HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, June 29, 1993*

The House met at 11 a.m.

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

We pray, O God, that we will not have to learn the pain of living in order to see the glory; that we will not have to experience the darkness in order to see the light; that we will not have to hurt in order to have healing. Gracious God, from whom comes every good gift and from whom we receive the promises of faith, and hope, and love, be with us in all our days that we will gain hearts of wisdom and understanding. This is our earnest prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. PRYCE] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will announce that he will not receive routine requests for 1-minute speeches.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF BIRTH OF JAMES GEREMIA BLUTE

(Mr. QUINN asked and was given permission to speak out of order for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct pleasure and honor for me to announce to the Members the birth of James Geremia Blute, born 3:42 a.m., today, weighing in at 8 pounds, 4½ ounces. The proud parents, Congressman PETER BLUTE from Massachusetts, Third District of Worcester, MA, and Mrs. Robi Blute are doing just fine.

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 28, 1993, the previous question is ordered on the bill, H.R. 2491.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I demand separate votes on several amendments agreed to in the Committee of the Whole. The amendments are the Penny amendment regarding HUD's community development block grants account; the Grams amendment regarding HUD's research and technology account; and the Kolbe amendment regarding HUD's research and technology and HOPE accounts.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I demand separate votes on the Hefley amendment to cut the Office of Science and Technology Policy by $970,000; and the Klug amendment to eliminate funding for the Advanced Solid Rocket Motor Program.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Roemer amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will inform the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the Roemer amendment was not adopted in the Committee of the Whole and, therefore, it is not subject to a separate vote request.

Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: Page 31, strike lines 9 through 20.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

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

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the second amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet. On the Penny amendment on page 31, was it the ruling that that amendment passed?

The SPEAKER. The Chair announced that the amendment had been adopted by a voice vote. Does the gentleman have a request to make to the Chair?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. The amendment was to remove that, is that correct?

The SPEAKER. The amendment was adopted yesterday by a vote of 202 to 194, and a demand for a separate vote was made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], the chairman of the subcommittee. The Chair put the question. The question was put, and the Members present in the Chamber, in the Chair's opinion, adopted the amendment again on a separate vote.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet. I object that the amendment passed.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, if that is necessary, yes. It would be my understanding that Mr. PENNY, Mr. STOKES, and others had agreed that this amendment would not have to be put to a vote and would be withdrawn. But if it is not going to be, I am going to be forced to request a vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will tell the gentleman that if he objects to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and makes the point of order that a quorum is not present, the Chair may be obliged to find that a quorum is not present and the yeas and nays will be ordered.

Does the gentleman from Hawaii make such a point of order?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Yes, Mr. Speaker, reluctantly I do.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. Could we reduce to 5 minutes by unanimous consent request any other demand for votes on separate amendments?

The SPEAKER. The Chair, under rule XV, may do that on succeeding amendments, but not on the first amendment put to the House.

Mr. MURPHY. That was my unanimous consent request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] objects to the vote on the grounds that a quorum is not present and makes the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Evidently, a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes votes on the remaining amendments on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 170, nays 244, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 284]

YEAS—170

Allard
Andrews (TX)
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bliley
Boehner
Bonilla
Brewster
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Castle
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooper
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Deal
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Emerson
English (OK)
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Glickman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hoagland
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Houghton
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Levy
Linder
Machtley
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
McCandless
McCrery
McCurdy
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Meyers
Michel
Minge
Molinari
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Myers
Nussle
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Penny
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Roberts
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Roth
Royce
Sangmeister
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Slattery
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stenholm
Stump
Talent
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Walker
Weldon
Wolf
Wyden
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—244

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentley
Berman
Bevill
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blackwell
Boehlert
Bonior
Boucher
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Condit
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
English (AZ)
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gingrich
Gonzalez
Gordon
Goss
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Hoyer
Hughes
Hutto
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCollum
McDade
McDermott
McKinney
McNulty
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Mica
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Stark
Stearns
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Unsoeld
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—20

Blute
Borski
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Cox
Engel
Ford (TN)
Henry
Johnston
Lowey
McMillan
Meehan
Miller (CA)
Owens
Ridge
Skeen
Tucker
Valentine
Wilson
Young (FL)

□ 1129

Mrs. VUCANOVICH and Messrs. BARLOW, SUNDQUIST, DERRICK, and PAYNE of Virginia changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. HYDE and Mr. SLATTERY changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the amendment was rejected

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1030

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: Page 32, line 11, insert after the period the following new sentence:

The amount otherwise provided under this heading is hereby further reduced by $48,000,000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 198, noes 214, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 285]

AYES—198

Allard
Andrews (TX)
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barca
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Castle
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooper
Costello
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fingerhut
Fish
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hoagland
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Houghton
Huffington
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levy
Lewis (FL)
Linder
Livingston
Machtley
Manzullo
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Penny
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Slattery
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sundquist
Synar
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Williams
Wise
Wolf
Young (AK)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—214

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Bonior
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn

Coleman
Collins (IL)
Coppersmith
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Hoyer
Hughes
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McKinney
McNulty
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schenk
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shepherd
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—22

Barlow
Blute
Borski
Carr
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Cox
Engel
Ford (TN)
Henry
Hunter
Johnston
Lowey
McHale
McMillan
Meehan
Meek
Ridge
Skeen
Tucker
Wilson
Young (FL)

□ 1138

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 184. An act to provide for the exchange of certain lands within the State of Utah, and for other purposes.

S. 1167. An act to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 to restructure the electric and telephone loan programs, and for other purposes.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: Page 34, after line 6, insert the following:

REVISION OF AMOUNTS FOR HUD

The amounts otherwise provided by this title are revised by reducing the amount made available for "Policy Development and Research—Research and Technology", and increasing the amount made available for "Housing Programs—Homeownership and Opportunity for People Everywhere Grants (HOPE Grants)", by $10,000,000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 204, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 286]

YEAS—216

Abercrombie
Allard
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blackwell
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Borski
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Byrne
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Coppersmith
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
de la Garza
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Fish
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hayes
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Houghton
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lancaster
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Machtley
Manton
Manzullo
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Nussle
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Penny
Petri
Pickle
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Rowland
Royce
Santorum
Sarpalius
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sundquist
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Washington
Weldon
Wolf
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—204

Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Barca
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Cantwell
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hastings
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Hoyer
Hughes
Hutto
Inslee
Jacobs
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lantos
LaRocco
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lloyd
Long
Maloney
Mann
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McDermott
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Orton
Owens
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sawyer
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Serrano
Sharp
Shepherd
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—14

Blute	Henry	Torricelli
Carr	Lowey	Tucker
Collins (MI)	McMillan	Wilson
Cox	Ridge	Young (FL)
Engel	Skeen	

□ 1148

Mr. HEFNER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. MONTGOMERY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: Page 44, line 10, strike "$5,170,000" and insert "$4,200,000".

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds Members that this will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 251, noes 171, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 287]

AYES—251

Allard	DeLay	Herger
Andrews (NJ)	Derrick	Hoagland
Andrews (TX)	Deutsch	Hobson
Applegate	Diaz-Balart	Hoekstra
Archer	Dickey	Hoke
Armey	Dicks	Holden
Bachus (AL)	Dooley	Huffington
Baker (CA)	Doolittle	Hunter
Baker (LA)	Dornan	Hutchinson
Ballenger	Dreier	Hutto
Barca	Duncan	Hyde
Barrett (NE)	Dunn	Inglis
Barrett (WI)	Edwards (TX)	Inhofe
Bartlett	Emerson	Istook
Barton	English (OK)	Jacobs
Bateman	Everett	Johnson (CT)
Bentley	Ewing	Johnson (GA)
Bereuter	Fawell	Johnson, Sam
Bilbray	Fields (TX)	Johnston
Bilirakis	Fish	Kasich
Bliley	Fowler	Kennelly
Boehner	Franks (CT)	Kim
Borski	Franks (NJ)	King
Browder	Frost	Kingston
Brown (OH)	Gallegly	Kleczka
Bunning	Gallo	Klink
Burton	Gekas	Klug
Buyer	Geren	Knollenberg
Callahan	Gilchrest	Kolbe
Calvert	Gillmor	Kyl
Camp	Gilman	Lancaster
Canady	Gingrich	Lantos
Cantwell	Glickman	LaRocco
Castle	Goodlatte	Lazio
Clement	Goodling	Leach
Clinger	Gordon	Lehman
Coble	Goss	Levin
Collins (GA)	Grams	Levy
Combest	Grandy	Lewis (FL)
Condit	Greenwood	Lightfoot
Coppersmith	Gunderson	Linder
Costello	Gutierrez	Lipinski
Crane	Hall (OH)	Livingston
Crapo	Hamilton	Long
Cunningham	Hancock	Machtley
Danner	Hansen	Maloney
Deal	Hastert	Manton
DeFazio	Hefley	Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky	Penny	Skelton
Martinez	Peterson (FL)	Slattery
McCandless	Peterson (MN)	Smith (MI)
McCloskey	Petri	Smith (NJ)
McCollum	Pombo	Smith (OR)
McCrery	Pomeroy	Smith (TX)
McCurdy	Porter	Snowe
McDade	Portman	Solomon
McHale	Poshard	Spence
McHugh	Pryce (OH)	Spratt
McInnis	Quillen	Stark
McKeon	Quinn	Stearns
Meehan	Rahall	Stenholm
Menendez	Ramstad	Stump
Meyers	Ravenel	Sundquist
Mica	Regula	Swett
Michel	Roberts	Talent
Miller (FL)	Roemer	Tanner
Minge	Rogers	Tauzin
Molinari	Rohrabacher	Taylor (MS)
Montgomery	Ros-Lehtinen	Taylor (NC)
Moorhead	Roth	Thomas (CA)
Morella	Roukema	Thomas (WY)
Murphy	Rowland	Thurman
Myers	Royce	Torkildsen
Neal (MA)	Sangmeister	Upton
Neal (NC)	Santorum	Vento
Nussle	Saxton	Vucanovich
Ortiz	Schaefer	Walker
Orton	Schiff	Walsh
Oxley	Schumer	Weldon
Packard	Sensenbrenner	Wolf
Pallone	Shaw	Wyden
Parker	Shays	Young (AK)
Paxon	Shuster	Zeliff
	Sisisky	Zimmer

NOES—171

Abercrombie	Gejdenson	Pastor
Ackerman	Gephardt	Payne (NJ)
Andrews (ME)	Gibbons	Payne (VA)
Bacchus (FL)	Gonzalez	Pelosi
Baesler	Green	Pickett
Barcia	Hall (TX)	Pickle
Barlow	Hamburg	Price (NC)
Becerra	Harman	Rangel
Beilenson	Hastings	Reed
Berman	Hayes	Reynolds
Bevill	Hefner	Richardson
Bishop	Hilliard	Rose
Blackwell	Hinchey	Rostenkowski
Boehlert	Hochbrueckner	Roybal-Allard
Bonior	Horn	Rush
Boucher	Houghton	Sabo
Brewster	Hoyer	Sanders
Brooks	Hughes	Sarpalius
Brown (CA)	Inslee	Sawyer
Brown (FL)	Jefferson	Schenk
Bryant	Johnson (SD)	Schroeder
Byrne	Johnson, E. B.	Scott
Cardin	Kanjorski	Serrano
Carr	Kaptur	Sharp
Chapman	Kennedy	Shepherd
Clay	Kildee	Skaggs
Clayton	Klein	Slaughter
Clyburn	Kopetski	Smith (IA)
Coleman	Kreidler	Stokes
Collins (IL)	LaFalce	Strickland
Collins (MI)	Lambert	Studds
Conyers	Laughlin	Stupak
Cooper	Lewis (CA)	Swift
Coyne	Lewis (GA)	Synar
Cramer	Lloyd	Tejeda
Darden	Mann	Thompson
de la Garza	Markey	Thornton
DeLauro	Matsui	Torres
Dellums	Mazzoli	Torricelli
Dingell	McDermott	Towns
Dixon	McKinney	Traficant
Durbin	McNulty	Unsoeld
Edwards (CA)	Meek	Valentine
English (AZ)	Mfume	Velazquez
Eshoo	Miller (CA)	Visclosky
Evans	Mineta	Volkmer
Farr	Mink	Washington
Fazio	Moakley	Waters
Fields (LA)	Mollohan	Watt
Filner	Moran	Waxman
Fingerhut	Murtha	Wheat
Flake	Nadler	Whitten
Foglietta	Natcher	Williams
Ford (MI)	Oberstar	Wise
Ford (TN)	Obey	Woolsey
Frank (MA)	Olver	Wynn
Furse	Owens	Yates

NOT VOTING—12

Blute	Henry	Skeen
Bonilla	Lowey	Tucker
Cox	McMillan	Wilson
Engel	Ridge	Young (FL)

□ 1156

Mr. GLICKMAN changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The Clerk will report the final amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: Page 51, line 12, strike "$4,882,900,000" and insert "$4,778,400,000".

