051,988	+69,771
DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY						
Financial Management Service: Payments to the Farm Credit System Financial Assistance Corporation	2,565	.....	.....	.....	.....	-2,565
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
Commodity Futures Trading Commission	61,000	67,655	65,000	61,000	63,000	+2,000
Y2K conversion (emergency appropriations)	356	.....	.....	.....	.....	-356
Farm Credit Administration (limitation on administrative expenses)	(35,800)	.....	(35,800)	.....	(35,800)	.....
Total, title VI, Related Agencies and Food and Drug Administration	1,046,138	1,209,355	1,149,700	1,104,888	1,114,988	+68,850
TITLE VII - GENERAL PROVISIONS						
Hunger fellowships	.....	.....	1,000	3,000	2,000	+2,000
Sec. 388 Fair Act - NH	.....	.....	.....	250	250	+250
Total, title VII, General provisions	.....	.....	1,000	3,250	2,250	+2,250
TITLE VIII - EMERGENCY APPROPRIATIONS						
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 105-277)	5,916,655	.....	.....	.....	.....	-5,916,655
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 106-31)	700,630	.....	.....	.....	.....	-700,630
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE						
Commodity Credit Corporation						
Crop loss (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,200,000	+1,200,000
Market loss (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	.....	.....	5,544,000	+5,544,000
Specialty Crops:						
Peanuts (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	.....	.....	42,000	+42,000
Suspend sugar assessments (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	.....	.....	42,000	+42,000
Tobacco (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	.....	.....	328,000	+328,000
Subtotal, Specialty crops	.....	.....	.....	.....	412,000	+412,000
Oilseeds (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	.....	.....	470,000	+470,000
Livestock and dairy (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	.....	.....	322,000	+322,000
Upland cotton competitiveness (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	.....	.....	201,000	+201,000
Extend milk price supports (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	.....	.....	-102,000	-102,000
Crop insurance (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	.....	.....	400,000	+400,000
Crop insurance discount associated costs (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	.....	.....	250,000	+250,000

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 1906) — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
Water and waste loan forgiveness (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	.....	.....	2,000	+2,000
Total, title VIII, Emergency appropriations	6,617,285	.....	.....	.....	8,699,000	+2,081,715
SEC. 748 EMERGENCY APPROPRIATIONS						
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE						
Commodity Credit Corporation						
Market loss (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	.....	5,544,000	.....	.....
Specialty Crops:						
Fruits and vegetables (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	.....	50,000	.....	.....
Peanuts (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	.....	42,000	.....	.....
Suspend sugar assessments (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	.....	42,000	.....	.....
Tobacco (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	.....	328,000	.....	.....
Subtotal, Specialty crops	.....	.....	.....	462,000	.....	.....
Oilseeds (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	.....	470,000	.....	.....
Livestock and dairy (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	.....	322,000	.....	.....
Upland cotton competitiveness (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	.....	201,000	.....	.....
Crop insurance (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	.....	400,000	.....	.....
Crop insurance discount associated costs (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	.....	250,000	.....	.....
Total, Sec. 748 Emergency appropriations	.....	.....	.....	7,649,000	.....	.....
Grand total:						
New budget (obligational) authority	61,127,644	66,883,182	60,736,572	68,358,618	69,017,125	+7,889,481
Appropriations	(54,463,835)	(61,883,182)	(60,736,572)	(60,709,618)	(60,318,125)	(+5,854,290)
Emergency appropriations	(6,663,809)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-6,663,809)
Contingent emergency appropriations	.....	.....	.....	(7,649,000)	(8,699,000)	(+8,699,000)
Advance appropriations	.....	(5,000,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....
(By transfer)	(612,780)	(681,569)	(629,146)	(612,635)	(628,793)	(+16,013)
(Loan authorization)	(8,453,684)	(9,096,281)	(10,695,416)	(9,650,251)	(10,712,421)	(+2,258,737)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(144,087)	(108,287)	(144,087)	(108,287)	(144,087)	.....

1/ In addition to appropriation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let me commend my colleague, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), for his hard work on this bill, though I cannot support the bill. I think it is like a two-legged dog being brought to the floor of the Congress today.

Mr. Speaker, I will reserve my remarks until closing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the great State of Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON), who has fought harder than any other Member here to try to get the needs of not just his district but rural America recognized.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to oppose this conference report. And I do that reluctantly.

I want to commend the chairman. He has been very fair and works hard on this. But I represent a part of America that has had disasters. Some of these people have lost their crops 6 years out of the last 7. And this bill does not address their problems. Frankly, I do not know what we are going to do if we do not get some help for these people up in this area.

There is a disaster component in this bill. In my judgment, it is not enough money to cover all of the things that have gone wrong with this country. I also do not think that it is structured in a way that is going to get at what people really need.

Also, we have got a price problem in this country, as everybody knows, in agriculture. Some of us that oppose Freedom to Farm said that we thought this was going to happen eventually, and it is here right now. And we all want to address that. But I do not know how I can go home and tell the people in Roseau County or Kittson County that it is more important that we put out money to people that have not been damaged by disaster, that have had bumper crops year after year after year and have sold those bumper crops, received the AMPTA payments and then we are going to give them additional AMPTA payments, and we are not going to go out and help the people that have lost crops 5 or 6 or 7 years out of the last 7 years.

I do not know how I can go home and tell the people that this is a good bill, that this is something we should support. I do not know how my colleagues can do that. I wish they could come up and look in the eyes of these people and see what they are up against. We are not dealing with this the way we should. We are spending this money the wrong way. We are not spending enough money.

I would just implore my colleagues to defeat this bill, give us a chance to go back to the committee, and address these issues.

As I understand it, this was basically taken away from the subcommittee, and there was not even a chance for people to debate these multiple-year problems, to debate these other disaster problems. Defeat this conference report.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH).

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my chairman, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), for yielding me the time and for the hard work that he has done on this very important bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to take the unusual step of opposing my chairman and also opposing this bill, a bill that I have spent a good deal of my time on this year trying to resolve some of the real issues in farm country.

I am very disappointed with the way this bill came out. I am disappointed with the process. We had assurances all the way along through subcommittee and full committee and then going into conference that we would be able to address the dairy issue, but that was denied us. In fact, the conference never actually concluded its work. We did not have the opportunity even to offer amendments or to debate these critical issues. That is very disappointing, and it is very unusual. I hope we do not see a lot of this in the future.

But more to the point than just the process are the issues. The absence of dairy legislation in this bill is going to hurt farmers all over the country. It may benefit two States, but it will definitely hurt over 40. Dairy farmers who work 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, who never get a break, are going to lose money. It is estimated as much as $8,000 a family in my State.

And believe me, I do not know a dairy farmer in my State on a regular size farm that is putting $8,000 in their pocket after a year of dairy farming. It just is not a cash-flow business.

Disaster relief. My colleagues, I have no envy for what the Midwest has accomplished in this bill. I praise them. I admire them. I wish we could have done the same for farmers in the Northeast. But the fact is Midwestern farmers will receive $7.5 billion in disaster payments because they did not get the price they wanted for the crops.

Our farmers in the Northeast had no crops. In fact, they have no topsoil because of drought and now flood. They will get pennies on the dollar, $1.2 billion for all the Northeast for weather-related disaster; and the Midwest gets $7.5 billion. That is not fair. It is not right.

Sanctions reform. My colleagues wanted to open up new markets to the farmers so that we could sell our crops and get the price that we need. Would they rather open up and sell food to Iran and Iraq, where people are starving, or would they rather spend all of our taxpayers' dollars to give the farmers the price that they want through an artificial means? Let us open up our markets. But we did not do it.

The dairy compact, which provides price stability, supported by consumers and farmers in the Northeast, we cannot have that anymore because this does not allow it to be extended.

Mr. Speaker, the pricing option that the Secretary has promulgated is a presidential policy, this is the Clinton policy on dairy, helps two States and it harms 40. I do not get it. I mean, I thought these people were good politically down at the White House. This makes no sense. It hurts 40 States to benefit two.

But we do not have to do that. There is another option, Option 1–A, that holds Minnesota and Wisconsin harmless and it helps the other States. But that is not available to us, either.

So, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I thank the chairman for yielding me the time to speak against our own bill. I respect him highly. I regret that I have to oppose this bill, but I can take no other action.

I urge my colleagues to voice their objection to the process and the policy by voting no on this bill.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY), a member of the subcommittee, who has worked so diligently on this bill and, as the rest of the members on our subcommittee, was actually robbed of his rights as a Member of this institution because our committee was recessed and never called back to complete work on this bill.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to express my appreciation and respect for the chairman of the subcommittee and the hard work that he has done, the diligent and conscientious work that he has done to try to put an effective bill together. The gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) is an example for all of us in this House. I also thank the staff of the subcommittee for the work that they have done, as well.

For those reasons, I wish I could support the bill. But I cannot. I cannot support it for the same reasons which were enunciated just a moment ago by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), my friend and colleague from the other side of the aisle.

I would focus my remarks in the brief time that I have on the dairy issue alone. As the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) pointed out, the provisions that fail to appear in this bill would have benefited the dairy industry in 40 States across this country. They are suffering so that perhaps two States can benefit, and that is only perhaps. Because the real beneficiaries of this legislation and the failure to act in a responsible way with regard to the agriculture dairy industry in our country, the real beneficiaries are those who seek to consolidate the dairy industry, those who seek to rob consumers of the opportunity to buy fresh, wholesome dairy products from local producers in their own State and the surrounding region.

The real beneficiaries are a handful of people who are seeking increasingly

to consolidate the dairy industry in the hands of fewer and fewer people so that they can control where dairy is produced, where it is shipped, under what conditions and at what price.

Dairy farmers in New York and New England and New Jersey and Pennsylvania, the middle Atlantic States, and elsewhere in this country are suffering because of the failure to put effective dairy provisions in this legislation, and that failure is due entirely to the fact that the bill was wrested from the subcommittee by the leadership of this House which adheres to an ideological imperative which is outdated and always has been wrong, and that is let the free market system run agriculture in this country.

It will not work because the free market is run by a handful of people. They control it, and they will continue to do so. Therefore, we must defeat this bill.

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

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of our subcommittee (Mr. SKEEN) for yielding me the time. He is a fine gentleman and has been eminently fair with me and I thank every other member of the subcommittee. I thank him for his dedication to agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, I speak today in support of this bill. I am going to vote for it. I think it is a good bill. It could be a much better bill, for the reasons that the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) stated and I think the reasons that other Members may state here today, as well.

My concern has been not only with process but with policy relative to this particular measure as it relates to me as a member of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies. I felt for a long time that, in order to have the Freedom to Farm approach to agriculture policy succeed, we have to have freedom to market. Our farmers need to market overseas.

My State of Washington, the east side of the State of Washington, grows some of the best wheat crops and peas and lentil crops and potatoes and other commodities, apples and others, to compete with anybody in the world. But we are restricted, Mr. Speaker, because of an antique kind of a sanctions policy, unilateral sanctions policy, that hurts our farmers.

The power to change this policy rests with Congress. And we tried to do that on this bill, but the process did not allow it. I felt frustrated, frankly, that we could not have a good vote on this issue and let the Senate speak, as they have, Senator ASHCROFT, Senator HAGEL and others, Senator BROWNBACK, Senator DURBIN, Senator DORGAN, who spoke in favor of this change in policy, as well as people on our side, like the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. DICKEY) and others who feel that that policy is outdated.

