

Commercial Concerns with the People's Republic of China released their report on Chinese spying. We now know the truth. The Chinese communists have obtained virtually all of our nuclear secrets. And today, brand new American-designed Chinese missiles are aimed at our homes.

Mr. Speaker, we know the truth and we are not going to hurry off as if nothing had happened. The security of our Nation depends on how we respond to this report of Chinese espionage. It is not too late to pass a Nation that is safe and secure to our children.

Through a strong defense, more decisive leadership, and a renewed vigilance in protecting our secrets and prosecuting spies, we can make sure that every citizen lives in freedom and security.

**CONGRESS MUST DEAL WITH
PROBLEM OF YOUTH VIOLENCE
NOW**

(Mr. WEINER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, there has emerged a national consensus that we have to deal with the problem of youth violence. Hollywood must help, parents must be involved, and, yes, I say to my colleagues, Congress must act as well.

There are some commonsense proposals that have reached a national consensus level for good reason. We now have laws in this country to require child-proof caps on aspirin bottles, but we do not have any laws that require trigger locks on handguns.

The Speaker of this House deserves great credit for speaking up this week and saying he agrees we need commonsense gun regulations. The other body has spoken, and overwhelming numbers of us in this body agree we need these changes in the law.

So why the stall? Why not act now, right now, today? We will have an opportunity before the Memorial Day break to take that national consensus and close the gap that often exists between what people are saying in the country and what we do here in the Congress.

BOTH PARTIES MUST WORK TOGETHER TO ACHIEVE GREATER GOOD FOR AMERICA

(Mr. EWING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I come here today and I listen and I am amazed by the vitriolic rhetoric from the other side of the aisle; accusations that everything wrong in America is the majority party's problem.

It takes both parties to get something done. Gun laws are a good example. Yes, we need to move on gun legislation; and, yes, we need to protect the rights of Americans under the Second Amendment. I believe sometimes, when I listen to the rhetoric, they would throw out the Constitution for the political gain they think they might get on that issue. Or campaign finance reform. Yes, we must do that now, whether it is fair or whether it is not fair.

My colleagues, I am amazed by the attitude, the political rawness that I see here in this House, when only by working together can we achieve what is good for America.

TOYS HAVE CHILD SAFETY MECHANISMS BUT NOT GUNS

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, this silly toy has safety regulations, yet today in the United States, guns, that is right, guns do not have child safety regulations. What is wrong with this picture?

The message we are sending to the American people is that toys, this silly stuffed toy, is more dangerous to children than a gun. That is outrageous. It is outrageous that we do not have child safety locks on guns to protect our children from hurting themselves and hurting others if they get a gun in their hands.

How many more accidents, I ask my colleagues, will it take? How many more school shootings before we do something about this? How many lives will be taken? How many children will be killed before we have safety locks on guns?

We must pass gun safety now. We must prevent senseless tragedies from

happening to our children, our families, our communities. We must schedule a vote on gun safety legislation and we must do it immediately.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 185 and Rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 1906.

□ 1041

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of 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, with Mr. PEASE in the Chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, May 25, 1999, the amendment by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) had been disposed of and the bill was open for amendment from page 10, line 1 to page 11, line 24.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I submit for the RECORD tabular material relating to the bill, H.R. 1906:

**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	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS					
Production, Processing, and Marketing					
Office of the Secretary	2,836	2,942	2,836		-106
Executive Operations:					
Chief Economist	5,620	6,622	5,620		-1,002
National Appeals Division.....	11,718	12,699	11,718		-981
Office of Budget and Program Analysis.....	6,120	6,583	6,583	+463	
Office of the Chief Information Officer.....	5,551	7,998	6,051	+500	-1,947
Y2K conversion (emergency appropriations).....	46,188			-46,188	
Office of the Chief Financial Officer	4,283	6,288	4,283		-2,005
Total, Executive Operations.....	79,460	40,190	34,255	-45,205	-5,935
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration.....	613	636	613		-23
Agriculture buildings and facilities and rental payments.....	137,184	166,364	166,364	+29,180	
Payments to GSA	(108,057)	(115,542)	(115,542)	(+7,485)	
Building operations and maintenance.....	(24,127)	(24,822)	(24,822)	(+695)	
Repairs, renovations, and construction	(5,000)	(26,000)	(26,000)	(+21,000)	
Hazardous waste management.....	15,700	22,700	15,700		-7,000
Departmental administration.....	32,168	36,117	36,117	+3,949	
Outreach for socially disadvantaged farmers.....	3,000	10,000	3,000		-7,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.....	3,668	3,805	3,668		-137
Office of Communications.....	8,138	9,300	8,138		-1,162
Office of the Inspector General	65,128	68,246	65,128		-3,118
Office of the General Counsel.....	29,194	32,675	29,194		-3,481
Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education and Economics	540	2,061	940	+400	-1,121
Economic Research Service.....	65,757	55,828	70,266	+4,509	+14,638
National Agricultural Statistics Service	103,964	100,559	100,559	-3,405	
Census of Agriculture	(23,599)	(16,490)	(16,490)		(-7,109)
Agricultural Research Service.....	785,518	836,888	836,381	+50,863	-487
Buildings and facilities	56,437	44,500	44,500	-11,937	
Total, Agricultural Research Service.....	841,955	881,368	880,881	+38,926	-487
Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service:					
Research and education activities	481,216	468,965	467,327	-13,889	-1,638
Native American Institutions Endowment Fund	(4,600)	(4,600)	(4,600)		
Extension activities	437,987	401,603	438,987	+1,000	+37,384
Integrated activities		72,844	10,000	+10,000	-62,844
Total, Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service	919,203	943,412	916,314	-2,889	-27,098
Office of the Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs	618	641	618		-23
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service:					
Salaries and expenses	425,803	435,445	444,000	+18,197	+8,555
AQI user fees	(88,000)	(95,000)	(87,000)	(-1,000)	(-8,000)
Buildings and facilities	7,700	7,200	7,200	-500	
Total, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	433,503	442,645	451,200	+17,697	+8,555
Agricultural Marketing Service:					
Marketing Services.....	48,831	60,182	49,152	+321	-11,030
Standardization user fees.....	(4,000)	(4,000)	(4,000)		
(Limitation on administrative expenses, from fees collected).....	(60,730)	(60,730)	(60,730)		
Funds for strengthening markets, income, and supply (transfer from section 32)	10,998	12,443	12,443	+1,445	
Payments to states and possessions.....	1,200	1,200	1,200		
Total, Agricultural Marketing Service.....	61,029	73,825	62,795	+1,766	-11,030
Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration:					
Salaries and expenses	26,787	26,448	26,448	-339	
Limitation on inspection and weighing services	(42,557)	(42,557)	(42,557)		
Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety	446	469	446		-23
Food Safety and Inspection Service	616,986	652,955	652,955	+35,969	
Lab accreditation fees 1/	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)		
Total, Production, Processing, and Marketing	3,447,877	3,572,986	3,528,435	+80,558	-44,551
Farm Assistance Programs					
Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services.....	572	595	572		-23
Farm Service Agency:					
Salaries and expenses	714,499	794,839	794,839	+80,340	
(Transfer from export loans).....	(589)	(672)	(672)	(+83)	
(Transfer from P.L. 480).....	(815)	(845)	(845)	(+30)	
(Transfer from ACIF)	(209,861)	(209,861)	(209,861)		
Subtotal, Transfers from program accounts	(211,265)	(211,378)	(211,378)	(+113)	
Total, salaries and expenses.....	(925,764)	(1,006,217)	(1,006,217)	(+80,453)	
State mediation grants	2,000	4,000	4,000	+2,000	
Dairy indemnity program.....	450	450	450		
Subtotal, Farm Service Agency.....	716,949	799,289	799,289	+82,340	

**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	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Farm ownership loans:					
Direct.....	(85,651)	(128,049)	(128,049)	(+42,398)	
Guaranteed.....	(425,031)	(431,373)	(431,373)	(+6,342)	
Subtotal	(510,682)	(559,422)	(559,422)	(+48,740)	
Farm operating loans:					
Direct.....	(500,000)	(500,000)	(500,000)		
Guaranteed unsubsidized.....	(948,276)	(1,697,842)	(1,697,842)	(+749,566)	
Guaranteed subsidized.....	(200,000)	(97,442)	(97,442)	(-102,558)	
Subtotal	(1,648,276)	(2,295,284)	(2,295,284)	(+647,008)	
Indian tribe land acquisition loans.....	(1,000)	(1,028)	(1,028)	(+28)	
Emergency disaster loans.....	(25,000)	(53,000)	(53,000)	(+28,000)	
Boll weevil eradication loans.....	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)		
Total, Loan authorizations.....	(2,284,958)	(3,008,734)	(3,008,734)	(+723,776)	
Loan subsidies:					
Farm ownership loans:					
Direct.....	12,822	4,827	4,827	-7,995	
Guaranteed.....	6,758	2,416	2,416	-4,342	
Subtotal	19,580	7,243	7,243	-12,337	
Farm operating loans:					
Direct.....	34,150	29,300	29,300	-4,850	
Guaranteed unsubsidized.....	11,000	23,940	23,940	+12,940	
Guaranteed subsidized.....	17,480	8,585	8,585	-8,895	
Subtotal	62,630	61,825	61,825	-805	
Indian tribe land acquisition.....	153	21	21	-132	
Emergency disaster loans.....	5,900	8,231	8,231	+2,331	
Boll weevil loans subsidy.....	1,440			-1,440	
Total, Loan subsidies.....	89,703	77,320	77,320	-12,383	
ACIF expenses:					
Salaries and expense (transfer to FSA).....	209,861	209,861	209,861		
Administrative expenses.....	10,000	4,300	4,300	-5,700	
Total, ACIF expenses.....	219,861	214,161	214,161	-5,700	
Total, Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund.....	309,564	291,481	291,481	-18,083	
(Loan authorization).....	(2,284,958)	(3,008,734)	(3,008,734)	(+723,776)	
Total, Farm Service Agency.....	1,026,513	1,090,770	1,090,770	+64,257	
Risk Management Agency.....	64,000	70,716	70,716	+6,716	
Support Services Bureau.....		74,050			-74,050
Total, Farm Assistance Programs.....	1,091,085	1,236,131	1,162,058	+70,973	-74,073
Corporations					
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation:					
Federal crop insurance corporation fund.....	1,504,036	997,000	997,000	-507,036	
Commodity Credit Corporation Fund:					
Reimbursement for net realized losses.....	8,439,000	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)		
Total, Corporations.....	9,943,036	15,365,000	15,365,000	+5,421,964	
Total, title I, Agricultural Programs.....	14,481,998	20,174,117	20,055,493	+5,573,495	-118,624
(By transfer).....	(211,265)	(211,378)	(211,378)	(+113)	
(Loan authorization).....	(2,284,958)	(3,008,734)	(3,008,734)	(+723,776)	
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(108,287)	(108,287)	(108,287)		
TITLE II - CONSERVATION PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment.....	693	721	693		-28
Natural Resources Conservation Service:					
Conservation operations.....	641,243	680,679	654,243	+13,000	-26,436
(By transfer).....		(44,423)			(-44,423)
Watershed surveys and planning.....	10,368	11,732	10,368		-1,364
Watershed and flood prevention operations.....	99,443	93,423	99,443		+16,020
Resource conservation and development.....	35,000	35,265	35,265	+265	
Forestry incentives program.....	6,325			-6,325	
Debt for nature.....		5,000			-5,000
Farmland protection program.....		50,000			-50,000
Total, Natural Resources Conservation Service.....	792,379	866,099	799,319	+6,940	-66,780
Total, title II, Conservation Programs.....	793,072	866,820	800,012	+6,940	-66,808

**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	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE III - RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development.....	588	612	588	-24
Rural community advancement program	722,686	670,103	666,103	-56,583	-4,000
Rural Housing Service:					
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Single family (sec. 502)	(965,313)	(1,100,000)	(1,337,632)	(+ 372,319)	(+ 237,632)
Unsubsidized guaranteed	(3,000,000)	(3,200,000)	(3,200,000)	(+ 200,000)
Housing repair (sec. 504)	(25,001)	(32,396)	(32,400)	(+ 7,399)	(+ 4)
Farm labor (sec. 514)	(20,000)	(25,001)	(25,000)	(+ 5,000)	(- 1)
Rental housing (sec. 515)	(114,321)	(100,000)	(120,000)	(+ 5,679)	(+ 20,000)
Multifamily housing guarantees (sec. 538)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)
Site loans (sec. 524)	(5,152)	(5,152)	(5,152)
Credit sales of acquired property	(16,930)	(7,503)	(7,503)	(- 9,427)
Self-help housing land development fund.....	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)
Total, Loan authorizations.....	(4,251,717)	(4,575,052)	(4,832,687)	(+ 580,970)	(+ 257,635)
Loan subsidies:					
Single family (sec. 502)	114,100	93,830	114,100	+ 20,270
Unsubsidized guaranteed	2,700	19,520	19,520	+ 16,820
Housing repair (sec. 504)	8,808	9,900	9,900	+ 1,092
Multifamily housing guarantees (sec. 538)	2,320	480	480	- 1,840
Farm labor (sec. 514)	10,406	11,308	11,308	+ 902
Rental housing (sec. 515)	55,160	39,680	47,616	- 7,544	+ 7,936
Site loans (sec. 524)	17	4	4	- 13
Credit sales of acquired property	3,492	874	874	- 2,618
Self-help housing land development fund.....	282	281	281	- 1
Total, Loan subsidies.....	197,285	175,877	204,083	+ 6,798	+ 28,206
RHIF administrative expenses (transfer to RHS)	360,785	383,879	377,879	+ 17,094	- 6,000
Rental assistance program:					
(Sec. 521)	577,497	434,100	577,500	+ 3	+ 143,400
(Sec. 502(c)(5)(D))	5,900	5,900	5,900
Subtotal	583,397	440,000	583,400	+ 3	+ 143,400
Advance appropriation, FY 2001	200,000	- 200,000
Total, Rental assistance program.....	583,397	640,000	583,400	+ 3	- 56,600
Total, Rural Housing Insurance Fund	1,141,467	1,199,756	1,165,362	+ 23,895	- 34,394
(Loan authorization)	(4,251,717)	(4,575,052)	(4,832,687)	(+ 580,970)	(+ 257,635)
Mutual and self-help housing grants	26,000	30,000	28,000	+ 2,000	- 2,000
Rural housing assistance grants	41,000	54,000	50,000	+ 9,000	- 4,000
Subtotal, grants and payments.....	67,000	84,000	78,000	+ 11,000	- 6,000
RHS expenses:					
Salaries and expenses	60,978	61,979	61,979	+ 1,001
(Transfer from RHIF)	(360,785)	(383,879)	(377,879)	(+ 17,094)	(- 6,000)
Total, RHS expenses	(421,763)	(445,858)	(439,858)	(+ 18,095)	(- 6,000)
Total, Rural Housing Service.....	1,269,445	1,345,735	1,305,341	+ 35,896	- 40,394
(Loan authorization)	(4,251,717)	(4,575,052)	(4,832,687)	(+ 580,970)	(+ 257,635)
Rural Business-Cooperative Service:					
Rural Development Loan Fund Program Account:					
(Loan authorization)	(33,000)	(52,495)	(52,495)	(+ 19,495)
Loan subsidy	16,615	22,799	22,799	+ 6,184
Administrative expenses (transfer to RBCS)	3,482	3,337	3,337	- 145
Total, Rural Development Loan Fund	20,097	26,136	26,136	+ 6,039
Rural Economic Development Loans Program Account:					
(Loan authorization)	(15,000)	(15,000)	(15,000)
Direct subsidy	3,783	3,453	3,453	- 330
Rural cooperative development grants	3,300	9,000	6,000	+ 2,700	- 3,000
RBCS expenses:					
Salaries and expenses	25,680	24,612	24,612	- 1,068
(Transfer from RDLFP)	(3,482)	(3,337)	(3,337)	(- 145)
Total, RBCS expenses.....	(29,162)	(27,949)	(27,949)	(- 1,213)
Total, Rural Business-Cooperative Service	52,860	63,201	60,201	+ 7,341	- 3,000
(By transfer)	(3,482)	(3,337)	(3,337)	(- 145)
(Loan authorization)	(48,000)	(67,495)	(67,495)	(+ 19,495)

**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	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Rural Utilities Service:					
Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Direct loans:					
Electric 5%	(71,500)	(50,000)	(121,500)	(+50,000)	(+71,500)
Telecommunications 5%	(75,000)	(50,000)	(75,000)	(+25,000)
Subtotal	(146,500)	(100,000)	(196,500)	(+50,000)	(+96,500)
Treasury rates: Telecommunications	(300,000)	(300,000)	(300,000)
Muni-rate: Electric.....	(295,000)	(250,000)	(295,000)	(+45,000)
FFB loans:					
Electric, regular.....	(700,000)	(300,000)	(1,500,000)	(+800,000)	(+1,200,000)
Telecommunications	(120,000)	(120,000)	(120,000)
Subtotal	(820,000)	(420,000)	(1,620,000)	(+800,000)	(+1,200,000)
Total, Loan authorizations.....	(1,561,500)	(1,070,000)	(2,411,500)	(+850,000)	(+1,341,500)
Loan subsidies:					
Direct loans:					
Electric 5%	9,325	450	1,095	-8,230	+645
Telecommunications 5%	7,342	560	840	-6,502	+280
Subtotal	16,667	1,010	1,935	-14,732	+925
Treasury rates: Telecommunications	810	2,370	2,370	+1,560
Muni-rate: Electric.....	25,842	9,175	10,827	-15,015	+1,652
Total, Loan subsidies.....	43,319	12,555	15,132	-28,187	+2,577
RETLP administrative expenses (transfer to RUS)	29,982	31,046	31,046	+1,064
Total, Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account.....	73,301	43,601	46,178	-27,123	+2,577
(Loan authorization)	(1,561,500)	(1,070,000)	(2,411,500)	(+850,000)	(+1,341,500)
Rural Telephone Bank Program Account:					
(Loan authorization)	(157,509)	(175,000)	(175,000)	(+17,491)
Direct loan subsidy.....	4,174	3,290	3,290	+884
RTP administrative expenses (transfer to RUS)	3,000	3,000	3,000
Total	7,174	6,290	6,290	-884
Distance learning and telemedicine program:					
(Loan authorization)	(150,000)	(200,000)	(200,000)	(+50,000)
Direct loan subsidy.....	180	700	700	+520
Grants	12,500	20,000	16,000	+3,500	-4,000
Total	12,680	20,700	16,700	+4,020	-4,000
Alternative Agricultural Research and Commercialization Revolving Fund	3,500	10,000	-3,500	-10,000
RUS expenses:					
Salaries and expenses	33,000	34,107	34,107	+1,107
(Transfer from RETLP)	(29,982)	(31,046)	(31,046)	(+1,064)
(Transfer from RTP)	(3,000)	(3,000)	(3,000)
Total, RUS expenses	(65,982)	(68,153)	(68,153)	(+2,171)
Total, Rural Utilities Service	129,655	114,698	103,275	-26,380	-11,423
(By transfer)	(32,982)	(34,046)	(34,046)	(+1,064)
(Loan authorization)	(1,869,009)	(1,445,000)	(2,786,500)	(+917,491)	(+1,341,500)
Total, title III, Rural Economic and Community Development Programs	2,175,234	2,194,349	2,135,508	-39,726	-58,841
(By transfer)	(397,249)	(421,262)	(415,262)	(+18,013)	(-6,000)
(Loan authorization)	(6,168,726)	(6,087,547)	(7,886,682)	(+1,517,956)	(+1,599,135)
TITLE IV - DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services.....	554	576	554	-22
Food and Nutrition Service:					
Child nutrition programs	4,128,747	4,620,768	4,611,829	+483,082	-8,939
Transfer from section 32	5,048,150	4,829,268	4,835,199	-112,951	+5,931
Discretionary spending	15,000	-15,000
Total, Child nutrition programs	9,176,897	9,565,036	9,547,028	+370,131	-18,008
Special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children(WIC).....	3,924,000	4,105,495	4,005,000	+81,000	-100,495
Food stamp program:					
Expenses	21,159,106	20,109,444	20,109,444	-1,049,662
Reserve	100,000	1,000,000	100,000	-900,000
Nutrition assistance for Puerto Rico	1,236,000	1,268,000	1,268,000	+32,000
Discretionary spending	7,000	-7,000
The emergency food assistance program	90,000	100,000	100,000	+10,000
Advance appropriation, FY 2001.....	4,800,000	-4,800,000
Total, Food stamp program.....	22,585,106	27,284,444	21,577,444	-1,007,662	-5,707,000
Commodity assistance program	131,000	155,215	141,000	+10,000	-14,215

**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	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Food donations programs:					
Needy family program.....	1,081	1,081	1,081		
Elderly feeding program.....	140,000	150,000	140,000		-10,000
Total, Food donations programs.....	141,081	151,081	141,081		-10,000
Food program administration.....	108,561	119,841	108,561		-11,280
Total, Food and Nutrition Service.....	36,066,645	41,381,112	35,520,114	-546,531	-5,860,998
Total, title IV, Domestic Food Programs.....	36,067,199	41,381,688	35,520,668	-546,531	-5,861,020
TITLE V - FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS					
Foreign Agricultural Service and General Sales Manager:					
Direct appropriation.....	136,203	137,768	137,768	+ 1,565	
(Transfer from export loans).....	(3,231)	(3,413)	(3,413)	(+ 182)	
(Transfer from P.L. 480).....	(1,035)	(1,093)	(1,093)	(+ 58)	
Total, Program level.....	(140,469)	(142,274)	(142,274)	(+ 1,805)	
Public Law 480 Program and Grant Accounts:					
Title I - Credit sales:					
Program level.....	(219,724)	(150,324)	(214,582)	(-5,142)	(+ 64,258)
Direct loans.....	(203,475)	(138,324)	(200,582)	(-2,893)	(+ 62,258)
Ocean freight differential.....	16,249	12,000	14,000	-2,249	+ 2,000
Title II - Commodities for disposition abroad:					
Program level.....	(837,000)	(787,000)	(837,000)		(+ 50,000)
Appropriation.....	837,000	787,000	837,000		+ 50,000
Title III - Commodity grants:					
Program level.....	(25,000)			(-25,000)	
Appropriation.....	25,000				-25,000
Loan subsidies.....	176,596	114,062	165,400	-11,196	+ 51,338
Salaries and expenses:					
General Sales Manager (transfer to FAS).....	1,035	1,093	1,093	+ 58	
Farm Service Agency (transfer to FSA).....	815	845	845	+ 30	
Subtotal.....	1,850	1,938	1,938	+ 88	
Total, Public Law 480:					
Program level.....	(1,081,724)	(937,324)	(1,051,582)	(-30,142)	(+ 114,258)
Appropriation.....	1,056,695	915,000	1,018,338	-38,357	+ 103,338
CCC Export Loans Program Account (administrative expenses):					
Salaries and expenses (Export Loans):					
General Sales Manager (transfer to FAS).....	3,231	3,413	3,413	+ 182	
Farm Service Agency (transfer to FSA).....	589	672	672	+ 83	
Total, CCC Export Loans Program Account.....	3,820	4,085	4,085	+ 265	
Total, title V, Foreign Assistance and Related Programs.....	1,196,718	1,056,853	1,160,191	-36,527	+ 103,338
(By transfer).....	(4,266)	(4,506)	(4,506)	(+ 240)	
TITLE VI - FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES					
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES					
Food and Drug Administration					
Salaries and expenses, direct appropriation.....	970,667	1,109,950	1,072,950	+ 102,083	-37,000
Prescription drug user fee act.....	(132,273)	(145,434)	(145,434)	(+ 13,161)	
Subtotal.....	1,103,140	1,255,384	1,218,384	+ 115,244	-37,000
Mammography clinics user fee (outlay savings).....	(14,385)	(14,817)	(14,817)	(+ 432)	
Payments to GSA.....	(62,866)	(100,180)	(100,180)	(+ 17,314)	
Buildings and facilities.....	11,350	31,750	31,750	+ 20,400	
Total, Food and Drug Administration.....	982,217	1,141,700	1,104,700	+ 122,483	-37,000
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	+ 4,000	-2,655
Y2K conversion (emergency appropriations).....	358			-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	1,169,700	+ 123,562	-39,655
TITLE VII - GENERAL PROVISIONS					
Hunger fellowships.....			1,000	+ 1,000	+ 1,000

**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	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE VIII - EMERGENCY APPROPRIATIONS					
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 105-277) (Title VII and Title VIII).....	5,916,655			-5,916,655	
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority.....	61,677,014	66,883,182	60,842,572	-834,442	-6,040,610
Appropriations	(55,713,835)	(61,883,182)	(60,842,572)	(+ 5,128,737)	(-1,040,610)
Emergency appropriations.....	(5,963,179)			(-5,963,179)	
Advance appropriations		(5,000,000)			(-5,000,000)
(By transfer)	(612,780)	(681,569)	(631,146)	(+ 18,366)	(-50,423)
(Loan authorization)	(8,453,684)	(9,096,281)	(10,695,416)	(+ 2,241,732)	(+ 1,599,135)
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(144,087)	(108,287)	(144,087)		(+ 35,800)

1/ In addition to appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to this portion of the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KUCINICH

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KUCINICH:

Page 10, line 14 (relating to Agricultural Research Service), after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$100,000 (increased by \$100,000))".