Page 51, line 21, strike "$545,300,000" and insert "$512,700,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 379, noes 43, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 288]

AYES—379

Abercrombie	Clayton	Fingerhut
Ackerman	Clement	Fish
Allard	Clinger	Flake
Andrews (ME)	Clyburn	Foglietta
Andrews (NJ)	Coble	Ford (MI)
Andrews (TX)	Coleman	Ford (TN)
Applegate	Collins (GA)	Fowler
Archer	Collins (IL)	Frank (MA)
Armey	Collins (MI)	Franks (CT)
Baesler	Combest	Franks (NJ)
Baker (CA)	Condit	Frost
Baker (LA)	Conyers	Furse
Ballenger	Coppersmith	Gallegly
Barca	Costello	Gallo
Barcia	Coyne	Gejdenson
Barlow	Crane	Gekas
Barrett (NE)	Crapo	Gibbons
Barrett (WI)	Cunningham	Gilchrest
Bartlett	Danner	Gillmor
Barton	Darden	Gilman
Bateman	de la Garza	Gingrich
Becerra	Deal	Glickman
Beilenson	DeFazio	Goodlatte
Bentley	DeLauro	Goodling
Bereuter	DeLay	Gordon
Berman	Dellums	Goss
Bilirakis	Deutsch	Grams
Bishop	Diaz-Balart	Grandy
Blackwell	Dickey	Green
Bliley	Dicks	Greenwood
Boehlert	Dingell	Gunderson
Boehner	Dixon	Gutierrez
Bonilla	Dooley	Hall (OH)
Bonior	Doolittle	Hamburg
Borski	Dornan	Hamilton
Brewster	Dreier	Hancock
Brown (FL)	Duncan	Hansen
Brown (OH)	Dunn	Harman
Bryant	Durbin	Hastert
Bunning	Edwards (CA)	Hayes
Burton	Edwards (TX)	Hefley
Buyer	Emerson	Hefner
Byrne	English (AZ)	Herger
Calvert	English (OK)	Hilliard
Camp	Eshoo	Hinchey
Canady	Evans	Hoagland
Cantwell	Ewing	Hobson
Cardin	Farr	Hoekstra
Carr	Fawell	Hoke
Castle	Fields (TX)	Holden
Clay	Filner	Horn

Houghton
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kreidler
Kyl
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Levy
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Myers
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickle
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walker
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weldon
Wheat
Williams
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—43

Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Bevill
Bilbray
Boucher
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Callahan
Chapman
Cooper
Cramer
Derrick
Everett
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Gephardt
Geren
Gonzalez
Hall (TX)
Hastings
Hochbrueckner
Jefferson
Kopetski
Lewis (CA)
Lightfoot
Livingston
Matsui
McCloskey
McNulty
Mineta
Mollohan
Montgomery
Murtha
Natcher
Parker
Pickett
Stokes
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Traficant
Vucanovich
Whitten

NOT VOTING—12

Blute
Cox
Engel
Henry
Johnson, E. B.
Lowey
McMillan
Ridge
Skeen
Tucker
Wilson
Young (FL)

□ 1205

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. MYERS OF INDIANA

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. In its present form, I am, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MYERS of Indiana moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2491, to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report back the same to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

On page 69, after line 2, insert the following new section:

"SEC. . Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, except for Title I, Department of Veterans Affairs, each amount appropriated or otherwise made available that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 6 percent.";

And on page 58, line 16, strike "$5,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$25,000,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion to recommit.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, this is an effort to bring the bill down to just about last year's level, with the exception of title I, for the Bureau of Veterans Affairs. This motion to recommit would not touch that. It stays in the same.

The bill in its present form is a little over $2 billion more than last year. This is an attempt to bring it down to last year's level.

It provides one other thing. It does put the $20 million back in to reestablish the Selective Service System.

This bill, if we do not touch it, will add more than $2 billion to the national debt above what we had last year. The American people are crying for reduction in expenditures.

Over the past 2 weeks, I had three town meetings in my district. Several hundred people attended these meetings. I had only three people tell me they supported increased spending. Everyone is saying the same thing: Hold the line.

There are 110 new Members here this year, many of whom were elected last year on the premise of "change the way Congress is running."

I know there are a lot of good programs here. We would all like to see some of these programs have more money, but we just simply do not have it.

□ 1210

I regret that we must do this. But if we are ever going to meet President Clinton's request of reducing spending, we have got to start now and not wait for 5 years from now when he pledges to have a balanced budget.

So Mr. Speaker, I urge that we have a vote on this, and I urge that we have a positive vote, a vote hopefully to support this motion to recommit.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I will speak just briefly. Members know that the Solomon amendment which would have restored 90 percent of the funding for the Selective Service System lost yesterday by a vote of 202 to 207. There were 31 Members missing from the Chamber at the time, and a number of Democrats have come to me wanting a separate vote whereby they could vote for that amendment. A number of Republicans want to change their votes, too. I just want to make a commitment to Members that if this motion to recommit passes, which cuts 6 percent across the board except for veterans' affairs and which reinstates $20 million for the Selective Service System, I intend, out of fairness, to ask for a separate vote on the Solomon amendment after the motion to recommit passes so that the House can work its will fairly.

Of course, any Member can also ask for a separate vote on the 6-percent across-the-board cut.

I ask Members to vote for the motion to recommit and to vote for my amendment which would reinstate 90 percent of the funding for the Selective Service System.

Again I thank the gentleman for his time.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close by saying this does cut 6 percent from all of the titles with the exception of the title for veterans. We have a commitment, we have an obligation, we have a responsibility to take care of the veterans of this country. This bill then after the recommittal still provides slightly more than a $1 billion increase from last year's level for veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for support for this amendment.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and rise in opposition to the motion, not-withstanding the fact, as the distinguished gentleman from New York knows, that I supported his amendment on the floor, and as I have in the past, in terms of the continuation of the Selective Service.

However, I believe again we have had a process here where we had an opportunity to review this bill, go through it title by title, subject by subject, make such cuts as we deemed appropriate and proper, which I think is the appropriate way to do this. Notwithstanding the exemptions which the gentleman from Indiana has spoken to, this is still an across-the-board cut. I think that is inappropriate, and particularly I believe it is inappropriate when we have the opportunity to take these bills title by title, object by object, and either include them or cut them out or restore them or add to them.

I think the across-the-board cut is not the way we ought to set the policy, and would speak against the motion and urge that the motion be defeated.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's response on this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the motion to recommit would reduce all accounts except those in the Department of Veterans Affairs by 6 percent.

I would like for the Members to know what a 6 percent cut would do. It takes $3 billion from the bill, nearly $400 million for the Environmental Protection Agency, more than $850 million from NASA. This would be a cut of $600 million below last year's level of $14.3 billion. It would be a cut of more than $180 million from the National Science Foundation. It would reduce approximately 3,900 assisted housing units, including 680 for the elderly and the disabled. It would take $250 million from the community development block grants program.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, is within the 602(b) allocation for both budget authority and outlays. I think it is important for the House to understand a 6 percent reduction here will not change the allocation totals. It will have no impact on deficit reduction. Let me repeat that. It will have no impact on deficit reduction.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is already approximately $1.3 billion in budget authority and $900 million in outlays below the President's request.

I would urge all Members to vote against the motion to recommit.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would just propound the question, if the motion to recommit is adopted, is it not then in order for a demand for a division of the question under the rules of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the motion to recommit is adopted, the amendment in the form presented could be divided when reported back to the House forthwith.

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the Chair.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 178, noes 244, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 289]

AYES—178

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooper
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeLay
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fingerhut
Fish
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Houghton
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levy
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Machtley
Manzullo
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Myers
Nussle
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Penny
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shuster
Sisisky
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sundquist
Swett
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Weldon
Wolf
Young (AK)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—244

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Bateman
Bellenson
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Blackwell
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Hall (OH)
Hamburg
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Hoke
Holden
Hoyer
Hughes
Inslee
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Roemer
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shays
Shepherd
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swift
Synar
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Valentine
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Whitten

Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—12

Becerra
Blute
Green
Gutierrez
Henry
McMillan
Pelosi
Skeen
Velazquez
Wheat
Wilson
Young (FL)

□ 1232

Mr. QUILLEN changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 313, nays 110, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 290]

YEAS—313

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bateman
Becerra
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blackwell
Bliley
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Buyer
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoke
Holden
Houghton
Hoyer
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inslee
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
Kyl
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Lehman
Levin
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Packard
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Price (NC)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sharp
Shays
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Sundquist
Swift
Synar
Talent
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NAYS—110

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barca
Bartlett
Barton
Beilenson
Boehner
Bunning
Burton
Callahan
Castle
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeFazio
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Franks (NJ)
Gekas
Gillmor
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hoekstra
Huffington
Hughes
Hunter
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kasich
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Leach
Lewis (FL)
Linder
Long
Manzullo
McInnis
McKeon
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Minge
Moorhead
Myers
Nussle
Orton
Oxley
Parker
Paxon
Penny
Petri
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Ramstad
Roberts
Roemer
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shuster
Smith (MI)
Smith (OR)
Solomon
Stark
Stump
Swett
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Walker
Weldon
Wolf
Young (AK)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—11

Blute
Dicks
Edwards (CA)
Henry
Horn
McMillan
Pelosi
Serrano
Skeen
Wilson
Young (FL)

□ 1241

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLARIFICATION OF LEGISLATION

(By unanimous consent, Mr. KLUG was allowed to speak out of order for 1 minute.)

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, a point of clarification.

On the amendment we just voted on the ASRM program there was apparently a mistake made in terms of which amendment was actually recorded. It should have been amendment No. 6 which would have stricken $4.5 million from the ASRM program, and in addition eliminated the new construction costs on the facility which to the best of my memory as I remember is about $35 million; so if we would put that in the RECORD to make it clear to the conference committee that was both my intention and the intention of my cosponsors and also the intention of the House.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, during the vote on the Myers amendment to H.R. 2491, rollcall 289, I was unavoidably detained due to a previously scheduled meeting with a constituent. Had I been present I would have voted "no".

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on rollcall votes 284, 285, 286, 287, and 288. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 288. Additionally, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall votes 284, 285, 286, 287.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, on this last vote, rollcall No. 290, I was unavoidably detained and I missed the vote. It was a 5-minute vote.

Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2493, which will be considered today, and that I be permitted to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2493) making appropriations for Agriculture, rural development, Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1245

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 consideration of the bill, H.R. 2493, with Mr. SPRATT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. By unanimous consent, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to be on the floor today with this important piece of legislation. My only regret is that my colleague, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], the ranking minority member on this committee, is recuperating at home from recent surgery and is unable to join us, but I know he is here in spirit. I also want everyone to know at the outset that the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] and all the members and the staff worked exceptionally hard to make this a good bill. We have had a strong bipartisan effort to craft this bill.

I am honored today to be joined on the floor by my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] who has been my steady right hand as we have come through the closing days of preparing this bill for floor consideration.

Most people who are listening to this debate do not understand the work that goes into the preparation of a bill of this magnitude. This bill will appropriate some $70 billion to be spent. That, of course, is larger than the appropriation for the entire State of California. It is almost three times the appropriation for my home State of Illinois.

The committee work schedule preparing this bill included 22 days of hearings over an 8-week period, 282 witnesses, 27 Members of Congress who testified, 473 letters from Members, 6,526 pages of hearing record, and 7 volumes of hearings.

The $70.6 billion which is appropriated in this bill, is $5.9 billion less than the administration's request. It is $9.8 billion above the amount that was appropriated last year.

I will concede for all who are listening that that is a very significant increase, $9.8 billion, but I believe that Members should understand why this increase is taking place.

Of the $70.6 billion which we appropriate, almost $56 billion of that amount is mandatory spending, which means that this subcommittee in fact appropriates the money without any control as to how it is spent. It is for programs such as food stamps, other feeding programs, and the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The two primary reasons for the increase in spending in this bill are for items totally beyond the control of the subcommittee.

The $9.8 billion increase over last year's appropriation is accounted for by an $8.8 billion increase for the Commodity Credit Corporation. These are, of course, deficiency payments made to farmers over the last several years. Our subcommittee is required by law to replenish the Commodity Credit Corporation account. Replenishing that account has added $8.8 billion in spending. We have another $670 million for an increase in the child nutrition programs. This increase is primarily for the school lunch programs where the cost of the program has gone up because of inflation and the increased cost of food and participation. Again, this is mandatory spending over which we have no direct control.

The amount of increase in spending over last year's appropriation is primarily embodied in the two amounts which I have just noted.

Now, within this bill is some $14.3 billion in discretionary spending, which is spending within the control of this subcommittee. I am happy to tell you that this subcommittee has worked hard to make sure that the bill we now present to the floor today is $248 million in budget authority below the allocation given us by the budget resolution and about $90 million below the allocation given to us for outlays.