It is nonsense, in my judgment, that we should not sell food and medicine to countries that others can sell to around the world. It hurts our farmers. It hurts us as a country I believe. And we can open up dictatorships and open up terrorist regimes, for that matter, if we can engage them and engage the people.

The measure that was ready to pass the subcommittee and the conference was no funding for government-to-government assistance. Absolutely not one dollar would go to the governments of Iran, Iraq, Cuba, or anyplace else. But there would be a funding option allowed in order to allow our farmers to get some coverage for the sale of their product overseas.

I fought the President on this in some respects. This administration threw up a roadblock with respect to completing the sanction relief that we had imposed. We want to work with the administration and the Democrats and the Republicans and our leadership to try to have this sanctions policy relief become a reality.

So I would urge my colleagues to support this policy in the future.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), a distinguished member of the subcommittee who also was robbed of her rights to offer an amendment, as these proceedings were recessed.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the agriculture appropriations conference report.

The process was unprecedented and heavy-handed. But the substance and the policy and final version reflects the majority leadership's lack of concern for farmers of America.

The summer's droughts and hurricanes have devastated thousands of farming families. In my own State of Connecticut, farmers suffered $41.6 million in losses. The pastures dried up. Fruit dropped. Trees and bushes and dairy production plummeted.

□ 1145

Farmers across the country are begging Congress to do something and we must do something. It is our responsibility. It is why we were elected. We come here to give voice to the people that we represent. Our constituents can only conclude from this conference report that we have been silent on their behalf.

This report includes only $1.2 billion in much needed emergency aid. But this is a short-term fix to a long-term problem, the lack of markets promised when the Freedom to Farm bill eliminated the farmers' safety net.

Committee members on both sides of the aisle were ready to address this issue with sanction relief, but the opportunity was snatched away. It is wrong to deny our farmers over $1 billion in new sales abroad, and it is wrong to punish innocent families, children, in other countries who suffer under repressive regimes by denying them food and medicine.

Finally, this report fails to reauthorize the Northeast Dairy Compact. Without that compact, Connecticut's farmers will lose $4.2 million a year as well as the security of stable prices to guarantee safe futures.

We are here to help farmers address short-term disasters and the long-term problems that threaten their survival. The health of our Nation is directly linked to agriculture's future. We must do more. I urge my colleagues to oppose the conference report.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. DICKEY).

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, understanding the immediate need for assistance that our farmers have, I have signed the conference report, and I am supporting this bill. However, there were several issues that were left undecided, and I want to discuss one of them, that is, sanctions on our agricultural products with other countries.

Let us take Cuba, for example, and in this context, we have to understand that our Arkansas farmers are the finest and the largest producers of rice there is in this country. For 37 years, it has been proven that the embargo on food and medicine in Cuba does not work. Fidel Castro and the members of his Communist regime have never missed a meal, but the poor have gone hungry. Those are who the embargo is affecting.

But the effects of this embargo are not only felt 90 miles off of Florida's coast, it has had much more of a local effect. An enormous market for our agricultural products has been deemed off-limits. Our Arkansas farmers sit facing one of the largest financial crises that we have ever encountered. They are the best farmers in the world and produce an excellent crop, but they need more places to market it. The USDA estimates that Cuba will import 570,000 metric tons of long grain, rough rice from countries all across the world. Conversely, the United States has over 630,000 metric tons of this very type of rice from the 1998 harvest still in storage. The USDA anticipates this number to drastically increase and next year our farmers will have 1.5 million metric tons of carryover stock from the 1999 harvest, all of which will bring prices down. The Cuban rice market has an estimated value of $125 million annually. Allowing our rice producers to trade with Cuba would not only enable them to collect the lion's share of the $125 million but it would also reduce our yearly carryover stock which would increase the commodity's market price.

The Congressional Research Service estimates that current economic sanctions on agricultural goods for sanctioned countries in 1996 reduced farm income by $150 million, overall U.S. economic activity by $1.2 billion, and U.S. jobs by 7,600. This is an issue that

America cannot afford to ignore any longer. Even though I am going to vote for this bill, I want us to be aware of the fact that we must do something about these sanctions to help our farmers in America.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL) who represents such a major share of U.S. agriculture.

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time. First off, let me say that I am supporting this bill. I think that I have to associate myself with those who made other comments about the inadequacies. I do not understand why we did not have an opportunity to have the full discussion. But there is where we are at.

We have got two economies in our country right now, a robust economy and an ag economy. The ag economy is in bad, bad shape. We have to address these things. The farmers are desperate out there. I am supporting this to get the movement going and get this money to those producers. They need it now. I would say to the Secretary and anybody else that is listening that this money needs to go to those producers that have had losses. They are the ones that need it. I would trust and hope that we are doing everything we can to get it to them.

I also appreciate the fact that my colleague and friend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) is offering something that will be coming up I hope very soon, the Supplemental Income Protection Act that will help all of us put the money where it belongs and help the farmers move ahead. Support the bill.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM).

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the agriculture appropriations conference agreement. This agreement will keep America's family farms afloat, fund critical research and protect the environment in some of our most fragile regions. Furthermore, this legislation includes language that dramatically improves competition for livestock producers.

Thanks to the cooperation of the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) and determined colleagues in the Senate, in the other body, we were able to include mandatory price reporting for livestock in this package. This legislation will contribute to our efforts to revive the current farm economy. As anyone in Iowa can tell you, the difficulties associated with low grain prices have been compounded by low livestock prices to a devastating level last December and January.

Today, America's farmers want to know if they are receiving fair compensation for their hard work. With this agreement, we have made the first step in assuring that they can. It is important that accurate information be available to the livestock industry in order for competitive markets to function properly. Without this pricing information, we risk supporting a business environment that gives too much control to a few. We cannot allow our Nation's farmers to be left without the tools they can use to make sure they receive the best possible price for their livestock.

It is important to note that mandatory price reporting language included is the result of significant negotiations and represents a concerted effort to find consensus. Title 9 of the bill is identical to legislation that was ordered reported by the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry on July 29, 1999. The intent of these provisions and their attendant legislative history are explained in detail in that committee's report on the reported bill, S. 1672, and Senate Report 106–168.

Much of the language in this report was also the subject of painstaking negotiations and represents the consensus of a number of parties interested in mandatory price reporting legislation. I join all of these interested parties in directing the Department of Agriculture and the administration generally to this document for use in the correct interpretation and administration of this important law.

Mr. Speaker, this is an extremely important provision, and this bill does truly address as best we can under the budget constraints that we have the real problem we have in agriculture today, trying to get in a very timely manner dollars in the hands of farmers who so desperately need it. I just want to thank the chairman and the ranking member of the subcommittee, the chairman and ranking member of the full Committee on Appropriations, the staff on the subcommittee and my personal staff for doing an outstanding job. There are problems obviously, but a lot of the issues that were not addressed should never be on this bill to start with.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the able gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOLDEN) who has worked so hard with us to try to make sure that the producers of Pennsylvania and the drought affected areas of this country are treated fairly in this measure.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report. There is not a Member from either side of the aisle from the mid-Atlantic or northeastern States that can go home and look their farmers in the eye and say that this is a fair piece of legislation. It simply is not. $1.2 billion for all weather-related disasters simply does not add up to meet the needs of our farmers throughout the country. We have experienced a 100-year drought in the Northeast. In Pennsylvania alone, $700 million of damage; New York, $370 million; Maine, $31 million; Ohio, $600 million. Combined in the mid-Atlantic and northeastern part of the country, $2.5 billion of losses from drought. Then we look at the terrible situation in North Carolina, what they are facing in flooding and how we need to help our friends and colleagues from North Carolina; early on in the year, the flooding in the upper Midwest.

Mr. Speaker, we were not trying to be greedy in this bill, we were just trying to ask for what our friends in other parts of the country received before in other emergency appropriation bills. We wanted 42 percent of our losses that were uninsured to be paid for with cash assistance and livestock assistance. $1.2 billion, Mr. Speaker, simply does not get there. I urge my colleagues to reject this conference report and give us the opportunity to do what is fair for the mid-Atlantic and northeastern States.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), the ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1906. Let me say I am grateful to the conferees for their recognition of the economic plight of American agriculture and I commend the chairman and the ranking member for their efforts. I cannot, however, feel good about the way in which we are helping our farmers and ranchers. For the second year in a row, we are using emergency spending to compensate producers for low prices. This fact is a stark admission that our basic farm program is not working. Our Nation deserves a long-term reliable farm policy. Taxpayers have a right to know what the Nation's agriculture programs will cost and agriculture producers should be able to know up-front what kind of assistance they can expect and what the rules will be for distributing it. I wonder how much longer we can go on like this, how much more our government will spend on ad hoc, supplemental AMTA payments before we realize that a more rational, predictable policy needs to be in force.

Mr. Speaker, last year we waited until the last hour to debate the omnibus appropriation bill and the emergency agricultural spending it contained. Many of us spoke at that time about the need to prepare for this year. Instead of preparing, however, we waited, and today we respond with off-budget spending to address a problem that was entirely foreseeable. I would like to once again thank the appropriators for delivering a bill that recognizes many of the needs. The deficiencies contained in the bill are a result of a lack of coherent agricultural policy which is impossible to address in one year's spending.

Let me say to my friend from Pennsylvania who spoke a moment ago, his request is reasonable. We should treat

the northeastern States no different than any other States were treated last year, and it is my belief that in a supplemental we will do so. Dairy policy, I agree, but we passed a bill here. It is now up to the Senate to deal with it in the regular legislative process. Sanctions, we ought to be doing more, but we cannot do it all on an appropriations bill. We need to do most of this in the regular legislative process. I am dedicated to working with my colleagues on that.

I am very grateful that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) has announced that we start full committee hearings early next year to address this problem so we do not find ourselves back in the same position next year at the same time.

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

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Mexico for his extraordinarily good work in very, very unordinary circumstances on this bill. As everyone has said, our farmers are facing the worst financial crisis in decades because of low prices, because of weather-related disasters, and unfortunately our current farm law does not provide a safety net for our producers. And so we will lose a lot of them this year, causing the very fabric, the very essence of our rural way of life to be at risk.

And so with reluctance I say yes, we must pass this bill today. But I also want to say, as my colleagues have, as an ag conferee, the last 2 weeks have been gut wrenching, they have been heart wrenching, as our rights to write this bill were stolen from us. That makes me angry. I am deeply disappointed that we were not allowed to vote on lifting food and medicine embargoes against six foreign countries. We should have learned the lesson from the Soviet grain embargo that food should not be used as a tool of foreign policy, that our farmers in America are the only losers in this battle. And we could not vote on fixing a problem for our dairy producers even though the vast majority of this body supports that fix.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am greatly disappointed, but the bill does have many good things in it for America's producers, for our ranchers and our farmers. They need our help today. They need financial assistance today. And so I urge a ''yes'' vote on the bill. I can only say in closing that we will continue the fight to lift embargoes and sanctions, we will continue the fight for our dairy farmers, because that fight, Mr. Speaker, has only just begun.

□ 1200

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) who has been such an advocate for the needs of farmers in his State as well as around our Nation.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time, and I commend her for her hard work to focus attention and action on disaster relief in the bill. I think everyone in this body is aware of the disaster that has befallen our farmers, our citizens in North Carolina and other States up and down the Eastern Seaboard with Hurricane Dennis and Hurricane Floyd. Our communities have been severely damaged, our infrastructure, our farms.