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, a few years ago I visited an elementary school in Cleveland at the start of the school year. The children celebrating the beginning of their school year had released hundreds and hundreds of butterflies into the air.

Now, a butterfly is a powerful symbol in our society. It is a symbol of transformation, transformation from a caterpillar into this beautiful winged being. Butterflies excite the imagination, they enthral us with their possibilities. Yet, the butterfly may become the next casualty of our brave new world.

We are all familiar with the genetically altered crops where pesticides are engineered right into the crop. A recent study indicates that pollen from such crops may have the potential to kill off butterflies, including the majestic and beautiful Monarch butterfly.

Mr. Chairman, my intention with this amendment is to provide the Agricultural Research Service with \$100,000 to study the effects of pollen from genetically modified crops on harmless insects, and to study the effect on other species, including animals and humans, that may come in contact with the pollen.

Corn that has been genetically engineered with the pesticide Bt has been approved and was introduced to farmers' fields in 1996. It now accounts for one-fourth of the Nation's corn crop. Bt is toxic to European and Southwestern corn borers, caterpillars that mine into corn stalks and destroy developing ears of corn.

□ 1045

According to a recent study conducted at Cornell University, it is also deadly to Monarch butterflies. The Cornell study found that after feeding a group of larvae, milkweed leaves dusted with Bt pollen, almost half died. The larvae that did survive were small and lethargic.

The implications of this are very clear. Pollen from Bt-exuding corn spreads to milkweed plants, which grow around the edges of cornfields. Monarch larvae feed exclusively on milkweed. Every year, Monarchs migrate from Mexico and southern States, and many of them grow from caterpillars into beautiful black, orange, and white butterflies in the United States corn belt during the time the corn pollination occurs.

I am sure that millions of Americans have had the experience of taking their

children in hand and going into a pasture and watching for beautiful butterflies to come by and visiting an arboretum, a zoo, a park and watching the butterflies.

Well, now, if we read the Washington Post, it says that pollen from plants can blow onto nearby milkweed plants, the exclusive food upon which the Monarch larvae feed, and get eaten by the tiger-striped caterpillars.

At laboratory studies at Cornell, the engineered pollen killed nearly half of those young before they transformed into the brilliant orange, black, and white butterflies so well-known throughout North America. Several scientists expressed concern that if the new study results are correct, then monarchs, which already face ecological pressures, but so far have managed to hold their own, may soon find themselves on the Endangered Species list. Other butterflies may soon be at risk.

From the Friends of the Earth we hear, "The failure of Congress and the administration to ensure more careful control over genetically modified organisms has unleashed a frightening experiment on the people and environment of the United States. It is time to look more closely at the flawed review process of the three Federal agencies that regulate genetically modified products: EPA, FDA, and USDA.

"The implications of the Cornell University study go far beyond Monarch butterflies and point to the need for a revamping of our regulatory framework on biotechnology."

Monarchs have already lost much of their habitat when tall-grass prairies were converted to farmland. We now need to protect them and other species that are harmless to farmers' crops, that may be adversely affected by Bt pollen.

It is shocking that more extensive studies like the one performed at Cornell were not done before the crop was approved. It also makes one wonder what effects other genetically altered crops may have on other species, such as birds, bees, and even humans, and if adequate risk assessments are being done on bioengineered products before they are approved and released into the environment.

My fellow colleagues, more research obviously needs to be done on these transgenic crops. I ask my colleagues to support my amendment to protect Monarch butterflies from the harmful effects of genetically modified crops.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, last year I had the opportunity to visit Pelee Island in Canada, which is a migration point for the Monarch butterflies. There is nothing more beautiful than to see hundreds of thousands of these beautiful creatures moving in a migratory pattern. It is an awesome sight. And yet, because of a lack of foresight on the part of our government, there is the possibility that these beautiful

creatures may in fact be doomed. That is why this amendment is important.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to enter into a colloquy with the strong, gentle woman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the ranking member of the subcommittee.

I am strongly supportive of this bill because agriculture is an essential part to our country. It is as essential to our country as manufacturing, services, transportation, or any other sector of our economy.

I am concerned, however, about two major programs in particular. These programs are the Agricultural Research Service, which conducts and funds a variety of research projects, including those related to animal and plant sciences, soil, water and air sciences, and agricultural engineering; and the Cooperative State Research Education and Extension Service, which works in partnership with universities to advance research, extension and education in food and agricultural sciences.

My concern, Mr. Chairman, is not so much about how much money is being spent on these programs or what research projects are being done. My concern is what other hands are needed to do this work. In looking over the list of universities that are conducting research in these programs, I am concerned that land grant colleges and universities in general, and historically black colleges and universities in particular, are underrepresented in research and education funding.

There is still a woeful gap between the capacity of majority land grant colleges and historically black land grant colleges, particularly in the amount of research being done and the facilities that are available. Despite this, historically black colleges have consistently outperformed majority institutions in the development of minority scientists and engineers.

The assistance of the government in this effort has been essential. I would hope that as the legislative process moves forward today and in conference with the Senate, my colleague will help voice these concerns and work with the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), in working for a fairer distribution of Federal agriculture research and education funding.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentlewoman that she is correct about the lack of funding for historically black colleges and universities. While the bill contains programmatic funding for these institutions, such as capacity-building grants, we must do more for historically black colleges

and universities that can make valuable contributions to agricultural research and really deserve the support of this Nation.

I promise that I will work with the gentlewoman and the chairman, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) of our subcommittee and my colleagues on the full committee to address this problem as the bill moves through the process and through conference, particularly starting with report language to require the Department to report back to us on what is currently being done, if anything, so we can establish the baseline for the future.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment dealing with research by the Agricultural Research Service for the Monarch butterfly. Let me just say that the Committee on Agriculture, which the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) chairs and of which I am the ranking member, is the chief ecosystem committee of this Congress, and I believe, of this country.

There is an expression: "You can't fool Mother Nature." There are some fundamental questions being raised here by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) that are very important to the future of botanical life and biological life in our country. Because we have never before had these genetically engineered crops, we really do not know their long-term impacts.

I know recent articles in Scientific American and many newspapers indicate that as a result of butterflies, which are essential to pollinating crops so we can produce fruit and corn, and representing the eastern part of the eastern corn belt, we know something about corn and soybeans, and these butterflies are essential to our future. After being impacted by this pollen, 40 percent of them died. 40 percent. This is a profound result. So I think the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) brings to us a very important and current finding that is well deserving of research.

I also would say to the gentleman, I thank him for doing this, because I know he represents the inner part of Cleveland, Ohio; and one of my greatest concerns as another American is that we have the first generation of Americans now that have no connection to the land. We have literally raised the first generation of people in the Nation's history who do not spend the majority of their time raising their food or with any connection to production at all, so they are divorced from the experiences that he is talking about.

I would just say, for someone from Cleveland, Ohio, a major city in this

country, to bring this amendment to the floor, to me, in some ways is a modern-day miracle. So I want to thank the gentleman, and I look forward to supporting him.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman's response. And it is an honor to serve with the gentlewoman in this Congress, serving the people of Ohio.

She raised an interesting point, and that is, what effect do these genetically engineered products have on our natural environment? I mean, sometime in the 20th century there was kind of a disconnection between humanity and the natural environment; and we will spend, I suppose, a good part of the next century trying to reconnect.

The disassociation from the land which the gentlewoman speaks about is a profound disconnection from nature. I think that is why schoolchildren, for example, find it so fascinating to study butterflies. Because in some ways, that primal human sympathy which Wordsworth talked about in his poetry flutters in the heart when we see something so beautiful. And I think that as the schoolchildren, who spend time with their parents and their grandparents going to parks and zoos and arboretums, have the knowledge that this very beautiful butterfly could be impacted by this bioengineering, I think that we are going to see a response nationally. And it would be healthy because this country needs to look for opportunities to reconnect with our natural state.

So I thank the gentlewoman. I would hope that the esteemed chairman, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) would be able to respond.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I will tell the gentleman I am all aflutter. I would like to say that I understand the concern of the gentleman, and I will continue to work with him to address this situation, and I think he has got a good program.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman would continue to yield, I would be more than happy to work with the chair. I need the help of the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) and I need the help of the Chair. We can work together to address this issue, bring it to the committee.

With that kind of assurance, I say to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), I will withdraw the amendment, but look forward to working with both of my colleagues to find the appropriate venue within the committee so that we can start to get

these agencies to be aware of this major concern of public policy.

I thank the gentleman again for his work on this matter and for his work on the agricultural bill. And again, my gratitude to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR). It is an honor to be with her in this House.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman from Cleveland, Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) that I thank him very much for bringing this to the Nation's attention. He is a leader on this issue, and I look forward to working with our chairman to find an answer to this as we move toward the conference.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to speak out of order for 2 minutes.)

THANKS TO THE FOLKS BACK HOME

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I will not take long, but to say I should have said this yesterday as I began my remarks on this Agricultural Appropriations bill for the Year 2000. And that is that I am very indebted to the people from back home who have sent me here to serve on their behalf. A number of them are farmers and have spent their life in production and in agriculture.

I want to recognize a few of them on the floor today, in particular, Ray Zwyer and Thelma Zwyer, who are now, I believe, Social Security recipients. And I know Ray is undergoing kidney dialysis several times a week. I want to thank him and his wife, Thelma, for everything they taught me about agriculture, for taking me out on my first combine, for helping me understand chicken production and poultry production, for helping me to understand direct marketing and how hard it was for the average farm family in this country to make it, to watch their son Tom and his children and their family to try to carry on the family tradition on that farm in Monclova Township.

I want to thank his brother, Howard, and his wife, Eleanor Zwyer, right across the street, for all the hard work they have done to create and keep in our area production agriculture.

I also want to thank Herman and Emma Gase up the street, who have worked so very hard to raise their family. And I notice they had a couple of pieces of equipment for sale in their front yard this past week.

I also want to thank Melva and Pete Plocek. Pete is the one that taught me what it is like to have wet beans and that they do not get as much when they take them to the elevator.

There are so many people like this back in our community who truly represent rural life in this country, the very best traditions of our Nation. And I just want to thank them for letting me try to be their voice here, as well as

the one million farm families across our country who expect us to do the job for them in this bill.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COBURN

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COBURN:

Page 10, line 14, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$50,863,000)".

□ 1100

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the chairman and ranking member will bear with me on this amendment. I do intend on withdrawing this amendment at some point in the discussion, but I think the American people need to know about the increase in agricultural research. I agree with many of the increases that are in there, but I think it is going to do us a good job of informing the American people where we actually spend this money.

This is a \$50 million increase that this committee has put in for agricultural research. I want to put it in light of the real issues of why we are trying to trim this budget back to last year's level.

I am going to say again, for our seniors out there that are watching and for our children that are watching, that are going to pay the bills for the money that we spend above the caps and the Social Security money that ends up getting spent this year despite the fact that we made a commitment to not spend that money: The graph that you see to the left shows what is going to happen to Social Security revenues. The bars that you see in the black are the increase in the number of dollars that are coming in over expenditures, the amount of money that comes in minus the amount of money that goes out for Social Security payments.

In 2014 we see a tremendous change. We start seeing red show up. That money, that red, is indicative of the amount of money that is going to have to come from the general fund, not the Social Security fund, to meet the obligations for Social Security.

Where is that money going to come from? That money is going to come from increased payroll taxes on our children. The Congressional Budget Office and the Social Security Administration estimate that if we stay on the track that we are staying right now, that in fact our children and grandchildren most likely will be paying twice in payroll taxes as they pay today just to meet the requirements of the baby boomers.

I happen to be a baby boomer. I was born in 1948. I was a product of the postwar greatness that came in this country in terms of we came back from the war and were allowed to have children and our material standard of living rose greatly.

Our commitment in this body, both by the budget that the Democrats pro-

vided and the Republicans provided, everybody committed that we would not touch one dollar of Social Security money, not one dollar. Yet we are on a track to make sure that we spend about \$45 billion of that money this year. Most people know that but they are not willing to say it. They are not willing to admit that the 302(b) allocations that have been put out will actually in the long run spend Social Security money.

I think that it is unfair to the American public to say that we are going to go through an appropriations process that is going to protect Social Security and protect 100 percent of the dollars in that, when in fact in our heart we know that Washington is not going to live up to that commitment. That commitment is a secure, honorable commitment to the seniors of this country. But, more importantly, it is a commitment to our children and our grandchildren.

If you ask the seniors in this country, the people that won World War II, do they want to burden their grandchildren with a FICA tax rate that is twice what they paid so that we can meet the mere obligations of Social Security, they are going to say no. And if you ask them what if we just trim spending a little bit more in Washington so that does not happen, they will all say yes.

I am a grandfather. I will do almost anything for my grandchildren. I will make whatever physical, material sacrifice that I need to make for my grandchildren. The question that we have before us and the debates that we have before us today are about whether or not we are going to do that.

Agriculture is a very important part of our country. I have said when we discussed this bill and when we discussed the rule, this is a good bill. My hope is to make it somewhat better so that we are back to last year's level, so that we have a chance to fulfill our commitment to the American people by not spending Social Security money. Just so that everybody can know, here is 1999.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. COBURN was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, what we see in 1999 and 2000 estimated numbers for Social Security surplus. Last year there were \$127 billion in excess Social Security payments in over what we paid out. What did we do? We started out, we had a budget that spent \$1 billion of it. This is before we had made a commitment not to do that. Then we had a \$15 billion supplemental. And then at the end of the year we crashed with what was called the omnibus bill at the end of the year.

So what we ended up doing was spending \$29 billion of Social Security

payments to run this country last year because the Congress did not have the courage to force the Federal Government to be efficient. It is not a matter of making cuts. It is a matter of demanding efficiency from the Federal Government and living within the budget.

In 1997, we agreed with the President, both bodies of this Congress, that we would live within the 1997 total budget caps. At the time we did that, most of the pain we knew was going to start this year. The actual spending on discretionary programs, programs other than Medicare, Medicaid and mandated programs, has to decline by \$10 billion this year if we are not going to spend Social Security money.

Here is where we are going. Right now the President's numbers that say that we are going to have \$138 billion in Social Security excess payments, we are on track to spend \$57 billion of that money. If you look at it conservatively, the best we will do if we stay on this track is that we will spend \$45 billion of that money.

This House has a lot of integrity. It is time for us to stand up and meet that integrity. It is time for us to live within the budget dollars that we agreed that we would live with.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment continues the process that began yesterday. The gentleman has demonstrated that he has patience and endurance, and I would say that the committee has no shortage of endurance or patience.

Yesterday the House adopted an amendment by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) which I opposed. It reduced the amount for the Agricultural Research Service by \$13 million in order to provide an increase of \$10 million for the Commodity Assistance Program.

I opposed that amendment because I think that research is absolutely essential if we want the 2 percent of our people who are farmers to continue to feed the other 98 percent of our people and much of the rest of the world, too. I am sure that they would like to contribute to that. And contributing a huge amount to our balance of trade and humanitarian assistance. This simply would not be possible if it were not for our agricultural research efforts which are the envy of the entire world.

The gentleman's amendment would reduce this amount by \$51 million in addition to the \$13 million reduction that the House agreed to yesterday. This would reduce the Agricultural Research Service well below the fiscal year 1999 level and would make it impossible to maintain the base level of activity. I oppose this amendment. I ask all the Members to oppose it and to support the committee.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I also rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. Let me say in terms of Social Security, the most important input to Social Security's Trust Fund is an America that is working and that is productive. Therefore, the reason we have seen the revenues bounce up in Social Security is because the economy has been stronger in the last several years than in past decades. And so the most important thing we can do is help people's incomes rise and help people keep working so that that revenue flow increases.

The Social Security Trust Fund is not a static fund. It is a fund that is very connected to what is happening in production America, whether it is in the industrial plants, whether it is in agriculture or in our service industries.

Rural America, however, right now is in serious crisis. It is in depression. Our job here should be to be partners with rural America in helping them pull out of the tailspin that they are in so that they again can become productive partners, contributing to the national well-being as well as their own well-being.

And so I would say to the gentleman, I think his efforts to try to be responsible and to deal with the budget issue here are admirable. However, in the context of the way we function as the Congress, we are one of 13 committees. We have been given the budget mark against which we must not go over. When we bump our heads up against it, we know we cannot go over.

As the gentleman admitted on the floor yesterday, we have done our job on this committee. Now, other committees have spending that is cut several hundred million dollars. That is all balanced out by the leadership of your party. Therefore, we on the Committee on Agriculture in some ways are insulted by the fact that you would try to go line item by line item inside our accounts and say, "Well, this isn't important" or "This isn't important" when we have so many tradeoffs that we have had to try to make, especially in Depression level conditions like rural America is facing today.

This agricultural research account is critical, because it is the future. If America is going to have a future in agriculture, it is built on the research that is being done every day by scientists who are not given enough credit here in Congress or in general in the country.

If you look at some of the costs to our economy where we do not have answers, something like soybean nematode which takes 25 percent of our crop, if we could produce 100 percent of the crop or 90 percent rather than 75 percent, how much more wealth and buying power and income that would add to our rural sector. In the South, something like a corn earworm costs farmers over \$1.5 billion annually in

losses, in chemical costs. We do not have answers to that problem.

These may seem like funny names to people who do not live in rural America but to people who face this every day, these are vital problems. We had the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) yesterday talk about the Asian Longhorn beetle infecting New York City as well as Illinois. Maple sugar producers in my area are scared to death that that thing is going to come across the State and cause billions of dollars worth of damage and kill all of our hardwoods.

These are not simple issues. We need answers to these questions. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) was just here on the floor talking about the problem with the Monarch butterfly. We do not have an answer to why nearly half the Monarchs in this country are dying, but we better find an answer because if we do not, production agriculture goes down, income goes down and we do not have dollars flowing into that Social Security Trust Fund.

I would just say to the gentleman also in my time here that he keeps looking at the accounts in our overall budget and he says, "Well, this one is going up," but he does not look at the ones that went down. We have a lot of accounts, for instance, our surplus commodities and foreign food shipments account has gone down by over \$25 million, our P.L. 480 title I by over \$11 million, all of our rural community advancement programs by over \$56 million. You look at our Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund by over \$18 million, the Agricultural Research Service buildings and facilities, over \$11 million.

So we feel that we have done what we need to do in each of these accounts, but I would beg the gentleman not to cut America's future, not cut her seed corn for the future by cutting these agricultural research accounts. And also to say to the gentleman, go back to your leadership. If you have got a budget problem, do not put it all on the backs of this subcommittee. We have done our job, we have met our mark. We are proud of the work that we have done.

I rise in strong opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. Actually, before I begin with my comments, I would yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I want to address a couple of things that the ranking member of the committee said.

First of all, my first comments were that I supported the research, that I planned on withdrawing this amendment, that I thought it was good that the American people knew where we were spending the money. So I want to put some of this in so that they can get

some flavor of where we are spending the money.

"Sugarbeet research. The Committee is aware of the need for additional funding to adequately support the ARS sugarbeet research program at Fort Collins, Colorado, to strengthen sugarbeet research at the ARS laboratory. The Committee directs the ARS to fund this project in FY 2000 at least at the same level as in FY 1999."

But in fact what are the prices of sugar in this country and how much are we subsidizing sugar versus what the price is in the rest of the world?

□ 1115

There is no question we should be directing our research to improve our productivity, and I am for that. But now we are directing research to a program where we are subsidizing and falsely charging in this country a higher price for sugar than what the market would ever have us have.

So it is not about not agreeing with the research. It is about sending money into areas where we have a market that is not working today because we have overproduction, and we are spending research to enhance that overproduction more, which means a lot more money is going to come out of the subsidy programs that are available for sugar beet or sugar.

So the question is, should we not have a discussion about these things? And I am sure there is a defensible position for that. I am not saying there is not, and I am saying that I support without a doubt, and I will make a unanimous consent, and I hope that it is agreed to, to withdraw this amendment.

But we still have a 6.5 percent increase in agricultural research of which most is directed to specific Members' requests and programs, and we ought to talk about what that is. Do we have a coherent, to talk about what that is. Do you have a coherent, cogent policy for research that is directed fundamentally at the basic needs that we have in this country?

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would just like to interrupt for 2 seconds.

For instance, I want to follow up with the brief comment he made on sugar because this issue of sugar makes my blood boil. The idea that we have a research system set up that costs a little guy a lot of money, I think is crazy.