In other words, this subcommittee has not spent all the money it was allocated to spend. We are doing this in an effort to be fiscally responsible in these difficult times.

We are also some $160 million below the President's budget request for discretionary spending.

In various ways we have disagreed with the administration and agreed with them. We will describe those as we go into the bill.

At the outset, let me also say that the people working for the agencies that we appropriate money for are by and large very hard-working career-minded individuals who are doing a fine job. We regret to inform them that we were unable to include an increase for a pay raise next year.

□ 1250

We, instead, have annualized the pay increase from this year, but there will be no pay raise funding under this legislation.

We have also been very careful when it comes to special research grants, which I am sure will be discussed at great length by the Members on the floor of the House. We have asked Members, universities, and other entities asking for special research grants to provide specific information on how this money is going to be spent, what their research hopes to find and what benefit it ultimately will add to the production of food and fiber in America. We have 71 special research grants in this bill as opposed to 133 in last year's bill.

Now let me tell my colleagues where the major increases in spending are.

First, I am proud to tell my colleagues that this subcommittee has joined with the Clinton administration in pledging to fully fund the WIC program in 3 years. The women, infants, and children supplemental feeding program may be the most successful single program administered by the USDA, or perhaps the Federal Government. This program gives nutrition assistance, information, and guidance to pregnant mothers and to their infants, and children. The net results of it are dramatic. We are seeing healthier children, we are seeing children carried to full-term in pregnancy, and we are seeing mothers who are doing the right things during their pregnancies to make sure that their kids are healthy. I cannot think of a better investment in the future of this country than the birth of a healthy baby. The WIC program has made that happen so many times over that I could not begin to guess how many. But I will tell my colleagues the $350 million we add to the WIC program this year is the largest single increase in WIC funding in the history of the program.

We have also put additional funds in for loans and grants for water and sewer construction. Those of us from medium sized and smaller communities know that it is very difficult for these

communities to build the infrastructure they need to provide clean and safe drinking water and to make certain that they meet EPA requirements. We now have a backlog of about $1.5 billion in approved applications for water and sewer grants. We put additional funds in this bill so that these communities can make certain that the people living within their bounds have no threat to the public health.

There is additional money in the bill for rural housing which, unfortunately, has been overlooked in the past few years. There is money for direct loans, as well as guaranteed loans, for rural housing, and some of these programs again, I think, are as good an investment of Federal tax dollars as we could ask.

For example, on the guaranteed loan program, for an investment of $12.2 million in Federal funds we are going to build $750 million worth of homes in rural America. That will mean for a lot of families the first opportunity in their lives to own a home, and that program, I think, is really going to inure to the long-term benefit of our country.

One aspect often overlooked when we talk about the agriculture appropriations bill is the fact that we appropriate money for the Food and Drug Administration. I will tell my colleagues that dollar for dollar we get more from this agency than virtually any agency of the Federal Government.

Consider a few weeks ago when the Pepsi Cola Co. faced the tampering scare and wanted to restore consumer confidence in their product. There was only one place to turn. It was not to the corporate giants that also are in the industry, and it was not to the corporate lawyers. It was to the Food and Drug Administration, and, when Dr. Kessler came forward and said that he believed this was largely a hoax, it restored the public confidence like no other statement could have from the Federal Government. It says a lot about this agency and its reputation, it says a lot about Dr. Kessler, and I am happy that we have the responsibility of funding this important agency.

Mr. Chairman, we have added $121 million to the FDA. We put $10 million in for the inspection of mammography clinics, something most Members of Congress voted for, and now we are facing the responsibility to fund. By doing so women across America, who go in for mammography screening to avoid the incidence of breast cancer, will know that the equipment and the people using it are certified by the Food and Drug Administration to be professional and to be accurate.

We also eliminate some spending in the Food and Drug Administration. I am happy to report to my colleagues that a group of people who have been sipping tea on the international board of experts on tea are frankly going to be paid from sources other than the Federal Treasury if they are going to continue their job. This is an anachronism, almost a hundred years old, where we, in fact, inspect and sip tea imported into the United States. It is time for us to take a look at these programs, large and small, and decide whether they should be continued. In the wisdom of this subcommittee it was decided to discontinue that particular project.

The Federal meat inspection program increase that is asked for by Secretary Espy in light of the E. coli outbreak has been responded to by this subcommittee by not only funding the 160 meat inspectors hired by the Secretary this year, but also providing funding to hire another 40. I might add that we put $8 million into the bill for the pathogen reduction program. What that means, of course, is that we will go beyond visual inspection of meat to microbial inspection, giving more confidence to American consumers.

We also propose in this bill some agency streamlining. We are going to try to make some pretty significant changes in the Rural Development Administration.

We are going to combine some smaller agencies with larger agencies. We hope to save over $3 million in the process.

One of the more contentious aspects of this bill relates to the question of crop insurance. This is a program which , frankly, I have been very critical of for many years. It does serve a valid purpose in protecting producers across America from the vagaries of nature, but unfortunately, after 10 or 12 years experience, we have found that the program is not working well. In fact, the crop insurance program has cost American taxpayers $2.6 billion over the last 10 years. That is $2.6 billion more paid out in losses than collected in premiums.

In fact, it is not a crop insurance program. It is a crop loss subsidy program.

Our bill states this basic premise:

> If you grow a crop on your farm or in your county that has failed by crop insurance standards 70 percent of the time or more, we are not going to write crop insurance for you next year.

Now I do not think that is an outrageous suggestion, and I say, "If your crop has failed 70 percent of the time or more, perhaps God is trying to tell you something. Perhaps that crop is never going to grow on that farm or in that county." We think it is unreasonable to ask the Federal taxpayers to continue to provide crop insurance in that circumstance.

Mr. Chairman, we have also put in a user fee in the Agricultural Marketing Service. Many people who are watching this debate probably saw the news accounts or the television specials relating to USDA personnel who are measuring the flow of catsup, measuring the length of pickle stems and determining the standards for pistachio nuts. I want to say to my colleagues that is another aspect of USDA activity which should be paid for by private industry. We have reached a point where these standards grease the wheels of commerce and the people who benefit from that should be paying for it. So, we are suggesting a user fee of $4.5 million, which the Clinton administration has requested.

The Yearbook of Agriculture is one of the real venerable institutions of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. For a 101 years we have published this yearbook, given it to farmers and rural America alike. It is a wonderful institution. It is an institution, though, that has outlived its usefulness.

As an example, we printed 232,000 of this yearbook and distributed them to Members of Congress last year. We then turned around to the Government Printing Office and said, "We would like you to see how many people in the general population in America would like to buy this same yearbook." Mr. Chairman, about 2,000 people responded. This suggests to me that the Agriculture yearbook is not a best-seller, and its also suggests that today's farmer does not turn to an Agriculture yearbook for information. That farmer is going to turn to the television, to his radio, to his fax machine, to the uplink on his satellite dish. That is what today's farmers have to do to be current with changes. So the Agriculture yearbook, according to this subcommittee's efforts, will go away, saving the taxpayers about a half a million dollars.

We expand the wetlands reserve program to another eight States and 50,000 critical acres. We have said there will be no new signups in the conservation reserve program, hoping that in the next farm bill we can talk about permanent solutions. We have conformed to the House Committee on Agriculture loan levels set for the Rural Electrification Administration.

We have provided that the children who are served in WIC clinics will not be exposed to smoking, which we all know is a danger, not only to them, but to the people who work there. We have said that no funds will be used in this bill to promote tobacco exports through the market promotion program, the Foreign Agricultural Service or the General Sales Manager. We have kept last year's provision on restricting the use of market promotion funds for the sale of tobacco overseas.

We are also taking on a contentious item here saying that we want to remove the requirement that school districts must provide fluid whole milk to children in schools. My colleagues will hear more about this during the course of the debate. We want kids to drink milk, but we think it is important the schools follow the dietary guidelines and try to reduce the fat intake by reducing the amount of fluid whole milk.

I want to especially thank the members of the subcommittee who have worked so hard to make this bill a reality. I could not have done it without the fine assistance and the legacy of the former chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], my colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR], the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. THORNTON], the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH], and of course our Chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER]. The gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] I mentioned earlier. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] will be speaking in a minute. And there is the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH], the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE] who have also made this possible.

I will tell my colleagues at the outset that this is my first time trying to pass an appropriations bill. I am learning a lot. I know that there is going to be a lot of debate here, a lot of differences of opinion. We think, in fact, there are many issues in agriculture which deserve a fresh look, and that is what we have tried to do.

I would suggest that there are some groups in this town who are not happy with this bill. They would like to see some of the provisions changed or removed. During the course of debate on this appropriations bill, Mr. Chairman, I hope all that are listening and all the Members who follow it will have a better understanding of the importance of these appropriations.

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

□ 1300

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, Chairman DURBIN of the subcommittee has certainly spoken almost line by line in describing what is in this bill. He has given credit to the fine staff under the able leadership of Bob Foster and the new members of the committee this year, including the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. THORNTON], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON], the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. PASTOR], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH], all new members. But we always had the old head himself, Chairman WHITTEN, who had been chairman of this committee for a good many years. Always we had that sage advice that was available from the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], who is here with us.

I am a substitute today for the Member who should be here. This has already been described. The gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] had surgery last Wednesday. It was difficult surgery. Thursday he was up walking after having spinal surgery just the day before. Friday I visited him in the hospital. Sunday he went home. Yesterday he was out walking. This morning I tried to call him. He was out walking someplace. But his doctor said he could not be here. He told me just before we came to the floor, "I'll be watching you every moment, every move you make." So I am sure he will be calling us if he thinks we made a mistake. We do miss him. I will try to fill in as a substitute.

This is a good bill. It touches all of us, and it touches every district in the country. The only thing wrong is that it is too much money. It is almost $10 billion above last year.

As the chairman of the subcommittee said, 80 percent of this bill is mandatory spending, for which the Appropriations Committee has little discretion but to appropriate the money. I do not know how we can even freeze this year when we look at the obligations we find ourselves in because of the mandatory spending.

That indicates to me that Congress must do something about mandatory spending in the future, but we cannot do it today on the floor. But somehow during the debate today we are going to look at how we might make some changes.

As an example, back just 2 years ago, in the fiscal year of 1992, there was $34.3 billion of mandatory spending in the agriculture appropriation bill. Last year the mandatory spending was $37.4 billion. This year there is $56.2 billion of mandatory, nondiscretionary spending. So about 20 percent of this bill is discretionary, when we as a committee have any choice as to what we might do.

As to that $14.3 billion of discretionary spending, which is a slight increase from last year, it is about $507 million above last year's level. As the chairman of the subcommittee said, $350 million is kind of a catch up for the WIC Program, the Women, Infants, and Children's Program to provide for families, particularly women and children who are suffering from malnutrition.

The Commodity Credit Corporation, as the subcommittee chairman has said, is the large culprit this year. The fact is that what we have had to appropriate, out of the $9.8 billion increase above last year in spending, $8.8 billion comes from the Commodity Credit Corporation. I just looked at the facts here as the chairman of the subcommittee was speaking. These are to replace actual and anticipated losses to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

For those Members who do not understand, the Commodity Credit Corporation pays deficiencies on crops where the price and what is estimated to produce a crop is deficient, what the price averages during a certain period of time. So farmers, if they are in the program, get paid a figure out of this Commodity Credit Corporation. If there are losses in crop production because of drought or inclement weather or for whatever reason, farmers are also eligible for disaster payments.

In the last 2 years we have had huge losses in citrus both in California and Florida. We have had drought in the South, and we have had drought in areas of the Midwest. This year we had some wet crops both in the South and in the Midwest. So it is anticipated the losses again this year will take most of the $18 billion that we will provide in the makeup of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

But looking back, the actual 1991 losses were $5.917 billion. In 1992 the actual losses that this committee had to make up in money were $11.776 billion. As to the 1993 estimates, we have no way of estimating that at this time, but we estimated it will take most of the $18 billion that we will provide.

The subcommittee chairman has already spoken about the Federal crop insurance. I am sure we are going to hear some discussion from the authorizing committee about this. We all recognize it is a real problem, but whether it is the responsibility of the Appropriations Committee or of the authorizing committee, there is no question that it is the authorizing committee's responsibility.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I am sure there are going to be some strong disagreements about this bill. I have already heard it from both sides. Some Members say they just cannot support an agriculture appropriation bill that increases the national debt to this extent.

There is a question about the Commodity Credit Corporation. Is it actually an outlay? It is a commitment, but it is not an outlay until it is actually spent. So hopefully this year there will be no disaster payments that amount to much. If we can hold the price up to the point where we would not have to make it up, we would not need the entire amount of money.

But today we do have to meet our obligation, and there is some discussion on our side right now as to whether we will do it now or later when we actually have the losses.