Mr. Speaker, it is already estimated that the overall damages in North Carolina for this hurricane will exceed the 6 billion in damages we experienced with Hurricane Fran, which was our historical high point up to this year. Too many North Carolinians are still in shelters, and many have returned home or will return home to find out they have lost everything. Estimates from the United States Department of Agriculture and the North Carolina Department of Agriculture now are approaching 2 billion in agricultural losses alone for North Carolina alone, $2 billion.

Now, consider the amount of disaster relief in this bill. When we look at that, Mr. Speaker, we realize how pitifully inadequate it is. It is $1.2 billion, and it is supposed to meet the needs of both drought and flood relief.

The State Departments of Agriculture in the Southeastern and Eastern States, drought States, have estimated that the need for drought assistance alone is $2.5 billion. That is before anyone had ever heard of Hurricane Floyd. And unlike aid to homeowners and businesses, direct aid cannot go to farmers unless we appropriate it in this or a comparable bill.

Farmers need immediate assistance, and we ought to give it to them, yet there was never any real opportunity for the conference to consider disaster assistance. Before the conference had sufficient opportunity to take up this issue, the bill was taken by the majority leadership from the hands of the conferees. So, Mr. Speaker, we are forced to ask, what are we going to do? How are we going to get this assistance to the people who so desperately need it?

Yesterday I offered, and the Committee on Appropriations approved, an amendment to the Labor HHS appropriations bill to provide 508 million for direct assistance to farmers in all the states affected by Hurricane Floyd for crop and livestock losses. The Labor-HHS bill is not the normal vehicle for agriculture disaster assistance, but fortunately, Appropriations Committee leaders, Mr. YOUNG and Mr. PORTER, as well as Mr. OBEY, accommodated us, and we got this done.

That is not the way this process is supposed to work, but it was made necessary by the inadequacy of this agriculture appropriations bill. Farmers in North Carolina and the other states affected by natural disasters need our help now, and that need is greater than what is provided in this bill.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BARRETT).

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me, and I certainly rise in support of the conference report. And I want to thank my colleagues on the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee for their very hard work. This bill, especially the emergency provisions, is very badly needed by our farmers and ranchers.

Mr. Speaker, we have got a unique problem in agriculture. It is a cash flow crisis, and this conference report will help ease that situation by providing farmers with the financial resources to close out this year's growing season and prepare for the next.

I specifically want to commend the conferees for maintaining the AMTA payment mechanism. This will allow producers to receive payments in possibly less than 2 weeks after it is enacted, and I charge the Department of Agriculture to meet this goal.

I strongly encourage the President to sign the bill. Our producers do not have the time for political games as they are making decisions today which will affect their families for many years to come. We have got the right bill, and now is the right time to sign it.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is critical that the House agree to this conference report, and I urge an aye vote.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) who has been such an active participant in these negotiations.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for yielding this time to me, and I appreciate her hard work along with the hard work of all the other people that have worked on this bill, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, our farmers need the assistance in this bill, and they need a lot more. The funding in this bill is just simply not enough.

The other side of the aisle comes to the well over and over to criticize the lack of action on trade issues, yet when they have the opportunity, they fail to lift the sanctions on Cuba and other countries for food and medicine for only political reasons. Mr. Speaker, this is shameful.

This bill is inadequate. I will vote for it, but once again we are forcing America's farmers to pay for the political and foreign policy failures. The majority leadership should be ashamed of this bill because they did not accomplish what they should have for America's farmers.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST).

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot this morning about, obviously, the wants and desires of Members in regards to the process, in regards to things that were in the bill,

that were not in the bill, and if we spent, made all of those decisions, based upon that and those Beltway issues, we would probably never pass anything. Let me just mention a few of the people that are out there that this bill has tried to intend to help that support it:

The Southwest Peanut Growers Association of Virginia, North Carolina Peanut Growers Association, the American sheep industry, the American Farm Bureau, the National Cotton Council, the American Soybean Association, the U.S. Rice Federation, the National Grain and Sorghum Association, the United States Sugar Beet Association, the American Sugar Beet Growers, the Hawaiian Sugar Growers, the Florida Sugar League, the Rio Grande Valley Sugar Growers, the National Corn Growers Association are the ones that have just come in since we started debating this bill.

Mr. Speaker, let me mention one other thing, if I might, as well. I agree with those people who have said that this is probably inadequate in terms of disaster money. We do not know how much that is. In fact, in some instances and in some cases the waters have not even receded enough to know what the damage is.

But I will tell my colleagues that as this bill started off at $500 million, we had a hearing in the Committee on Agriculture, and we asked the administration and the Secretary how much would they need, and they said they had no idea. But they guessed, and they would estimate at this time between 800 million and 1.2 billion.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has 1.2 billion. It is at the top end of what the administration suggested that they would need. If that is not enough, then at some point in the process I think we should come back and revisit that issue. But I will tell my colleagues that the farmers of America see the opportunity in a very short order to begin to get some very needed assistance in their hands. This is the way to do it, and I would encourage Members on both sides to give strong support to this bill. I think the American farmers deserve it, and I think they anticipate it.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) who has done such a tremendous job as a member of the authorizing committee.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for yielding the time, and I want to thank her for her leadership and her strong advocacy for rural America and for her due process, and I want to thank the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), the chair of the subcommittee, for his fairness and his advocacy for rural America and for agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does have things that many of our farmers are advocating. I, too, have received the notice from my peanut farmers, said they would like to have this bill passed. But I also have received notice from people who need disaster relief saying: Is that all the disaster relief they have? I have my farm bureau, which I am very strongly supported by, call and say, yes, this is insufficient, but vote for it.

Here we have a bill. Not only did we have an opportunity to respond to the disaster, but we refused to. I heard the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) say $1.2 billion was the up side of what USDA suggests, but that was before we had Hurricane Floyd. Now we have had such disaster in large proportions. We have lost in North Carolina alone the agriculture has estimated to be over $3 billion. Over 120,000 hogs have died, 2.5 million chickens have died; that is just agriculture, and all of the crop has gone.

One third of agriculture production is said to be lost in North Carolina, and we have $1.2 billion both for the drought and for Hurricane Floyd from the Northeast and to the Midwest.

How can we even think that is indeed sufficient response? We had a unique opportunity to respond. That is almost an insult, Mr. Speaker, to suggest that that is sufficient.

Now do I find that there are things in this bill that my farmers want? I would be less than honest to say yes, they do. The process really is important. Process in a democracy is important. Even when we lose, we would like to think that people have had an opportunity to have a full discussion. I am amazed that we have refused to have the opportunity to talk about the disaster that we so desperately need.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS).

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my strong support for H.R. 1906, the agriculture appropriations conference report. Let us pass this bill today and show our unwavering commitment to all agricultural producers across this country.

I am extremely proud of this legislation, of what it does, and what it provides for Oklahoma agricultural producers. The 100-percent bump-up on the 1999 AMTA payment is desperately needed by our producers who have faced some unbelievable challenges this past year including Mother Nature, low commodity prices, and the worldwide financial situation. I am proud that this Congress has decided to take the necessary steps to combat these obstacles.

I am also pleased to see funding for the Cotton Step 2 program and the inclusion of much needed livestock price reporting language. We have worked with producers over the past several months to ensure that these items were included in the conference report. This is just one more indication that this Congress is listening and responding to the needs of our producers.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this Congress expects the USDA to allow producers to collect a payment equal to their LDP on their wheat crop.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) who has just been vigilant throughout this process to be fair to all segments of the United States.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding this time to me.

I strongly oppose this legislation, and I urge all of my Democratic and Republican Members and friends to oppose it.

This bill should be opposed from both a process point of view and a policy point of view.

In terms of process, there is no disagreement that this bill, as a Republican member, the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON), just told my colleagues a few moments ago was quote, unquote, stolen away from the committee by the Republican leadership. That is what she said, and what the Republican leadership then did is went behind closed doors, where, heavily influenced by special interests, they wrote the bill. We received the bill this morning, hundreds of pages, and now we are supposed to support it.

This process is undemocratic, it is an outrage, and no Member should vote for this bill on that ground alone. But we should also oppose this bill because of its content.

Last week we had an all-day debate upon the crisis of dairy farming in this country. There were six or seven amendments, and we went on and on, and at the end of the day, by a 285 to 140 vote, the Members of this body, Republicans and Democrats, said we need to reform the milk market order system in order to protect family farmers all over this country; 285 Members voted for it. When that issue came to the conference committee, they did not spend 1 minute discussing that issue. We spent all day; we voted for it; they did not spend 1 minute.

□ 1215

How can you support legislation which ignores an attempt to address the crisis facing dairy farmers? Please vote ''no.''

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

Mr. Speaker, again to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), for whom I have the highest respect, the chairman of our committee, I know that no member of our committee could be proud of the bill that is on the floor today. Many have referenced that in their remarks.

I would urge the membership to recommit this bill back to our subcommittee where it belongs to fix its flaws.

In the years that I have been here in the Congress, I have never seen a conference report that comes to the floor where over one-third of our members do not even sign it. There was pressure put on a number of these people who

did sign. This is not the way that one of the bills out of appropriations ought to come to the floor.

I want to say a word about how this overall legislation is structured. Our concern does not necessarily go to the fundamental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture that are in the bill for the Year 2000. Our problem goes to the heart of the emergency package, the disaster assistance package, which is so fundamentally unfair.

I would beg my colleagues to listen. I am going to spend a few minutes here and lay out some numbers.

There are two parts to that portion of the legislation. There is $7.5 billion that goes out in economic assistance. That basically means low prices—trying to help people, as one of the gentlemen here said, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BARRETT), meet cash flow problems in rural America. Of that $7.5 billion, $5.5 billion of it goes out under the AMTA formula. But, remember, AMTA is based on the planting of program crops in the years 1991 to 1995. It is not tied at all to what was planted this year, to what is planted now, prices received, or economic loss. In fact, there is no requirement to have planted a crop at all in order to get these dollars!

In fact, there is nothing in that section of the bill for fruits and vegetables. Many of our Members are coming up here and saying we want a fair bill. There are provisions that are in there for sugar, for cotton, for peanuts, for tobacco, for oil seeds, for honey, for mohair. But there are no provisions for vegetables, for fruits, for revegetation.

In fact, in that section of the bill, if we look at livestock, hog farmers, an industry that is on its knees, it only gets a chance to compete for up to $200 million nationally. Other claimants in that fund are livestock producers, including those suffering from natural disasters. So their ability to be made ''whole,'' or to even be helped to be made ''half'' or even ''40 percent,'' is almost nothing when you look at the losses that are out there.

I will submit for the RECORD from the Governors of over a dozen States what they believe the losses to be in their areas. Or look at a State like Ohio, my own State, where over $600 million of losses is documented, with a letter from our Governor. Dollars in the bill for livestock amount to almost nothing as we try to keep some family farmers whole as they try to transition in this difficult rural economy.

SEPTEMBER 10, 1999.

Hon. TRENT LOTT,
Majority Leader,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. THOMAS A. DASCHLE,
Minority Leader,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

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

Hon. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT,
Minority Leader,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS LOTT AND DASCHLE AND REPRESENTATIVES HASTERT AND GEPHARDT: On behalf of farmers and agricultural communities in more than 12 states, we request your help in obtaining immediate federal emergency grant assistance to address the economic losses caused by this year's severe drought. Farmers and rural communities along the eastern seaboard—from Rhode Island to South Carolina and west to Ohio—are experiencing the worst drought in decades. The drought of 1999 is compounded by the farm crisis caused by low agriculture commodity prices. This combination is placing tremendous financial stress on farmers throughout the region.