I mean, if we look at the sugar subsidy program that is in place, basically it costs the consumer \$1.4 billion a year in the form of higher sugar prices. Our sugar prices domestically are about double that of world prices, and all that benefit goes down to the hands of truly a few.

I mean, there are about 60 domestic sugar producers in the United States. One of those sugar producers is, for instance, the Fanjul family, who live

down in Palm Beach. They are on the Forbes 400 list, they have got yachts, they have got helicopters, and they have got airplanes, and yet they get \$60 million a year of personal benefit as a result of this program.

So the idea of sending taxpayer money from somebody that is struggling in my district to help fund the life-styles of the rich and famous with the Fanjul family is, to me, not sensible.

Now, as I understand it, he may actually withdraw this amendment, but to say there is not another dime that could be cut within ag research I think is a grossly inadequate assumption.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANFORD. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, was the gentleman suggesting that there is one dime in money in the agricultural research account that goes to the family that he is talking about, that he claims receives funds? Is he saying agricultural research funds go, or is he trying to distort this argument?

Mr. SANFORD. The gentlewoman from Ohio is absolutely right; they are apples and oranges. The research goes toward sugar, and our sugar system, as it is configured in the United States, Mr. Chairman, very much benefits this one particular family and basically about 60 other domestic sugar producers in the United States.

Ms. KAPTUR. If the gentleman would just be kind enough, Mr. Chairman, I have farmers in my district that raise sugar beets. I would challenge the gentleman any day to come and put in the day of work that they do. That is one heck of a dirty job, to raise beets in this country, and if there is a better beet that can get them a little bit more at processing time, I am for them.

Mr. SANFORD. Reclaiming my time, I think there is no question that there are some hard-working, sugar-producing, sugar-beet-producing families throughout the Midwest, but there also happens to be the Fanjul family that controls over 180,000 acres of sugar cane production in south Florida. That is not exactly the family farm, and the fact of the matter is that part of this research will benefit a family like the Fanjuls.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 185, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

None of the funds in the foregoing paragraph shall be available to carry out research related to the production, processing or marketing of tobacco or tobacco products.

In fiscal year 2000, the agency is authorized to charge fees, commensurate with the fair market value, for any permit, easement, lease, or other special use authorization for the occupancy or use of land and facilities (including land and facilities at the Beltsville Agricultural Research Center) issued by the agency, as authorized by law, and such fees shall be credited to this account and shall remain available until expended for authorized purposes.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For acquisition of land, construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities as necessary to carry out the agricultural research programs of the Department of Agriculture, where not otherwise provided, \$44,500,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b); *Provided*, That funds may be received from any State, other political subdivision, organization, or individual for the purpose of establishing any research facility of the Agricultural Research Service, as authorized by law.

COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND EXTENSION SERVICE

RESEARCH AND EDUCATION ACTIVITIES

For payments to agricultural experiment stations, for cooperative forestry and other research, for facilities, and for other expenses, including \$180,545,000 to carry into effect the provisions of the Hatch Act (7 U.S.C. 361a-1); \$21,932,000 for grants for cooperative forestry research (16 U.S.C. 582a-a7); \$29,676,000 for payments to the 1890 land-grant colleges, including Tuskegee University (7 U.S.C. 3222); \$62,916,000 for special grants for agricultural research (7 U.S.C. 450i(c)); \$15,048,000 for special grants for agricultural research on improved pest control (7 U.S.C. 450i(c)); \$105,411,000 for competitive research grants (7 U.S.C. 450i(b)); \$5,109,000 for the support of animal health and disease programs (7 U.S.C. 3195); \$750,000 for supplemental and alternative crops and products (7 U.S.C. 3319d); \$600,000 for grants for research pursuant to the Critical Agricultural Materials Act of 1984 (7 U.S.C. 178) and section 1472 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3318), to remain available until expended; \$3,000,000 for higher education graduate fellowship grants (7 U.S.C. 3152(b)(6)), to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b); \$4,350,000 for higher education challenge grants (7 U.S.C. 3152(b)(1)); \$1,000,000 for a higher education multicultural scholars program (7 U.S.C. 3152(b)(5)), to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b); \$2,850,000 for an education grants program for Hispanic-serving Institutions (7 U.S.C. 3241); \$500,000 for a secondary agriculture education program and two-year post-secondary education (7 U.S.C. 3152 (h)); \$4,000,000 for aquaculture grants (7 U.S.C. 3322); \$8,000,000 for sustainable agriculture research and education (7 U.S.C. 5811); \$9,200,000 for a program of capacity building grants (7 U.S.C.

3152(b)(4)) to colleges eligible to receive funds under the Act of August 30, 1890 (7 U.S.C. 321-326 and 328), including Tuskegee University, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b); \$1,552,000 for payments to the 1994 Institutions pursuant to section 534(a)(1) of Public Law 103-382; and \$10,888,000 for necessary expenses of Research and Education Activities, of which not to exceed \$100,000 shall be for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109; in all, \$467,327,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COBURN

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COBURN:

Page 13, line 11, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000)".

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, throughout the Federal Government we have multitudes of agencies and departments and grants and billions of dollars that are being spent on global change and global climate change. We happen to have in this bill a million dollars in an isolated little pocket that is going to go to study, within the Department of Agriculture through a grant, global change.

It makes no sense to appropriate any money for global change through the appropriations process in ag when we have the vast majority, 99.9 percent of the rest of the money, being spent on this issue in other departments.

The question that I would have is, should we be spending a million dollars of Social Security money on global change in such an inefficient way? A million-dollar grant on such a large area of science and research today can in no way be spent efficiently, and I would pull this back. Is this money that has to be spent, that needs to be spent at this time and in this manner, and is it the best way to spend this million dollars?

As my colleagues know, we recently saw some of the results of some of the research on global change. We have a Kyoto Treaty that is being implemented by the administration that has never been approved by the Senate in direct violation of the Constitution of the United States. We have a Kyoto Treaty that is going to take jobs away from Americans because it is going to make us live at one standard and the rest of the world, developing world, live at a different standard.

We are throwing a million dollars for a favor for somebody on global change, one isolated, small grant program that is going to make no difference whatsoever in the overall study and effect on this issue; and so my question and the reason I have this amendment is that this is not going to accomplish its purpose, this is not going to further our research on global change, it is not going to be a wise use of a million dollars of taxpayers' money, and in fact will encourage us to do the same thing in other areas.

The next time somebody's constituent comes from my area, who

wants something for a university for a grant, they are going to say, Well, they did it on this one; why will they not do it here? It is not a wise use of our money.

As my colleagues know, we have a lot of seniors out there. There is no question we are going to provide them with their Social Security checks, and I do not want anybody to be able to say that I am trying to scare the first senior into thinking they are not going to get their Social Security. They are. We are going to meet that commitment. But we cannot say that to our children, and anybody in this body that says they can, they have to come up with a plan to do that, and the first plan to do that is to not spend the revenues that are coming into this country, into the Treasury, for Social Security.

So I would ask the chairman and I would ask the ranking member to consider this amendment as a good amendment. This \$1 million will not ever contribute positively to the situation on global change. What it will do is send a million dollars of taxpayers' money to somebody else, and it will generate some research; but will it in fact have an impact on the very thing that it was directed for? And I would challenge someone to tell me that out of the billions and billions of dollars that we spend in other areas through the EPA and other areas, how \$1 million for one grant system is going to make a difference in terms of global change.

As my colleagues know, in World War II this country recognized that we had an obligation to fight that war, and we downsized every aspect of our Federal Government because we had an emergency. Now we have a war going on, and it is not near the emergency that World War II was, but we have another emergency. And that emergency is whether or not our children are going to have the same standard of living that we have had the opportunity to have. Unless we address the issue of spending Social Security money, unless we address the issues associated with Medicare and Social Security, and unless we pay attention to that in every dollar that we spend, whether that comes out in one appropriation bill or all of them, or whether it is at the end of the year, unless we are good stewards of that money, that emergency will overwhelm our children. And everybody in this body knows that; they know that the baby boomer bust is coming as far as Social Security and Medicare.

So we cannot deny it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) has expired.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. POMEROY. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the sponsor of the 100-plus amendments that have turned the appropriations bill into such an utter fiasco on the floor of this House has strong convictions. Good for him. I believe they are heartfelt, and he is certainly articulate in advancing his belief on these things.

I have strong convictions, too. In fact, there are 435 of us in this body with strong convictions.

Many of us believe that hijacking the floor of this House is not the appropriate way to advance our strong convictions, work within the process, plug along, and ultimately try and make our beliefs prevail.

But to unilaterally tee off on America's farmers, as is the case with the 100-plus amendments sponsored by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), is fundamentally wrong and utterly unrelated to the concerns that he continues to tell us so much about.

There is a budget. It has been adopted by this body. It provides for spending of general fund dollars. The Committee on Appropriations has made allocations to its subcommittees, and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), dealing with the appropriation made to agriculture, came up with a bill that enjoyed bipartisan support coming out of that committee.

I do not like the bill. I do not think there is enough response to the needs in agriculture funded in the bill brought forward. I believe we needed to do more.

But to have the gentleman tee off on agriculture, slice and dice and try to make his ideological points at the expense of America's farmers is wrong.

It is his prerogative. We all have our own ways of doing things.

Ultimately, the blame for this fiasco falls upon majority leadership. Speaker HASTERT, where is he? Majority Leader ARMEY, where is he? Majority Whip DELAY, where is he? America's farmers need their direction and they need your leadership, and they need it now.

I believe that we need to assess what is taking place on this bill, and if Speaker HASTERT cared about America's farmers, he would put a stop to it, and there are innumerable ways available to the Speaker of the House to get this bill from being eviscerated in the fashion the gentleman is attempting. Give him an opportunity to have his amendment, one amendment, and then let us get on and appropriate the money so our farmers know where they stand.

□ 1130

There is not a component of our economy that is hurting as badly as

our family farmers, and we all know that. These are boom times. The Dow flirts with record levels every day it seems like, but in the heartland of American agriculture there is nothing but pain and despair. At a time when our farmers are suffering, and when prices are below the cost of production, to have the agriculture appropriations bill held up for mockery and ridicule and evisceration like the gentleman from Oklahoma, as seemingly endorsed by the majority leadership is doing, is wrong. Rural America needs this Congress to respond to its problems.

Those of us that represent farm country, we cannot do it all on our own. We need the body to work together, Republicans and Democrats standing up for farmers, and ultimately that is going to take some leadership out of the leadership. That is what leadership is all about.

So I wish Speaker HASTERT would think about the farmers in Illinois. I wish Majority Leader ARMEY would think about his North Dakota roots. I wish Majority Whip DELAY would reflect on the pain in rural Texas and put a stop to this process so that we might get on to voting on an agriculture appropriations bill and send some support to our farmers.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman currently has this amendment and 10 other amendments that are pending at the desk. I have no doubt that the gentleman has many more such amendments that he will propose for this account. At this point they are all flawed, as was his amendment yesterday on the Department of Agriculture buildings and facilities.

Each of them proposes to eliminate a single item, but does not reduce the overall total, and so there is no reduction accomplished by the amendment. In this series of amendments, each amendment proposes to eliminate a single special research grant within the Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service, and in almost all cases these are projects that have been ongoing for many years and were proposed to be eliminated in the administration's budget request, and that were restored by the committee at the same level of funding provided in fiscal year 1999.

The special research grant that this amendment proposes to eliminate is described in detail in part 4 of the committee's hearing record on page 1,432, and the following is a brief description of the research performed under this grant:

"Radiation from the sun occurs in a spectrum of wavelengths with the majority of wavelengths being beneficial to human and other living organisms. A small portion of the short wavelength radiation, what is known as the Ultraviolet or UV-B Region of the

spectrum, is harmful to many biological organisms. Fortunately, most of the UV-B radiation from the sun is absorbed by ozone located in the stratosphere and does not reach the surface of the Earth. The discovery of the deterioration of the stratosphere ozone layer and the ozone hole over polar regions has raised concern about the real potential for increased UV-B irradiance reaching the surface of the earth and the significant negative impact that it would have on all biological systems, including man, animals and plants of agricultural importance. There is an urgent need to determine the amount of UV-B radiation reaching the Earth's surface and to learn more about the effect of this changing environmental force. The Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service, CSREES, is in the process of establishing a network for monitoring surface UV-B radiation which will meet the needs of the science community for the United States, and which will be compatible with similar networks being developed throughout the world."

Grants for this kind of work have been reviewed annually and have been awarded each year since 1992, and the work is performed at Colorado State University.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good project and it deserves the support of all Members, and I support the project and I oppose the gentleman's amendment to eliminate it.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I have nothing but the deepest respect and admiration both on a professional and personal level for the distinguished chairman of the agriculture subcommittee, as I do for every other member of the Committee on Appropriations. I have watched with amazement as the gentleman from Oklahoma has withstood the most withering criticism from other Members of Congress, not so much for the content of the amendments that he has offered, but for his insistence upon exercising his right as a Member of this body to question the product that has been produced by a committee of this House.

I think it is regrettable that Members of Congress get up and imply that a Member's right to debate line items in the budget is somehow an insult to the Committee on Appropriations or any other committee of the House. In fact, in my opinion it is an opportunity for individual Members of Congress to state their views and positions on issues, regardless. They may seem trite and unimportant and wrong to some Members of Congress, but they are important for other Members of Congress.

And it may take a few hours to get through the agriculture appropriations bill, and I have no doubt that we will pass a fine product in the end. But I

hope this body will give every Member of Congress the tolerance that we should exercise in allowing everybody the opportunity to debate their amendments. Because remember, you will be the person at some future date that will want to have that same respect shown for you. Scrutiny is painful, but it is good for the process.

So I commend the gentleman from Oklahoma for what he is doing, and I rise in support of this amendment.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BASS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for those words of support.

The gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) said that the purpose of this is to make a mockery and to ridicule and to desecrate the agriculture bill. Far from it. The purpose is to ridicule money that does not go to our farmers.

We had seven votes last night on money that is spent on bureaucracy. This is not going to slow down one penny of money going to our farmers because this bill is going to pass. I said when we first started this debate that this was a good bill. I said that I supported the research.

The fact is we have a rule that allows us to debate these issues, and if one did not like the rule, one had an opportunity to vote against the rule. I voted against the rule because I think we spent money in the wrong ways and I wanted to change it, and I am here exercising my right as a Member of this body to try to change it.

My whole goal is to free agricultural research from the shackles of personal political favors for Members, and to make sure dollars go to the farmers, not political whims to get somebody reelected. So there is nothing wrong with asking questions about how the money goes.

The question of UV light, we are spending hundreds of millions of dollars on ultraviolet radiation in other areas of this government. This is a pork project, plain and simple, and it has been funded and it continues to be funded. It is \$1 million that is going to do squat. And it is \$1 million that could go to farmers instead of to research for something that is already being researched at a higher level in a much more thorough way in almost every medical university in this country, and to portend that this is a significant research that we cannot do without or not use somewhere else efficiently is not an accurate statement.

I am not testing and going after the integrity of anyone here. It is the process that I object to and the fact that we have a lot of dollars in this agriculture bill that do not go directly to farmers. I come from a farm State. My district is rural. I have the support of my farm-

ers. They do not want money spent in Washington that should be going to farmers. They do not want money paid out in terms of favors to get somebody reelected so that they will not have what they need when they go to farm their land.

So the question is not about whether or not we should do research. The question is about whether or not we should do research in a way that gives us a result that does not pay somebody off for a political favor.

So that may not be very palatable here, but there is a lot of that going on, and what I am saying is, let us free this agriculture bill from that type of thing and let us make sure that our research is directed in such a way that we get a benefit from it in this country.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think this debate is all framed in the sense that we are all here to try to make a better America. Well, a better America is not just the Social Security program, it is the totality of what we try to do here. A lot of that totality is regarded in quality of life. If one wants to have a better quality of life, which requires that one has healthier communities and strong economies, one has to remain competitive in the world, when America remains competitive in its research.

I guess if we go through all of the research projects that we do, we would find that there are some that we like and some that we do not like. Certainly the gentleman from Oklahoma, who is a doctor, would agree that if we cut out medical research, one, we are not going to be competitive with the rest of the world and two, we are not going to provide for a better quality of life.

The same is true with agriculture, this research issue, the ozone issue. It is a big issue in the world. It has become the number one issue for one of our competitive agricultural countries, Australia. They grow the same crops that we grow, only in reverse seasons. They are competitive in markets that we are in. They have made ozone one of the biggest issues in the country. They have made it a national policy. They have a saying there, slip, slop, slap. Slip on a T-shirt, slap on a hat, and slop on some lotion before you go outside. It is that big and that is everywhere, on billboards and everything.

So the issue about research and quality of life and agriculture is that our bodies are what we eat. If we do better research in agriculture, we are going to be eating healthier foods and living healthier life styles.

So I wish that the gentleman would really not attack agricultural research as some kind of big pork that is in here just for Members. This country was

based on land grant colleges, on universities that were based on studying agriculture, training people for agriculture. We still honor those with research programs, and I can tell the gentleman the research that we are doing in our area is really a cutting edge issue.

So I mean there has been a debate here, because this process of bringing in, as the gentleman told the desk, 114 amendments to an appropriations bill after never attending any of the hearings that the Committee on Appropriations had, if each Member offered, I just figured it out, if each Member, 435 of us, if each of us offered 114 amendments on an appropriation, we would have 41,590 amendments offered here. Mr. Chairman, the process does not work when we do it that way.

So yes, there has been criticism of sort of the number of amendments and the style which the gentleman is going about, but in the end this bill, which I was involved in the markup and attended all of those hearings because I am a member of the committee, this bill really is about trying to make for a healthier America, trying to make for a more competitive agriculture, a more environmentally friendly agriculture, a healthier food product, all of the things that make America the great place in which we live and respecting our heritage in that.

So yes, the gentleman is getting some negative responses to his amendments for the same reasons that I have indicated. I stand opposed to this amendment and to the others that the gentleman is offering.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Some of the attacks on my friend from Oklahoma have been downright humorous, the fact that he was accused of unilaterally trying to tee off on America's farmers. I want to speak out for my friend from Oklahoma and say he is willing to tee off on anybody who goes over the budget.

This is not about agriculture. This is about a process of how we are going to try to keep within our budget agreement.

I want to say up front that I support this bill and furthermore, I believe we do not devote enough to agricultural research. Furthermore, I will add that I believe that in the specifics of much of this agricultural research, much of it can be easily mocked and made fun of, but it is the backbone of the agriculture of this country.

Furthermore, I do not know enough about this particular project to know whether this is indeed real research or whether or not it was put in because some Member of Congress had clout. It is naive for Members of Congress to walk up here and say that we, in fact, have to trust our leadership, trust our Committee on Appropriations. We

should at least be willing to challenge occasionally.

If the Members of Congress do not want their projects struck, they should come up here and defend them, as the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), the chairman of this subcommittee, eloquently explained what the intent of this was. Where are the Members who represent this particular university in this particular State explaining what it is? Because this should be an opportunity for those who favor agricultural research to explain why this is in the bill.

A lot of this is a fight about the process. We hear that this is a "filibuster" or that we have had over 100 amendments. We have not had over 100 amendments. We do not know how many amendments there are going to be. But if we are worried that this is going to slow our process down, we should have had more days in session earlier this year; we should not be taking four additional days next week, because this is what Congress is about. We do not presume to know when we go into the appropriations process. There has been a lot of discussion whether we should go to the subcommittee, whether we should offer amendments.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOUDER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

□ 1145

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I took to heart what the gentleman said, that we should not bring bills to the floor in an ill-considered manner.

The gentleman is from the State of Indiana. As I recall, I did not receive any letters from the gentleman regarding projects in the gentleman's State or anywhere in the country relative to this bill.

Did the gentleman come before our committee to testify, or send any correspondence regarding any line item in this bill, yes or no?

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I would tell the gentleman, no, I had no line item in this bill.

I reclaim my time because I did put, in fact, a request in to boost agricultural research spending, because I support an increase in agricultural research spending. I support this bill. I believe if there is any part of the overall spending process that we need to be careful not to tinker with, it is agriculture.

I am not fighting with the specifics here, I am fighting on a process; that all the appropriations bills should be allowed to have amendments and a full-fledged debate.

And whether it is one Member or a group of Members, they should be allowed to come here, because we are not trying to micromanage the subcommittees, but when we see the final report we have a right to say, as Members of

Congress, that we do not believe that this full amount of money is legitimate; that we take apart pieces of this bill and say, defend this piece.

In fact, the only way an amendment cannot pass this House is if the majority of this country does not favor that amendment. It is not like some kind of a game here where there is some kind of a trick that can get to a majority.

Quite frankly, at least one of our leaders is threatening about this process, that we should not be allowed to offer amendments because it is uncomfortable. We are Members of Congress. We have a right. Not all of us are on a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, on the full Committee on Appropriations or its subcommittees. Some of us are on authorizing committees or on the Committee on the Budget. We would like to have the ability to come here and at least question.

I will vote for some amendments. I am voting against some amendments. I am going to vote on the end bill. But I do not think it is fair when the attacks come to the floor and they are aimed at a generic, hey, this is an attack on agriculture, this Member is trying to tie up the House.

It sounds to me like, thou dost protest too much. If there are particulars that Members want to defend, come down and defend the particulars, because Members should be able to. There are plenty of reasons; even if it sounds embarrassing on some of these research projects, there are scientific reasons why we are the best agricultural Nation in the world.

If we do not do this research and if we let this get caught up in whether or not somebody had an inside deal, if someone's project cannot stand the light of day, if their research project in their district cannot stand the light of C-Span in this national debate, then it should not be in the bill. Members should be down here defending it, as the subcommittee chairman did.

I commend my friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma, for challenging the structure; for making sure that each part of this bill can either be defended or not defended. I stand with him today because I think it is a healthy process for the United States Congress.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. Let me just say, in reference to something the earlier speaker said, when we do not follow regular order, which means when we do not come to the subcommittee and the full committee and do not make views known, and then try to come to the floor and repair it, that is not regular order.

Regular order is making Members' wishes known to the committee as we go through the regular process, because we have to deal with 435 Members.

Now let me say, in reference specifically to this amendment, which is global climate change, in terms of global climate change, this is not a project that will be done in this Member's district. I know it will not be done in the chairman's district. But there is no issue more important to agriculture in this country and in the world than climate.

I can remember one time walking into the office of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), the ranking member on the Committee on Agriculture, and he was watching television. But what was he watching? He was watching the weather as he was marking up one of the major authorizing bills for agriculture in this country.

I kind of laughed, because the sound was not on. I said, Charlie, what are you really doing? He said, you know how important weather is.

With changes in global climate, just a little bit of melt in any of the poles causes a change in the currents and the water. We have major research going on in terms of genetics, to try to make plants grow in deserts or where there is lack of rainfall.

What about when we have major changes in climate, which happen at the edges, they certainly do, and how we get plant life to survive in those circumstances?

What about the oceans? What about trying to do more in the way of production out of saltwater?