In any event, this committee has done a good job. Maybe not quite as good in trimming some of it out that we could. But I do congratulate the chairman of our subcommittee. He did have open hearings this year. We had a discussion on several occasions. It was not a partisan discussion. We all pitched in and did what we could, trying to make this bill as good a bill as we possibly could to meet our obligations. But, as the chairman of the subcommittee said, this is a huge bill.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] wanted me to say that he gives his appreciation for the spirit of cooperation that the new chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], extended not only to all of us on both sides of the aisle but especially to himself. So he says to the subcommittee chairman, "Thank you very much."

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR], a great member of this subcommittee.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I am privileged to rise as a member of the subcommittee on this important bill dealing with agriculture in this, the most productive agricultural land on the face of the Earth. We sometimes take that for granted.

I want to congratulate our new chairman of the subcommittee from the great State of Illinois, who had a tremendous job on his hands in filling the shoes of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]. I think he has established in his first bill that he brought to the floor, with the cooperation of the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS], tremendous bipartisan cooperation on the part of our committee. There was an openness during the time we met as a committee that was unusual. I think in all respects, as we serve on committees here in the Congress, we could say that it was a real roll-up-your-sleeves work session every time we met. And what was impressive to me was the close scrutiny of programs that occurred for the first time in my service here, with a line-by-line evaluation of every single item in this bill that is proposed.

This bill also held out hope for the future, with a provision that we incorporated in the bill this time to have tough performance evaluation standards that will be set up and that we require by law that the Department of Agriculture evaluate every single program against others that may exist, and that we begin to prioritize and eliminate those programs that no longer are necessary. Let's put our attention where it is needed. In fact, the bill reads that we ask the Department to be even more committed than in the past to trying to streamline and meet the needs of the taxpayer for a more efficient Government, that they concentrate their evaluation during this next fiscal year on rural housing insurance funds or the food and nutrition feeding programs as a first step.

We expect a lot of this administration. We expect a lot of ourselves. I think the chairman of the subcommittee has set a good pace with the type of rigor and bipartisanship and hard work that went into this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to support this bill.

□ 1310

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2493. I would like to commend my chairman, Mr. DURBIN and my ranking member, Mr. SKEEN, who unfortunately cannot be with us today and Mr. MYERS for so ably taking Mr. SKEEN's place. I commend them for crafting a very fair and balanced bill.

The bill provides roughly $56.2 billion for mandatory domestic food programs such as food stamps and farm program crop subsidies.

In addition, it provides roughly $14.4 billion in spending authority for discretionary programs. This amount represents a $303 million increase over fiscal 1993 funding, but it remains $248 million less than the subcommittee's 602(b) allocation and $160 million less than the amount the President requested.

I am very pleased that the subcommittee has placed priority on the WIC Program and rural water and sewer programs. Under this bill WIC is increased by $350 million and rural water and sewers by $200 million.

I have always been a strong supporter of the WIC Program. This special supplemental food program for women, infants, and children provides critical nutrition and health benefits to low-income pregnant women and young children. These benefits reduce infant mortality, avert premature births and help our needy children reach their full potential.

To those of us who represent rural areas, the increase for rural water and sewers is very important. These programs help improve the quality of life of those who live and work in rural areas.

I am also glad that the bill includes funding for full time equivalents for the Food and Drug Administration. I am hopeful that the Commissioner will use this funding to support at least 65 FTE's for the implementation of the Mammography Screening Act as he recommended earlier. As a breast cancer survivor, I know the importance of accurate testing for this devastating disease. Because there is no cure for breast cancer, we must do all we can to provide an accurate and responsible method of diagnosing this disease. I look forward to working with Chairman DURBIN and Commissioner Kessler to ensure the expedient implementation of this act.

Mr. Chairman, again, I voice my support for this bill and urge my colleagues to cast their votes in favor of the bill.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO], who has just joined the subcommittee and has made an extraordinary contribution in her first year.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my respect and gratitude for the work done by Chairman DURBIN, Mr. SKEEN, and the subcommittee staff on this bill. Thanks to Chairman DURBIN's leadership, this bill comes to the floor $248 million under the budget target. Yet through careful balancing of available resources and thorough consideration of the needs of this country, Chairman DURBIN has made every dollar count.

Few people realize how many people's lives are improved by the provisions in this bill. It is not simply an agriculture bill—in it are provisions that fund vital health research; help protect and conserve natural resources; improve nutrition for children, mothers, and the elderly; provide housing for the rural poor; help high risk kids in the inner city; make possible research for safer food and drugs; and protect consumers.

As someone who has a longstanding interest in health care, I was impressed during this—my first year on the committee—to find out the degree to which this bill improves the health of people across this country.

Through its initiatives, additional research will be done on the commercial cultivation of taxol—a promising cancer-fighting drug. Research on drugs being developed to fight rare diseases will be increased $3 million to more than $15 million. And women will have access to better breast cancer screening because this bill provides increased funds for the inspection and certification of mammography clinics nationwide.

Through the nutrition programs in this bill, we have an extremely effective means of providing preventative health care at a time when we are more concerned than ever about rising health care costs. Our children will be healthier because of the school hot lunch and breakfast programs and the special milk program contained in this bill. The disadvantaged elderly—17,000 of whom this program serves in my State of Connecticut alone—will get decent meals because this bill increases funding by $8 million for that program. And through the WIC Program—which provides food as well education on nutrition and childhood immunization to 67,000 people in Connecticut each month and millions more across the country—babies will be born healthier and mothers will be better able to care for their children. Funds for WIC have been increased by $350 million.

Mr. Chairman, with its health research, food and drug inspection, and nutrition programs this is an extremely important bill especially as we consider how to keep health care costs

low. Chairman DURBIN has done an outstanding job of providing the funds necessary to keep these important programs strong, and I urge your support for this bill.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and would like to associate myself with the remarks of our chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS], and, more especially, with their reference to and remarks about the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN].

As has been described on the floor today, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] is not able to be with us, having come through surgery on his back. I know of nobody in the Congress who has worked more tirelessly on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, farmers and ranchers all throughout America, than the gentleman from New Mexico. He is a former member of the Committee on Agriculture. He is a rancher in his own right in his State of New Mexico, and we want to thank him for his leadership and work.

Mr. Chairman, this subcommittee's efforts I think have been on the mark. I would say to the chairman and to all of my colleagues that through their efforts in the past and with the present bill, they really provide the lifeblood for agriculture as we look at our agriculture program policy.

I know there is always an interest in farm programs on the floor of the House. I would like to repeat the advice and counsel of the esteemed chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA], who points out that in terms of farm programs and expenditures, which I know are a real hot topic in this body, that we have been cut 9 percent a year for the past 4 years. We have reduced outlays $57 billion over 10 years.

Most Members do not understand that. Most Members think agriculture is a target. Hopefully we can educate them to the extent of what we have been able to do in regard to reduced outlays.

Mr. Chairman, let me also point out that in farm country things are not good in terms of the economic situation. In my home State of Kansas and my home community the price of wheat at the country elevator has gone from $3.60 6 months ago down to $2.40. That is more than a 25-percent drop in personal income. I know of no segment in our American economy that has suffered this kind of price decline. But we are enduring hard times, and we have to at least fund the farm programs to the extent we can under budget restrictions.

Let me say this with regard to a personal concern that I have. If you go down the authorizations contained in the agriculture appropriation bill user fees with the Agriculture Marketing Service, changes in the Federal Crop Insurance Program, changes in the Rural Development Administration, changes in the School Lunch Program, significant changes in the WIC program, changes in the CCC, changes in the Rural Development Administration, changes in the market promotion program, changes in the wetlands reserve program, and changes in the CRP, which is the conservation reserve program—some of us would say on the House Committee on Agriculture that this just might be legislating on an appropriation bill, more especially in regard to practical effect.

Now, the Parliamentarian of the House may or may not rule that this would be legislating in an appropriation committee, and goodness knows the chairman of the full committee and myself as the ranking Republican on the Committee on Agriculture want to work with the new chairman as best we can to determine what is best for agriculture.

I would simply say to the new chairman, welcome aboard. I know that the gentleman has exhibited past strong leadership as a former member of the Committee on Agriculture. The gentleman is aggressive. He believes in reform.

I would just remind everybody that we need to look under the banner of reform to prevent the law of unintended effects. We do that on the authorizing committee. We are trying to make the farm program more cost effective.

When the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] and the appropriators ride over the fence into our pasture, I would harken back to the days of the country that I am from. Some would say that that would be homesteading; others would say that that would be a squatter. I think perhaps, since we used to burn out squatters and we are not going to do that, that we will welcome the gentleman as a homesteader, and we will try to work it out.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I might tell my colleague, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS], that I come from a family of sodbusters, and we are happy to team up with the gentleman where we can.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA], the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, who is my new partner in this effort on the Democrat side.

□ 1320

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding time to me.

Let me say that I share the sentiments expressed by the previous Members regarding our desires for a very successful first venture in handling legislation for the Committee on Appropriations to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

To our friend, the gentleman from New Mexico, Aliviate pronto mi hermano, get well soon, brother, to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], and to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] and all who have worked on the other side.

Let me say that there is a generic historical discussion every time we have one of these bills in that the authorizing committee feels that the appropriating committee overstepped their bounds. The Committee on Appropriations feels that they acted legitimately. We always expect that discussion.

Let me say that on this occasion, the distinguished chairman did not disappoint us. We had the usual disagreements. Fortunately, I think the major areas of concern, we have been able to address. And amendments will be offered later in order that we might achieve the intent of both the authorizing committee and the appropriations subcommittee. For that we are grateful for the cooperation.

The gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] mentioned oversight. We will do the same from our end. And together, we will have strong, positive oversight over all of the programs.

There will be areas, there are a few still unenlightened persons who perceive what this Committee on Appropriations and this bill does, what we do in the authorizing, because of 30-second sound bites and one-liners that Members hear in the media, unenlightened programs on the television and on the radio. Those, we can assure our colleagues, are legitimate programs that we can defend on the facts and not with sound bites.

Now, to put it all together, as far as the fiscal responsibility, this we have done together, the authorizing committee and the Committee on Appropriations. All of the talk that Members have heard, I think I can more graphically describe to my colleagues what the chairman mentioned about how much is discretionary, how much is mandated.

Here is a chart which shows the division of how the funds go to the Department of Agriculture. Almost 60 cents out of every dollar goes to nutrition, food stamps, feeding the elderly, school lunch, and only 18 cents goes to the farm programs that might be attacked today. So when we talk about agriculture, there is some great confusion that everything goes to the farm programs. Only 18 cents out of every dollar. Sixty cents goes to nutrition.

Now, let me show my colleagues what we have done. In the future, the projections are, in the entitlements, Social Security, it is proposed that all of the entitlements show an increase up to 1997. The only thing showing a

decrease is agriculture. That is what we are doing today. Only thing showing a decrease up to 1997 is agriculture.

In the past, from 1985 to 1991, everything grew, as high as 15 percent. The only thing showing a decline was agriculture. So how can anyone say that agriculture is responsible for overspending? We are the only ones projecting a reduction. We are the only ones showing a reduction.

And then the so-called top entitlements, I am going to let my colleagues in on a secret that very few Members know, venturing into another area, many say we need to cut the entitlements, we need to cut the entitlements, we need to cut the entitlements.

The No. 1 entitlement is Social Security, $267 billion. No. 2 is Medicare, $114 billion. No. 3, guess what No. 3 is, deposit insurance for banks and savings and loans. That is the No. 3 entitlement, then Medicare, then civilian retirement, then unemployment, then military retirement, then food stamps, then supplemental security, then family support, then veterans benefits.

Then we come to agriculture. It is at the bottom of the pyramid where agriculture is. And then, my friends, let me show what do we get for our investment?

The only thing bringing money back from abroad is agriculture. Everything else is in deficit. All nonagriculture is in deficit. Only agriculture is bringing money back from abroad.

The part of GNP, 18 percent comes from agriculture.

And then finally, my colleagues, let me add, we drew a chart. I said, put the total budget, the $1.4 trillion, superimpose on it what we spend for agriculture. They did. And we cannot see the little line, seven-tenths of 1 percent. That is what we are going to be, some Members are going to be arguing today here over seven-tenths of 1 percent, for 18 percent of GNP, for the only thing bringing money back from abroad.

I commend the gentleman for this frugality in many areas. It will hurt in some areas, but in 12 years, agriculture has reduced $57 billion. Had every other committee done this, we would not be worried about a deficit or a balanced budget. Fifty-seven billion dollars were cut by agriculture.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes and 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH], a member of the committee.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2493 and its accompanying report that provides funding for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and related agencies programs for fiscal year 1994. I commend the distinguished chairman of the Agricultural Subcommittee, Mr. DURBIN, and the ranking minority member, Mr. SKEEN, and their leadership and their fine work in crafting this complicated bill and in a very open fashion. As a new member of the subcommittee I would also like to thank the subcommittee staff for their diligence and expertise and I enjoyed working with my fellow subcommittee colleagues in developing a strong bipartisan bill.