Initial estimates indicate that these states will experience agricultural losses in excess of $1.64 billion because of the severe and extended drought conditions. This will have a ripple effect on the economy. The USDA Disaster Declarations which have been issued for our states enable farmers to apply for emergency low interest loans; however, loan assistance programs do not adequately respond to this year's unexpected economic impact on the farm communities. Many farmers are simply not in the financial position to assume more debt when they have lost their income. We urge you to act quickly to include direct payment assistance to those producers impacted by the drought.

The recently passed Senate Agriculture Appropriations bill provides assistance for the commodity price disaster, but does not address the natural disaster impacting our farmers. We request that the final aid package be augmented to provide adequate funding for USDA disaster assistance programs such as the Crop Loss Disaster Assistance Program, the Non-insured Crop Disaster Assistance Program, the Livestock Assistance and the Emergency Conservation Programs. These programs can provide the rapid response we are looking for and the agricultural community deserves. We further request that this disaster funding be earmarked for drought-impacted states.

We appreciate your assistance in helping our farmers in this time of crisis.

Sincerely,

Bob Taft, Parris N. Glendening, Jim Hodges, Cecil H. Underwood, James S. Gilmore III, Lincoln C. Almond, George E. Pataki, Jim Hunt, John G. Rowland, Tom Carper, Tom Ridge, Christine T. Whitman.

MEMORANDUM

Re: Latest Estimates of Agriculture losses in 13 State Drought Region (revised 9/21/99 4:30 pm).

Date: September 21, 1999.

To: Agriculture Appropriations Conferees.

From: DC Offices of Drought-Affected States.

Following, you will find our most recent estimates of agriculture losses in our states due to the recent drought. You will note these estimates reflect increases from our August numbers due to the inclusion of specialty crops, livestock, aquaculture and dairy that had not been accounted for in our previous estimates. Some states were unable to provide specific estimates per commodity at this time. The recent Hurricane has caused constraints on staff resources. Our states believe these numbers are conservative estimates of what is expected to be the eventual effect of this devastating drought, but represent the best information we can provide at this date.

We also request the following programs be activated to deliver immediate and direct emergency assistance to our agriculture communities:

(1) Crop Loss Disaster Assistance
(2) Emergency Livestock Feed Program
(3) Emergency Conservation Program
(4) Dairy Loss Assistance Program
(5) Non-Insured Crop Disaster Assistance Program
(6) Tree Assistance Program

The Secretary should be directed to release funds to our farmers and producers in need within a reasonable, but expedited timeframe, based on estimated crop losses. We suggest 30–90 days.

	In millions
State Losses:	
Connecticut	$41
Delaware	30
Maryland	78
Maine	31
New Jersey	80
New York	370
North Carolina	53
Ohio	600
Pennsylvania	700
Rhode Island	10
South Carolina	150
Virginia	200
West Virginia	200
Total	2,543

STATE OF OHIO, WASHINGTON OFFICE,
Washington, DC, September 21, 1999.

Hon. MARCY KAPTUR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE KAPTUR: On behalf of Ohio's farm families, I am writing to request your help in contacting House leadership to secure federal emergency assistance to overcome drought losses. This summer's drought not only has devastated crops, but has caused corresponding economic loss of livestock and dairy producers.

In the past month I have notified you of the State of Ohio's response to the drought emergency and expressed my hope that additional appropriations might be made available to provide the help that Ohio farmers badly need. Ohio's drought losses already are approaching a projected $600 million and will continue to grow (see attached Ohio Drought Impact Fact Sheet and memo to the Agriculture Appropriations conferees for estimated crop loss breakout).

I understand that Agriculture Appropriations conferees will soon meet to discuss a final bill and will consider providing meaningful drought assistance to states such as Ohio where it is sorely needed. I hope that you can support this effort and work with your House colleagues and the leadership to ensure that this happens.

As you know, the USDA has made available low interest loans to disaster designated areas. However, loan assistance programs do not adequately respond to this year's unexpected economic impact on the farm communities of the Drought affected states. Rather, producers impacted by drought require dedicated direct payment assistance. A farm aid package should provide adequate funding for USDA disaster assistance programs, such as the Crop Loss Disaster Assistance Program, the Non-Insured Crop Disaster Assistance Program, the Livestock Assistance Program and the Emergency Conservation Program. Further, this disaster funding should be earmarked for drought-impacted states.

In addition, I hope you will agree that in order for our farmers to receive the help they need, Congress should include emergency grant assistance for drought disaster in the FY 2000 Agriculture Appropriations Bill.

I appreciate your efforts with this important issue.

Sincerely,

BOB TAFT.

FACT SHEET: IMPACT OF 1999 DROUGHT ON OHIO CROP AND LIVESTOCK FARMS, SEPTEMBER 21, 1999

Drought Loss—Governors' recent estimate for 12 northeastern states: $2.5 billion.

Natural Disaster Loss—National Assn. Of State Departments of Agriculture (U.S.) estimate for all affected states: $3.56 billion.

Drought loss—Projected estimate for Ohio: $600 million (While harvest has just begun, there are projections that Ohio's losses could be in the range of $600 million of agricultural products. This represents about 10 to 15 percent of the nearly $4.7 billion of Ohio agricultural products sold in 1997. The FSA's July estimate was $422 million.)

Estimated direct USDA assistance payments

Drought Assistance—Estimated direct USDA assistance payments for which Ohio producers would be eligible: $164.8 million.

Breakdown of potential USDA funding to program assistance grants:

Crop Loss Disaster Assistance Program (CLDAP) and Noninsured Assistance Program (NAP), $80.6 million;

Livestock Assistance Program (LAP), $82.3 million;

Emergency Conservation Program (ECP), $1.9 million.

According to the Palmer Drought Severity Index, the long-term forecasting tool used by the NOAA's Climate Prediction Center, all of Ohio is now in either severe or extreme drought. Rainfall needed to end the drought, according to the Index, ranges regionally from about 6 to 10 inches. Topsoil moisture in Ohio is now 78 percent short to very short, compared to the five-year average of 41 percent short to very short. (See Palmer Index map.)

Eighty-seven Ohio counties have been designated natural disaster areas by U.S. Agriculture Secretary Glickman, enabling qualified farmers in those counties to apply for federal disaster assistance loans. Of those, 66 counties were designated primary natural disaster areas.

Hay Shortage: There is a significant shortage of hay in southern Ohio (estimated need is 325,000 tons).

MEMORANDUM

Re: Latest Estimates of Agriculture losses in 12 State Drought Region.

Date: September 17, 1999.

To: Agriculture Appropriations Conferees.

From: DC Offices of Drought-Affected States.

Following, you will find our most recent estimates of agriculture losses in our states due to the recent drought. You will note these estimates reflect increases from our August numbers due to the inclusion of specialty crops, livestock, aquaculture and dairy that had not been accounted for in our previous estimates. Some states were unable to provide specific estimates per commodity at this time. The recent Hurricane has caused constraints on staff resources. Our states believe these numbers are conservative estimates of what is expected to be the eventual effect of this devastating drought, but represent the best information we can provide at this date.

We also request the following programs be activated to deliver immediate and direct emergency assistance to our agriculture communities:

(1) Crop Loss Disaster Assistance
(2) Emergency Livestock Feed Program
(3) Emergency Conservation Program
(4) Dairy Loss Assistance Program
(5) Non-Insured Crop Disaster Assistance Program
(6) Tree Assistance Program

The Secretary should be directed to release funds to our farmers and producers in need within a reasonable, but expedited timeframe, based on estimated crop losses. We suggest 30–90 days.

	In millions
State Losses:	
Connecticut	$41
Delaware	30
Maryland	78
New Jersey	80
New York	370
North Carolina	53
Ohio	600
Pennsylvania	700
Rhode Island	10
South Carolina	150
Virginia	200
West Virginia	200
Total	2,512

NET EXPENDITURES OF THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

[In billions of dollars]

	Total	Commodity programs (incl. AMTA)	Other
FY 1990	6.5	4.5	2.0
FY 1991	10.1	7.8	2.3
FY 1992	9.7	6.9	2.8
FY 1993	16.0	11.9	4.1
FY 1994	10.3	6.1	4.2
FY 1995	6.0	4.1	2.0
FY 1996	4.6	4.5	0.1
FY 1997	7.3	5.3	2.0
FY 1998	10.1	8.0	2.2
FY 1999 est.	18.4	13.2	5.2
FY 2000:			
Budget estimate	14.1	10.1	4.0
Emergency package	7.3	.....	.....
Total	21.5		

FY 1999 and FY 2000 estimates are from the OMB mid-session review.

Figures for FY 2000 emergency package is CBO estimate of outlays resulting from the package (which is $8.7 billion in budget authority).

''Other'' includes export programs (EEP, MAP, export credit, etc.), conservation programs (CRP, etc.), various disaster assistance programs, among other items.

Then if you look at the natural or weather-related disaster portion of the emergency bill, there is only $1.2 billion in that, $1.2 billion. And these estimates are pre-hurricane Floyd. As Members have verified these numbers were put in the draft bill before North Carolina happened. So the natural disaster section is woefully inadequate. These are weather-related losses, and the funds are seriously short of what would be needed to assist those faced with disasters this year.

Why should producers in the Northeast and the middle Atlantic States that have had droughts this year not get some attention in this bill, as have producers in Texas who had droughts last year? If you look at the way the formulas work, there is not fair treatment for these States. Had our conference not been suspended, we would have offered amendments that would have attempted to fix these formulas and constructs that give such unequal treatment.

We know what this will mean are more bankruptcies and more loss of equity, which is so unfair. This bill should be targeted at people who are suffering hardship, not just some formula that was cooked up 3 or 4 years ago that does not meet current needs.

I wanted to put this on the RECORD and beg my colleagues, it would not take us long to go back to subcommittee to try to fix this, to make sure that we meet fairly the current needs of our country, and also help to position ourselves for the long term because of the fundamental inadequacy of Freedom to Farm alone to deal with the volatility that we have experienced with the downturn in the markets and what has happened with our lack of access to overseas markets.

There are longer-term solutions here that we are not being given the opportunity to address in this bill. Please do not do this. Please do not do this. Next year we are going to be back here again with more requests for supplemental credit, as we were this year.

This is not the way to deal with this problem. This is important enough and the gun is at our head, that if the Members of this Congress recommit this bill, we can do it right. Just do not bar us from the opportunity to do that.

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

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING).

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

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I cannot get two pennies to help disadvantaged children in the area of education, but we can put $7 million into this bill to make sure your children, my children, and every other child of a Member of Congress, can have a free breakfast. That really makes a lot of sense.

They will tell you well, it has been authorized. It has been on the books, yes, but it has never been funded. Why? Because we have done something a darn sight better. What we have done is said that any school district that feeds a lot of free and reduced-price children in lunch can also serve free breakfast, and we know that 85 percent of all children eating free and reduced-priced meals at noontime are now eating breakfast.

Others will tell you, oh, well, the rich and those almost rich do not have time to give their children breakfast. What a sorry state that is; the Government should do it.