There are all kinds of issues that we deal with relative to the globe and relative to climate. There is nothing more important for us to know about.

Frankly, the Department of Agriculture is the department that farmers trust. They are not going to trust, with all due respect to the Environmental Protection Agency, but it has had a different view of what is in the air and a different perspective on climate.

But in terms of plant life and animal life, the research depository and the intelligence is stored at the Department of Agriculture. We make it available to our farmers in the field through the modern wonders of technology, and frankly, we help the farmers of the world to the best of our ability feed the people of their own country.

So I think to make any recommendation to eliminate this line item is certainly backwards looking.

I would just say, and I am sorry that the gentleman left the floor, but I will bring it up again when he returns, if in fact he has a problem with special grants under the Cooperative State Research Extension and Education Service, I would recommend that the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) eliminate the grants that he asked for. In fact, I will list just three of them, totaling over \$691,000.

We have a letter in our possession that was sent to one of the Members in

our committee in which the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) asks for assistance to the State of Oklahoma, and asks for targeted line item funding through the agricultural appropriations bill.

We do not have any discrimination against Oklahoma. We want to help Oklahoma. They include the following.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) specifically asked that those be offsets. That is the heart of the matter that he is dealing with here today, and that is the issue of offsetting versus not. So I think every Member of Congress—

Ms. KAPTUR. I would reclaim my time and just say that the point is that the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) put three projects in this bill. There are actually five projects he put in the bill, totalling well over \$1 million. My feeling is that if he wants to eliminate \$1 million from the bill, let him eliminate the projects for Oklahoma.

Frankly, this Member would not eliminate projects for Oklahoma, but let me say what the projects are:

Expanding wheat pasture research, \$285,000; integrated production systems for horticulture crops, \$180,000; preservation and processing research for fruits and vegetables, \$226,000. That is just \$691,000 for those three projects alone under the very account that he is now trying to cut for global climate research, which affects every farmer in this country and their future.

So I would just say that I think the gentleman is maybe not quite knowledgeable enough about these accounts, because in fact, why would he add funding to a bill and to a set of accounts that he is trying to cut? Why would he not cut his own projects, rather than trying to cut a project that deals with the entire Nation's needs?

My apologies to the State of Oklahoma, because they deserve a voice here. I would not have recommended that their particular projects be cut. But the fact is the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) sent a letter.

THE CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) has expired.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 30 seconds.

THE CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

THE CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would just pick up on our last conversation. That is, it

seems to me fundamentally that the idea that the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and others on this House floor are trying to get at is not the idea of should we disenfranchise people within any of our respective congressional districts, but simply the idea of should we offset spending that takes place in the government.

As the gentleman has consistently stated, his struggle is not so much with the agricultural bill, but the larger process we find ourselves in. That is a process headed towards a train wreck.

I would say this, there was an earlier comment talking about how anybody who would offer amendments to this bill was basically one teeing off on agriculture. I want to associate my words with those of the gentleman from Indiana, because that is absolutely not the case.

If Members simply think about the contrast that exists, when I think about the average farmer back home, he is getting up before sunrise, he is maybe having a cup of coffee in a fairly simple room in the back of his house, he is getting in a pick-up truck, he is going off, getting in a Massey Ferguson or John Deere tractor, and he is spending the day outside in the field. He ends up coming back covered with dust. That is one picture.

We have another picture of somebody getting up and getting, let us say, in a Volkswagen Jetta or a Rabbit, going off to the administration buildings for agriculture here, and spending their day here. Those are very different days.

The bulk of these amendments have been about trying to do something about this huge and bloated bureaucracy that happens to exist within the Department of Agriculture here in Washington, D.C. To me, when we think about the idea of downsizing government, with the Department of Agriculture we have over 100,000 employees, we have 80,000 contract employees. That works out to be one agriculture employee for every 10 farmers.

Most of the farmers that I talk to are real independent folks. They are hard-working folks. The idea of them needing a handholder or a babysitter to sort of accompany them, or at least to report on them, throughout the day is not something that makes common sense.

One of the amendments that the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) offered yesterday was in fact a proposal to cut simply 12 percent from an increase in administration here in Washington. That seems to be sensible to farmers that I talked to.

Another had been to cut \$400,000 from the Under Secretary of Agriculture. Mr. Chairman, why the Under Secretary of Agriculture needs another \$400,000 does not quite fit with, again, the hard and simple lives that I see for so many farmers back home.

Another amendment had been to trim \$26 million from space planning;

not actually construction of buildings, but just planning on space for the future.

Again, these amendments have made sense when we look at the contrast that exists between the life that the farmer leads and the life that somebody in Washington leads working, for instance, for the Department of Agriculture.

As to this amendment in particular, as has already been indicated, there are a whole number of different projects around this country, and in fact, I sit on the Committee on Science, and there are a number of projects related to ultraviolet research.

So the issue here is this \$1 million is duplication. It represents one 100th of 1 percent of the overall agriculture budget, and to say that it will cripple the agriculture budget is not exactly the case. It goes back to the heart of what these amendments have been all about.

I have here a letter from Ms. Evelyn Alford, born in 1924. She writes me from Johns Island, South Carolina: "It really is frightening when one thinks about what the Federal Government can get away with. If the politicians would keep their hands out of the social security fund and use it for what it was originally intended for there wouldn't be a problem with the fund. The government takes money from us and tells us that the money is designated for one thing and they use it for something else. Isn't there a word for that?"

And a P.S., please read this letter. Ms. Alford, I read the letter.

This is what these amendments have been all about. They have been about trying to prevent a train wreck that is most certainly headed our way if we do not adopt the proposals of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

Because as we all know, while agriculture has stayed within the caps, Labor-HHS, there is no way we are going to come up with \$5 billion worth of trimming in that account; VA-HUD, over \$3 billion worth of trimming in that account.

Unless we come up with savings now, we are headed for a train wreck later on.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I came down to the floor with great respect for my colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN). But I would say to the gentleman that I understand that this committee has met its 302(b) allocation; we are on mark, they met their budget.

As I was listening to this debate, I thought that I would come down to discuss with my colleagues one of the programs that my friend's amendment will cut. I think it is important to know that these programs are not just some programs that are out there that

no one knows about and that are not having an impact.

The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) is indiscriminately attacking important programs in this bill without much discussion about the impact of his proposed cuts. I want to take a moment to talk about the program that the gentleman is attacking with this amendment.

The Cornell University Program on Breast Cancer and Environmental Risk Factors was launched in 1995, and responds to the abnormally high incidence of breast cancer in New York.

□ 1200

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that we are on is an amendment on UV research for \$1 million. We have not attacked breast cancer research.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman have a point of order?

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is, the discussion is not about the amendment at hand. It is not germane to the amendment at hand.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, if I may respond to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), it is my understanding that it is the same account, and the gentleman's amendment will cut indiscriminately that account.

Mr. Chairman, if I may proceed, I would like to discuss another item in that account, because it will be impacted.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate must be relevant to the matter before the Committee. The Chair finds that the debate so far has been so.

The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) may continue.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that this will impact the project. I think it is important for my colleagues to know that the Cornell University program on breast cancer and environmental risk factors was launched in 1995 in response to the abnormally high incidence of breast cancer in New York.

The program investigates the link between risk factors in the environment like chemicals and pesticides and breast cancer. The BCERF, which it is called, takes scientific research on breast cancer, translates it into plain English materials that are easy to understand, and disseminates this information to the public.

They have a web site that is filled with information on BCERF's activities, breast cancer statistics, scientific analyses, and environmental risk factors and links to other sources of information. They sponsor discussion groups that provide a public forum to discuss breast cancer. This amendment

will destroy our ability to bring the important work of the BCERF program to more people around New York and around the country.

Let me make this very simple, Mr. Chairman, if my colleagues oppose efforts to educate the public about breast cancer, if they think they have done enough to prevent breast cancer in this country, then vote yes on this amendment.

But if my colleagues agree with me that we need to do more about stopping the terrible scourge of breast cancer in this country, if they agree with me that they cannot sit idly by while one in eight women are diagnosed with breast cancer over the course of their lifetimes, if it outrages them that approximately 43,000 women will die from breast cancer and 175,000 women will be diagnosed with breast cancer this year alone, then join me in voting no on this terribly misguided amendment.

My colleagues, these are just some of the materials that they distribute, avoiding exposure to household pesticides, protective clothing, safe use and storage of hazardous household products, pesticides, and breast cancer risks and evaluations, and on and on and on.

Mr. Chairman, we all want to spend money wisely. We all understand that the hard-earned dollars of taxpayers should not be distributed willy-nilly. But the gentleman from New Mexico (Chairman SKEEN), the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), our ranking member, have worked very hard to keep the numbers in this budget within their budget allocation.

I think it is very important that we not get misled by the desire to cut and balance our budget, because we all want to spend wisely. But we have to look at what these potential cuts will do, what kind of impact they will have on the lives of our constituents.

That is why, as I was sitting in my office, I decided to come down here. This is the kind of impact that this unwise, foolish cut will make.

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Missouri for yielding to me.

What the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) does not know is my sister has breast cancer. My closest cousin just died from breast cancer. If the gentlewoman will look at this amendment, we do not cut total research. We cut a million dollars out of it, as the chairman just said, because we did not cut the total dollars. We redirected the money in there. This \$1 million will say that \$1 million cannot go for this, but the total number was not cut in our amendment. The chairman made that point earlier.

I treat women, as the gentlewoman from New York very much knows. Breast cancer is a great concern for me. I do not believe that the gentlewoman's intention was to say that I was not concerned about breast research, because I am.

If my colleagues will look at the amendment and how it is actually written, it is written to cut this spending, but does not cut the total and allows the committee to spend that money elsewhere.

So the question is, we did not, in fact, attempt to cut that research. We attempted to withdraw an amendment after we had a discussion on total research.

I want to take this time to answer another question that the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) brought up in trying to say that I sought funding. I very carefully worded a letter to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK).

I want to read very carefully the wording in it, because here is what I do with the research universities that come to my office. When they ask for money, I ask them, where are they going to get the money.

Then I sent a letter to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. Istook), and I said, "They wish to receive funding." Then I said, "What support do you plan to give for that funding?"

The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) represents this university as well. My promise to that group of university leaders was, I said, I would ask if he would do it. I did not make a request for funding.

The other thing that most of the chairmen in the Committee on Appropriations will tell my colleagues is that when I make a specific request for something that I want funded, I send with it a request for something that I want cut. If my colleagues would kindly check with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) on the bills, things that I have asked.

So I want to make very clear that I support breast cancer research, that I support NIH research, that I support the research. But I want to make clear again, a million dollar grant on UV research at one university on ultraviolet radiation has little to do with global change, one.

Number two, we are spending millions and millions and millions of dollars on this same subject in other areas. It is my feeling, as a prerogative, as a Member, to say this: I think that money can be spent better and elsewhere.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. EMERSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN). It is my understanding that the amendment of the

gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) will cut \$1 million from the research account. This research project for breast cancer is within that account. In fact, if his amendment will not cut from that account, then I am not sure what we are doing here debating it.

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I yield again to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment cuts \$1 million from one specific account, but does not cut it from the total account, because we did not lower the total amount in the research. Had we done that, we would have intended to cut the total amount. So it still leaves the money there.

Actually what it does is, it offsets \$13 million that was taken last night by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), out of research, which we did not get, we had a voice vote on and not a recorded vote on, and actually makes \$1 million of that go back into general research.

So the gentlewoman from New York misstates the true facts of the amendment.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman from Missouri would yield, based upon the information I have, I believe the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) has distorted the response, or there is a misunderstanding here between people on this committee. But it is my understanding that the gentleman's amendment does come from the special research account and that this breast cancer project is within that special research account.

Therefore, although the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) has supported it, and I thank him, our gracious chairman, and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) has supported it, it will have an impact in this project.

So, Mr. Chairman, there must be a misunderstanding here. Because on the one hand, it will cut; on the other hand, it will not have any impact.

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say very specifically that I believe that they are mistakenly pointing this out. What this amendment really does is it will eliminate the million dollars and allow \$1 million to go back into the general research against the \$13 million losses.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say, in the furtherance of explaining and giving clarity to what is intended and what is written, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and

Drug Administration, and Related Agencies.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me, and I wanted to clarify a couple of matters here for the RECORD in terms of this amendment.

First of all, the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) is to page 13, line 11, which reads: \$62,916,000 for special grants for agricultural research. The gentleman's amendment proposes to eliminate \$1 million from that account. Am I correct in reading the gentleman's amendment? That is exactly what the gentleman's amendment states, page 13 line 11.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. CLAYTON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, if my colleagues will turn the page to page 14, they will see that we did not amend the total amount of research. Therefore, the million dollars is reduced in that one area, but the total amount of research is left the same. My colleagues will notice, on line 19, on page 14, that we did not amend \$467,327,000.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman from North Carolina will further yield, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN). That gets to my very point that he amends line 11, page 13, out of the special grant category. The project of the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) is in the special grant category.

I wanted to get back to the letter that the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) sent to the committee back on March 4. I am very glad that the gentleman brought it up himself here on the floor, because his letter says that Oklahoma State University met with him. They did not meet with another member of the committee.

Through that meeting, the gentleman learned about the specific projects, and then I quote from the gentleman's letter, "They have targeted to get line item funding through the Agriculture Appropriations bill this coming spring." This is the bill. This is the time we are talking about.

The next paragraph goes through five different projects. The last paragraph the gentleman from Oklahoma says, "They wish to receive funding," this is what he says to another member of the committee, "in a line item form." The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) even tells them how he wants it, for each one; each one of the projects, he means. Then the gentleman says, "And I wanted to inquire as to what support you plan to give them in regards to these projects as they progress through the Committee on Appropriations."

I will tell my colleagues, when I receive a letter from a Member, and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr.

COBURN) did not send this particular letter to me, I would take it that when the gentleman lists which projects he wants on behalf of his university, that is a request for funds.

So, therefore, if this is not a request for funds, I go back to my original proposal to the gentleman, because I understand he wants to cut funds, why not take the special grants that he has asked for, \$285,000 for expanded wheat pasture, \$180,000 for integrated production systems for horticulture crops, and \$226,000 for preservation and processing research for fruits and vegetables, which total \$691,000, and let us eliminate those first.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman from North Carolina further yield?

Mrs. CLAYTON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, first of all, this was not sent to the Committee on Appropriations. This was sent, one letter, to another Member asking his status on those projects.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman from North Carolina will further yield, which committee is that gentleman on?

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will continue to yield, he is on the Committee on Appropriations, but he is also from Oklahoma, and he also would have to support that, should that come.

When I make a request, and please go and look at my request, I specifically request things that I ask for. I mean what I say and say what I mean; I think the gentlewoman knows that. I am very cautious with how I do it.

I want to answer one other point. We made legislative history when I specifically asked this amendment to take \$1 million for a specific amendment. So that means no money is going to come out of breast cancer research; it is going to come out of that one specific amendment.

I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) for yielding to me.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will continue to yield, let me say to the gentleman from Oklahoma, I take it, then, he does not wish to support the Oklahoma State University's request for these ongoing research projects. I think that the gentleman's representative from the Committee on Appropriations should know that from the State of Oklahoma. I hope that the people from the University of Oklahoma also would know that.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman from North Carolina yield? I just want to answer the last statement, if I may.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman, if he can do it briefly.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I will be happy to support Oklahoma State re-

search for that only if they can help me cut some spending from somewhere else.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) has a chance to respond, I hope he will respond as if he has written the amendment, if indeed it is designated not to come off the general special grant, because as it is written, it is not what his intentions are. The gentleman's intentions, as he stated, giving him the benefit of the doubt, he does not plan for it to come from cancer, but the result of his action means it will come from cancer.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

The question was taken; and the chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 185, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) will be postponed.

□ 1215

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SANFORD

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SANFORD:
Page 13, line 11, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$5,136,000)".

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a very simple amendment. All it does is decrease research in education by \$5,136,000 for wood utilization research. These are specific grants to seven States, basically throughout the Southeast.

The real question that has to be asked with an amendment like this, and with wood utilization overall, is who does it best. If we think that the Federal Government, through grants to universities and private interests, is the best place to figure out where best to utilize wood, then my colleagues will want to vote against this amendment. If, however, we think private enterprise, free enterprise might be more capable at determining where and how wood utilization research ought to take place, then I think my colleagues will want to vote for this amendment.

I happen to have a lot of experience in terms of wood utilization. I grew up on a family farm down south of Charleston. My dad died when I was in college and we converted the farm from basically a row crop and from cattle to pine trees. So over the course of my life, my brothers and I have been out behind a tractor, either mechanically or by hand, planting pine trees, throughout our whole life. And that has given me a lot of experience in this world.

Because with improved loblollies down in the Southeast, a first thin can

be had in 12 years. Now, improved loblollies did not come as a result of wood utilization research grants. In fact, \$45 million has been granted in this category since 1985. It came about because people like Westvaco, people like Georgia Pacific, people like Union Camp were going out and doing research on what would create the fastest growing loblolly or slash pine down in the Southeast.

Now, what we have in that part of the world are people like Joe Young. Joe Young is an independent timber producer based in Georgetown, South Carolina. And I would ask somebody like Joe Young if he thinks \$5 million ought to be spent on wood utilization research or does he think that he, with folks running skidders, folks out in the woods, would have a better idea of, for instance, harvesting the woods. We have people at Union Camp or Georgia Pacific, we have a big plant, actually a Westvaco plant in north Charleston, South Carolina, and the people there put literally millions of dollars each year into basically wood utilization research and coming up with the best ways to mill wood, the best ways to get wood from the stump to the home place.

So this is an amendment that is largely a philosophical amendment about where do we think this kind of research takes place best. If we think it takes place best with government, through a Department of Ag grant, then we will want to vote against the amendment. If we think otherwise, we ought to vote for it.

Going back to what this money would do, because again I go back to the original premise behind this series of amendments that the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and others are offering, what this amendment is about is simply saying do we want to borrow from Social Security to pay for \$5 million worth of wood utilization research; or, if we do not want to think about it in terms of Social Security, we can think about it with competing interests in agriculture itself.

This \$5 million would buy 250 tractors for farmers across the country. This \$5 million would pay the taxes for 2,500 farmers for their taxes on a family farm for 1 year. This \$5 million would buy about 500,000 bags of fertilizer for farmers across the country. And what I hear from farmers that I talk to is, if given the choice between an abstract grant that is already being handled by the private sector and money that could actually go to a farmer, they say they would take the second option.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The special research grant that this amendment proposes to eliminate is described in detail in part four of the committee's hearing record on page

1612. The following is a brief description of the research performed under this grant, and I will read from this:

"This research includes developing processes to upgrade low quality wood so it is suitable for higher value structural applications, catalyzing the formation of new business enterprises, and reducing environmental impact while improving systems for timber harvesting and forest products manufacturing."

Grants for this work have been reviewed annually and they have been awarded each year since 1985. There are eight locations where the work is performed: Oregon State University, Mississippi State University, Michigan State University, University of Minnesota-Duluth, North Carolina State University, University of Maine, University of Tennessee, and the University of Idaho.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good project and it deserves the support of all Members. I support the project and I oppose the gentleman's amendment to eliminate it.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COBURN. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I just want to follow up again on what I have actually seen in the field, because our family actually grows pine trees. And when I talk to people like Joe Young, they used to go out there with a chain saw and cut the wood. Now they have a thing called a feller-buncher, basically a cutter set up on top of a four wheel drive tractor that moves around through the woods.

But these guys out in the woods, without government research grants, without government money, they are able to figure out how best to cut a tree rather than some researcher from the Department of Agriculture in Washington, D.C. telling them how.

Mr. COBURN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, again I would make the point that the purpose of this amendment does not cut overall research; rather it allows that money to go for something that we would deem to be more productive.

Again, I would come back to something I said earlier. There is no question that our Agriculture Committee on Appropriations came in under the 302(b), and I have heard that thrown up several times. But the people who are bringing that point to the floor have to say if they are going to support the 302(b) for agriculture, they have to support the 302(b) for Labor, HHS and Education. We all want to fund education at a higher level, and we are not one of us are going to tolerate a \$5 billion cut in Labor, HHS.

So to use the claim that we met the 302(b) when it was set at a high level,

none of the amendments that have been offered thus far have directly taken money away from America's farmers. Not one. Not one amendment has been offered that takes money away from American farmers. What it does is it takes away money from people who are on the gravy train and on the line, that take money out of this budget.

If we care about American farmers, as the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) said, then we have an obligation to make sure that there is nothing in this bill that could not be spent better elsewhere. Our American farmers know how to do it. And they know if we will get the resources to them, and if we will direct it down to their level, that they will continue to lead the world in terms of research.

I would also make the point that if we make the claim we are within the 302(b), then we are certainly going to support a \$3.8 billion cut to housing and our veterans. There is not going to be a Member in this body that will support a \$3.8 billion cut to veterans and our housing.

So to claim that this process is working because this committee is under the 302(b) or is within the 302(b) is not an honest representation of where we are going with this process. And it is okay, if we all will admit that this process is going to end with us spending \$40 or \$50 billion of Social Security money. We all voted to say we would not do that, and yet we are on a train that is going that way.

So, yes, it is a process, and it is a process that is going to end up in this body not keeping its word to the American public about their Social Security dollars. That is why I am insistent on these amendments. That is why I am insistent on us persisting and looking at every aspect of this bill that does not do what it is intended to do for our farmers.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, Ohio, my own State, is a very large forested State, and though this particular proposal for wood utilization research does not impact us directly, I think indirectly it impacts us as well as every other State in the Union, and I thought I would read some of the accomplishments of the research that has been done under this program.

Truly, one of the issues we face as a country is a need to provide wood product as well as fibrous product for various building needs and industrial needs, and yet those hardwoods that we used to have are really becoming extinct. In fact, we even have other committees here that deal with ancient forests, trying to save some of the last trees that we have in certain stands, and yet we still have to continue building homes, we have to replace what used to be wood with other products.

I am sure if Members have seen some of the new homes being built around the country, they even use these laminated products where they take wood chips and put glues in it in order to create the fiberboard that is used. In some places we are growing sugar cane and other types of cane products and figuring out how to take the moisture out of them and laminate them and use them for wood construction, or what looks like wood but really is not.

The new knowledge that is gained through this research program has been conducted through six centers around our country. Let me just read some of the new types of products that they have been able to bring to market.

The design of glued laminated beams that are reinforced with plastics saves up to 25 to 40 percent of the wood fiber that would otherwise have to be used in that construction. So even our forests, and our privately-owned forests are not growing fast enough to meet the needs that we have domestically and internationally.

In addition to this, they have been working on technology to apply those wood preservatives, using superfluids to reduce the environmental problems associated with present commercial treatments. When they put on these laminates and these various glues, this is a very difficult industrial process and they have been working on that.

They have been working at better harvesting systems that are efficient and environmentally acceptable. Easy to say, hard to do.