In this bill we had to make some difficult choices. The $70.6 billion provided in the bill includes $56.2 billion for mandatory spending programs. These mandatory programs will provide additional money for food stamps, for child nutrition programs, and for popular feeding programs such as Meals-on-Wheels which benefit low-income senior citizens. We have also increased spending on the high priority WIC Program by $350 million to $3.21 billion. This increase is the largest in our bill and it will enable WIC to enroll over 5.9 million low-income women and children into this cost-effective program.

This bill takes a significant step toward reforming the Federal Crop Insurance Program by phasing in an area yield concept. Since its inception in 1980, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation [FCIC] has lost hundreds of millions of dollars while private insurance companies, who have borne little of the programs risks, have profited handsomely. Furthermore, the availability of crop insurance has not succeeded in eliminating other forms of disaster assistance. Congress has always been and will continue to be sympathetic to pleas from our constituents for relief from natural disasters. This is just human nature.

I am also glad to report that this bill provides $2.9 billion for conservation programs. Conserving, improving, and sustaining our natural resources and environment has to be one of our country's top priorities. Agriculture today is facing greater challenges than ever in meeting public demands for environmental protection. Agriculture has been identified as a major contributor to nonpoint source water pollution. In fact, water quality is the most rapidly emerging issue impacting agriculture today.

In this bill we are also able to expand the Wetlands Reserve Program by providing funding for an additional 50,000 acres of wetlands. Last year, the committee was not able to provide any funding for this program. While I would have liked to have seen more land set-aside for wetlands protection, this committee has added eight new States to the Wetlands Reserve Program and enrolled, protect and restore our wetlands habitat while staying within the tight budgetary constraints under which the committee was forced to operate.

Our committee has agreed to restructure the Rural Electrification Administration loan programs. This fundamental change to REA programs will eliminate the current 2-percent loan program for rural telephone and electrical cooperatives, thereby cutting back the Federal subsidies that phone companies and rural cooperatives have been receiving.

While many Members, including myself, have argued in the past that the REA has outlived its usefulness, I believe that REA has seen the light and has belatedly responded by increasing its interest rates and revamping the agency's mission. Our committee's appropriation supports this reduction in REA subsidy rates and our action has resulted in a savings of $97 million.

This bill also significantly increases spending for both direct and guaranteed singly-family rural housing loans. These programs will help provide low-income residents with affordable housing. The bill also provides much needed research for farm safety programs and it provides for a $27 million increase for the food safety inspection service. Given the recent outbreak of E coli bacteria in Washington State it is imperative that we accelerate our efforts to develop an improved science-based approach in inspection service to enhance the continued public safety or our meat and poultry supply.

Finally, the committee provides $813 million for Food and Drug Administration programs. The FDA sets food and product standards, evaluates the safety and efficacy of new drugs and medical devices and protects and promotes the health of virtually every American by regulating the activities and uses of food and drug products. While I have continuing concerns about the notoriously slow drug and products approval process, I am hopeful that this $200 million increase over President Clinton's request will assist the FDA in expediting the drug approval process.

There are numerous other beneficial programs which I could cite in support of this bill. I commend again the work of the distinguished subcommittee chairman, Mr. DURBIN and I urge Members to support this important legislation.

□ 1330

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON], a colleague from the Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman and the ranking member of the committee for their hard work and their excellent diligence on the agricultural appropriations bill. Inevitably, there will always be some differences between the authorizing committee and the Appropriations Committee, and those differences I am confident we can work through, but the basic thrust of what the Committee on Appropriations has done is consistent with the budget resolution, consistent with the action of

the committee on agriculture, and I think will move this committee forward as well as making significant progress on our Federal budget deficit.

As the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture's Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities, I want to draw special attention to the contributions that American farm workers and ranchers are making towards deficit reduction in the context of this appropriations bill and the overall budget resolution.

While the overall agricultural appropriations bill will increase spending for food programs in particular, which are now the lion's share of the agricultural budget, the Food Stamp Program going up in excess of $7 billion, consistent with the Mickey Leland Child and Hunger Relief Act, WIC funding going up, other nutrition programs going up, but in fact that share of the budget that goes to farmers in the form of farm program payments of every kind is going to be going down by $2.95 billion, a huge decrease, over the next 5 years.

I think we need to keep in mind the context, as well, that this comes on the heels of a 13 plus reduction in farm program spending mandated by the 1990 budget agreement. Over the last number of years that share of the agricultural budget, always relatively small compared to the entire budget, has been on a rapid decline, and continues to be so. It is important that our colleagues understand that and give full credit to the farm and ranch community for the contributions they are making.

Obviously, our first priority is to find savings that have the least impact on direct farm income. That is difficult to do. We have crafted cuts that minimize the hit to farm income, but nonetheless there are consequences.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON].

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the good faith in which the chairman of our Committee on Agriculture and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] have come forth today in speaking with the new chairman of the committee. I think there is always a proper place for protocol, and they have properly done their role, but I have to tell the Member that, as a member of the authorizing committee, I am not sure if we pass this bill in its present form that we need to have an authorizing committee any more. We might just want to tell the Congressional Reform Commission that they might just as well eliminate our committee, because all of the decisions we make are either going to be reversed, changed, or modified by the appropriators.

I think that is why we see the kind of frustration we do in America, and why we see the debate in this Congress over whether we ought to have both authorizing and appropriating committees because it is clear that one of them is unnecessary or certainly interfering with the other.

Mr. Chairman, I thought the Members would all be interested, because I think this is that important, that I take just a second of the Members' time to go through some of the authorizations that are included in this appropriation bill.

First of all, the bill authorizes user fees for the Agriculture Marketing Service to fund the cost of standardization activities of the Agriculture Marketing Service, clearly a decision of the Agriculture Committee, not the appropriators.

Second, it makes crop insurance unavailable to farmers in counties where crops have a loss ratio in excess of 1.10 in 7 of the last 10 years, despite the existence of an authorization to the contrary.

Third, it provides that all the Rural Development Administration activities ought to be moved back into the Farmers Home Administration. If we are going to get into reorganization of the USDA, which we will this year, and if we are going to eliminate the Rural Development Administration which was created on a bipartisan basis, the authorizing committee ought to be involved in that.

The bill then interferes with the jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and Labor over the school lunch program, which will be up for reauthorization in the second session of this Congress. We will get into this more in the amendment process later, but to preempt us from considering these changes in this area, in my opinion, is just not right.

Then the bill decides that we do not have enough to do at the Federal level, so we are going to get involved in literally prohibiting reimbursement of administrative expenses of WIC clinics that do not have announced policies prohibiting smoking. Can you imagine Washington running around to every county WIC office in this country trying to determine whether or not they have a smoking policy?

The bill then prohibits the Commodity Credit Corporation from using funds to promote the sale or export of tobacco or tobacco products, even though no authorization language permits such a limitation.

The bill then prohibits any funding for the several regional offices of the Rural Development Administration. Then it prohibits the expenditure of market promotion program funds on any kind of a tobacco promotion in foreign countries. It then puts limits on the Wetlands Reserve Program, even though we, in reconciliation, just got done saying we would cap the conservation reserve in exchange for a commitment to do more on the wetlands conservation program.

Finally, the bill prohibits the enrollment of new acres in CRP, despite the existence of specific authorizations requiring certain enrollments for fiscal year 1994.

I bring these authorizations to the attention of the Members not because I want to pick a war with the appropriators in any way, shape, or form, but because I think these are points that legitimately ought to be debated in the authorizing committees. Indeed, I think we ought to tell every Member of this Congress, urban or rural, if we are going to do this, we do not need both committees, and we ought to decide right now which one we are going to eliminate.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, will the Chair please advise me how much time remains on each side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL].

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I also commend my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] for the hard work and leadership that he has certainly put into this bill. While I do not support all parts of the bill, I recognize that it represents a tremendous amount of work and leadership on his part.

Mr. Chairman, I will be offering two amendments today to the agricultural appropriation bill, the first with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY] on behalf of the porkbusters coalition to eliminate funding for 100 specifically unauthorized cooperative State research service projects totaling about $87 million.

The second amendment requires that specific earmarks for all projects in the committee report be specifically authorized by law. This amendment goes to the heart of what porkbusters believe is what we are all about. Most of the earmarked projects cited by the porkbusters coalition are those included in reports of the Committee on Appropriations or conference reports for which there is no specific authorization.

I should add that this later amendment does not cut one dollar from the appropriation bill. I want to emphasize that. It simply does not allow money appropriated to be earmarked for a specific project without a specific authorization.

□ 1340

Without the earmarking, the funds would still be available for obligation as provided for under law. When I attempt to offer this amendment, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], of course, chairman of the Agriculture

Subcommittee, has the right to move to have the Committee rise. If this motion to rise passes, I will not be able to offer my amendment and, therefore, I ask that the Members consider the defeat of the motion to rise so that indeed I will have the right to be able to offer the second amendment.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, this Member would also like to direct commendations to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], the chairman of the subcommittee, and the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], the ranking member of the subcommittee, and to all the members of the subcommittee for their exceptional work in bringing this bill to the floor.

This measure includes $750 million in loan authority for the Farmers Home Section 502 Middle Income Loan Guarantee Program. This Member originally proposed this housing program and ultimately steered it through the House Banking Committee. After a very successful 20-State demonstration program in 1991, the 502 Unsubsidized Loan Guarantee Program was expanded to all 50 States in 1992. Once the program was in place, this Member successfully pushed in the authorizing committee for the income limits of the program to be expanded from a top limit of 100 percent of median area income to a top income of 115 percent of median area income to match existing HUD programs for urban areas.

The $329.5 million in loan authority appropriated in fiscal 1993 was completely allocated in the first 6 months of this fiscal year. Congress recently passed a supplemental bill to provide another $250 million in loan authority for the program.

This Member is, as you might expect, very supportive of additional appropriations for this program. The Clinton administration is equally supportive, requesting $681.768 million in loan authority for fiscal 1994. The committee members are to be commended for recognizing the value of this unsubsidized program and providing funding levels which are more in line with the demand for the program from lenders, borrowers, and future low-middle and middle-income homeowners.

Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate my compliments to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], chairman of the subcommittee, and the distinguished ranking member, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], and all of the members of the subcommittee for the outstanding effort they have made in analyzing the variety of programs in this appropriation measure. I have already commented favorably on the subcommittee's recognition of the need for additional appropriations for nine Farmers Home Administration unsubsidized direct home loan mortgage programs, the 502 program, which is growing dramatically. It is helping to meet the needs of low- and middle-income Americans in small rural communities and rural areas.

Beyond that, this Member would say he thinks the subcommittee has taken the right step in effectively eliminating the district offices of the Rural Development Administration and returning those responsibilities to the Farmers Home Administration—hopefully, for the most part to the State directors of FmHA.

Second, this Member appreciates the restoration of $10 million to the cooperators program. Third, this Member thinks it is the appropriate step to appropriate at current levels for the market promotion program.

However, I would say I have great reservations and concerns about the way the subcommittee is proposing legislative language in the area of Federal crop insurance programs. But I realize that the Federal Crop Insurance Program is a program crying out for reform and richly deserving such reform.

Let me conclude by saying that my State, generally ranked fourth in agricultural production with a preeminent land grant institution, the University of Nebraska—Lincoln, had important research projects requests advanced by this Member before the subcommittee that were not included in this legislation. I regret that fact. I suspect that the subcommittee is looking ahead to the good efforts of the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. KERREY], a Member on the Appropriations Committee in the other body to advance the UN–L proposals, but I would say that the chinch bug research conducted by Kansas State University and the University of Nebraska—Lincoln, which this Member requested for continuation is a unique problem in parts of Kansas and Nebraska. A solution is extraordinarily important to our States. I hope it continues to be funded by the other body and sustained in the conference.

The variety of programs related to a food processing center, a research program emphasizing nonfarm industrial user for agricultural products, and continued research in the area of sustainable agriculture at UN–L are very important to the agricultural industry in my State and to farmer and agricultural processing, around our Nation. Yet, these applied research projects were not recommended by the subcommittee. I regret that fact and ask the House conferees to support initiatives from the other body on these specific proposals or programs.