Give the money to the farmers who are caught in drought problems. Give the money to those of us who are trying to educate those who are disadvantaged. But, for goodness' sake, don't give $7 million to feed your children or my children free breakfast.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the Chair for doing a beautiful job of allowing equal time during this debate, which is something we were not allowed by the leadership of this institution in subcommittee. I would like to know how much time we have remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BEREUTER). There are 6½ minutes remaining on either side at this moment.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES).

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. I am from North Carolina. We have a serious problem, a huge problem; but this bill helps our farmers now. We can do more for them later,

and we will. But, please, support this conference report. It helps North Carolina farmers and it helps them now.

I come to the floor today along with my fellow colleagues from North Carolina to educate Congress on the state of dire emergency in North Carolina. I support this conference report. As you know, Mr. Speaker, North Carolina has experienced the most destructive natural disaster ever to hit our State, It is already estimated that damages from Hurricane Floyd will exceed $2 billion in agricultural losses alone, not to mention loss of homes, businesses, roads, schools and other services.

The extent of damage is currently still being assessed and will not be known for sure until the water recedes. It is for that reason that I implore this body, as Representatives of the United States, to work with us from North Carolina, as well as with those suffering in New Jersey, New York and other States from the destruction of Hurricane Floyd, when we came back to you in the upcoming weeks and ask for your assistance in passing a package which will accurately address the needs of these people who have literally lost everything.

In light of the fact we do not have a clear idea of how much money will be needed to aid these hurricane victims, I believe it is wise for us to press forward with the emergency farm assistance package we are voting on today. Farmers from North Carolina, as well as farmers from all the nation, will greatly benefit from this bill. We need to pass this bill and pass it quickly so that farmers can begin receiving assistance as soon as possible.

I urge you to vote in favor of this conference report.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD).

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have the greatest respect for the chairman of this committee, a man with his roots deep in agriculture, and he has worked long and hard on this bill with his committee. But there are some fundamental problems if you are from the Northeast or mid-Atlantic. This does not address our drought relief. I wish the people that could have decided to shortchange us could have been to Bradford County, Pennsylvania, with me and looked at the corn this high and the barns empty of forage.

This bill is bad for us for three reasons: it does not address the drought; it does not address option 1–A, which means we are going to allow Secretary Glickman's mistake to put our farmers out of business, and it does not address the compacts.

Mr. Speaker, the only thing that this bill is good for in the Northeast is the auctioneers. I hate to go home and see the hammer fall on another Northeastern dairy farm.

I ask Members to oppose this bill.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), who has been such an outspoken advocate for fairness to all people.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that we should be doing something and doing it quickly for our farmers in America, because they are in distress. At times of economic prosperity, we go to some of our agriculture regions in this country, and we find that farmers are having to close down their shop, and there are fewer and fewer farmers independently farming in this country, and that has to stop.

But this bill, unfortunately, is very troubling for someone like me who comes from California, where right now, with a State prospering so much, and you find unemployment rates have plummeted in a State that for the longest time was suffering higher unemployment rates than the rest of the Nation, right now, while we are doing well in California, if you walk into the agricultural regions of California, you will find unemployment rates above 10 percent, up to 15 to 20 percent in some of our rural areas where there are farm workers desperate to work. Yet in this particular conference report we have a particular provision that was added with regard to guest worker programs where we get to import workers to do work here in America.

This provision would allow us to go out and seek people from other countries to do the work that Americans can do today by simply saying that for 3 to 4, maybe up to 8 days, we searched for someone to do the job out there in the fields.

That is unfortunate, because those unemployment rates for farm workers still exist. They are very high. Yet right now this bill would say rather than give those American workers a chance to work in those fields, to earn a decent living, even if sometimes it may be a low wage, no, instead we are going to allow some of these mega-corporations to go out and say we tried for 3 days to find an American worker to work that crop, but we could not find anyone, so now let us go abroad and hire the cheap labor to come in here and do the work for us.

How can we do that right now, when not just farmers, but farm workers are hurting, to say we are going to cut the throats of agriculture? This is not the way to do it.

This is a good bill with many good features to it, but why we had to go about doing it this way I do not know. It makes it very difficult for someone who, by the way, has not a piece of farmland in his congressional district, to get up here and say this; but I think we may have to oppose this bill.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY).

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, in the brief time I have, I simply want to say this: I have spent the last several weeks working with the committee and working with the members of the committee to impress upon them the needs of the dairy farmers of the northeastern part of our State.

To my colleagues who will come to this floor to vote on this bill, I want to make this very clear: because we have been threatened by a veto and because we have followed a misguided path set for us by the Secretary of Agriculture on option 1–A and because we have decided to ignore the fact that the Northeast Dairy Compact, which provides for minimum supports for farmers in the Northeast so that they can maintain their process, we have decided to put forward a bill today that promotes the worst kind of regional divisions in this body. We have decided to put forth a bill today that promotes and benefits singular Members, singular states, at the expense of others.

So, with that, I would urge all of my colleagues to strongly oppose this bill and let us make sure we come back and do the right thing for all of our farmers.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from New York for his remarks and again plead with my colleagues, as we move to a motion to recommit, to support the motion to recommit and go back to subcommittee where it belongs and fix this bill.

As you have listened to the speakers today, you have heard Members like the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON). We look at the farmers in the Red River Valley. We can do better for them. They have had no crops. Just because some areas of the country have been benefited by this current conference report before us, simply because of who was in the room writing it, does not mean that other parts of America that have been deeply hurt by drought and by crop loss do not also deserve the attention of this broader membership. We need to fix what was done improperly by those who took the bill away from our committee where it rightfully belonged.

How can you turn down someone like the gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACCI), an area of the country in the Northeast that really has not had a lot of losses in years past.

□ 1230

Yet if we look at the specialty crop area, it is given almost no consideration in this legislation. Speaking for our region of the country, the heart of the midwest, for those people who are literally going bankrupt in the pork industry, why should they not be treated similarly to those who are in the row crop business?

These are good Americans, too. They deserve the attention of this Congress. It is not going to take a Ph.D. or 6 years of education for us to go back into committee and fix this. All we need is people who are sensitive to the differing needs across this country to do a good job.

I want to say to our chairman, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr.

SKEEN), no chairman could have treated his committee members more fairly than he has. To the staff who has worked with us throughout, they have my highest admiration on both sides of the aisle.

However, what was done to us is unforgivable, and it is the reason that we have a two-legged dog bill before us today. Give us the opportunity next week to go back and do what is right for America, for those who are hurting today and to help position this marketplace for the future.

No less is expected of us as leaders who know more about these subjects, frankly, than anyone else in the United States. So to produce a bill that is half baked just does not do credit to this institution. I beg my colleagues who are listening today, to those who are with us here on the floor, to support our motion to recommit. Let us go back and fix this thing and bring it back next week. America deserves better than we are able to produce today.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, is recognized to close. He has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to restate the points that I have made earlier. This is a bill that benefits every American every day, no matter where they live. Whether it is FDA protecting the safety and foods and medicines or the nutrition programs for children and the elderly or creating economic development in rural America, this bill is for urban and suburban America just as much as if it were for the farmer or the rancher.

I know that some colleagues are concerned for what is not in the bill, particularly dairy policy and the relaxation of export sanctions to certain countries, but if we all voted on the basis of what is not in a bill then I am not sure that any legislation could get passed here.

I would like to say to my colleagues that this is a good, bipartisan bill. It will benefit every one of our constituents. I have letters from a number of farm groups supporting this conference report: The American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Cotton Council, USA Rice Federation, National Grain Sorghum Producers, and the National Corn Growers Association.

Mr. Speaker, there has been talk of a motion to recommit. I think that recommitting this bill to conference would be a serious mistake. There is $8.7 billion in assistance to rural America in this bill. Sending this bill back to conference for weeks or months of more haggling would deny any money at all to the people that we are trying to help.

A motion to recommit, in effect, says we want more money for farm assistance so we will send no money at all, farmers and ranchers will just have to wait while we talk.

I would say to my colleagues, some folks cannot wait. They need assistance now. They do not need more talking from Congress. They need the help that is in this bill, and they need it now. Vote no on any motion to recommit.

This is the first day of the first fiscal year, and we need to put this bill to work immediately. Please support the good that is in the bill today and vote aye on the conference report, and hopefully, Mr. Speaker, this will finally come to an end.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Agriculture Appropriations conference report. I am especially concerned about the Senate rider, not included in the House version of the bill, which would deny jobs to United States farmworkers by allowing agricultural employers to secure vulnerable foreign guest workers without any meaningful recruitment of U.S. farmworkers. This rider makes a mockery of the obligation of employers to show a labor shortage before gaining access to temporary foreign agricultural workers.

The General Accounting Office has reviewed the unemployment rates in America's counties where there are major populations of migrant farmworkers and found that in most, there were double-digit unemployment rates. From this, one would expect that agricultural employers would develop new methods of recruiting this readily available pool of unemployed and underemployed farmworkers.

But that is not what has happened.

Instead, they have sought this legislation to permit employers to escape the requirement that they recruit U.S. workers before gaining access to vulnerable foreign workers. This proposal, offered by Senator MCCONNELL of Kentucky, (where many tobacco growers use the H–2A guest worker program), would drastically shorten the time period for recruitment of U.S. workers before the Department of Labor must decide whether the growers actually faces a labor shortage.

Agricultural employers, under this provision, will apply for guest workers 45 days before the first day of work. The Department of Labor then will have 7 days to make sure that the wages and working conditions meet applicable standards. If they do meet applicable standards, then the employer begins recruitment inside the state and in other states where migrant workers reside. That leaves just 38 days before the season begins. But the Department of Labor must decide whether recruitment was successful no more than 30 days before the season begins. So in reality, employers have just 8 days to recruit U.S. farmworkers.

This would be bad enough, but there are even more problems: Often, the employer offers wages and working conditions that do not meet DOL standards. The Department must then give such an employer 5 additional days to correct the job terms. Recruitment does not begin until that approval is granted, at about 33 days before the season begins. But DOL is still bound to decide whether a labor shortage exists no more than 30 days before the season begins. This leaves only three days to recruit U.S. workers—a scenario utterly designed for failure.

In the meantime, many agricultural employers have elaborate recruitment networks that have been seeking foreign guestworkers for months.

I recognize that the H–2A law contains job preference requirements for U.S. workers. But there exist great economic incentives for H–2A program employers to hire foreign guest workers rather than domestic farmworkers. Guestworkers are far more docile and compliant than U.S. workers who have legal protections. Also, employers save money because guestworkers' wages are not subject to unemployment taxes or Social Security contributions. Once DOL has give approval to hire foreign guestworkers, U.S. farmworkers know that they usually won't be welcome at those jobs.

The General Accounting Office report on the H–2A program made recommendations about the very issues the McConnell rider addresses, and the McConnell amendment is inconsistent with the GAO recommendations. The GAO recommended shortening the H–2A progress, which the Department of Labor recently did through regulation changes. But the GAO warned that recruitment of U.S. workers should not be reduced and that is precisely what the McConnell amendment does.

I am firmly opposed to the conference committee report because this appropriations bill contains the McConnell amendment that unjustifiably denies jobs to the poorest of the working poor, America's farmworkers.

Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1906, the Agriculture Appropriations Conference Report. If everyone in Congress is serious about locking away Social Security, we simply can not afford to pass this bill. I urge all of my colleagues to exercise fiscal responsibility, and vote ''no'' on this conference report.