They have been looking at the increase of wood machining speeds and the reduction of saw blade widths to increase productivity and save raw material itself. The world of the 21st century and the new millennium will be one of shrinking natural resources and trying to use what we have in wiser ways.

They have been working on a patented system to apply pressure and vibration to prevent the enzymatic sap stain which degrades hardwood lumber by \$70 to \$200 million a year. I know that because I have a little coffee table in my house, and I cannot get that sap to stop staining up through the covering that is on it. We need to find scientific answers to that so that wood can be fully utilized.

They have been doing research on the reduction of the quantity of wood bleaching chemicals needed by wood pulp producers. In other words, to try to be more environmentally conscious.

They have been working on the design and strength of wood furniture frames to minimize wood requirements. The wood being used today in furniture, if we were to take everything apart that used to use wood, we would be surprised at how that has

been minimized. In States like Michigan, States like Ohio, where many industries use this new research, it has been immediately adapted.

Also, they have been using the adoption of European frame saw technology to composite lumber to provide a new raw material source for industry. It is very interesting to look at some of the layered wood products that have been used across our country. Some of the glues did not work originally. Now they are doing much better at that, where we are using just the top coating is actual wood and what is underneath is various types of composite products.

So I would say that this is extremely important. We are one of the largest forested nations in the world. We are having trouble with many of our softwoods, bringing them to market. People do not just want to live on plastic, they do like the feel and look of wood, and many of these wood utilization scientific studies and undertakings do have a direct commercial market application.

So I just wanted to put that on the record, and I would support the chairman in his opposition to this amendment.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Once again I want to state that I actually favor increased agricultural research, and having grown up in the furniture industry, as well as understanding a lot of this, I am not even sure I am going to vote for this amendment. I am listening to the debate on it.

But I want to make an additional point, and that is there have been a number of comments about the amendment process and how we, in fact, as Members learn.

□ 1230

I am on seven different subcommittees. The idea that I am going to sit in every single appropriations subcommittee and listen as every single proposal comes up, to hear all the background, is ridiculous.

What we have as a Member, the only option when we get the final bill, unless it is a high-profile event, is to deal with it after we get the appropriations bill, if we are lucky enough to get the appropriations bill before we vote, to look at it and see if there is anything here, if this bill exceeds the budget caps, that we believe should be looked at and debated on the House floor. And that is, in fact, what we are going through.

There are Members who are proposing that we are supposed to sit, as though we do not have other committees, on every single debate item. Now, presumably, if the committee has done its work well, and the subcommittee, they will be able to defend particular things.

But I have another concern and that is that one point that has been made on this floor seems to resonate a lot with me. And that is that agriculture, while I do not believe it is being picked on in the nature of all the bills, guess what the only bill that Members of Congress cannot reduce is? It is our own branch appropriations.

We are not allowed to come to the floor and offer amendments to reduce expenditures on Congress because we might micromanage Congress. Now, we are allowed to come to the floor to micromanage other agencies under House rules. But under the Democrats and under the Republicans, we are not allowed to come to the floor and do our own.

The reason this becomes important is because we keep hearing about these allocations to committee and how agriculture, which in fact has been very reasonable and stayed pretty much on an even keel in the budget, is getting battered in this process here, at least debated. But some, like Labor HHS, where our education and health expenditures are, have a \$5 billion reduction coming.

We all know that that is not going to happen. At a time of school violence and the pressures we have on education in America, we are not going to reduce it by \$5 billion.

And the Department of the Interior, our national parks and environment questions, is getting reduced by 18.7 percent in these great 302(b) allocations we are hearing.

But guess what? The Members of Congress are going to get a 7.3 percent increase for their personal offices. Members of Congress are going to get a 5.6 percent increase for their committees. In fact, the Committee on Appropriations is going to get a 14.9 percent increase, meaning the committees are going to get a 7 percent increase.

And the leadership is going to get an 8.4 percent increase, plus the 660,000 they got in the supplemental bill, meaning they are going to get an 11.7 percent increase.

When we come with 302(b) allocations that propose unrealistic cuts in environment and education, but have increases in it for this House, for our personal offices, for the committees, for the leadership, and then tell the Members of this House that we can amend everybody else's bills to reduce expenditures, but we cannot reduce the expenditures on ourselves, I believe we have a problem here.

We are starting to act in many ways like the Congresses before us. I ran in 1994 because I wanted to see a change. Part of the debate we are hearing in the appropriations process and the patience we are hearing from the subcommittee chairmen and the committee chairmen have been magnanimous as we worked through Labor HHS and other things over the last few years. And we need to have this debate.

But I am very concerned about double standards being put on the Committee on Appropriations vis-a-vis legislative branch appropriations and letting that go up but telling them they have to meet these unrealistic caps in many of the other subcommittees, particularly when we all know that at the tail end we are likely to bump into this so-called train wreck in the supplemental.

So I think we best not talk about whether somebody is in their 302(b). The subcommittee chairman has no choice but to work with that number. But, in fact, this debate is far beyond the 302(b)s because they are not realistic. And there is no way to illustrate that better than that Members of Congress and their personal offices are getting 5.6 percent, that Members of Congress will get 7.3 percent for their personal offices, the committees will get 7 percent, the leadership gets 11.7 percent, but these same allocations are reducing education by \$5 billion, education and health and Interior, by 18 percent.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOUDER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman made a reference to the point this it is not this subcommittee's fault, because there are unrealistic allocation numbers given through the budget process to each of the committees.

Could the gentleman tell me who produced those numbers, then, that he is objecting to?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SOUDER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman is correct. It was not the Democratic side of the aisle that produced these unrealistic expectations.

Many of us have concerns, as the gentleman from Oklahoma has pointed out, that these things should be done in an independent and bipartisan way. When we think our leadership is wrong, we will speak up, as when we think her leadership is wrong.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOUDER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I guess, as one ranking member on one of the 13 subcommittees, we did our work and we produced a bill under the mark we were given. As my colleague can imagine, we feel somewhat troubled by the fact that we have been dragged out to the floor here, now 2 days, with every line item picked apart when, in fact, we produced a bill under the rules we

were told to play by. And I guess we do not really understand why this is being fought out on the House floor.

Mr. Chairman, is this their only measure to bring it to us? Can my colleagues not do it in their own caucus?

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, we in fact have been bringing it up. And our leadership, as my colleague well knows, has a very small majority and it is very difficult to work out. And when we cannot work it out, we have no choice but to bring it to the full Congress and debate it bill by bill.

Agriculture has the misfortune of being the first bill up. My colleagues have basically stayed almost at a flat freeze. And the argument here is not with agriculture in particular, but the process. I believe we ought to air this through the entire process because the numbers are going to be greater variations in the future subcommittees than they are in agriculture.

But agriculture was picked because it was supposed to be the least controversial. And what the American people are seeing and the Speaker is seeing and the Members of the House are, even this bill is controversial because it is a test of where we are going as far as our budget process and how we can try to reach those goals.

But once again, I want to agree with the basic statement of my colleague. The problem is that we have unrealistic 302(b)s and my colleagues did indeed in their subcommittee stay within that, but that the overall category is fallacious and that is what we need to bring out.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am here today to voice my support for the efforts to adhere to a freeze, to not increase spending this year.

I empathize with the comments that my colleague has made and the difficulty that we are having in working some of these issues out through our own leadership. But I think that, as we have taken a look and heard the rhetoric in Washington this year, the President talking about saving 62 or 68 percent of Social Security, Republicans talking about 100 percent of Social Security, and I think we really believe that this is the year and this is the opportunity where we can move forward and have a surplus not only on the back of Social Security, but taking Social Security out of the equation and have a balance in our general fund, that that is the appropriate and the best way for us to go.

It really then lays the foundation for us to move forward effectively and aggressively into the future, to start addressing some of our real priorities that we need to be looking at as we move into the new millennium.

We need to be taking a look at paying down a portion of our debt. We need

to be taking a look at reducing the tax burden on American families. The only way that we are going to be able to address those issues is if we hold the line on spending. And the only place that we can hold the line on spending is through the appropriations process, and that is why we are here and that is why this debate, as well as the 12 other appropriations bills, that is why the debate on each of those issues is so critical, because it sets the foundation for saving Social Security, for reforming Social Security, for saving and reforming Medicare, and then to move forward towards paying down the debt and reducing the tax burden on the American people.

I want to talk a little bit on this issue for just a second. I came out of the furniture business. I worked in the office furniture industry. I worked for the second largest manufacturer of office furniture in America. I have three of the largest office furniture companies either in my district or very close to my district, and I have got a lot of smaller office furniture manufacturers, many of them who use wood products. I am not sure that they need or want the government to direct or fund this research.

As a matter of fact, we were just up in the Committee on Rules, and I told my colleagues what they really want is, they would rather not have us fund this research; what they really want to have is, they want to have the ability to compete.

The amendment that we brought up in the Committee on Rules goes to an industry like this and says they cannot compete for business with the Federal Government. It is kind of interesting that we are saying we are going to give them \$5 to \$6 million to be more competitive, but at the same time, whatever they—earn—learn, they cannot compete for business with the Federal Government.

Why is that? Because their largest competitor in the Federal Government for Federal Government business is Federal prison industries. Federal prison industries make \$200 to \$300 million worth of office furniture each and every year.

So I am sure that the office furniture business would say, let us not worry about the subsidies, let us move back to free market enterprise; and that they will take care of their own research, they will take care of new developments, new technologies, breakthrough technologies, they will fund that. Just give us the opportunity to compete for Federal Government business. We will more than earn our return in terms of profit and at the same time give the Federal Government a better quality product on a better delivery schedule and at a lower price.

So I think that gets to be a very interesting kind of a trade-off. And I think it just shows us one of the ways

that we can actually hold the line on Federal spending here in Washington where everybody can win and nobody really gets out.

So those are the priorities that I have.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I want to make two points because I think a lot of people have heard the word "302(b)."

When we pass a budget, we give an allocation of a certain amount to each of 13 spending bills, and that amount of money is what can be spent.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to finish the discussion so the people who are watching this debate will understand that that number is arbitrarily assigned, and when it is assigned in such a way that means that we are going to spend Social Security dollars to run the government, when we should not, then it is an inappropriate assignment. So that is an amount of money that is given to each appropriations committee on what they can spend.

The final point that I would make is that 10 hours of debate on \$61 billion worth of the taxpayers' money is not too little debate. As a matter of fact, it is not enough. And I find very peculiar, to use the word of the gentleman from Michigan, that we would be worried about discussing out in front of the American public where we are spending their money. And 10 hours of debate, which is what we have had thus far on this \$61 billion, I think is far too little.

So I find it peculiar that we do not want the light of sunshine to come on what we are doing.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, if I may, I just wanted to come to the floor to discuss all of this because I have some views on this that may be a little bit different than what we have heard. I support the particular amendment, as I have a number of these amendments, with respect to reductions.

I have a tremendous amount of respect for the chairman of the committee and for the work that the staff has done. I think they have actually worked hard on this. But I have a huge problem with the way that we are managing the finances of the country today. I am not talking about just here in the House. I am not talking about the House and the Senate. I am talking about the House, the Senate, and the White House and the President of the United States.

It is my judgment that there are sufficient revenues on hand today to do

virtually everything that I have heard the people think needs to be done; that is, to help rescue the Social Security and/or Medicare systems; to make our expenditures proper, particularly in the areas of defense and education and other areas that we agree need a great deal of help, as well as agriculture, I might add; to live well within a balanced budget circumstance, and probably frankly to be able to have a tax cut.

□ 1245

But somehow we have gotten tied into the 302(a) allocation and the 302(b) allocations. Everyone is unwilling to talk about doing anything different. Nobody is willing to get together to sit down and say, "What are we going to do?"

I can tell you exactly what we are going to do. We might pass this particular bill and a number of the other appropriations bills, but we are going to end up with at least five of these bills, and maybe six or seven of them. We are going to have a train crash, and the train crash is going to be the same as the train crash we have had almost every year since I have been here.

Sometime along about November, we are going to be in a circumstance in which we are not able to get the others passed. We are going to get into an omnibus situation, we are then going to break the budget caps, we are probably going to spend about \$50 billion more than we should have spent otherwise because we did not sit down now and plan how we are going to manage the revenues and the budget of the United States.

A lot has happened in the last 2 years since we came to the balanced agreement. There are a lot more revenues on the table now. I believe that I am fiscally conservative, as are many Members here, but I also believe that we have to make decisions which are astute and which make some sense.

I think the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma is making some very good points here, not just individually on each of the amendments which he is presenting but on the basic concept of what we are doing. For that reason, I think that we have to start to think outside of the box on the finances of the United States.

I intend to take this up directly with the President, at least in the form of a letter, as well as with our leadership, to stress some of these points and to suggest that we are going down a road that we are not going to be able to complete and we are going to be casting votes here throughout the summer on a series of appropriations bills that are going to end up being very different when it comes to November. In a way it is a shame that somebody as distinguished as the present chairman is sort of at the brunt of the feelings of some of us who do not think the proper decisions are being made.

It is very simple. Why wait until the end, when virtually everybody agrees that probably we are going to break out of these budget caps and the allocations will probably change in some way or another? Why can we not get together now? Why can we not get together with the White House, which has a major voice in this, sit down and make the decisions and go from there?

That is what the people of the country want. They want our country managed well from a financial point of view and in a basically conservative way so that we are able to move forward. That is what I would like to do.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASTLE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Could I ask the gentleman to clarify something for me? I heard what he said and that he wants an honest budget process. Our subcommittee came in exactly as we were told on the mark we were given. He does not like the marks the subcommittees were given?

Mr. CASTLE. That is correct.

Ms. KAPTUR. What would make the gentleman happy? This process cannot make him happy. He is nit-picking a bill apart on the floor. What does he want?

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman is correct. I think that her subcommittee did fine. I have a problem with the allocations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) has expired.

(On request of Ms. KAPTUR, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CASTLE was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I believe that her subcommittee has done just fine based on the allocations which are there. My problem is that I do not think we can live with the budget caps which are there and get everything in that we are ultimately going to have to do in the course of this year.

You might be able to pass your particular appropriation bill, but, as I said, I think there are at least five and probably more than five, maybe six or seven which simply are not going to pass with these caps. You happen to be sort of in the upper end of that if you really look at it. You are not as high as Defense and a couple of others but you are in the top four or five. Therefore, you are probably in the best circumstance in terms of what you can do.

But if you look down through these, VA-HUD and a series of others, Labor-HHS in particular and Interior and some others simply are not going to make it in this circumstance. We are going to come to the end, then it will all get rolled together, we will do it in the form of an emergency bill, taking money away from Social Security and

other spending we could do; or we will roll it together in some sort of omnibus bill at the end of the year as we did last year with all kinds of extraneous spending.

Unfortunately, you suffer the brunt of the conclusions of people like me and maybe some others who approach you from a different point of view. But because of that we need to express ourselves and try to get the attention of people all over Washington to try to pull this together and come up with some resolution of the matter.

Ms. KAPTUR. But that is my question to the gentleman. Obviously there is a problem on your side of the aisle. What is the mechanism for you to solve that problem internal to your caucus without dividing us on this floor? You had a budget. You did 13 appropriation allocations. What went wrong?

Mr. CASTLE. Reclaiming my time, it is not, and I say this respectfully—I do not want to pick a political fight today particularly—it is not just on this side of the aisle. For example, the OMB director, Mr. Lew, has said he is going to slam Republicans today for deep, unwarranted cuts in funding, yet he will insist that the GOP resist the temptation to raise the budget caps this year. That is probably a strategy that maybe your side of the aisle will use as well.

The bottom line is it involves all of us. If we are going to resolve this problem, it involves all of us. Yes, I think my side of the aisle should be involved, they should go down to the White House, too, but we should all be talking about this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) has again expired.

(On request of Ms. KAPTUR, and by unanimous consent, Mr. Castle was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Ms. KAPTUR. I do not know what the White House has to do with this. The budget process is for us, the Budget Committee of the House, the Budget Committee of the other body. We do our budget, we get our allocations. What I do not understand, nobody has been able to explain to me in 2 days, if you do not agree with the budget allocations that have been given, why do you not go back and do the budget?

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), they were out here yesterday, they voted with the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) on the amendments that he brought up. And I am standing here thinking, "Wait a minute, they gave us the budget marks that we used in our committee, so now why are they voting against their own marks?" I do not understand. What is not working? Which committee is not working over there? The Budget Committee? They already did the work. They gave us the marks. How do we avoid what is going on here?

Does the gentleman understand my question?

Mr. CASTLE. I do understand your question. Reclaiming my time, I am going to try to answer your question.

The system of budgeting in this country in general has failed in many ways. I believe that the emergency appropriations, in which the White House was very involved, was a series of expenditures beyond what we should have done, cutting into what could have been used for Social Security and what could have been used for other spending. I believe that the omnibus bill that passed at the end of last year, and the President is involved in that, I am not saying it disrespectfully but the President is involved in that, was a bill which went well beyond any dollars that we should have spent in the course of the year because the President wanted to spend more.

I am cognizant of the fact that the President is going to want to spend more in my judgment by the end of this year. As I said, sometime in October or November, that is going to happen. The executive branch is always involved in decisions such as this. It is a political war going on. The White House is saying, "Don't break the budget caps." And the House and the Senate are saying, "Well, we're not going to break the budget caps."

But we are coming up with a methodology that is ultimately going to lead to that happening and it is going to have to happen at the end of the year. I do not think that is proper. I am not excusing what we are doing here, but I am also not going to say that the White House is not involved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) has again expired.

(On request of Ms. KAPTUR, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CASTLE was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. If the gentleman will yield further, I would forget the White House. My advice to your side of the aisle is: You have the majority. You do the budget you want to do. If you have got a problem with the other side over there, with the S-e-n-a-t-e, then deal with whatever that is. I do not know who is cutting the deals for you, but do not do this to our bill. I do not understand. The gentleman's party has the majority. You can produce whatever bill you want.

Mr. CASTLE. To suggest that the President of the United States should not be involved in the resolution of the spending of the United States, including the budget allocations, as well as all other decisions which are being made on Social Security and Medicare and tax cuts and whatever else we do, is to presume that the President is powerless. And this President is not powerless. The White House is a major player in this.

It is simply not just the prerogative of the majority here or even a majority and a minority together here. It is something that should be worked out with everybody sitting down to try to make a difference. I say that constructively. I do not say it in a political sense. I say it entirely constructively.

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

First of all, having only been here three terms, I do understand, though, the process with the budget, and the budget resolution is a document that is approved by both bodies of Congress and does not need to have the President of the United States' signature on it, and is a blueprint for then how the committees on appropriations should go about doing their work. It is at that point when the committees on appropriations are doing their work and working its way through Congress and approving those bills, they are sent on to the White House, and then the White House determines whether to veto it or sign it into legislation. So I do not want to get too far along in that discussion, but I thought it was appropriate for some of those that may not be as familiar with the process.

I want to thank the gentlewoman and also the chairman of the subcommittee for the work that they have done in achieving the budget resolution and levels that they were given by leadership and by the Committee on the Budget. I appreciate the work that they put into it.

I also appreciate the amendments by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and those that seek to address the issue of the budget overall in agriculture, because I think frankly it gives the agriculture community an opportunity to talk about agriculture. Sometimes in our country we just take agriculture for granted. We think it is a produce aisle at Shop 'N' Save or some large chain, but it is families out there that are working hard, trying to make ends meet and carrying on from one generation to another. A lot are participating in a 4H program and a lot of other activities throughout rural America that I think make the quality of life second to none.

I think though in proposing these amendments, and not being as familiar with the research that goes on at our land grant institutions, I wanted to come to the floor to better explain and to seek your understanding in regards to wood utilization research. Presently the State of Maine has an excess of over 22 million acres. The State of Maine has a small population and does not have a population base to be able to spend as much money on pavement as a lot of other States.

So in the State of Maine we have a very good research and development entity at the University of Maine, and they have been studying wood utiliza-

tion so that we would be able to use a lower grade wood with a laminate added to it to be able to be used in bridge construction. We are looking at being able to use an awful lot of that because in the islands and traveling around the State of Maine, it is one thing to make sure the roads are smooth but it is another thing to be able to get from here to there. If you do not have the proper bridge and the stress that goes with all of that, then you are not going to be able to do that. The research at the University of Maine is allowing that to happen.

It is also involved in doing environmental work to reduce the amount of chlorine that is used in processing. A lot of the wood that we do have in our State of Maine is of a higher grade and to be able to add value to that, we are creating a lot more in-State processing. By having a State which has natural resources be able to add value to those natural resources is reducing higher unemployment, which happens to be in more of the rural areas where we see a lot of our natural resources exported and processed elsewhere because of the processing that has been provided. We do not have that within our State and in a lot of rural States.

So by being able to have the technology and the research, now companies are lining up around that research to then add to the construction and reconstruction efforts, to add to the employment and additional employment of better paying jobs in a part of rural America and rural Maine where there is higher unemployment. This research does mean an awful lot to the people who are working in those areas.

At the same time, because of an environmental concern about the number of trees that get cut, by being able to add more value to what you are doing with your natural resources, you find yourself in a situation of not needing as many of those natural resources because of being able to add value on it. So that means that we have people who are not just out there cutting the trees to gain income but they are also working in the in-State processing and value added of that product to get a higher value out of it, better paying jobs and benefits. And more of that is occurring on our side of the border rather than on the other side of the border. So a lot of this research is being done and I think it is important.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACCI) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BALDACCI was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. BALDACCI. So I think it is important, though, because at first blush it may not have the understanding that it would by reading it. I think it is important that we do explain it, not only for those that may wonder about it but there may be others that have some

concern about it. I appreciate the opportunity and the work that has gone into this.

(On request of Mr. SANFORD, and by unanimous consent, Mr. BALDACCI was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BALDACCI. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I would agree, there certainly is a lot of valid research in any of the land grant colleges. My particular reason for offering this amendment, though, ties to part of the research goes, for instance, into better harvesting methods. Though Maine does not have the mosquitoes that South Carolina has, I know that you have a few mosquitoes in the summer.

The old saying is, necessity is the mother of invention. I cannot imagine a more resourceful person than that person laying under a logging truck or laying under a skidder, getting bit up by a mosquito—you have those—we call them dog ticks in South Carolina, they will be the size of your thumb coming at you. That person is going to be pretty resourceful in coming up with the quickest way to move a tree from a stump to a mill.

The reason for this amendment was not to in any way discount some of the valuable research that takes place but to say there is also some stuff that is probably extraneous and probably better done by the Joe Youngs of the world in Georgetown, South Carolina.

□ 1300

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Chairman, just gaining back an opportunity, I do appreciate that, and I would just like to say for public relations purposes the mosquitoes in Maine are not that big, even though they are called black flies, and so if my colleague is interested in coming to Maine rather than South Carolina, he can enjoy that.