Finally, I would make a point which I believe would be appreciated by all members of the Agriculture and the Appropriations Subcommittee. If you take a look at the total appropriation considered here, it is approximately $70.6 billion. Our urban colleagues and rural colleagues should remember that, incredibly, nearly four-sevenths of this total budget goes for the domestic and food programs at $39.4 billion. On the other hand, if you take a look at those appropriations directly related to agriculture, instead of $39.4 billion we are talking about a total of $22.4 billion. So the agricultural processing, production, and marketing programs today at $22.4 billion of the total $70.6 billion is a minority part of the dollars spent by USDA. This is a point of concern which is frequently advanced at the town hall meetings I hold. Farmers and agricultural processors want the critiques of USDA expenditures and all Americans to know that only a small part goes for what are directly considered to be the farm programs, while about four-sevenths of $39.4 billion of the total $70.6 billion appropriated in this bill goes to the Food Stamp Program and other domestic food assistance programs for Americans eligible for food assistance.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK], a new member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mrs. MEEK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank Chairman DURBIN and the Agriculture Committee for the kind of bill that they have brought to the floor today.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my strong support for H.R. 2493, and in particular for the funding provided in the bill for the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children.

A recent study suggests that, in my own State of Florida, 114 more infant deaths would have occurred had the WIC Program not been in place. It is clear that WIC saves lives and gets babies off to a healthier start. This is a Federal program that works.

It should be our goal to reach as many WIC-eligible women as possible, and H.R. 2493 marks an important step toward full funding of WIC. Mothers or mothers-to-be should not go without help because of a lack of funds. I am pleased that the President has given this program a high priority, and I commend the committee for increasing WIC funding by $350 million. I urge all my colleagues to save more lives by supporting this bill. Vote for healthier mothers and babies.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING].

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time. I want to add my congratulations to the chairman of the committee, my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], and the ranking member, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], for the work they have done.

I would like to just point out the importance of agriculture. Too often we take our agricultural industry for granted. We have a great need to cooperate and to work together between the authorizing committee and the appropriating committee to do what is best for agriculture. We need to come together on a nonpartisan basis, and we

can do that, and have proven we can do that in the area of agriculture.

Agriculture is our basic industry in this country. We take it for granted because it is so strong and so productive. But we need to do things to make agriculture more productive, and I think this bill does that. We have to protect our agricultural industry so that we bring new, young members into it. And by the research and some of the programs involved in this appropriation committee we will be able to do that.

American agriculture is the best in the world. What we have to do is to be sure that we keep it that way, and we keep it strong and competitive with our competitors around this world.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my colleague on the subcommittee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON]. He sat through all of the meetings in preparation for this bill, and he said when they were all over that he had never been more relieved, except the day that he was liberated from a POW camp.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this agriculture appropriation bill. This is a strong, bipartisan effort under the leadership of Chairman DURBIN and ranking member JOE SKEEN, and with the help of the committee's very able staff.

With the new leadership and several new members on the committee, there is a new direction, a direction driven by the new realities we find in the agricultural communities in America. The committee sought efficiency, productivity, and compassion in this bill. We want our farmers to be profitable as well as productive. We want the Agriculture Department to be efficient as well as instructive, and we want American families to be healthy and confident of the safety of the Nation's food supply and its medication.

This is a good bill, fiscally responsible with the mandatory programs driving the appropriations in past years.

I ask my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I just wish to advise the members of the subcommittee and also the Members of the House that later on when we get to title IV I will be offering an amendment that would strike the provision relating to the school lunch program.

Presently the law permits its use. Under the provisions in the bill, the school district would not have to provide whole milk for their children.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to respond to our colleague who is not here, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN]. I just got word from him that he has been watching and has been satisfied so far. But I want to warn him that it has taken two of us today to fill his shoes as capably as we could, myself and the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH]. If he thinks he is just going to lay off the job and we are going to do it, we will do it today, but not in the future.

In closing, we want to wish him a happy birthday tomorrow. He reaches that big age, and he catches up with me for a few months.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself our final 1 minute.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, allow me to close this debate by just saying two things. First, I want to thank all of the staff who have been involved in preparing this bill. Many people who listen to the likes of Rush Limbaugh and other commentators believe we have armies of staff people working on these bills.

This is a $70 billion appropriation bill that was crafted by five professional staff people in our appropriations office. As I said before, it is almost three times the budget of my home State of Illinois, and five people working day and night for 5 months have put it together.

I want to thank Bob Foster, Tim Sanders, Carol Murphy, Denise Riley, and Toni Savia for their work as well as those on the Republican side, which I am sure the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] will mention and acknowledge.

Let me say in closing that we have tried to make this process as open as is humanly possible, from the hearings on through to the markup, and we have done everything we can to give every Member an opportunity.

□ 1350

We have come to the floor without a rule so the minority has their chance to make any offerings they would like to make. But I would also like to implore all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to be reasonable in limiting the time for debate so that we can finish this bill at a reasonable hour and move on to other appropriation bills. In that spirit of cooperation, I think we can have the deliberation we need on this bill and really debate the important issues contained in it.

I would just say to the gentleman from Indiana that I know we have discussed this yesterday, but I think if we can have reasonable limitations on debate, each side will have a chance to state their position, and we can move on and allow the Members to vote.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURBIN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Could we have an agreement before we get into the amendment process so that we have no misunderstanding about someone saying, "My amendment is more important that the one that you disallowed?"

Mr. DURBIN. Of course, as I understand it, I will have to ask for unanimous consent, or the gentleman from Indiana will, but I would like to try to at least limit to 30 minutes each amendment, 15 per side. I would also like to suggest some amendments may take less time and would like to encourage the Members to try to be as concise as possible.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Can we just have a lady's and gentleman's agreement that we will hold each one to 30 minutes, without having a unanimous-consent, and see how it works for a while?

Mr. DURBIN. Well, let us try that. I will be happy to. I hope that works.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Equally between the pro's and con's, maybe not because of Democrats and Republicans, but equally between those for and opposed?

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

Mr. DURBIN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, my only concern is that if we have the gentleman's agreement about the allocation of time, we also have a gentleman's agreement about the allocation of that time between proponents and opponents of the amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Certainly.

Mr. GUNDERSON. We do not want to give the committee all the time.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. No.

Mr. DURBIN. No. That is understood.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Kansas.

The seven RDA regional offices were established to assist rural areas and small towns throughout the Nation in rural economic development and infrastructure. The offices were established with widespread support and much hard work and effort by members of the Agriculture authorizing committee, including strong support from our former colleague in the House, now Secretary of USDA Mike Espy, from both political parties and both House and Senate Members.

RDA is mandated in the 1990 farm bill. The seven regional offices authorized by law have only been operational for less than 1 year, certainly not enough time has passed to make a judgment on whether they should be suddenly closed before they are given a chance to work. We should avoid the mistake of suddenly closing all of the RDA regional offices improperly and without a careful evaluation by the authorizing committee, the Secretary of USDA, and most importantly by the public who need and use the services provided by RDA. This is clearly not the time and certainly not the right process or place to shut down the RDA. No congressional or public oversight

hearings were ever held by any of the committees of jurisdiction.

So far we have invested more than $20 million of the taxpayers' hard-earned money and transferred more than 246 dedicated Federal career employees to pay for and staff these offices. Action proposed in this appropriations bill will cause great hardship, dislocation, and cost burdens to people and small towns where the offices are located. It makes no sense either to be forced to pay extra dollars, estimated by the USDA budget office to be as high as $4 to $6 million in extra termination and relocation costs to do something which has not been properly evaluated.

The administration, including Secretary Espy, strongly opposes termination of RDA in this bill. The legislative provision which kills RDA funding to support the existing regional offices also preempts the authorization committee and the Secretary's right to determine how USDA is to be managed and organized.

These new regional offices if closed by this bill will set improved regional planning and better quality rural economic development projects now underway and in the pipeline back, and as well increase costs and redtape burden.

The RDA was established with significant public support to help close the economic disparity between the Nation's rural and urban areas and to incentivize economic and job development opportunities and to stem the tide of steady and devastating migration of rural population to the cities. It is just now starting to work in improving the rural economy by creating jobs, maintain and attract businesses, and provide services comparable to those available in urban areas. RDA regional offices are helping small towns and rural remote villages to stabilize their economies, and we very much need to support and maintain that commitment and effort.

I strongly seek the support of all of my colleagues to vote "yea" on the amendment to strike section 722 offered by the distinguished ranking minority member of the authorizing committee and to give RDA a fair chance.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2493, the Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1994. I support this bill because it provides much needed funding for several programs important to my district. For example, the committee provides report language to assist the Southern Kentucky Rural Economic Development Center in receiving a grant for a telecommunications facility to provide education and training services to my district. In addition, the bill includes $39.5 billion for domestic feeding programs, including a 12 percent increase in funding for the Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) program. A 15 percent increase is also provided for rural water programs critically needed to bring clean water to my area.

Mr. Chairman, while I will support the bill because of these and other important programs, I strongly object to anti-tobacco provisions included in the bill. These provisions amount to nothing less than an all out assault against the over 100,000 family farmers in Kentucky which rely on tobacco for their livelihood.

H.R. 2493 prohibits employees of the Department from taking any action to aid in the sale of tobacco abroad. This is grossly unfair Mr. Chairman. My farmers pay the taxes which fund the Department of Agriculture, and they rightfully expect the same treatment that other farmers receive. To deny them the services their tax dollars pay for is an injustice.

In addition, H.R. 2498 prohibits tobacco growers from using the Market Promotion Program. Let me clear up the misunderstanding many of my colleagues have about tobacco and the Market Promotion Program. This is a program to build U.S. exports in areas where the United States has suffered from unfair competition in foreign markets.

Proponents of these prohibitions want you to believe this is a health issue, but it is not. It is solely a competitiveness issue. Eliminating tobacco from the Market Promotion Program and prohibiting USDA to offer services to tobacco farmers will not decrease tobacco consumption abroad. The fact is the United States grows less than 10 percent of the world's tobacco. These prohibitions will only undercut U.S. farmers in international markets and allow our foreign competitors, such as the European Community which subsidizes tobacco by almost $1 billion, to grab the international market. Once again, the United States will lose its position in the international market for a critical commodity which contributes almost $6 billion surplus to our balance of trade.

These provisions help no one, but hurt hundreds of thousands of American farmers and workers, numerous States which depend on this important revenue, and the Nation as a whole which benefits from the trade surplus tobacco generates. The impact on my State would be tremendous—over 160,000 families derive income from tobacco and tobacco contributes over $2 billion to Kentucky's economy. My State and our Nation, cannot afford to lose this important revenue.

My colleagues, American jobs and American competitiveness are at stake, and I am deeply disappointed that my colleagues voted to include these provisions in this bill. However, I will continue my fight to stop the anti-tobacco forces in Congress from taking away money and jobs from my constituents.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, there are some good things in the fiscal year 1994 agriculture appropriations bill: funding for child nutrition programs; the Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) program; food donation programs; and the Emergency Food Assistance Program.

These are the kinds of programs that are targeted to those who are most in need. They are the kinds of programs we ought to be supporting.

I want to commend the committee, too, for recognizing that such food and nutrition programs can provide a vital link in educating low-income families about the importance of immunizing their children. The committee calls for making immunization education part of nutrition education and health counseling.

Funding is also included in the bill for the extension service, which provides instruction and practical demonstrations in agricultural and home economics and related subjects. The service provides nutrition training in impoverished areas.

The problem, however, is not only that the good in the bill is outweighed by the bad, but that the good is actually overwhelmed by the bad.

Domestic food programs, for example, are slated for a net increase in funding of about $1 billion, or just 2.7 percent over fiscal year 1993. The extension service gets just a $5 million increase, or 1 percent over fiscal year 1993. While these good programs squeak by with increases not even large enough to compensate for inflation, farm subsidies and pork get generous treatment.

Funding for the Commodity Credit Corporation will jump nearly $9 billion. That is an extra $9 billion just to pay for losses sustained as a result of supporting certain crop prices.

Taxpayers take a double hit. First, when they pay their tax bills; then a second time when they go to the grocery store to feed their families. For the needy, food stamps do not go as far when grocery prices are inflated by Government price support programs.

The price of peanuts and peanut products is a good example, and one that is dealt with specifically in the Appropriations Committee's report. The Government has to buy peanut products for its food assistance programs at the Government-set, quota support price rather than at the lower world market price.

According to the General Accounting Office [GAO], that cost taxpayers an extra $14.4 million in 1990 alone—just for peanuts; just for Federal food assistance programs.

But, that's nothing compared to what consumers across the country pay as a result of the Federal Government's peanut program. The GAO estimates that consumers pay half a billion dollars extra—that is an additional $500 million—in Government-inflated peanut prices when they do their grocery shopping. And, that is only for peanut products. Prices of rice, sugar, honey, wool, and wheat are also inflated by the Government.

The committee calls on the USDA to submit legislation to allow it to buy peanut products for domestic feeding programs at lower world prices. But, if the Federal Government needs the relief, what about the rest of the American people? Why the disparate treatment?