This agreement is a perfect example of the type of legislation that pushes us down the path towards raiding the Social Security trust fund. The Agriculture Conference agreement provides $69 billion for the Department of Agriculture and related programs—including $8.7 billion in ''emergency'' funds for disaster relief.

Emergency funding aside, the conference report is approximately $100 million over its allocation. That increase will be paid for through the projected surplus.

Indeed, since the emergency relief funds do not count against the 1997 spending caps, those, to, will be paid for with the surplus. In fact, the emergency funds alone consume more than half of the expected non-Social Security surplus for fiscal year 2000.

If we continue to chip away at the surplus, beginning with H.R. 1906, Congress will begin to dip into Social Security. As someone who is committed to locking away Social Security and living within the budget caps, I urge all of you to vote No on this and every bill that leads us down a fiscally irresponsible path.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1906 the agriculture Appropriations Bill for FY2000.

Mr. Speaker, I understand the concerns of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have concerns about this bill. Farmers truly are facing a crisis in his country. From the drought of the Northeast to the recent flooding in North Carolina, more federal funding is needed to insure the livelihood of the American family farmer.

But there is also an agriculture crisis in our cities. This bill funds important agriculture programs which help provide more greenery in

our cities, trees to fight pollution and make the air cleaner and Federal research monies against plant and tree pests.

I am supporting this bill because it addresses the needs in urban areas, and New York City in particular, which have been severely impacted by the Asian Long Horned Beetle. This predator, which is a non-native species came to New York and other areas through packaging materials in shipping crates. This infestation has led to the destruction of thousands of trees in Queens, New York and most recently was found in Central Park in Manhattan.

I thank Chairman SKEEN, Ranking Member KAPTUR, and the House and Senate Conferees for including $2.1 million for the Animal Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) for eradication of the Asian Long Horned Beetle in New York City. This money is an important step to stop this pest which left unchecked will destroy the trees of New York City which provide my constituents with much needed shade and greenery.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chairman I rise in support of this Conference Report for the Agriculture Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2000. We members of the subcommittee were charged with developing an appropriations bill, not a bill to address every agriculture authorization issue pending before Congress.

There are several very important agriculture issues that call for attention. They should be addressed, and considered on the House floor. But these are not issues that should hold up a badly needed appropriations bill. In fact, I do not recall over the last two weeks hearing any complaints regarding the regular appropriations bill.

There are some very good provisions in this appropriation. Each one of us would probably like to change some part of this bill, but we have to remember this bill provides for $8.7 billion in emergency assistance for agriculture producers.

I have had calls streaming into my office from producers, and I am talking the producers, not the Washington lobbyists, asking me to support the bill. They know that the items in the disaster package are too important to lose.

In this bill there is $5.5 billion in direct emergency financial assistance. There is help for cotton's step 2 program, help for livestock producers and $1.2 billion for disaster funding.

No, this bill may not be perfect, and there are things that may not be in the bill that we would like to have seen in the bill, but I do not believe we can turn our backs on $8.7 billion in financial assistance and our producers.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express great disappointment on behalf of our farmers throughout the State of New York and the entire northeast region.

In my home State of New York, agriculture is the largest industry. With abundant rainfall, productive soil, and proximity to the Nation's largest markets, the outlook for the future of New York's dairy farmers is of great potential. However, as a result of the recent drought, natural disasters, and fluctuating market prices, New York farmers are in dire need of assistance; which is not provided in this legislation.

Apple and onion producers in New York State have suffered severe weather conditions in three out of the last four years, including this year's drought. Nevertheless, the USDA has been ineffective in providing needed, equitable crop loss disaster assistance for onion and apple producers.

Due to 1998 onion and apple losses in New York State, repeated and intense communications transpired between producers, Congress and the USDA. Over the past few months, communications with the Secretary of the USDA, Dan Glickman, have failed to address most of our producers concerns.

Our agricultural producers have received sympathy from the Department of Agriculture, but USDA has stated that they do not have a clear direction from Congress on how to proceed with the complicated, untraditional questions which are unique to these nonprogram crops.

In 1999, estimates of drought losses to onions and apples in New York are again substantial. In fact, the loss in yield at $12CWT for onions on the 5,000 acres in Orange County, New York will translate into an approximate $15 million loss.

The $15 million loss in 1999, coupled with the $15 million dollar loss in 1998 for onion producers in Orange County, will prove devastating not only for the Hudson Valley's family farms, but also for those businesses dependent upon the onion and vegetable $100 million industry in New York.

Furthermore, New York's dairy farmers, which make up 60% of our agricultural base in my home State, have been cut out of this legislation. Producers and their organizations have been concerned about the viability of the dairy industry in the northeastern states for several years.

Declining herd and cattle numbers, combined with drought and fluctuating market prices, have led to loss of infrastructure and revenue for our New York dairy farmers. Our farmers are facing the implementation of option 1B milk pricing, a plan that reduces farm income in 45 states and will force New York producers to lose at least $200 million annually. Our dairy farmers are relying on their inclusion in the Northeast Dairy Compact, to provide them with stability in pricing. However, that measure is not only missing from this legislation, it was not even permitted to be discussed. Time and time again, our Nation's dairy farmers have had to face the challenges of nature and an unstable market.

In response to these challenges, these distressed farmers looked to the Congress to provide them with a crucial milk price safety net, by extending the Northeast Dairy Compact, and offering the preferred milk pricing structure, option 1A.

Accordingly, along with my colleagues from New York and throughout the region, I anticipated the opportunity to respond to our farmers by negotiating for the inclusion of favorable dairy language in this legislation. However, in an effort to force this legislation through, this opportunity was not afforded to us.

Therefore, on behalf of farmers throughout our Nation, I cannot support this legislation and, in the name of the thousands of farmers forgotten today, I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, agriculture is Pennsylvania's number one industry and Pennsylvania has one of the largest rural populations in the nation. There are 45,000 farms in the state and Pennsylvania is second in the nation in the number of acres of farmland preserved for agricultural use. We all depend on the food that these hard working citizens produce for our tables.

As we all know, 1999 has been a bad year for farmers. Month after month brought no rain. September brought hurricane rains.

There is a small dairy farmer in my district who raises fresh market sweet corn to sell from a roadside stand. His normal production is about 28,000 ears. This year, his production was 500 ears. This farmer has already purchased hay from out of state for his dairy herd and will do so repeatedly through the winter. This is one small example of the effect of the devastating 100-year drought in Pennsylvania.

Pennsylvania farmers have lost $700 million. This bill provides an anemic $58 million for our farmers. Our farmers need a combination of direct assistance, emergency livestock feed assistance and low interest disaster loans. Unfortunately, this bill does not adequately meet these needs.

This conference report provides only $1.2 billion for crop losses due to all natural disasters in the 1999 crop year. This includes the damages due to Hurricanes Dennis and Floyd, natural disasters in Texas and the Northern Plains in addition to the 13 states affected by the drought.

This bill leaves our northeastern farmers without enough help, and I will therefore vote against this conference report.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BEREUTER). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MS. KAPTUR

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the conference report?

Ms. KAPTUR. We are, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. KAPTUR moves to recommit the conference report on the bill H.R. 1906 to the committee of conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 187, nays 228, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 468]

YEAS—187

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baldacci
Barcia
Bartlett
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Cardin
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Doyle
Ehrlich
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foley
Forbes
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hoyer
Inslee
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
King (NY)
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Moakley
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Norwood
Oberstar
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rangel
Rivers
Roemer
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sawyer
Saxton
Schakowsky
Serrano
Sherman
Sherwood
Shows
Shuster
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Sweeney
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Vitter
Waters
Watt (NC)
Weiner
Weygand
Woolsey
Wynn

NAYS—228

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boswell
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capuano
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dooley
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Fossella
Fowler
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kasich
Kelly
Kind (WI)
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mink
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Nussle
Obey
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rodriguez
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sandlin
Sanford
Schaffer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauzin
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Traficant
Upton
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—18

Berman
Boucher
Carson
Chenoweth
Clay
Ford
Hinojosa
Hooley
Jefferson
Levin
Meeks (NY)
Rush
Scarborough
Stupak
Taylor (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Wu

□ 1257

Messrs. MILLER of Florida, HAYES, BONILLA, BARRETT of Wisconsin, PITTS, EHLERS, and HOUGHTON changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. MURTHA, DOYLE, NADLER, LAMPSON, BENTSEN and GOODLING changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

Mr. WALSH changed his vote from ''present'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. SWEENEY, SAXTON and KING changed their vote from ''present'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on the conference report.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 175, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 469]

YEAS—240

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boswell
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Chambliss
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (VA)
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dooley
Doolittle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Emerson
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fletcher
Foley
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hobson
Horn
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
John
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kasich
Kind (WI)
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Lampson
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCarthy (MO)
McCollum
McCrery
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Miller, Gary
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Nussle
Obey
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pastor
Pease
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Reyes
Riley
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sandlin
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shows
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (NM)
Walden
Wamp
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—175

Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barr
Bartlett
Bass
Becerra
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Burr
Campbell
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Collins
Conyers
Cox
Coyne
Crane
Cummings
Davis (IL)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Engel
English
Eshoo
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Fossella
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gilman
Goodling
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hefley
Hinchey
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer

Inslee
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (CT)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
King (NY)
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lantos
Larson
Lazio
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Moakley
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Norwood
Oberstar
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pitts
Quinn
Rangel
Reynolds
Rivers
Rohrabacher
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shuster
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Stark
Stearns
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Toomey
Udall (CO)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Vitter
Walsh
Waters
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Weygand
Woolsey
Wynn

NOT VOTING—18

Berman
Boucher
Carson
Chenoweth
Clay
Ford
Hinojosa
Hooley
Jefferson
Levin
Meeks (NY)
Rush
Scarborough
Stupak
Taylor (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Wu

□ 1315

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD and Mrs. MALONEY of New York changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY changed her vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast a vote on the Agriculture Appropriations Conference Report due to a family emergency. However, had I been present, I would have voted ''nay.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on several items today, the 1st of October.

Had I been present, I would have voted: ''Yea'' on rollcall No. 466; ''no'' on rollcall No. 467; ''yea'' on rollcall No. 468; ''yea'' on rollcall No. 469.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday during the vote on H.R. 2910, the National Transportation Safety Board Amendments Act of 1999, I was unavoidably detained. If I had been present and voting, I would have voted ''aye'' on rollcall vote 462.

TRIBUTE TO LILLIE DRAYTON ON HER RETIREMENT FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

(Mr. INSLEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I would ask Members in the Chamber to join me for just a moment in honoring a very important American who is in the gallery to my left today, Lillie Drayton, who for the last 39 years has served the American public and us running the elevators in our office buildings. I want to recognize her on her day of retirement. I do not know anyone who has epitomized public service as much as Lillie. When Americans have come to their Capitol, she has been the one to let them know that people care about them and they are doing a fine job of them.

I would like to recognize and respect her for all her fine work, Lillie Drayton.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Regrettably, Members are reminded not to introduce guests in the gallery.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1999

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE RIGHT TO SUE AN HMO

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

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, in a few days this House is going to vote on an issue that will impact the health of every family in this country. The managed care lobby will do their best to confuse the Members of this body as to the real effect of the Bipartisan Consensus Managed Care Improvement Act that I introduced along with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

I urge all Members to simply read the bill. The HMO lobby is telling Members that employers can be sued for simply offering a health plan, for their choice of a health plan, for the actions of that health plan. But yesterday Members heard in this Chamber the truth, the actual language of the bill, that dispels every one of these falsehoods.