The second thing is that what the gentleman has helped to do as a Member of Congress, and many other Members, is that now all of a sudden it just does not go out and the research is done through this money, but this money is matched by industry and by private support, and it is actually in collaboration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACCI) has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BALDACCI was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Chairman, last year the University of Maine received about 890,000 in Federal funds, matched with 500,000 in programs support, and industry provided in kind support an additional 250. So the collaboration is there, so it is not being just done by the university and by the money that is being provided here, it is a collaborative effort which has been forged, I

believe recently, which I think is going to lend more value because there is actually going to also be an economic gain from that.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDACCI. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to state for the record that the gentleman clarified something very important that I would like to put on the RECORD, and that is the industrial fund match in each of these centers: at Mississippi State, an average of \$783,458 for the last 5 years; Oregon State University, over \$670,000; Michigan State University, \$605,000, and the list goes on. We will submit it for the RECORD.

But the point is there are not only industry matches, there are also State matches. So this is truly a Federal, State, private sector cooperative program, and I thank the gentleman for coming to the floor.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) for his leadership on the floor and for holding this colloquy with me to clarify the Agriculture Research Service funding level for rainbow trout research.

Is it correct that the chairman's amendment offered in subcommittee markup provided that within the funds provided to the Agriculture Research Service the committee recommends an increase of \$500,000 for research at the University of Connecticut on developing new aquaculture systems focused on the rainbow trout?

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Ms. DELAURO. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct, and this is a typographical error. The amendment adopted in the subcommittee clearly stated \$500,000. I regret the error, and I do welcome this opportunity to set the record straight.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Mexico.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I just wanted to say for the record there was some references made a little bit earlier to the role of this House and the other body in preparing a budget and approving a budget, the role of the White House. I just wanted to mention that normally the way government at the Federal level works is that the Congress prepares and passes bills.

The President can propose, but it is our job to dispose, and when we finish our work, and it is ours to finish, we send it to the White House, and under

the Constitution he has only two options: sign the bill or veto the bill.

So I do not really understand all this extralegal negotiation that may be referenced here on the floor and so forth. We have our job to do, and we ought to do it, and if the President does not like what we do, then let him use his constitutional powers to veto and we will override, or we will come back to the drawing board and do this again.

But truly we are not meeting our constitutional responsibilities through the kind of dilatory tactics that we have experienced now on the floor for over 2 days. I do not remember when I have seen a bill, an appropriations bill for certain, come to the floor with hundreds of amendments filed on one particular subcommittee like this one.

So I just wanted to say to the leadership of this institution, "Do your job, send the bill over to the White House, and if they don't like it, let them veto it. If they like it, let them sign it. But let's not be bound up by some sort of private conversations which none of us here on this floor are party to. Let's do our job. That's our constitutional responsibility."

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. COBURN. The objection to spending, now 10 hours of debate on a \$61 billion spending bill in the Committee of the Whole, the House, the whole House; that is why we do appropriations, so we can have it in the Committee of the Whole.

So my colleague's objection is that we should not spend this time, or our purpose in trying to keep us under the spending totals that we all made a commitment to? Which of those two does she object to, because I am having trouble understanding.

My colleague knows what my purpose is. My purpose is to not to allow \$1 of Social Security money to be spent when we have all said we would not spend it.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, if I might reclaim my time, I think the gentleman's purpose is to bring an interfamily fight within his party on the floor of this Congress. I am still having a little trouble understanding that fight.

But we met the budget numbers our colleagues gave us in the bill we have brought to this floor. We dealt with hundreds of Members. We had all kinds of testimony. We dealt with every Member respectfully. We dealt with all kinds of interests across this country in crafting this bill.

We are happy to have some attention, but it is interesting to me that there is just about a handful of Members with amendments to this bill. The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) has hundreds of amendments, and what I cannot figure out from what

I have heard, and it is very confusing to me, people on his side saying he does not like the budget that his party prepared, so he is down here now trying to pick it apart and using our bill as the excuse.

I do not understand. If my colleague has the votes, he should go back in his cloakroom and work out his own budget, and bring us back a repaired budget. But what he is doing is, he is making us a victim of some sort of squabble I still do not truly understand inside his party.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. What I find interesting about that is, let us assume it took 20 hours we have been on the floor, what the gentleman from Oklahoma is trying to do is basically save \$200 million. I mean, that is over \$10 million an hour that he would be saving the taxpayer. To me, that would be time well spent.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to say to the gentleman that under the budget they produced, we have done our job. We have met their budget mark. We are not the problem. He is making us a victim. He is anticipating the problem to come with some other bills. Well, if the gentleman does not like the marks on those bills, go fix that, but why is the gentleman making us the victim?

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, would the ranking member please yield?

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

Mr. COBURN. My intention is not to make the gentlewoman a victim, I promise her, and I cannot imagine, as well as I know her, that she would ever be a victim of what we are trying to do.

Ms. KAPTUR. We are today, we were yesterday.

Mr. COBURN. The process is the victim. And I agree with the gentlewoman, I agree that the process is the victim; and our intention is, there is nothing wrong with the budget, there is plenty wrong with the process.

Ms. KAPTUR. What process? The gentleman's process?

Mr. COBURN. The gentlewoman must know that I profess to be an Oklahoman and a conservative before I ever profess to be a Republican, but I will say to this woman the process is, and she has already readily agreed, that there probably are not a lot of these other 302(b) allocations, the amount of money that is allocated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) has expired.

(On request of Mr. COBURN, and by unanimous consent, Ms. KAPTUR was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

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

Mr. COBURN. They are probably not going to be agreeable to the gentlewoman because we are not going to be able to take care of our veterans under 302(b) allocations.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, within the gentleman's structure, he decided what those levels were. Now he is saying he does not agree. On this side of the aisle we have to act in good faith with the budget the gentleman's party has given us.

I am saying to my colleague, if he does not like what he was given, other than coming down here and doing this, does he not have some other amending process he can do on his side, inside his caucus, to produce the budget that he wants?

Mr. COBURN. If the gentlewoman would yield, if we had that capability, we would not be here.

Ms. KAPTUR. But they prepared the budget. It is their budget.

Mr. COBURN. The 302(b) allocations are prepared by certain groups within here, and those are the ones we object to. It is not the budget that we object to.

Ms. KAPTUR. Well, which party are they in? Is it the majority party?

Mr. Chairman, I would like the record to show it is the majority party that prepares the budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 185, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COBURN

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COBURN:
Page 13, line 11, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$300,000)".

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, Oklahoma is the leading producer in this country of Spanish peanuts. Last year peanut production in this country coming off the farm generated \$1 billion in revenue. The cost of peanuts in our country and the products that come from there end up being twice as high as they are worldwide.

Now, this amendment asks the question, we have a subsidized peanut program in this country that generates a billion dollars of revenue off the farm each year for peanuts. Why would we want to spend \$300,000 on peanut competitiveness when we already know the reasons why we are not competitive in peanuts? It is because we have an over-

supply and that we have tried to manage the problems with this oversupply through a subsidy program.

Again, here is \$300,000 that is directed for research on why we are not competitive worldwide on peanuts when we already know the answer. So I would again go back to the fact that here is \$300,000 that could be better spent, that could be better directed at other areas of research, that could in fact be used to help farmers directly rather than to set up a competitive research program when we already clearly know the answer.

The problem in peanuts is, we have to slowly wean away from this false market, and we all know that; and as my colleagues know, I do not want a peanut producer in my State to have to go out of business.

I understand the friction and the rub associated with these big problems for our farmers, but to turn around and to spend that kind of money in terms of our subsidy programs, and then to turn around, and those are mandatory spending, to turn around and to spend \$300,000 to tell us what we already know makes no sense.

I would rather see that \$300,000 go directly to farmers, corn farmers, wheat farmers, soybean farmers or cattle ranchers who are competing with a market that is coming in from Canada, that ignores any type of testing, any type of standards that the rest of our ranchers have to have.

If we really want our ag research directed to help our farmers, then we will not have \$300,000 set up for competitive peanut research, and instead we will spend that money somewhere else.

We do. We are demonstrating that we trust the committee because we are not taking this total amount out of the research. We are saying put it somewhere else, but do not spend it on a program that keeps us at the seat of political favors rather than at the best efforts for our farmers.

As my colleagues know, the real debate is, we have allocations of money set for agriculture that I think is really a little too much. That is what I have been trying to do, get \$250 million out of this bill because I think that is the only way we are going to meet our commitment to the seniors of not spending their money. But colleagues cannot claim that they did their job for the whole Congress, we as a body and the Committee of the Whole, if we meet a 302(b) here knowing that we have no intentions of meeting those allocations, that 302(b) allocation, on the four biggest bills that are going to come before us. It is not intellectually honest for us to say that.

We know that this committee has worked hard. I am sorry that we are where we are, but the fact is, if we made a commitment when the Democrat budget was offered, the commitment was made not to touch Social Security money. When the Republican

budget was offered, the commitment was made not to touch Social Security. When the President's budget was offered, which I offered because nobody from the other side would offer his budget, two Members of this House agreed to spend 38 percent of the Social Security money.

They are the only two people in this body that have the right to have this process go through the way it is setting up, because they already said, "We don't believe you can do that. We believe we ought to spend more money." The rest of us voted to say we would not spend one penny of Social Security surplus.

□ 1315

So for us to be in the position where we are going to allow a process to go forward that we know is going to deny the American people what we want them to have is the very thing that I am tired of in Washington.

It is my hope that we will return to the American people the confidence they deserve to have in this body. And if we say we are not going to spend their Social Security money, we should not spend it.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am searching in the report for the language that would be stricken by this amendment. I am searching in vain. I wonder if the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) could assist me in finding the line where this item exists. It says, page 13, line 11. However, we cannot seem to find it in the report.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINCHEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, the clerk has actually read the wrong line items. It is actually page 14, line 16. The Clerk read page 13, line 11. Our amendment was actually page 14, line 16. They happen to have the same amount of money, and therefore it was read as an inappropriate amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment and offer the amendment as offered on the right line item.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, if the gentleman chooses to withdraw the amendment, I will not object, but if he is planning to insert it elsewhere, then I will object because right now the amendment is basically void, am I not correct, Mr. Chairman, since it is an inappropriate amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will not interpret the substantive effect of an amendment offered by a Member.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, I

would inquire of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), is my good friend planning to offer this amendment elsewhere?

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINGSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have every intention of withdrawing this amendment and reoffering it. Whether the gentleman objects or not, I will still have the privilege of reoffering the amendment.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the gentleman is an incessant campaigner for his cause. With that, I will withdraw my reservation of objection and let the gentleman withdraw the amendment.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COBURN

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COBURN:

Page 14, line 16, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$300,000)".

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak to the intent of the gentleman's previous amendment, and I hope the gentleman is about to reoffer it so that I may do so and not move on to another section.

Mr. COBURN. Absolutely, Mr. Chairman. I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) for his courtesies.

Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief in what I have to say about this amendment. We have a \$300,000 expenditure for peanut competitiveness. We have a subsidized peanut program that produces \$1 billion worth of raw peanuts off the farm a year. The prices of peanut-graded products in our country are higher than what they would be if we did not have a subsidized peanut program.

I have voted in the past for the subsidized peanut program. I have lots of peanut farmers. That does not mean in the future that we should not try to change that and wean that to a competitive model where we have the appropriate amount of production and a competitive international model on that.

My point with this amendment is we know why we are not competitive on peanuts; why would we want to fund \$300,000 to answer that question?

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as a representative from the great peanut State of Georgia, I rise to oppose the amendment as

offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

This National Competitive Center for Peanuts, one would envision by that title a building of bricks and mortar when it in fact is not. This goes into funding research at the University of Georgia, the purpose being to find out if there are more efficient ways to produce peanuts. It is legitimate agricultural research, as is the type of research that we do on a myriad of other crops and fibers and foodstuffs all over the country.

One of the great challenges that we have on this Subcommittee on Agriculture is funding research which is open to easy ridicule. For example, if this committee funds something that has to do with the mating habits of the screw, it is a great sound bite for Jay Leno and it is a great article for the Reader's Digest to say "Look at what these idiots are doing, they are researching the sex life of bugs."

And it is funny, and we all have a big laugh about it, and somebody from the other body says to the President, veto this obvious pork. Yet, to the families of America who eat groceries every day, it is very important.

They might not think this immediately benefits them. But I can promise my colleagues that agriculture research benefits every American household. Because, unlike some folks in the media and some folks in the other body, our constituents in this side of the legislature have to eat. And the more one knows about food, the more one can effectively and inexpensively produce it. That is why we do peanut research. That is why we do corn research. That is why we do bug research. This is part of a bigger picture.

Mr. Chairman, we know that the learned and distinguished and conservative gentleman from Oklahoma's real purpose here is to cut spending. But we also know that this bill, while it can be nicked and dimed here and there and questioned here and there, and things can be pulled out for micro inspection and therefore ridiculed, we know that this bill is within the spending budget.

This bill is within the bipartisan agreement that was signed off by the President of the United States, that was signed off by the House leadership: The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Gingrich). It was signed off and adhered to by the ranking member and the chairman of this subcommittee and all of the Democrat and all the Republican members. We have fulfilled our mission. We have come in at goal. We hope that other subcommittees do the same thing.

The objective of the gentleman from Oklahoma is not necessarily to pick on peanuts, but it is to criticize this bill. We are saying, you know what? The bill might not be perfect, but it comes in at the right price, and it is about 80

percent as good as one can get it in a legislative body of 435 people coming from all over the United States representing the great 260 million people in America.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I would strongly urge my colleagues to soundly reject this amendment. Not for the sake of peanuts, not for the sake of peanut competitiveness, but for the bigger future, the bigger purpose of putting food on the family breakfast, lunch and dinner tables across America. Because we, unlike other nations, only spend 11 cents on the dollar on our groceries. Other countries spend 20, 25 cents, 30 cents, 40 cents. Other places even less fortunate than that spend all day long scratching out a living only to get food on their table.

Agriculture research, Mr. Chairman, is very important. It is part of our agriculture picture, and fortunately, we have very few people as a percentage of our population going to bed hungry at night, but it is because of important agriculture research, as well as this farm program.

Now, the gentleman talked about peanut subsidies. I would remind him that peanut subsidies are not there anymore. The peanut program is a program, and yes, it is an elaborate program, and no, it is not the model for capitalism and free market. But what it does do, it allows young people to go back home and farm for a living, because they know if they can make a profit on peanuts, then they can also grow corn, soybeans and hogs/pork which they cannot make a living off of.

Protect America's farmers. Vote "no" on this.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The Federal Administration grant that this amendment proposes to eliminate is described in detail in part 4 of the committee's hearing record on page 1701. The following is a brief description of the research performed under the grant.

The grant supports an interdisciplinary research and education program to enhance the competitiveness of the U.S. peanut industry by examining alternative production systems, developing new products and new markets, and improving product safety.

The project helps peanut producers be more competitive in the global market. In the first year of the project, 1998, a computerized expert system was adapted for handheld computers that were used to help farmers reduce pest control costs. In addition, economic factors were added to a computerized disease risk management system which includes a large number of factors involved in the onset of a very destructive wilt. For every one-point improvement in the "wilt index," a farmer's net income is increased by \$9 to \$14 an acre. USDA funds were used to leverage an additional \$124,000 for research by the Center for Peanut Competitiveness.

Thank goodness that they do not use smaller print on this thing, nobody could read it.

Grants for this work have been reviewed annually and have been awarded each year since 1998. This work is performed at the University of Georgia and involves cooperation from Auburn University in Alabama.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good project and it deserves the support of all Members. I support the project, and I oppose the gentleman's amendment to eliminate it.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the Center for Peanut Competitiveness is in its third year for a program that provides critical research addressing several aspects of the peanut industry, including production development, production practices, safety, economics, and other areas that contribute to the competitiveness of the U.S. peanut farmer. At a time when profit margins for farmers are collapsing, at a time when farmers are choosing whether they will sell their family farms or not, it is incomprehensible to take research money from a center that works for the universities in Georgia and in Alabama to help farmers help themselves.

I say to my colleagues, in case we have not noticed, we are in a global economy, a complicated system where information and technology is our key to survival. In my district alone, information on how to be more competitive or how to market one's product more effectively can be the difference between the bank taking your grandfather's farm or being able to keep it.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote on this in support of the American farmer. I would like to point out that I have listened to this debate for over 10 hours, and the lack of knowledge on the part of the people offering these amendments is startling.

First of all, there is no peanut subsidy. There has not been for a number of years. It is a no-cost program. In addition to that, it provides \$83 million in deficit reduction through the year 2002. In 1996, the peanut farm bill made major changes in the program. We have done that. The program supports 30,000 American jobs.

I am just appalled at what has gone on, frankly, in this House for the last few days. People are nitpicking this appropriations process. What for? At the end of the day do they want to say "I told you so"? This is a self-righteous indulgence by a very few people in this House and ought not be happening.

□ 1330

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, if there was ever a sensible amendment, this one is it. I do not know what could be more clear cut.

How many think it would be a good idea to put \$300,000 to efforts to study

democracy in Cuba? How many think it would be a good idea to put \$300,000 to study the democracy that exists in Iraq? How many think it would be a good idea to put \$300,000 to study good government in Libya? None of them exist. That is exactly what this amendment is about.

This is a study of \$300,000 for competitiveness in peanuts, which is something which does not exist. We have a market quota system. If you have a quota, you basically get to sell your peanuts for double, more or less double the price of anybody else.

For instance, I grew up on a farm down in Beaufort County, down in South Carolina. I am trying to pass on a few of those traits to my boys.

Can I imagine my boys raising peanuts in the backyard, and then being penalized simply because they do not have a quota? What this quota means, if you happen to live in Los Angeles, if you happen to live in Chicago, if you happen to live in New York and you have a quota, you can sell that quota. So you have fat cat quota owners that basically get double what somebody else does simply because they have the quota.

That is not something that makes sense, but more significantly, what it says is this amendment does make sense, because to spend \$300,000 studying competitiveness in something that is fundamentally not competitive is big government, at best.

That is what this amendment does. It makes common sense. It highlights, I think, the lunacy of some of the quota systems we have in place.

Can Members imagine a watermelon quota system? If you have a quota with watermelons, you can sell your watermelons for what my boys can raise them for in the backyard.

Can Members imagine a cantelopes quota system? If you have the quota you can live in New York City, you can sell your right to produce quota cantelopes to somebody who is down struggling on the farm. This is something that penalizes the family farmer.

Again, this is not something that makes sense. It is the equivalent of saying let us spend \$300,000 studying the democracy that exists in Cuba, \$300,000 studying the democracy in Iraq. We do not have competitiveness in the peanut program. This simply says, let us admit that and not spend \$300,000 of taxpayer money on something that does not exist.

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks of my friend, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EVERETT). Having listened to the last speaker, my friend, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD), I want to reiterate the problem that we have here in many of us not understanding the issues.

Just the instance that my friend, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) talked about with the absentee owners of quotas, he should know that the 1996 farm bill that he voted for changed that system in the peanut program. It was wrong to have it that way, and it was changed.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to say, I have been listening to the debate over the last couple of days of some of the amendments that we have before us. As I went home last night and began to think about the bigger picture, this thought came to my mind.

This country is the greatest country in the world because of the technology that we have developed, the money we have spent on research, in every aspect of our lives, whatever it be.

We are the greatest military power in the world because our research and development has developed technology that enables us to be that. We have the greatest medical community in the world because of the medical research that has been done in this country, mostly in our public universities with public money, to establish us as the greatest provider of medical services in the world.

Our agricultural industry is the greatest in the world because of the research and development, and most all of it has been in our public universities over the years. Our industrial basis the same way.

What we have seen in the last couple of days is an attack on our research and development to develop new technology to continue for us to advance into the 21st century.

I would strongly urge that Members defeat the amendment which is before us as it is simply another attack on research dollars which will enable us to continue to advance and be the greatest Nation in the world.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the last couple of days have been somewhat frustrating for a number of us who find that due to some of our committee responsibilities and some of our interests in agriculture, we are finding ourselves going through this.

I need to make it clear to the gentleman from Oklahoma that I have no qualms whatsoever with his rights to do what it is that he is doing.

I have heard a lot of comments here. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) mentioned earlier, and I do not know if he is on the floor, but that Members need to be sure to come over and support or defend the attacks that were being leveled on various projects in various districts, as if they were all personal and the work would not be done if it was not being done in that particular district.

It has to be done somewhere. I think probably it is done a lot better out in

the communities, rather than it is in Washington, always.

I do not have any defense that I need to make of this particular amendment. We do not do any peanut research in my district. But I do want to say that I do not feel terribly comfortable in the fact that if each person came over and did defend an attack that was being made, that that would be sufficient to some of the proponents of some of the amendments to make dramatic cuts.

I was the chairman in the last Congress of the Subcommittee on Risk Management, Research, and Specialty Crops, the first time that that title had been reauthorized in a number of years.

We spent a great deal of time looking at the value and the significance and the importance, not only to American agriculture but to the entire American population that eat, about the strides and about the accomplishments and about the progress and the success that agriculture research has made. I think it probably is some of the best money that is spent.

Now some people have said, well, we could best take this and give it to farmers and buy tractors or whatever. That is not part of the proposal. The proposal is not to take, in this case, \$300,000 and give it to anybody, it is to simply eliminate it. So that argument in itself is somewhat hollow.

I do not believe that intentionally people are trying to do harm to a significant number of very important programs that the chairman of this subcommittee and the ranking member of this subcommittee spent hours deliberating over to try to come up with a balance within what they were told they had to work with.

Some people do not like that, but that is what they were told they had to work within, and they did it. They did a very good balance of a number of very longtime continuing programs and some new programs. But I hope that we do not totally limit ourselves just to things that have always been done in the past; that we look at how we can do them better, that we look at new programs that ought to be brought into place, that we look at things that should be done on behalf of American agriculture with a very, very limited budget and the very, very small amount that is expended on agriculture.

I would hope that while the gentleman may continue for as long as he can hold out offering his amendments, that this body, that this committee, and that in the full House, we would take a very close look at a very well-defined product, and not let one and two and three here nitpick and pull this thing apart and totally disrupt what it is that we are trying to do, not only on behalf of American agriculture but the American people, who have the best quality food, the safest quality food, and the cheapest food of anybody in the world.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise reluctantly, because I have the greatest respect for my fellow colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), and he is one of the brightest men I have ever met, and one of the men that is committed to a lot of different causes.

But I could not let this debate go by without taking a few moments to make some remarks about agriculture. I grew up on a peanut farm. I have no financial interest in peanuts, except I do like peanut butter and have Oklahoma peanuts in my pocket. I have studied peanuts most of my life and agriculture most of my life. Because I have a couple of degrees in agriculture, I have an emotional tie about the agriculture position in this country, not just a political one.

Years ago our Founding Fathers set the Morrill Act, which established our land grant universities. One of the most important things they did with the land grant universities is they set up research farms, and those research farms were connected with other private sector farms and private sector research facilities.