Mr. Chairman, the bill earmarks nearly $90 million for special research grants, and buildings and facilities of the Cooperative State Research Service. There is funding for fairy goat research, cranberry research, and blueberry research to name a few. These are all programs which are not specifically authorized. Even President Clinton, in his "Vision of Change for America," criticized such earmarks, suggesting that many of these research projects should be undertaken and financed by the agribusinesses that directly benefit from them.

The bill includes $147 million for the Market Promotion Program [MPP], a program which helps promote agricultural exports abroad. Promoting exports is a good thing. The question is, do the taxpayers really need to subsidize the activity?

According to the State Regional Trade Groups, a coalition of private, non-profit international trade development organizations, the exports of companies participating in its branded programs jumped $219 million, or 25 times the total amount of MPP funds those companies received. Proponents argue that that is the very reason to support MPP funding.

But, that is the very reason I question whether the taxpayers need to be involved at all. Can anyone tell me that if the Government stopped funding the program, that any company would not still jump at the chance for a $25 return on every dollar of advertising or promotion spending? I can't believe the industry would forego that kind of return.

Mr. Chairman, if we can't even cut spending on programs like these—the special research grants, the price supports, the Market Promotion Program—we'll never be able to make a significant dent in the budget deficit.

We have got to begin distinguishing between our needs and our wants. We need to help the hungry; we have to do our best. But in a time of $300 billion budget deficits, I don't think it's asking too much for the agricultural industry to bear its own costs.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, we can't continue to inflate food prices, and then try to compensate with modest increases in funding for food programs for the needy. It is a cycle that just can't be sustained, and it's one that hurts people in the process.

I intend to vote against this bill.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2493, the Agricultural appropriations bill, contains funding for a program which is essential to our efforts to combat hunger among our Nation's children. The Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children, or WIC, has proven itself as an effective weapon in fighting malnutrition in pregnant and postpartum women and their infants and children.

At a time when every fifth child in America lives in poverty, and nearly half of all minority children are poor, expanding WIC's reach is not just a good idea—it is a necessity. For the past 2 years I have sponsored legislation entitled the "Every Fifth Child Appropriations Act" which is designed, in part, to provide full funding for WIC by the end of fiscal year 1996. H.R. 2493 includes a $350 million increase for WIC. If we commit ourselves to addressing the needs of hungry infants and children at this level over the next 3 years, we will indeed achieve full funding by the end of 1996.

This level of funding reaffirms the President's commitment to this program and is consistent with the budget resolution and the discretionary caps and is within the Agriculture Subcommittee's allocation.

The value of WIC is well documented. As the first line of defense against low birthweight, it plays a vital role in preventing infant mortality. A new study released this past May by the U.S. Department of Agriculture found that in 1988, WIC averted 114 infant deaths in Florida and 320 in South Carolina. These are not just numbers; they are lives saved.

Good nutrition provided through WIC is also very important for ensuring that children's cognitive development is not interrupted and that they enter school ready to learn. A study released by the Food Research and Action Center [FRAC] in collaboration with the National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion found that WIC participation reduces anemia among preschool children. The negative affects an anemia on a child's ability to learn include shortened attention span, irritability, fatigue, delayed motor development, decreased ability to concentrate, impaired memory, and the ability to combat infection is decreased. The FRAC study found that WIC participation among 3-year olds reduces the anemia rate by 17 percent and 20 percent among four-year olds.

WIC is also proven to be very cost effective. Every dollar spent on a pregnant woman under WIC saves between $1.92 and $4.21 in Medicaid costs. The problem with WIC is that it currently serves only 60 percent of those eligible.

This program is a sound financial investment for this country in terms of money saved and human potential realized, but for a Government whose role is to promote, protect, defend and enhance human dignity, it is also a moral obligation, and I strongly support the funding level contained in H.R. 2493.

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2493, the Agricultural Appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994. I want to thank my colleague, subcommittee Chairman DICK DURBIN, for putting together a good bill which recognizes some very important needs in my district.

The Appropriations Committee has included report language instructing the Department of Agriculture to give high priority to a number of water projects, including one in my district to use water from Lake Shelbyville to serve farming communities across several counties across central Illinois. In just a matter of months, and with the committee's assistance, there has been tremendous progress toward developing a water system which will alleviate severe supply and distribution problems for farmers and other rural residents in this area. The directions in this report will help move the process forward and make a dramatic improvement in the quality of life in that part of my district.

The committee also looked favorably upon a request for an investment in canola oil research. This is an investment in developing a domestic resource which is in growing demand from consumers. Canola oil production works well as a rotation crop with soybeans and as an alternative to winter wheat. With this investment, we can provide additional income for farmers and health benefits for all Americans.

Coming from a rural, farming district, I could go on at length about other important provisions of the bill, but I believe the committee members have done that sufficiently. Suffice to say that I believe this bill moves our agriculture and rural development programs in the right direction, and I wish to thank all the committee members who took time to meet with me to discuss the concerns of the 19th District.

I urge adoption of the bill.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2493, a bill providing appropriations for Agriculture, rural development, Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies for fiscal year 1994.

I want to commend and thank Chairman DURBIN and the Agriculture Subcommittee's ranking minority member, Mr. SKEEN, for their steadfast support of our Federal Nutrition programs for our Nation's children and elderly.

In particular, I was pleased to learn that the bill recommends current law level funding for the child nutrition account's schoolbased feeding programs and modest increases for the account's educational and training activities.

We are all well aware that the subcommittee has always assigned funding for the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children [WIC] its highest priority. I was very satisfied to note that while the Subcommittee responded to our common desire to see the program extend its benefits to a greater number of participants, it did not do so by throwing money at the program and jeopardizing the administrative stability that has characterized it.

In closing, I again extend my thanks to our Appropriations Committee for its continued support of our nutrition programs.

Mr. FRANKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to oppose H.R. 2493 the fiscal year 1994 Agriculture appropriations bill. I feel that in these tough fiscal times, I cannot support legislation that will augment the deficit.

Mr. Chairman, before I begin my criticism of this bill, I would like to state that I do support the child nutrition programs and the WIC [Women, Infants and Children] Program. I believe that these are valuable programs and that the funding in title IV of the bill adequately meets its goals while not overburdening the deficit.

However, I cannot say the same for the rest of H.R. 2493. I was absolutely appalled to learn this bill will provide $17.7 million to continue funding the National Agricultural Library in Beltsville, MD. With a $4 trillion deficit, do we really need a $17.1 million agriculture library? Unfortunately the pork doesn't stop here. We will spend another $12.2 million on something called the Packers and Stockyard Administration, that's a real fancy name for bringing home the bacon.

Mr. Chairman, these are just prime examples of wasted Federal resources. Too many programs and agencies that served there purpose or fulfilled their mission years ago continue to burden the budget. The Rural Electrification Administration certainly comes to mind. The new deal certainly helped us out of the Great Depression, but its archaic programs are going to continue to keep us in recession and in debt.

I believe it is time for the Congress to recognize that we have limited Government resources, and we must learn to appropriate these scarce resources in a way that best helps the American people. The American public is tired of business as usual, we need to put an end to it.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I believe a vote for this bill is a vote for bigger deficits, for bigger spending, and for bigger government. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Myers motion to recommit this legislation with instructions to reduce expenditures by 5 percent. This motion would save the American taxpayers approximately $3.5 billion. Finally, Mr. Speaker, I recommend a "no" vote on final passage of the bill.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2493, the fiscal year 1994 Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA, and Related Agencies appropriations bill. I commend Chairman DURBIN, the ranking member of the subcommittee, Mr. SKEEN, and the members of

the subcommittee as well as the subcommittee staff for the hard work and long hours that went into crafting this bill.

On the whole, H.R. 2493 is an excellent bill that provides funding for many critical programs in the U.S. Department of Agriculture. This year has been very difficult for all the appropriations subcommittees and the Agriculture Subcommittee was no different. Considering the shrinking budget and limited resources available to the subcommittee, H.R. 2493 is balanced and fair.

ALTERNATIVE PEST MANAGEMENT RESEARCH

I want to highlight certain provisions of the bill which benefit agriculture in northern California. H.R. 2493 continues efforts to construct two new alternative pest management research facilities in association with the University of California at Davis and at Riverside. These facilities are badly needed to develop alternatives to pesticides currently used to combat insects, plant diseases, and other organisms that harm production.

Phase I of the project will construct an 18,000-square-foot laboratory at University of California-Riverside to accelerate research leading to the development of biological and other natural pest controls. Phase II of the project will construct a 39,000 square foot facility on the University of California-Davis campus to support research in environmentally compatible pest management strategies, parasitoids, bioengineering, genetically altered organisms, and other crops, fruits, nuts, and vegetables.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, the National Academy of Sciences just released a study which states that the health effects of pesticides on children is understated since risk studies are based on adult dosages. This study does not mean that the food supply is unsafe. Rather, it means that we can do better to make food safer. The alternative pest management research facilities being funded in this bill will be an integral part of the effort to develop a safer food supply.

METHYL BROMIDE

This bill also enhances the country's efforts to find an alternative to methyl bromide, a pesticide which is used extensively by the agriculture industry. Methyl bromide is perhaps the most effective and important chemical available to protect a variety of crops from viruses, fungi, insects, nematodes and weeds. Methyl bromide is scheduled to be eliminated from the marketplace by the year 2000 as it has been designated as an ozone depleting chemical. Unfortunately, viable alternatives are just not available. Enhanced research into methyl bromide alternatives is urgently needed to find a replacement for this important and pervasive tool of the agriculture industry. The bill provides $8 million toward this end.

GRAPE PHYLLOXERA RESEARCH

Mr. Chairman, I also support the $200,000 provided for grape phylloxera research. With this funding, the committee has recognized the critical need to continue supporting research into phylloxera, which is a worm-like pest that is now devastating the California wine industry in Napa and Sonoma Counties. The committee has been very supportive of industry efforts to find a way to combat the phylloxera outbreak which threatens as much as 70 percent of grapevine production. I am greatly encouraged by this funding support and believe it will significantly help the California wine industry find an answer to the phylloxera outbreak.

MARKET PROMOTION PROGRAM

Mr. Chairman, the Market Promotion Program [MPP] has been extremely successful in enhancing agricultural exports overseas and increasing farm incomes here at home. American agricultural exports account for about $40 billion in annual sales. Agriculture provides a positive balance of payments in the U.S. trade account of approximately $17 billion. Future growth in U.S. agriculture will depend on export growth. Expansion of agricultural exports is critical for related sectors of the economy.

It is no secret that other countries have far more significant barriers to trade than the United States does. We should not ignore this fact. Our Government has a role to play in helping U.S. businesses compete and win in the international marketplace, and the MPP is a tool that has been used successfully for this purpose.

The House has already passed a permanent reduction of the MPP program as part of the budget reconciliation bill. The farm bill authorized level is $200 million. The House reconciliation bill reduced the authorized level to $147,734,000—a $53 million reduction. So MPP has given its share of cuts for deficit reduction.

I recognize that the MPP has generated a certain amount of controversy, and the committee has taken steps to address concerns about the program. MPP funds are matched on a 1-to-1 basis. Products supported must be predominantly grown or manufactured in the United States. In addition to these existing requirements, the committee has included report language steering the program to concentrate, to an even greater extent, on small and medium-sized businesses, and new-to-export participants. Further, the committee report supports requiring larger companies to provide matching funds in excess of 50 percent. I encourage my colleagues to support the MPP program at the level included in the bill.

WOMEN, INFANTS AND CHILDREN

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the committee for their strong support of the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children [WIC]. This year, the committee increased WIC funding by $350 million. WIC provides critical nutrition and health benefits to low-income pregnant women and young children. These benefits reduce infant mortality, avert low weight births, and help ensure that our Nation's needy children can learn in school and reach their full potential. And, WIC saves money. Each dollar invested in WIC's prenatal component saved between a $1.77 and $3.13 in Medicaid costs.

Overall, Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2493 is a strong bill for America. It continues support for our largest domestic industry, while rearranging spending priorities to meet the dynamic needs of our society at large. It is a fair and balanced bill, and I urge my colleagues to give it their support.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the House's attention to an amendment that I wished to offer to H.R. 2493, the Department of Agriculture appropriations bill today. I was not able to have my amendment considered because it would have been a limitation on spending that cannot be added to this bill at this time.

I trust that the Agriculture Committee and the administration will look at the issues that I have raised and take action quickly.

My amendment would stop the double subsidy that some farmers receive in the form of price support payments for crops grown on land they lease from the Federal Government.

Each year, the Federal Government leases over half a million acres of land to farmers, usually at bargain rates.

Some farmers are enrolling this land in Federal price support programs which guarantee a support price for surplus crops or pay these farmers not to grow crops on this land.

For example, one farmer in my district leases 221 acres of Federal land for approximately $1,600 per year. Meanwhile, he takes in $5,900 per year for enrolling in the crop subsidy program. He's making a net profit of $4,300 per year before he even lifts a finger.

What this farmer is doing is allowed under current law—but it simply does not make sense as a use of taxpayer dollars.