The managed care lobby has also tried to tell Members that employers and insurers can be sued for not buying or providing a specific benefit, and that this bill would mandate all kinds of new coverage. Read the bill, page 61 beginning on line 24. Read the bill. Employers and insurance companies cannot be sued for, and I would like to quote:

> ''The decision to include or exclude from the plan any specific benefit.

How can we be any clearer than that?

The managed care lobby has told Members that this bill opens the door for unlimited punitive damages against health plans with jury awards soaring into the hundreds of millions of dollars.

To begin with, 30 of our States have already capped punitive damages. In my home State of Georgia, if the consensus bill becomes law, when it becomes law, there will be no punitive damages allowed regardless of the circumstances.

It is for precisely this reason that the consensus bill puts these court remedies back into the hands of the States, where tort reforms have been far more effective than here at the Federal level.

Read the bill. We have left a way for insurance companies to remain shielded from any punitive damages. Not a penny. If there is a dispute and the health plan agrees to settle it fairly with external appeals, they remain shielded from all punitive damages. Read the bill, on page 60 beginning line 3. I quote again:

> The plan is not liable for any punitive, exemplary or similar damages if the plan or the issuer complied with the determination of the external appeal entity.

How can we be any simpler than that? As a matter of fact, read the whole section of this bill of who can sue for what. It is just three pages. But those simple three pages overturn 25 years of injustice, and they close the door on unscrupulous health plans using this loophole in the law to breach

their contracts and kill people with impunity.

The HMO lobby has one last chance to defeat this legislation and that is to distort the issue. If they were successful, I believe they would find the end result of their success would be far less agreeable than the reasonable reforms of this bill.

We can correct the problems of managed care with responsible legislation right here in the People's House, or it will be corrected by the courts and the States, without the carefully crafted provisions to ensure that we do not disrupt our current health care system in the process.

For those who would oppose reforms, take your choice. But either way, the people, the Constitution and the rule of law will prevail in this room next week.

WORLD SMILE DAY

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize one of Worcester, Massachusetts' favorite sons, Mr. Harvey Ball, on the occasion of the first annual World Smile Day.

Born and raised in Worcester, Mr. Ball worked as a free-lance commercial artist. He first designed the yellow smiley face in December of 1963 as part of a campaign to enhance morale in his workplace. Since then, the smiley face has taken on a life of its own, developing into an international symbol of friendship, love and peace.

In the early 1970s, the smiley face image became a symbol for an entire generation of Americans, emerging as one of the most well-known images in the country. Recently, the smiley face was chosen to represent the 1970s as a part of the Celebrate the Century commemorative stamp program.

This morning, the United States Postal Service unveiled the smiley face stamp in Worcester, Massachusetts. The stamp will be officially issued this November.

Mr. Speaker, there are few symbols which so fully represent the American spirit of friendship, happiness and peace as the smiley face. It is therefore my great pleasure to congratulate my friend Mr. Harvey Ball, and the entire Worcester community, on the occasion of World Smile Day.

NO EPA OR IBWC EXTORTION

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

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about a situation in San Diego, California on the border with Mexico, and I rise to object to a move by our very own Environmental Protection Agency to attempt to block a plan, a plan to treat 50 million gallons a day of raw sewage that flows from Mexico into the United States, a plan that was unanimously supported by this House of Representatives. The plan involves treating Mexican sewage that is flowing into the United States in Mexico. What can make more sense?

But the EPA supports a less comprehensive plan to build sewage treatment ponds in the United States. And to get its way, the EPA seems to be extorting support for the U.S. plant from Mexico. In fact, the EPA has told Mexico that if the sewage treatment ponds are built in the United States by their plan, rather than the House of Representatives plan, the EPA would have $9 million left over to help Mexico with Tijuana-area sewage projects. And if the treatment plant were to be built in Mexico, according to the plan approved by this House, with a private firm's money, EPA says Mexico gets no money from the U.S. Government for their infrastructure needs.

Mr. Speaker, that simply does not make sense. It is extortion, if I may speak bluntly. If a private firm builds a plant in Mexico, then the EPA would have its entire fund of $54 million available for infrastructure improvements in the Tijuana/San Diego area. It is hard to believe that the Environmental Protection Agency would not even consider working together with Mexico in this way to solve an international problem.

And to make matters worse, the International Boundary and Waters Commission, known as the IBWC, is a partner in this extortion. This is the bureaucratic sabotaging of a plan that the House voted unanimously to pursue. It thwarts the Mexican government's fair and open review of a proposal that promises environmental benefits to the United States and clean water for Mexico.

It is an outrage, Mr. Speaker, that this win-win international solution for the problem of sewage that has plagued us and our area for 50 years may never be fully explored. The EPA has a 2-year history of obstructing the consideration of any other proposal to conduct sewage treatment at our border. Mexico is where the sewage starts and Mexico, by right, owns the water from any treatment plant. Why is the EPA opposed to building treatment ponds, then, in Mexico? I cannot understand how an agency such as EPA, which I support in the main and which is charged with protecting the environment of the United States, can be preventing a long-term or comprehensive solution to this problem.

The gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) and I share the problem of Mexican sewage on the beaches and in the riverbeds of our districts. We have asked EPA, we have asked IBWC to work with us and to work with this House to solve the problem. We want those agencies to assure the Mexican government that they can undertake a fair review of this House's proposal without facing the possibility of loss of infrastructure help. We want the Mexican government, as supported by the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) and myself and hopefully with EPA and IBWC, to get Mexico to do a fair, objective review of this proposal and tell us how long it would take and what steps have to be done to implement it.

□ 1330

Mr. Speaker, the bureaucrats in EPA and IBWC have employed spectacularly poor judgment on this issue. Let us hope that they come to their senses soon. We look forward to continuing to work with them to create a long-term solution that will protect the environment of our districts in San Diego, of the international border in the southwest corner of our Nation.

RESOLUTION ON POTENTIALLY LETHAL FOOD ALLERGIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, as we complete this week of business here in Congress, I wanted to remind my colleagues of a resolution I introduced a little earlier; it is H. Res. 309, because it is an important resolution expressing the sense of the House regarding strategies to better protect the millions of Americans with food allergies from potentially fatal allergic reactions and to further assure the safety of manufactured food from inadvertent allergen contamination.

The majority of the 5.2 million people who have serious and potentially fatal allergic reactions to foods such at peanuts, fish, shellfish, tree nuts are children. These children will never outgrow their allergies, and there is no vaccine to prevent these deadly allergic reactions. All that these children can do is avoid eating or coming in contact in any way with peanuts, fish, shellfish or tree nuts.

Even a small trace of peanuts or shellfish can produce a severe allergic reaction. Many children spend their day at school in fear, afraid to touch a door knob or a desk top that might have a smear of peanut butter. While it would be difficult to control the school or the work environment, there are steps that can be taken to protect children and adults from severe allergic reaction to food.

For instance, major commercial food processors and producers should produce products on separate dedicated manufacturing lines. Allergens in food should be identified in terms that are clear, understandable to the average citizen. Most consumers have no idea that products that are labeled with ingredients such as natural flavors contain peanuts or that shrimp extract is used to enhance the flavor of frozen beef teriyaki. Any food product that lists natural flavors as part of the ingredients should specify on the package that the product includes peanuts.

Foods which are common, life-threatening allergens should not be added gratuitously to products where their taste is negligible.

Industry, consumer and scientific groups should voluntarily work together on initiatives to better educate food industry workers and the public on the issues of food allergy safety, and after 1 year an assessment should be made of the success of these initiatives.

Mr. Speaker, every year about 125 people die from fatal allergic reactions to food in the United States, and every year the number of people who have potentially fatal allergic reactions to food is increasing. I have a number of constituents who fall into that category, and I am sure that all of my colleagues will find the same in their districts.

H. Res. 309 will increase awareness of the serious impact of severe food allergies on the American people and the need to address this very important health problem.

ALTERING TAX CREDIT FOR WORKING FAMILIES IS WRONG

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, while I have not heard many cries of Happy New Year or singing of Auld Lang Syne, today is New Year's day for the Federal fiscal year. This is day number one, and we find ourselves in this new year with the Government being able to operate only because a stop-gap emergency measure was approved earlier this week.

As we begin this new year, the Federal Government is supposed to have some 13 appropriation bills approved for its normal operation. Fewer than half of those at this late date have even been sent to the President. The measure that funds all of our Federal education programs, our health research, a number of other very important programs for seniors, and for Americans of all ages, that bill has not even been presented for consideration on the floor of this House, much less sent to the President.

I have just come from a press conference with the Concord Coalition with the national debt clock, which displays by the second how the national debt continues to rise. Billions of dollars of new national debt are being incurred as we fail in the Congress to deal responsibly with our budget.

Instead of responsibility, what we have seen throughout this year has been one budget gimmick after another. We have had more budget emergencies designated here, I think more emergencies than the EMS has to deal with; the census being declared an emergency; an emergency on fuel assistance, since it still turns hot in the summer and cold in the winter, as it always has. All these gimmicks just like the proposal to go to a 13-month Federal fiscal year are designed solely to circumvent the spending limitations established in the Balanced Budget agreement.

This year the Republicans have dipped some $18 billion into the Social Security Trust Fund just to fund the measures that they themselves have advanced this year without even getting to their irresponsible tax bill.

Particularly indicative of the problems that we have been dealing with in this Congress is what has happened just within the last 24 hours. The latest of these gimmicks is to turn to the working poor in this country, the starting police officer or teacher, the fast-food worker, the nursing home worker, those who earn an earned income tax credit and get a tax refund at the end of the year as an incentive to continue working and providing for their families.

The Republicans voted yesterday in committee and plan to present perhaps as early as this next week a deferral of that earned income tax credit. Instead of providing it to the folks that are working hard to make ends meet, they want to defer it. They have had the audacity to suggest that this gimmick to gain $8 billion right out of the hides of working families; the Republicans defended that in the Washington Post this week saying their plan ''would encourage better monthly planning for the beneficiaries.''

They want better monthly planning for the nurse who is looking forward to that tax refund in order to make a down payment on a car, for the police officer that is looking forward to that money to pay for her child's tuition.

I think that that is wrong, and I am pleased to see within the last few hours that another person who thinks it is wrong is Governor George Bush of Texas, who said ''I don't think they ought to balance their budget on the backs of the poor.'' Another Texan responded to that, an indication of the problems we have here in this House.

The majority whip, my colleague from Texas (Mr. DELAY), is reported to have said ''It is obvious that Governor Bush needs a little education on how Congress works. I don't think he knew what he was talking about.'' I happen to believe that when you choose between these two Texas Republicans, Governor Bush has the better of it, and the American people will have the worst of it, if this Congress proceeds next week to balance the budget on the backs of those people who are there working hard trying to make ends meet, entitled to receive this earned income tax credit, House Republicans would deny working families from receiving that refund on a timely basis in the way that they have in prior years in what even Ronald Reagan called one of the ''most effective anti-poverty programs we have,'' the earned income tax credit. Because of their irresponsibility, because of their failure to budget in a proper and timely way, Republicans have turned to this gimmick.

Mr. Speaker, let us hope the House will reject it next week.

OMISSION FROM THE RECORD OF THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 1999

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1051. An act to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to manage the Strategic Petroleum Reserve more effectively, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

OMISSION FROM THE RECORD OF THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 1999

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration reported that the committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2981. An act to extend energy conservation programs under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act through March 31, 2000.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of personal business.