Those land grant universities, through that research coupled with the extension agents or county agents, and also with our agriculture teachers, allowed us to make agriculture a role model for transferring technology to use on the farm.

What happened was we had the greatest technology transfer ever recorded in the history of our country, as we developed a food production system, unmatched by any country in the world, which is allowing us today to stay somewhat competitive in world trade.

It was caused to happen because of the dollars in research that came about through our land grant universities, like Oklahoma State University. They have done a tremendous amount of research with peanuts and the peanut program.

The peanut program has changed a great deal in the last few years. If a lot of other of our agriculture programs were set up like the peanut program, it would not be costly to the government at all. But unfortunately, that is not the case.

I predict to the Members that somewhere in the near future in agriculture we will be producing a quota for this country, and then we will have a nonquota amount for the international marketplace.

As an agriculturist I was taught how to grow four blades of grass instead of one. We have done that in production agriculture in America.

On April 9, I had a meeting of the Agriculture Round Table leaders in Oklahoma. We talked about what were the policies we were faced with and what were the problems. It was not production. That was not even scored as a

problem. It was not the actual finances that many were confronted with. It was the agricultural policy of our government, and also the marketing. We have got to be able to learn to market through value-added activities, to meet the markets around the world.

We are in a global competitive world. The European Union spends nearly 75 percent of their budget on subsidizing agriculture, in the production of E.U. agriculture and also subsidizing export markets. We do not have free markets in agriculture. We have to be able to market, and research has to allow us to be competitive in those markets around the world.

I stand in support of, agriculture research dealing with peanuts. Probably not too much of peanut research is done with the land grant universities in Oklahoma anymore, but we do a lot of agency interchanging with other land grant universities in order to try to meet the needs of the peanut farmers in Oklahoma and helping them be competitive in the international market.

We have a value-added program at Oklahoma State University today that through research, we are being able to do more and more to allow our farmers and ranchers to benefit with greater profits, instead of just being efficient in production. I wanted to stand in support of this research for peanuts. It is important to Oklahoma agriculture.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I will be brief. I will not take all the time. I think most of us know where we are going to be on this bill or this amendment. It is a lot like a lot of the others. The proponent may have his own agenda, but I think we need to have the agenda for America.

If we did away with all the research in every bill that makes a difference in America, where would America be today? Where would we be without research for transportation, research in medical technology, research that comes from our science programs, and all the research for our farmers? Where would we be today in terms of opportunity for food and fiber?

I strongly oppose this amendment. The peanut farmers are really the backbone of our economy in some of the poorest counties in the southern and eastern part of this country. For people to come to this floor and say that they are not going to hurt farmers, they just do not understand what they are talking about, or otherwise they are attempting to mislead.

This Congress, this Congress in 1995, when some of the very Members were offering these amendments to distribute to farmers the research to help them stay in business, passed the farm bill, they entered into a contract with the farmers. They said, for 7 years we

are going to keep stable prices and they are going to go down. And they said to the peanut farmers, we are going to lower the rates. Where you are getting cut off, quotas are going to be reduced. Number three, the program will be open to new producers. Number four, out-of-State quota holders will be eliminated.

□ 1345

They voted on that, and now they want to come to this floor and eliminate that contract. In my opinion, that is a breach of faith, and this Congress ought not to do it. I do not think we are going to do it.

In return, they gave the farmers a farm bill that had virtually no safety net. We are seeing what is happening now across America; our farmers are in deep trouble.

Let me speak very quickly to peanut farmers and what this research money does. Peanut farmers face many obstacles and should not have to worry about paying the bills the way they do. If we get too much rain, they get soggy peanuts, and there is a loss. If they get a drought, they get dust instead of peanuts. There is no one there to help them.

They are hardworking people. They take great chances. They are the foundation of this country like every other farmer, whether they be in the Midwest, whether it be in the West or whether it be in the East or the South.

As I said yesterday when I took this floor very briefly, I am embarrassed for this Congress that we would take a bill that is here to make a difference for agriculture, and we are talking about research to make a difference in our future and the future of our children, to produce food and fiber at a cheaper price with less disease to help not only our people, but to help the people around the world, and we are saying we are doing it to save money.

I learned a long time ago, we can be penny wise and pound foolish. When my colleagues cut research, they are penny wise and pound foolish. If they do it in research for medical technology and everything else, we could carry ourselves right back to the Stone Age. I am opposed to this amendment, and I ask every Member in this body to vote against it.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make a few comments. Obviously peanuts are not a big crop in Iowa. But it just struck me, I just spent a half an hour outside on the steps here with a group of FFA students from Ocheyedan, Iowa. We had a good conversation, and they asked a lot of questions about Congress, about the agriculture.

One young lady asked me, "What is the future of agriculture?" It is a difficult question to answer. I have to

kind of go back in my own mind and see what has transpired.

When I graduated from high school in 1966, there were 50 kids in my class. When my daughter graduated from that same high school in 1995, there were 17 in her class. We are seeing a huge change in agriculture, in rural America. We are seeing communities shrink. The section where I still live, there used to be four families living on that section; now there is one. It is a huge change.

To try and answer the question of this young lady about what is the future, really the answer is that agriculture today is a business, and it has to be treated that way. The people who will be successful are people who are agribusiness people, not just farmers.

The only way that one can make good, sound decisions is to have adequate information. Mike Earl, the leader from Ocheyedan, Iowa, was talking about how that they are getting computers in their FFA classes, and they are learning how to use those computers, how to manage risk in the future.

But a key part of that is the information that will come in from our universities, unbiased information for these agribusiness people of the future to make sound decisions.

When I looked at that group, I did not just see 36 FFA kids from Ocheyedan, Iowa, I see the youth of America that is looking to us and asking what is agriculture's future for me. Whether it is in Georgia and they want to be a peanut farmer, whether they want to raise rice, whether they want to raise corn or soybeans or hogs or cattle or chickens or emus, whatever they want to do, it is a matter of getting good information, sound information, unbiased information.

The only place that one can find that, that is people believe, is from our university researches. That is why it is extraordinarily critical that we maintain our commitment to agricultural research, that whether it is peanuts, whether it is corn or soybeans or hogs in my district, we have got to maintain our support.

The future of agriculture, the future of sound agricultural policy for our young people, for a future for them, of safe food, ample supply for all Americans and for the rest of the world, depends on a lot on what we do here today.

So I would just ask everyone in the House here, this may look like a good little cutting amendment, but when my colleagues vote today, think about maybe those 36 FFA kids in Georgia who maybe will not have the kind of future that a lot of us hope we have in agriculture.

I am a farmer myself, and this means a great deal to me. But think about all of them; do not just think about one little amendment here. We have lived

within our budget constraints. We have done everything to try and focus this research where it should be.

It is about the future of this country. It is about the future of safe food, of the supply that is available. It is for the success of our young people. Please do not do this.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATHAM. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, there is no greater friend of the farmers than the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM). He has been a consistent advocate of farmers; I profoundly respect that.

I think the particular amendment, though, of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) in no way cuts overall research funding, but simply cuts out what seems to be an oxymoron, and that is \$300,000 for competitiveness research in a quota-based system.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, you are going to hurt the future of agriculture with this amendment and all these other amendments.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the preceding speaker, my Republican friend and colleague, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM).

I think that Members watching this debate ought to pay special attention to the bipartisan nature of the concern we are expressing. The House is, by its very nature, an urban institution, apportionment allocated by population. That means, those of us representing the country side have a particularly difficult task trying to convey why our issues matter.

I do not think anyone watching this spectacle continue to unfold has to have any doubt whatsoever that it is another case of urban interests, this time Republican urban interests, gang-ing up on agriculture. What is so astounding to me is that the majority leadership continues to let this debacle unfold.

I would ask all of my colleagues how they would feel if that which they care about most in the appropriations bills would be taken apart on the floor, like the agriculture budget is being taken apart here. Bear in mind that this is an appropriations report, brought out by the gentleman from New Mexico (Chairman SKEEN), that is within the allocation. We have a distinguished Member that has done everything right in bringing his appropriations bill forward.

But now we have some Members indulging themselves in trying to play appropriators. They want to turn the floor of the House into an appropria-

tions subcommittee. The thing that is most alarming is, they know not what they do. Will Rogers once said, "It is not what the gentleman does not know that scares me, it is what he knows for sure that just ain't so; that is the problem."

That is the problem with this slew of amendments, however well-intentioned they may be brought by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN). He might be trying to make some point, some broad macro budget point, some highly principled ideological point, but the real fact is, he is tearing apart the budget for agriculture at a time when family farmers are in the deepest hurt I have ever seen.

I have spent all my life in North Dakota. Agriculture is something that has been a part of me from the time I first formed any cognitive impressions of anything. This is not the time for the Congress of the United States to turn its back on the American farmer.

My colleagues can say what they want to about this being the fiscal year 2000 budget. We are talking today about something that is not going to apply for several months. To the American farmer, in their hour of need, my colleagues are playing politics, and they are trivializing that which they care about the most, their bread and butter, agriculture, family farming. This should stop.

As Members come to the House in a few minutes for votes, I hope they will stand with me and express just how they feel about this nonsense. It is our appropriations bill today; it could well be theirs tomorrow. I urge my colleagues to think about that.

To the majority leadership, as they come to the floor to vote, I hope they will sit and take stock of the spectacle that they have turned the floor of the House into. They are the leaders and they control this place.

To the extent that they allow a Member today to totally tie up this institution, they are unleashing a very unpredictable future course for the rest of this Congress, because what is important to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) this afternoon, there will be another issue of equally pressing importance to someone else further; and every appropriations bill about to be considered will be subject to this kind of debacle.

The Nation needs to have its work done. We do not need to turn the floor of the House into a debating chamber for a very narrow spectrum of interests.

Finally, and for me most importantly, the American farmers need help, and it is wrong for the majority to turn its back on them in their hour of need.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Members are reminded that they are to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to other persons.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WOLF was allowed to speak out of order for 3 minutes.)

DO NOT LIFT EMBARGO ON GUM ARABIC IN SUDAN

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I apologize to the Members to come, but I have been listening to the debate, and I support the bill, and I support the gentleman's efforts, but I just found out that the administration is getting ready to lift the gum arabic restrictions that are currently on Sudan.

This is a picture of a young boy that I took in 1989 in southern Sudan, and this young boy is probably dead, but if he is not dead, he has had a terrible life because almost two million people have died in Sudan since that time.

I supported this administration's efforts, some of their efforts in Kosovo with them going to the refugees. I voted to increase the amount of money for the refugees. But what about the Christians in Sudan? There is slavery in Sudan. This young boy's parents may have been in slavery and others.

I now find out that this administration and, I understand, John Podesta at the White House and powerful lobbyists that have been hired by special interests, are now trying to get this administration to lift this embargo with regard to gum arabic in Sudan.

So I urge, whenever this administration thinks of doing it today, not to do it on behalf of this boy, who is probably dead, but may be alive. Do not lift the embargo on gum arabic, because it is fundamentally immoral if they do. If they care about Kosovo and do not care about Sudan is doubly immoral.

I apologize to the Members, but I just heard this was coming up. I do rise in support of the bill.

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not represent any universities in this bill.

□ 1400

The gentleman knows where I am from, he used to live there, and we are good friends. The gentleman from Oklahoma, that is. Eighteen years ago when I first ran for Congress, I remember very vividly standing in a debate with my opponent and my opponent saying, "This guy comes out of the business world. What does he know about agriculture?" And I agreed with him, I did not know much about agriculture, but I knew one thing: that anyone who spent a dollar to grow something that they got 95 cents back on, they were in a rotten business. And I kept saying that over and over again.

Now, I happen to meet with my farmers, and they are very small population-wise. They are very large geographically in my district, but very small as it relates to population. And when I go to meetings, whether it is the Farm Bureau or my farmers' advisory board, or whatever it is, guess

what I see? Gray hair. Now, it is better than no hair, but it is gray hair that I see. I see very, very few young people.

Now, whether we knock out \$300,000 from this budget for research, whether that is going to do any harm to peanuts or not, we will just lay that aside. But let me tell my colleagues what it does do harm to, and this is why I came over here to get into this. It does harm to young people and to new people that want to farm.

I have to tell the people in the urban areas when they ask, "Why are you so interested in farming?" I tell them if we do away with the family farm, the people in the urban areas are going to know the real price of food, the real price of food, and that is why I worry. This is a symbol amendment. A symbol amendment, but I think it sends a message, and I would ask my colleagues to please vote against this amendment.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISISKY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. The gentleman does realize that this does not decrease total agricultural research by one penny. It just says we should not spend this money here. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SISISKY. Reclaiming my time, I would still say it sends the wrong message, and that is what I am concerned about.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment and just wish to say that the accumulation of amendments over the last 2 days, and I agree with my good friend, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SISISKY), ultimately results in a negative message to agricultural America and questioning whether or not we have made the right decisions.

Any Member has a right to question what any committee has done inside this Congress. However, one after another, after another, it is like, drip, drip, drip, in a situation today where rural America is in depression. The gentleman from Virginia made a good point. People are not getting 95 cents on a dollar. Farmers raising hogs in America today, it costs them 40 cents to break even, and last December they made 9 cents, and last March they made 28 cents; yet we go to buy chops in the store and they are going to run us \$2.26 to \$4 a pound and more. Who is making the money off that?

We end up with an agricultural system in this country where the person at the bottom of the totem poll, the producer, the farmer, his or her access to market is controlled, if they are trying to sell pork, by six companies; if they are trying to sell beef, it is three companies; if they are trying to get something on the shelves of a supermarket today, they have to pay a slotting fee of \$20,000 or \$50,000.

I ask my colleagues, why when we go down a supermarket aisle and we look at the names of the soda pop on the shelves, why do only certain names reach us right in the eye? If there are local producers, why can they not get on those shelves? It is an interesting system. And why would America be in a condition today where imports are coming in here faster than exports going out? In fact, 25 percent of the market in this country in agricultural products now is comprised of imported goods. Why would that be, in the most productive Nation in the world?

It is because we have not paid enough attention to those who are actually doing the work of producing. All of the weight has gone to the processing and the distribution ends of the equation, but we have not paid attention to those who are really still struggling down on the farm and losing equity every day.

It does not matter whether we are talking about upland cotton or rice or hogs or wheat or oats or cattle or poultry. It really does not matter today because every single sector is hemorrhaging. Farmers are losing equity. Farm values have started to drop. Prices, probably this year they expect to be 27 percent below last year, and here we are nitpicking a bill that has come in within budget, within the allocation that we were given.

So I would just say to my colleagues, please, let us get back to the business of doing the work of this Congress, and particularly for that sector in America which is hemorrhaging today, which is rural America. Let us move this bill.

I understand today we are going to pull the bill and perhaps deal with it later. Further delay, adding to the delay that has contributed to all of the difficulties in rural America today, when the Department of Agriculture cannot get the paperwork properly processed because the supplemental came in so late last year, and the supplemental this year that was just passed came in months late and agriculture got tied up in that, unfortunately.

Let us deal with this bill with dispatch. If there is a budget problem, get rid of it. Deal with it in some other way, but do not make the farmers in America pay any heavier price than they have already paid. The average age of farmers in this country today is 55 and rising. The gentleman from Virginia was right, every young person who is still thinking about farming is saying, is that really worth my time?

So today I rise in opposition to this Coburn amendment. It is just one of many being offered to delay this bill. Why this is in the strategy of the leadership of this Congress to delay this bill is beyond me. They have to power to fix everything. Let them go do it, and let the farmers of America have their presence felt here in this House.

I ask the membership to vote "no" on the Coburn amendment.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, despite all of the protests, this bill will not even go into effect until October 1. So no one is going to miss a payment, no one is going to miss a program, no farmer is going to be injured by delaying this process just a little bit.

And the issue, of course, is not whether or not farmers will ultimately be treated equitably by this Congress. The bipartisan agreement that we see here today means that we all want to help our farmers. But the real question before us is will we live within those spending caps; will we, in fact, balance the budget; will we, for the first time in my memory, perhaps in my lifetime, not actually steal from the Social Security Trust Fund? That is the issue that we are talking about. That is the issue we ought to focus on. And, ultimately, I think that is what a number of us want to see happen.

In fact, I believe that all of us want to see that happen. So if it means this bill is delayed by a day or two, that is regrettable, but I think in the end we will all be happy if we get a better product through the entire appropriation process, that abides by the spending caps, that saves Social Security and for the first time says to our kids, we mean what we say; we are going to try to preserve the Social Security system.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I want to reiterate what was said at the start of this debate; that this is a good bill. We are trying to make it better. That is number one. And that we believe in ag research. We are not trying to cut. Matter of fact, \$13 million was cut from ag research not by me but by the gentleman from Vermont last night. So we believe in those principles.

We also believe in another principle, and that is keeping our word. And keeping our word means we are not going to spend the first dollar of Social Security money anywhere else in this country except on Social Security. And so as we do that, this is a painful process, and I understand that it is not very tasteful for the Members of the Committee on Appropriations, but it is not directed towards them.

There is a benefit, however. There is nothing wrong with the American people finding out what is in these bills. And to say that there is something wrong with us talking about what is in the bills, discussing how we spend their money, is a little bit arrogant for us as a body. This is the people's House. We should allow them to have all the light that they would like to have on what

we do here, how we do it and where we spend our money.

So I want to just say I thank the gentleman for yielding me some time. This is about process and whether or not we are going to keep our word to the American people. We are going to keep our word to the American farmer. We are going to have the bill. We just passed \$12 billion in super, above-budget supplementary spending this last year for the farmers, and I voted for those. We just passed in the last month a comprehensive bill, and I agree with the gentlewoman from Ohio, we did not offset anything except in ag, and that is inappropriate. And when that bill came back to us, I voted against it because of that.

So we are going to do what we need to do by our farmers, but we are also going to do what we need to do for our seniors and for our children.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, and I am sure the gentleman from Oklahoma knows that sunshine is the best antiseptic, and allowing a little sunshine to shine on the appropriations process here in the Congress is not a bad thing. If it takes an extra day or two, so be it. In the end, I think we will all have a product that we can be more proud of, that we can defend when we go home to our constituents, and ultimately will keep that promise all of us have made to our kids, and that is that every penny of Social Security taxes should go only for Social Security.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 185, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) will be postponed.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 185, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) beginning on page 10;

Amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) on page 13;

Amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) on page 13;

Amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) on page 14.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COBURN

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote

on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 35, noes 390, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 158]

AYES—35

Barr	Franks (NJ)	Royce
Bass	Hayworth	Salmon
Biggert	Hostettler	Sanford
Bilbray	Luther	Sensenbrenner
Cannon	McInnis	Shadegg
Chabot	Miller (FL)	Shays
Collins	Miller, Gary	Smith (WA)
Cox	Paul	Sununu
Crane	Petri	Tancredo
Delahunt	Ramstad	Taylor (MS)
Doggett	Rogan	Toomey
Duncan	Rohrabacher	

NOES—390

Abercrombie	Chambliss	Forbes
Aderholt	Chenoweth	Ford
Allen	Clay	Fossella
Andrews	Clayton	Fowler
Archer	Clement	Frank (MA)
Armey	Clyburn	Frelinghuysen
Bachus	Coble	Frost
Baird	Coburn	Galleghy
Baker	Combust	Ganske
Baldacci	Condit	Gejdenson
Baldwin	Conyers	Gekas
Ballenger	Cook	Gephardt
Barcia	Cooksey	Gibbons
Barrett (NE)	Barrett (NE)	Gilchrest
Barrett (WI)	Coyne	Gillmor
Bartlett	Cramer	Gilman
Barton	Crowley	Gonzalez
Bateman	Cubin	Goode
Becerra	Cummings	Goodlatte
Bentsen	Cunningham	Goodling
Bereuter	Danner	Gordon
Berkley	Davis (FL)	Goss
Berman	Davis (IL)	Graham
Berry	Davis (VA)	Granger
Bilirakis	Deal	Green (TX)
Bishop	DeFazio	Green (WI)
Blagojevich	DeGette	Greenwood
Bliley	DeLauro	Gutierrez
Blumenauer	DeLay	Gutknecht
Blunt	DeMint	Hall (OH)
Boehmert	Deutsch	Hall (TX)
Boehner	Diaz-Balart	Hansen
Bonilla	Dickey	Hastings (FL)
Bonior	Dicks	Hastings (WA)
Bono	Dingell	Hayes
Borski	Dixon	Hefley
Boswell	Dooley	Heger
Boucher	Doolittle	Hill (IN)
Boyd	Doyle	Hill (MT)
Brady (PA)	Dreier	Hillery
Brady (TX)	Dunn	Hilliard
Brown (FL)	Edwards	Hinchee
Brown (OH)	Ehlers	Hinojosa
Bryant	Ehrlich	Hobson
Burr	Emerson	Hoeffel
Burton	Engel	Hoekstra
Buyer	English	Holden
Callahan	Eshoo	Holt
Calvert	Etheridge	Hooley
Camp	Evans	Horn
Campbell	Everett	Houghton
Canady	Ewing	Hoyer
Capps	Farr	Hulshof
Capuano	Fattah	Hunter
Cardin	Filner	Hutchinson
Carson	Fletcher	Hyde
Castle	Foley	Inslie

Isakson	Millender-	Sessions
Istook	McDonald	Shaw
Jackson (IL)	Miller, George	Sherman
Jackson-Lee	Minge	Sherwood
(TX)	Mink	Shimkus
Jefferson	Moakley	Shows
Jenkins	Mollohan	Shuster
John	Moore	Simpson
Johnson (CT)	Moran (KS)	Sisisky
Johnson, E. B.	Moran (VA)	Skeen
Johnson, Sam	Murtha	Skelton
Jones (NC)	Nadler	Slaughter
Jones (OH)	Napolitano	Smith (MI)
Kanjorski	Neal	Smith (NJ)
Kaptur	Nettercutt	Smith (TX)
Kelly	Ney	Snyder
Kennedy	Northup	Souder
Kildee	Norwood	Spence
Kilpatrick	Nussle	Spratt
Kind (WI)	Oberstar	Stabenow
King (NY)	Obey	Stark
Kingston	Olver	Stearns
Kleczka	Ortiz	Stenholm
Klink	Ose	Strickland
Knollenberg	Owens	Stump
Kolbe	Packard	Stupak
Kucinich	Pallone	Sweeney
Kuykendall	Pascrell	Talent
LaFalce	Pastor	Tanner
LaHood	Payne	Tauscher
Lampson	Pease	Tauzin
Lantos	Pelosi	Taylor (NC)
Largent	Peterson (MN)	Terry
Larson	Peterson (PA)	Thomas
Latham	Phelps	Thompson (CA)
LaTourrette	Pickering	Thompson (MS)
Lazio	Pickett	Thornberry
Leach	Pitts	Thune
Lee	Pombo	Thurman
Levin	Pomeroy	Tiahrt
Lewis (CA)	Porter	Tierney
Lewis (GA)	Portman	Towns
Lewis (KY)	Price (NC)	Traficant
Linder	Pryce (OH)	Turner
Lipinski	Quinn	Udall (CO)
LoBiondo	Radanovich	Udall (NM)
Lofgren	Rahall	Upton
Lowey	Rangel	Velázquez
Lucas (KY)	Regula	Vento
Lucas (OK)	Reyes	Visclosky
Maloney (CT)	Reynolds	Walden
Maloney (NY)	Riley	Walsh
Manzullo	Rivers	Wamp
Markey	Rodriguez	Waters
Martinez	Roemer	Watkins
Mascara	Rogers	Watt (NC)
Matsui	Ros-Lehtinen	Watts (OK)
McCarthy (MO)	Rothman	Waxman
McCarthy (NY)	Roukema	Weiner
McCrery	Roybal-Allard	Weldon (FL)
McDermott	Rush	Weldon (PA)
McGovern	Ryan (WI)	Weller
McHugh	Ryun (KS)	Wexler
McIntosh	Sabo	Weygand
McIntyre	Sanchez	Whitfield
McKeon	Sanders	Wicker
McKinney	Sandin	Wilson
McNulty	Sawyer	Wise
Meehan	Saxton	Wolf
Meek (FL)	Scarborough	Woolsey
Meeks (NY)	Schaffer	Wu
Menendez	Schakowsky	Wynn
Metcalfe	Scott	Young (FL)
Mica	Serrano	

NOT VOTING—8

Ackerman	McCollum	Oxley
Brown (CA)	Morella	Young (AK)
Kasich	Myrick	

□ 1432

Messrs. KINGSTON, WELDON of Florida, LARGENT, BERMAN, SCARBOROUGH, and FOSSELLA changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. GARY MILLER of California and Mr. SUNUMU changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COBURN

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 93, noes 330, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 159]

AYES—93

Archer	Goode	Pombo
Bachus	Goodlatte	Ramstad
Ballenger	Gordon	Reynolds
Barr	Graham	Riley
Barrett (WI)	Granger	Rogan
Bartlett	Green (TX)	Rohrabacher
Barton	Green (WI)	Roukema
Bass	Gutknecht	Royce
Biggert	Hall (TX)	Ryun (KS)
Blunt	Hayworth	Salmon
Boehner	Hefley	Sanford
Bono	Herger	Scarborough
Burton	Hilleary	Sensenbrenner
Campbell	Hoekstra	Sessions
Cannon	Hostettler	Shadegg
Chabot	Istook	Shays
Chenoweth	Jenkins	Sherwood
Coburn	Johnson, Sam	Smith (MI)
Collins	Jones (NC)	Spence
Cox	Largent	Sununu
Crane	Linder	Tancredo
Delahunt	Luther	Taylor (MS)
DeLay	Manzullo	Taylor (NC)
DeMint	McInnis	Terry
Doolittle	McIntosh	Thornberry
Duncan	Metcalf	Tiahrt
Dunn	Miller (FL)	Toomey
Fossella	Miller, Gary	Upton
Fowler	Myrick	Wamp
Franks (NJ)	Paul	Watts (OK)
Gibbons	Petri	Weldon (FL)

NOES—330

Abercrombie	Brady (TX)	Cunningham
Aderholt	Brown (FL)	Danner
Allen	Brown (OH)	Davis (FL)
Andrews	Bryant	Davis (IL)
Armey	Burr	Davis (VA)
Baird	Buyer	Deal
Baker	Callahan	DeFazio
Baldacci	Calvert	DeGette
Baldwin	Camp	DeLauro
Barcia	Canady	Deutsch
Barrett (NE)	Capps	Diaz-Balart
Bateman	Capuano	Dickey
Becerra	Cardin	Dicks
Bentsen	Carson	Dingell
Bereuter	Castle	Dixon
Berkley	Chambliss	Doggett
Berman	Clay	Dooley
Berry	Clayton	Doyle
Bilbray	Clement	Dreier
Bilirakis	Clyburn	Edwards
Bishop	Coble	Ehlers
Blagojevich	Combust	Ehrlich
Bliley	Condit	Emerson
Blumenauer	Conyers	Engel
Boehlert	Cook	English
Bonilla	Cooksey	Eshoo
Bonior	Costello	Etheridge
Borski	Coyne	Evans
Boswell	Cramer	Everett
Boucher	Crowley	Ewing
Boyd	Cubin	Farr
Brady (PA)	Cummings	Fattah

Filner	Lewis (GA)	Roemer
Fletcher	Lewis (KY)	Rogers
Foley	Lipinski	Ros-Lehtinen
Forbes	LoBiondo	Rothman
Ford	Lofgren	Roybal-Allard
Frank (MA)	Lowe	Rush
Frelinghuysen	Lucas (KY)	Ryan (WI)
Frost	Lucas (OK)	Sabo
Gallegly	Maloney (CT)	Sanchez
Ganske	Maloney (NY)	Sanders
Gejdenson	Markey	Sandlin
Gekas	Martinez	Sawyer
Gephardt	Mascara	Saxton
Gilchrest	Matsui	Schaffer
Gillmor	McCarthy (MO)	Schakowsky
Gilman	McCarthy (NY)	Scott
Gonzalez	McCrery	Serrano
Goodling	McDermott	Shaw
Goss	McGovern	Sherman
Greenwood	McHugh	Shimkus
Gutierrez	McIntyre	Shows
Hall (OH)	McKeon	Shuster
Hansen	McKinney	Sisisky
Hastings (FL)	McNulty	Skeen
Hastings (WA)	Meehan	Skelton
Hayes	Meek (FL)	Slaughter
Hill (IN)	Meeks (NY)	Smith (NJ)
Hill (MT)	Menendez	Smith (TX)
Hilliard	Mica	Smith (WA)
Hinchey	Millender-	Snyder
Hinojosa	McDonald	Souder
Hobson	Miller, George	Spratt
Hoeffel	Minge	Stabenow
Holden	Mink	Stark
Holt	Moakley	Stearns
Hooley	Mollohan	Stenholm
Horn	Moore	Strickland
Houghton	Moran (KS)	Stump
Hoyer	Moran (VA)	Stupak
Hulshof	Murtha	Talent
Hunter	Nader	Tanner
Hyde	Napolitano	Tauscher
Inlee	Neal	Tauzin
Isakson	Nethercutt	Thomas
Jackson (IL)	Ney	Thompson (CA)
Jackson-Lee	Northup	Thompson (MS)
(TX)	Norwood	Thune
Jefferson	Nussle	Thurman
John	Oberstar	Tierney
Johnson (CT)	Obey	Towns
Johnson, E. B.	Oliver	Traficant
Jones (OH)	Ortiz	Turner
Kanjorski	Ose	Udall (CO)
Kaptur	Owens	Udall (NM)
Kelly	Pallone	Udall (NM)
Kennedy	Pascrell	Velázquez
Kildee	Pastor	Vento
Kilpatrick	Payne	Visclosky
Kind (WI)	Pease	Walden
King (NY)	Pelosi	Walsh
Kingston	Peterson (MN)	Walters
Kleczka	Peterson (PA)	Watkins
Klink	Phelps	Watt (NC)
Knollenberg	Pickering	Waxman
Kolbe	Pickett	Weiner
Kucinich	Pitts	Weldon (PA)
Kuykendall	Pomeroy	Weller
LaFalce	Porter	Wexler
LaHood	Portman	Weygand
Lampson	Price (NC)	Whitfield
Lantos	Pryce (OH)	Wicker
Larson	Quinn	Wilson
Latham	Radanovich	Wise
LaTourette	Rahall	Wolf
Lazio	Rangel	Woolsey
Leach	Regula	Wu
Lee	Reyes	Wynn
Levin	Rivers	Young (FL)
Lewis (CA)	Rodriguez	

NOT VOTING—10

Ackerman	McCollum	Simpson
Brown (CA)	Morella	Young (AK)
Hutchinson	Oxley	
Kasich	Packard	

□ 1441

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SANFORD

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gen-

tleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 79, noes 348, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 160]

AYES—79

Archer	Ganske	Reynolds
Ballenger	Graham	Rohrabacher
Barr	Granger	Roukema
Barrett (WI)	Green (TX)	Royce
Bartlett	Hall (TX)	Ryan (WI)
Barton	Hayworth	Ryun (KS)
Bass	Hefley	Salmon
Biggert	Herger	Sanford
Bilbray	Hoekstra	Scarborough
Burton	Hostettler	Sensenbrenner
Buyer	Istook	Shadegg
Campbell	Johnson, Sam	Shays
Cannon	Kelly	Smith (MI)
Chabot	Kind (WI)	Smith (WA)
Coburn	Kleczka	Stark
Collins	Largent	Stearns
Cox	LoBiondo	Sununu
Crane	Lofgren	Tancredo
Delahunt	Luther	Terry
DeMint	Maloney (CT)	Tiahrt
Doggett	Manzullo	Tierney
Ehrlich	McInnis	Toomey
Foley	McIntosh	Upton
Fossella	Miller (FL)	Watts (OK)
Frank (MA)	Myrick	Weldon (FL)
Franks (NJ)	Paul	
	Petri	

NOES—348

Abercrombie	Callahan	Dixon
Ackerman	Calvert	Dooley
Aderholt	Camp	Doolittle
Allen	Canady	Doyle
Andrews	Capps	Dreier
Armey	Capuano	Duncan
Bachus	Cardin	Dunn
Baird	Carson	Edwards
Baker	Chambliss	Ehlers
Baldacci	Chenoweth	Emerson
Baldwin	Clay	Engel
Barcia	Clayton	English
Barrett (NE)	Clement	Eshoo
Bateman	Clyburn	Etheridge
Becerra	Coble	Evans
Bentsen	Combust	Everett
Bereuter	Condit	Ewing
Berkley	Conyers	Farr
Berman	Cook	Fattah
Berry	Cooksey	Filner
Bilirakis	Costello	Fletcher
Bishop	Coyne	Forbes
Blagojevich	Cramer	Ford
Bliley	Crowley	Fowler
Blumenauer	Cubin	Frelinghuysen
Blunt	Cummings	Frost
Boehlert	Cunningham	Gallegly
Boehner	Danner	Gekas
Bonilla	Davis (FL)	Gephardt
Bonior	Davis (IL)	Gibbons
Bono	Davis (VA)	Gilchrest
Borski	Deal	Gillmor
Boswell	DeFazio	Gilman
Boucher	DeGette	Gonzalez
Boyd	DeLauro	Goode
Brady (PA)	DeLay	Goodlatte
Brady (TX)	Deutsch	Goodling
Brown (FL)	Diaz-Balart	Gordon
Brown (OH)	Dickey	Goss
Bryant	Dicks	Green (WI)
Burr	Dingell	Greenwood

Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchev
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
King (NY)
Kingston
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Maloney (NY)
Markley
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-
McDonald
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Packard
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Price (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush

NOT VOTING—6

Brown (CA) Kasich Oxley
Gejdenson McCollum Young (AK)

□ 1449

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COBURN

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 119, noes 308, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 161]

AYES—119

Baird
Ballenger
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Berkley
Biggett
Bilbray
Brown (OH)
Burton
Buyer
Campbell
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Cox
Crane
Crowley
Davis (VA)
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeMint
Doggett
Doolittle
Duncan
Ehrlich
English
Eshoo
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Ganske
Gillmor
Gordon
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hilleary
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Inslee
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kelly
Kind (WI)
Kleccka
Largent
Lazio
Lee
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Manzullo
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
Meehan
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Obey
Olver
Paul
Petri
Porter
Portman
Ramstad
Reynolds
Roemer
Rogan
Rohrabacher
Rothman
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanford
Sawyer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Spence
Stark
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Upton
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)

NOES—308

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Adersholt
Allen
Andrews
Armedy
Bachus
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Billirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Burr
Callahan
Dixon
Camp
Canady
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Combust
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Deal
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Frost
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte

Goodling
Goss
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilliard
Hinchev
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
King (NY)
Kingston
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Maloney (NY)
Markley
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-
McDonald
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Packard
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Price (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Shaw
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)
Oxley
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—6

Archer Kasich Oxley
Brown (CA) McCollum Young (AK)

□ 1457

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1500

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to engage in a colloquy with the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) regarding the anticipated schedule on the agriculture appropriations bill. We understand that on our side there are few amendments that remain to be offered, but it is unclear to us what the desire of the majority is in moving this

piece of legislation. If the gentleman could clarify for our side, we would greatly appreciate it.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, it is the plan that we would rise at this point on further consideration of the agricultural appropriations bill and go to the lockbox issue. We would anticipate that the lockbox issue, considering the time for the rule, two hours of general debate, there will be no amendments under the rule, so I would anticipate a vote on final passage and/or possibly a vote on a motion to recommit, should that be the case.

After that, the majority leader will reassess where we are, what time of day it is, and then make an announcement at that time as to what the further activity would be on this bill or any other bill that would come before the House this evening.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the chairman for that clarification. I notice that the majority leader is on the floor and able to engage in this colloquy. I wonder if he would do me the great honor of giving those of us on our side his view of what the schedule for the remaining part of the day will be like and how the agricultural appropriations bill will fit into the schedule later today.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

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

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, obviously we are, as often has been the case over the years, the week before a district recess and we have a lot of work that is pending that is important. We obviously have, and have already indicated that we have a high priority for agriculture, and we want to move back to the agricultural appropriations bill as soon as we can, and we still have high hopes of completing that work tonight, or at least perhaps this week.

But I think it is time now for us to make sure that we move on, complete the other work which we know we can complete on the lockbox. We will have a chance to assess everything on the agriculture bill later on in the day, perhaps earlier. As soon as I have a clear picture of things, I will contact the gentlewoman and let her know.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman will let us know perhaps by 5:30 whether or not the agricultural appropriations bill will be coming to the floor later this evening so our Members could be ready?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, as soon as I can know something that would be helpful and reliable, yes; 5:30, 4:30, as soon as possible. But I understand the gentlewoman's point about the time line and I will try to respect that.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

I would just advise our membership that if we do have Members listening or on the floor who have amendments, call our office no later than 6 o'clock and we will try to let our Members know whether there will be additional votes this evening or not on the agricultural appropriations bill.

I would just ask the forbearance of the leadership of the majority to please treat our Members with respect, and I am sure they will, but to allow us the time necessary to prepare our Members for the floor. If we are not going to bring the bill up tonight, if we do not hear by 6 o'clock, I will assume it will not be coming up.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will yield, as an old economist let me just say we should be careful what we assume, but I will try to keep the gentlewoman as informed as possible.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the leader.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, today I would like to express my support for H.R. 1906, The Agriculture Appropriations Act of 2000. Our nation's farmers are by far the most productive in the world and we should continue to support their efforts.

Our nation's farmers often experience accomplishments reached through the struggles and achievements of past agriculturists. H.R. 1906 will allot the necessary funds to help increase agriculture research which in turn will help our farmers achieve the level of commodities needed to feed a hungry world.

I would like to specifically acknowledge the provision which allots funds for pesticide and crop disease research. This will directly benefit Southern California floriculture and nursery crop producers. With over 20 percent of the total agriculture share, California farmers rank first in the nation in overall production of nursery products. This research can positively impact rural and suburban economies, and increase international competitiveness by helping prevent the spread of pests and diseases among nursery and floriculture crops.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to commend Chairman SKEEN for once again producing an Agriculture Appropriations bill that is beneficial for the American farmer. Farming is still one of the toughest jobs in America, and I share Mr. SKEEN's wish to make sure that is not forgotten here in Washington.

Mr. PHELPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the FY 2000 Agriculture Appropriations bill, but I must also take this opportunity to express my concern that many needs in the agriculture community will remain unmet under this legislation.

I know that all of my colleagues are by now aware that American agriculture is in crisis. We provided some desperately-needed assistance by passing the Emergency Supplemental bill last week, and this appropriations measure will offer still more help. But I caution my colleagues that it will only help so much, and we must not allow ourselves to be lulled into thinking that agriculture's problems are over.

I applaud the House appropriators for crafting a good bill under extremely tight bud-

get constraints. They have the unenviable task of allocating scarce funds in a reasonable manner, all at a time when the needs in the agriculture community are greater than ever. While I plan to support the legislation, it nonetheless falls short in a number of respects, and I would be remiss if I failed to point them out.

First and foremost, the bill does almost nothing to address the farm crisis. It does not provide for any continuation of the emergency assistance provided in last year's Omnibus Appropriations bill or in the recently-passed Supplemental, and it contains no initiatives to support farm incomes or remove surpluses from markets. And although the bill funds farm credit programs and Farm Service Agency staff at the level requested months ago by the President, this package simply does not reflect the economic conditions that face farmers and the current needs that could not have been accurately anticipated at the beginning of the year.

Furthermore, nutrition programs do not fare well under this bill, particularly the Women, Infants and Children (WIC) program. WIC is one of the most successful and important federal programs ever undertaken and serves millions of pregnant women, nursing mothers, infants and young children. Unfortunately, although H.R. 1906 does include a slight increase over last year's funding for WIC, the bill provides over \$100 million less than the administration's request for this critical program. The legislation also fails to incorporate the requested \$10 million increase for elderly nutrition programs, and other programs receive no funding at all, including the school breakfast pilot program and the Nutrition, Education and Training (NET) program.

I am also disappointed by the funding levels for many conservation programs on which farmers in my district and around the country rely. Unfortunately, in trying to stay within tight budget caps, the bill's authors have included a number of limitation provisions that produce savings from direct spending programs. For example, the bill cuts the Wetlands Reserve Program and the Environmental Quality Incentives Program below authorized levels. These are extremely popular programs which help farmers while protecting our environment, and I am disappointed that they have been sacrificed.

Having said all that, let me point out again that I understand the tough decisions the appropriators were forced to make, and although we all have different priorities, this bill does provide critical funding for a number of very valuable programs. We have to start somewhere, and I cannot emphasize enough how sadly America's farmers need our help and our continued attention. I will support the bill and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, I hope my colleagues will join me in strongly opposing the Coburn amendment to eliminate funding for the National Center for Peanut Competitiveness.

It is no secret the peanut is a very important crop to Georgia and Southern agriculture, and this program is critical to ensuring that peanuts hold an attractive, competitive position in the global marketplace of the 21st century.

The 1996 Farm Bill reformed the federal peanut program; it is now a no-net-cost program to the government. It provides consumers with ample supply of one of the safest, most nutritious foods.

The National Center for Peanut Competitiveness is a broad-based research program that includes product development, economics, and the fundamental aspects of reducing production costs; additionally, it enhances consumer appeal and improves product safety. This program also encompasses research into nutrition, biotechnology, peanut allergies, and trade liberalization through the World Trade Organization.

Eliminating funding for the National Center for Peanut Competitiveness would be detrimental for both peanut farmers and the peanut industry.

Mr. Chairman, the FY 2000 Agricultural Appropriations bill contains critical funding for agricultural research, and I urge my colleagues to vote against cuts to the National Center for Peanut Competitiveness.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE) having assumed the chair, Mr. PEASE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration 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, had come to no resolution thereon.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1259, SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE SAFE DEPOSIT BOX ACT OF 1999

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 186 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 186

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1259) to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to protect Social Security surpluses through strengthened budgetary enforcement mechanisms. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The amendment specified in section 2 of this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) two hours of debate equally divided and controlled among the chairmen and ranking minority members of the Committees on the Budget, Rules, and Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. The amendment considered as adopted is as follows: page 3, line 13, strike "cause or increase" and insert "set forth".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), 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 186 provides for consideration of H.R. 1259, the Social Security and Medicare Safe Deposit Box Act of 1999, a bill that will help to protect the Social Security Trust Fund.

House Resolution 186 provides two hours of general debate divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority members of the Committee on Rules, the Committee on the Budget, and the Committee on Ways and Means.

The rule provides that the bill will be considered as read and provides that the amendment printed in section 2 of the resolution be considered as adopted. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions, as is the right of the minority.

Mr. Speaker, let me start by explaining exactly what this bill will do. First, the bill will establish a parliamentary point of order against any budget resolution utilizing the Social Security surpluses in its spending or revenue proposals. Second, the bill establishes a point of order against any legislation, including spending initiatives and tax cuts, that attempts to use any funds from the Social Security surplus. And third, this bill prohibits the Office of Management and Budget, the Congressional Budget Office, or any other Federal Government agency from including Social Security surpluses in Federal budget totals when publishing official documents.

Mr. Speaker, it is dishonest to talk openly about a budget surplus when our operating budget is still in deficit. The government continues to borrow money from Social Security, a fact that does not show up on the government's balance sheet but that has dire consequences for the future. This "lockbox" takes Social Security away from budget calculations so budget decisions are made only on non-Social Security dollars, a vital first step in ensuring retirement programs will be there for this generation and generations to come.

In our response to the President's State of the Union address, the 106th Congress committed itself to saving Social Security. This task has two important components. First, we must ensure that the current system is being managed responsibly by locking away today's contributions and securing the retirement of current beneficiaries. Today, we deliver our first component. Later, we will have to make fundamental reforms to the system to guarantee the program's long-term viability

while improving benefits and providing Americans with more control over their retirement savings.

We began to fulfill our promise to the bill on the first component when, two months ago, this Congress passed the budget resolution. That resolution outlined our budget goals for the next 10 years and called for the establishment of a "lockbox" to reserve the \$1.8 trillion in cumulative Social Security surpluses.

Today, we follow through on that original blueprint by taking advantage of this historic opportunity to save Social Security by ensuring that 100 percent of the money destined for the Social Security Trust Fund remain in the trust fund, \$1.8 trillion over the next decade.

Now, we will certainly hear the argument that this legislation is being rushed to the floor. To that I must respond that we have waited far too long for this kind of reform. It is the first time in the history of the program that a Congress will protect Social Security funds.

Would opponents rather continue the practices that since 1969 allowed those who ran this Congress to routinely spend the trust funds in order to pay for other government programs and mask the Nation's deficits? While other Congresses have chosen to use surplus Social Security revenues for other "spending priorities," this Congress is proud to be the first to preserve the retirement security of all Americans. With this effort today, we are working to ensure that not one dime of America's Social Security tax dollars are spent on big spending programs.

This is also a big improvement over the plan that the President sent to the Congress. His budget only claimed to save 62 percent of the Social Security surplus for Social Security, plainly stating the 38 percent would go to his pet spending initiatives.

However, the truth was even worse than that. The Chairman of the Federal Reserve, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, and the U.S. Comptroller General have all testified before Congress and soundly refuted the notion that the President's plan saves any additional money for Social Security.

Even Democrat Members of Congress have agreed that the President uses a series of fiscal shell games and double-counting schemes to inflate his projected savings for Social Security. In fact, Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan noted that the President's plan actually hurts Social Security by using improper accounting to lend a false sense of security to a program that desperately needs structural reform.

H.R. 1259 strengthens Social Security and ensures that big spenders can no longer raid the fund. This bill continues our determined efforts to provide more security and freedom to the