Mr. RUSH (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of personal business.

Mr. LEVIN (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of a death in the family.

Mr. FORD (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of personal reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCGOVERN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DOGGETT, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PICKERING) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. MORELLA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NORWOOD, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 4, 1999, at 12:30 p.m., for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4599. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a request and notification of the availability of appropriations for the Department of Health and Human Services' Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program to made available for the needs of North Carolina in the wake of Hurricane Floyd; (H. Doc. No. 106–138); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4600. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Reform of Affirmative Action in Federal Procurement, Part II [DFARS Case 98–D021] received September 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4601. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Reform of Affirmative Action in Federal Procurement [DFARS Case 98–D007] received September 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4602. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Judge Advocate General, Department of the Navy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—United States Navy Regulations (RIN: 0703–AA55) received September 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4603. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket No. FEMA–7293] received September 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

4604. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Final Flood Elevation Determination—received September 28, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

4605. A letter from the Acting Director, Mine Safety and Health Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Safety Standard for Preshift Examinations in Underground Coal Mines (RIN: 1219–AB10) received September 28, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4606. A letter from the Deputy Executive Secretary to the Department, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Federal Enforcement in Group and Individual Health Insurance Markets [HCFA–2019–IFC] (RIN: 0938–AJ48) received September 21, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4607. A letter from the Trial Attorney, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—List of Nonconforming Vehicles Decided to be Eligible for Importation [Docket No. NHTSA–99–6239] (RIN: 2127–AH88) received September 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4608. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Plans For Designated Facilities and Pollutants: Tennessee [TN 222–1–9928a; FRL–6448–3] received September 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4609. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; District of Columbia; GSA Central and West Heating Plans [DC040–2016; FRL–6448–9] received September 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4610. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Delaware; Enhanced Motor Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance (I/M) Program [DE039–1026; FRL–6449–2] received September 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4611. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Mangement and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision, El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District [CA 033–0171; FRL–6446–2] received September 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4612. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plan: Alaska [AK21–1709; FRL–6450–8] received September 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4613. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Division of Corporate Finance, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—International Disclosure Standards (RIN: 3235–AH62) received September 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4614. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting the listing of all outstanding Letters of Offer to sell any major defense equipment for $1 million or more as of June 30, 1999, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

4615. A letter from the Deputy Archivist of the United States, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting the Adminitration's final rule—Safeguarding Classified National Security Information (RIN: 3095–AA95) received September 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

4616. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—West Virginia Regulatory Program [WV–082–FOR] received September 28, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4617. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Application Procedures [WO–350–1430–00–24 1A] (RIN: 1004–AC83) received September 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4618. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Wyoming Regulatory Program [SPATS No. WY–028–FOR] received September 28, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4619. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Land and Minerals Management, Department of Interior, Bureau of Land Management, transmitting the Department's final rule—Leasing of Solid Minerals Other Than Coal and Oil Shade [WO–320–1990–01–24 A] (RIN: 1004–AC49) received September 28, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4620. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod [Docket No. 990304063–9063–01; I.D. 092299A] received September 28, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4621. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the Western Aleutian District of the Bering Sea and the Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 990304063–9063–01; I.D. 091499F] received September 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4622. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator For Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Shrimp Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Effective Data Notification and Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Control Numbers [Docket No. 990330083–9166–02; I.D. 091499E] (RIN: 0648–AK32) received September 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4623. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Executive Office for Immigration Review, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule—Office of the Chief Administrative Hearing Officer; Executive Office for Immigration Review; Rules of Practice and Procedure for Administrative Hearings Before Administrative Law Judges in Cases Involving Allegations of Unlawful Employment of Aliens, Unfair Employment Practices, and Document Fraud [EOIR No. 116F; A.G. ORDER No. 2255–99] (RIN: 1125–AA17) received September 28, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4624. A letter from the Associate Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—NASA Structured Approach for Profit or Fee Objective—received September 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

4625. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations Management, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule—Advance Payments and Lump-Sum Payments of Educational Assistance; Miscellaneous Nonsubstantive Changes (RIN: 2900–AI31) received September 28, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

4626. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Last—in, First-out Inventories [Rev. Rul. 99–42] received September 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4627. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Weighted Average Interest Rate Update [Notice 99–49] received September 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOODLING: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 1381. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide that an employee's ''regular rate'' for purposes of calculating overtime compensation will not be affected by certain additional payments; with an amendment (Rept. 106–358). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLILEY: Committee on Commerce. H.R. 2884. A bill to extend energy conservation programs under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act through fiscal year 2003; with an amendment (Rept. 106–359). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 764. A bill to reduce the incidence of child abuse and neglect, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–360). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. COMBEST (for himself, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. DELAY, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. EWING, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BERRY, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. BLUNT):

H.R. 2991. A bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to provide for periodic revision of retaliation lists or other remedial action implemented under section 306 of such Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYWORTH (for himself and Mr. CAMP):

H.R. 2992. A bill to amend the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act to protect Indian tribes from coerced labor agreements; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 2993. A bill to require congressional approval of unilateral United States agricultural and medical sanctions and to provide for the termination of agricultural and medical sanctions currently in effect; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE:

H.R. 2994. A bill to provide for the conveyance of various reclamation projects to local water authorities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. EVERETT (for himself, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SHOWS, and Mrs. THURMAN):

H.R. 2995. A bill to amend section 304 of the Tariff Act of 1930 to require the marking of frozen produce with the country of origin on the front panel of the package for retail sale; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr. GOODE, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. TANCREDO, and Mr. CHAMBLISS):

H.R. 2996. A bill to provide incentives for the Forest Service to improve its accounting and financial reporting systems by temporarily capping discretionary appropriations for the Forest Service until improvements are made; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HILLEARY:

H.R. 2997. A bill to provide grants to certain rural local educational agencies; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MCCOLLUM (for himself and Mr. DIAZ-BALART):

H.R. 2998. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to reduce the annual income level at which a person petitioning for a family-sponsored immigrant's admission must agree to provide support in a case where a United States employer has agreed to employ the immigrant for a period of not less than one year after admission or where the sponsored alien is under the age of 18; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCOLLUM (for himself, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. OSE):

H.R. 2999. A bill to permit the Attorney General to grant relief to certain permanent resident aliens of good moral character who are adversely affected by changes made in 1996 to the definition of aggravated felony under the Immigration and Nationality Act, and to amend certain provisions of such Act relating to detention of an alien pending and after a decision on whether the alien is to be removed from the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois):

H.R. 3000. A bill to establish a United States Health Service to provide high quality comprehensive health care for all Americans and to overcome the deficiencies in the present system of health care delivery; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 3001. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, an Cosmetic Act to promote clinical research and development on dietary supplements and foods for their health benefits; to establish a new legal classification for dietary supplements and food with health benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SWEENEY (for himself, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. KING, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. DELAY, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. POMBO, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. PAUL, Mr. ROGAN, Mr. QUINN, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. NEY, Mr. COBURN, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. GOSS, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. WAMP, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. CRANE, Mr. COBLE, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mrs. KELLY, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. TALENT, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. PICKERING, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H. Con. Res. 191. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Brooklyn Museum of Art should not receive Federal funds unless it cancels its upcoming exhibit featuring works of a sacrilegious nature; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. FROST, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. SABO, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. MCNULTY, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HOYER, Mr. SHOWS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DIXON, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. FATTAH, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. CARSON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. OWENS, Ms. WATERS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. WYNN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. FORD, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. LEE, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mrs. TAUSCHER):

H. Res. 319. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued in honor of Thurgood Marshall; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. EWING:

H. Res. 320. A resolution recognizing the Korean War Veterans National Museum and Library in Tuscola, Illinois, as a National Korean War Veterans Museum; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 8: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 110: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 133: Mr. MASCARA.
H.R. 135: Mr. WEINER.
H.R. 354: Mr. LINDER.
H.R. 405: Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 406: Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 460: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 528: Mr. BURR of North Carolina.
H.R. 534: Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. KIND, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. BAKER.

H.R. 568: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 602: Mr. GOODE and Mr. DEAL of Georgia.
H.R. 623: Mr. BRADY of Texas.
H.R. 670: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MOORE, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. BLILEY.
H.R. 728: Mr. BARR of Georgia.
H.R. 798: Mr. MENENDEZ.
H.R. 957: Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. BASS, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
H.R. 1001: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.
H.R. 1067: Mr. VITTER.
H.R. 1083: Mr. DUNCAN and Mr. VITTER.
H.R. 1091: Mr. BRADY of Texas.
H.R. 1103: Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1115: Mr. FARR of California, Mr. REYES, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. KIND, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. FORBES, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. SCOTT, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. SABO, and Mr. PICKETT.
H.R. 1180: Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 1344: Mr. PETRI, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 1423: Ms. RIVERS.
H.R. 1424: Ms. RIVERS.
H.R. 1494: Mr. VITTER.
H.R. 1504: Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. DOOLEY of California.
H.R. 1505: Mr. BARCIA.
H.R. 1644: Mr. SANFORD.
H.R. 1657: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 1693: Mr. COOK.
H.R. 1697: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. WISE.
H.R. 1728: Mr. DUNCAN.
H.R. 1785: Mr. RUSH, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 1794: Mr. COX and Mr. TANCREDO.
H.R. 1869: Mr. WELLER.
H.R. 1899: Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. SHAYS, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1987: Mr. HAYES, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. COBLE, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. BUYER, and Mr. BLUNT.
H.R. 2005: Mr. ROGAN.
H.R. 2101: Ms. CARSON, Mr. STUMP, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. SOUDER.
H.R. 2247: Mr. COMBEST.
H.R. 2300: Mr. BONILLA, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. GIBBONS, and Mr. GOSS.
H.R. 2303: Mr. BRADY of Texas and Mr. MINGE.
H.R. 2328: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BARR of Georgia
H.R. 2418: Mr. OXLEY and Mr. DUNCAN.
H.R. 2534: Ms. STABENOW.
H.R. 2539: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. MCKEON.
H.R. 2562: Mr. HYDE.
H.R. 2634: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 2636: Mr. VITTER.
H.R. 2720: Mr. GEKAS.
H.R. 2739: Mr. LANTOS.
H.R. 2741: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 2743: Mr. HALL of Ohio.
H.R. 2764: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
H.R. 2824: Mr. PICKERING.
H.R. 2890: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. BONIOR.
H.R. 2892: Mr. BAKER.
H.R. 2926: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BAKER.
H.R. 2933: Ms. STABENOW and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 2934: Ms. STABENOW and Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 2960: Mr. STUMP, Mr. NEY, and Mr. METCALF.
H.R. 2980: Ms. DEGETTE and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H. Con. Res. 51: Mr. WEXLER.
H. Con. Res. 120: Mr. BLUNT and Mr. NORWOOD.
H. Con. Res. 133: Ms. NORTON.
H. Con. Res. 189: Mr. COOK and Mr. METCALF.
H. Res. 107: Mr. WU.
H. Res. 298: Mr. EVERETT.
H. Res. 303: Mr. CANNON, Mr. COBURN, Mr. HASTERT, and Mr. OXLEY.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H. Res. 298: Mr. SAWYER.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 5 by Mr. RANGEL on House Resolution 240: Mr. PAUL E. KANJORSKI, Mr. JIM MCDERMOTT, and Mr. TIM HOLDEN.