From 1956 until 1974, this type of double dipping was prohibited by Executive order of the President.

However, the policy was reversed in 1974, and the taxpayers continue to subsidize this waste of Federal dollars today.

It is simply not a sound investment for the Federal Government to pay farmers not to grow crops on its own land. It does not make sense to grow surplus crops on Federal land. It does not make sense to lease land for as little as $5 an acre and then pay 5 or 10 times as much not to have certain crops grown on that land.

My amendment would prohibit any funds appropriated in this bill to be used to make commodity program benefits payments to a producer for a commodity grown on land leased from the Federal Government.

This language would not affect crops already in the ground. Nor would the amendment affect land on Indian reservations.

The General Accounting Office found that taxpayers funded almost $4 million in similar double subsidies in the 1988 and 1989 crop years on land leased to farmers by 10 different Federal agencies.

By changing the management of price support programs and agency lease agreements, we can save at least $1.7 million per year.

Record yields are expected on program crops this year, forcing prices down and the cost of Federal subsidies up, meaning this double dipping will cost us even more than usual this year. We simply cannot afford this type of double subsidy.

In its report, the GAO pointed out that as land and crop conservation programs remove large amounts of private land from production, it makes no sense to produce income-supported crops on Government land.

In its own report 11 years ago, the Agriculture Department said this is not sound agricultural policy.

But nothing has been done to stop this squandering of taxpayer dollars.

The GAO study told about a farmer who leased 275 acres of Federal land for $1,400 in

1990 and then received $5,000 from the Government for not growing feed grains.

In another case, a farmer leased 375 acres for $50 a year, a pretty good rent. He planted 125 acres, but he got paid $23,000 for not planting feed grains on the rest.

Getting the Federal budget deficit under control calls for eliminating waste and cutting unnecessary programs. As we look for ways to cut spending and streamline Government, we must make sure a policy's benefits outweigh its costs.

My amendment simply says that if a farmer wishes to lease Federal land, that's fine—we hope he has a successful crop. But we just want to insist that this farmer not grow a crop that is in surplus and thus receives Government price supports. It only makes good sense.

I hope you will agree that it is time to stop this double subsidy that is wasting taxpayer dollars, and I look forward to working with my colleagues in the Congress and in the administration to stop this practice.

I ask that the text of my amendment be printed in the RECORD following my statement.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2493, AS REPORTED
OFFERED BY MR. GORDON OF TENNESSEE

Page 30, after line 22, insert the following new paragraph:

SEC. 727. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to make any commodity program benefits under the Agricultural Act of 1949 available to any producer for a crop year for a commodity grown on land owned by and leased from the United States if the Secretary of Agriculture has announced an acreage reduction program for such commodity. This section shall not apply to any producer if the Secretary of Agriculture entered into a contract to make such benefits available for such commodity for such crop year under the Agricultural Act of 1949 before the date of the enactment of this Act. This section does not apply to lands held in trust for any Indian tribe or lands held by an Indian subject to a restriction by the United States against alienation.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2493, the Agriculture appropriations bill. I am particularly supportive of the Appropriations Committee's decision to provide increased funding for natural resource conservation programs. The bill increases funding to the Soil Conservation Service and the Agriculture Stabilization and Conservation Service which both administer valuable conservation programs. This bill allows the Department of Agriculture to continue to play an important role in preserving our precious lands and resources.

The district I represent, Marin and Sonoma Counties in California, is home to numerous farmers, ranchers, dairymen, and landowners, as well as many grapegrowers who contribute to the production of world-famous Sonoma wines. They are quick to praise the Soil Conservation Service for providing them with critical technical assistance, which enables them to use and conserve their land in ways that are in harmony with the land's capabilities. It is evident that the farmers in my district are interested in meeting their production goals in an environmentally responsible manner.

I would also like to commend the Appropriations Committee for continuing to fund natural resource programs and loan programs as they have in past years, instead of combining them under one agency. I agree with the farmers in my district who express great concern that the natural resource programs vital to their success would be lost in an agency that also operates loan programs. Although many farmers agree that the USDA is in need of reform, I believe it is of the utmost importance that the USDA maintains a strong conservation and environmental focus.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Agriculture appropriations bill which allows landowners to protect the Nation's natural resources, while producing a safe and abundant supply of food and agriculture commodities.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2493

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS

PRODUCTION, PROCESSING, AND MARKETING

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture, and not to exceed $50,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $2,320,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $8,000 of this amount shall be available for official reception and representation expenses, not otherwise provided for, as determined by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may transfer salaries and expenses funds in this Act sufficient to finance a total of not to exceed 35 staff years between agencies of the Department of Agriculture to meet workload requirements.

OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY SECRETARY

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Deputy Secretary of Agriculture, including not to exceed $25,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $553,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $3,000 of this amount shall be available for official reception and representation expenses, not otherwise provided for, as determined by the Deputy Secretary.

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND PROGRAM ANALYSIS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Budget and Program Analysis, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed $5,000 is for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $5,954,000.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration to carry out the programs funded in this Act, $808,000.

RENTAL PAYMENTS (USDA)

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For payment of space rental and related costs pursuant to Public Law 92-313 for programs and activities of the Department of Agriculture which are included in this Act, $135,503,000, of which $30,804,000 shall be retained by the Department of Agriculture for the operation, maintenance, and repair of Agriculture buildings and for non-recurring repairs as determined by the Department of Agriculture, and an additional $19,700,000 shall be retained by the Department of Agriculture for renovation and repair of facilities at the Beltsville Agricultural Research Center: *Provided*, That in the event an agency within the Department of Agriculture should require modification of space needs, the Secretary of Agriculture may transfer a share of that agency's appropriation made available by this Act to this appropriation, or may transfer a share of this appropriation to that agency's appropriation, but such transfers shall not exceed 5 per centum of the funds made available for space rental and related costs to or from this account.

ADVISORY COMMITTEES (USDA)

For necessary expenses for activities of advisory committees of the Department of Agriculture which are included in this Act, $940,000: *Provided*, That no other funds appropriated to the Department of Agriculture in this Act shall be available to the Department of Agriculture for support of activities of advisory committees.

HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Department of Agriculture, to comply with the requirement of section 107g of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 9607g, and section 6001 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 6961, $15,802,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That appropriations and funds available herein to the Department of Agriculture for hazardous waste management may be transferred to any agency of the Department for its use in meeting all requirements pursuant to the above Acts on Federal and non-Federal lands.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For Personnel, Finance and Management, Operations, Information Resources Management, Advocacy and Enterprise, Administrative Law Judges and Judicial Officer, and Emergency Programs, $26,301,000, for Departmental Administration to provide for necessary expenses for management support services to offices of the Department of Agriculture and for general administration and emergency preparedness of the Department of Agriculture, repairs and alterations, and other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for and necessary for the practical and efficient work of the Department of Agriculture, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed $10,000 is for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be reimbursed from applicable appropriations in this Act for travel expenses incident to the holding of hearings as required by 5 U.S.C. 551-558.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR CONGRESSIONAL RELATIONS

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations to carry out the programs funded in this Act, $1,333,000.

OFFICE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

For necessary expenses to carry on services relating to the coordination of programs involving public affairs, and for the dissemination of agricultural information and the

coordination of information, work and programs authorized by Congress in the Department, $8,629,000, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed $10,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, and not to exceed $2,000,000 may be used for farmers' bulletins: *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act may be used to produce part 2 of the annual report of the Secretary (known as the Yearbook of Agriculture).

INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

For necessary expenses for programs involving intergovernmental affairs and liaison within the executive branch, $478,000.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Inspector General, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $65,932,000, including such sums as may be necessary for contracting and other arrangements with public agencies and private persons pursuant to section 6(a)(8) of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, and including a sum not to exceed $50,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109; and including a sum not to exceed $95,000 for certain confidential operational expenses including the payment of informants, to be expended under the direction of the Inspector General pursuant to Public Law 95-452 and section 1337 of Public Law 97-98.

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

For necessary expenses of the Office of the General Counsel, $26,149,000.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ECONOMICS

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Economics to carry out the programs funded in this Act, $589,000.

ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE

For necessary expenses of the Economic Research Service in conducting economic research and service relating to agricultural production, marketing, and distribution, as authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621-1627) and other laws, including economics of marketing; analyses relating to farm prices, income and population, and demand for farm products, use of resources in agriculture, adjustments, costs and returns in farming, and farm finance; research relating to the economic and marketing aspects of farmer cooperatives; and for analysis of supply and demand for farm products in foreign countries and their effect on prospects for United States exports, progress in economic development and its relation to sales of farm products, assembly and analysis of agricultural trade statistics and analysis of international financial and monetary programs and policies as they affect the competitive position of United States farm products, $57,702,000; of which $500,000 shall be available for investigation, determination, and finding as to the effect upon the production of food and upon the agricultural economy of any proposed action affecting such subject matter pending before the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency for presentation, in the public interest, before said Administrator, other agencies or before the courts: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available to continue to gather statistics and conduct a special study on the price spread between the farmer and the consumer: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225): *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for analysis of statistics and related facts on foreign production and full and complete information on methods used by other countries to move farm commodities in world trade on a competitive basis.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS SERVICE

For necessary expenses of the National Agricultural Statistics Service in conducting statistical reporting and service work, including crop and livestock estimates, statistical coordination and improvements, and marketing surveys, as authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621-1627) and other laws, $82,069,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $40,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

WORLD AGRICULTURAL OUTLOOK BOARD

For necessary expenses of the World Agricultural Outlook Board to coordinate and review all commodity and aggregate agricultural and food data used to develop outlook and situation material within the Department of Agriculture, as authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1622g), $2,582,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225).

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR SCIENCE AND EDUCATION

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Science and Education to administer the laws enacted by the Congress for the Agricultural Research Service, Cooperative State Research Service, Extension Service, and National Agricultural Library, $569,000.

ALTERNATIVE AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND COMMERCIALIZATION

For necessary expenses to carry out the Alternative Agricultural Research and Commercialization Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5901-5908), $7,250,000 is appropriated to the Alternative Agricultural Research and Commercialization Revolving Fund.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to enable the Agricultural Research Service to perform agricultural research and demonstration relating to production, utilization, marketing, and distribution (not otherwise provided for), home economics or nutrition and consumer use, and for acquisition of lands by donation, exchange, or purchase at a nominal cost not to exceed $100, $688,805,000: *Provided*, That appropriations hereunder shall be available for temporary employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $115,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That appropriations hereunder can be used to provide financial assistance to the organizers of national and international conferences, if such conferences are in support of agency programs: *Provided further*, That appropriations hereunder shall be available for the operation and maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed one for replacement only: *Provided further*, That appropriations hereunder shall be available to conduct marketing research: *Provided further*, That appropriations hereunder shall be available pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 2250 for the construction, alteration, and repair of buildings and improvements, but unless otherwise provided the cost of constructing any one building shall not exceed $250,000, except for headhouses or greenhouses which shall each be limited to $1,000,000, and except for ten buildings to be constructed or improved at a cost not to exceed $500,000 each, and the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 per centum of the current replacement value of the building or $250,000, whichever is greater: *Provided further*, That the limitations on alterations contained in this Act shall not apply to modernization or replacement of existing facilities at Beltsville, Maryland: *Provided further*, That the foregoing limitations shall not apply to replacement of buildings needed to carry out the Act of April 24, 1948 (21 U.S.C. 113a): *Provided further*, That the foregoing limitations shall not apply to the purchase of land or the construction of facilities as may be necessary for the relocation of the United States Horticultural Crops Research Laboratory at Fresno to Parlier, California, and the relocation of the laboratories at Behoust, France and Rome, Italy to Montpelier, France, including the sale or exchange at fair market value of existing land and facilities at Fresno, California and Behoust, France; and the Agricultural Research Service may lease such existing land and facilities from the purchasers until completion of the replacement facilities and the foregoing limitations shall not apply to the purchase of land at Weslaco, Texas: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $190,000 of this appropriation may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Science and Education for the scientific review of international issues involving agricultural chemicals and food additives: *Provided further*, That funds may be received from any State, other political subdivision, organization, or individual for the purpose of establishing or operating any research facility or research project of the Agricultural Research Service, as authorized by law.

Special fund: To provide for additional labor, subprofessional, and junior scientific help to be employed under contracts and cooperative agreements to strengthen the work at Federal research installations in the field, $2,500,000.

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, $29,387,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b): *Provided*, That facilities to house bonsai collections at the National Arboretum may be constructed with funds accepted under the provisions of Public Law 94-129 (20 U.S.C. 195) and the limitation on construction contained in the Act of August 24, 1912 (40 U.S.C. 68) shall not apply to the construction of such facilities: *Provided further*, 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.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOSS: Page 13, line 15, strike "$29,387,000" and insert "$26,487,000".

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, This amendment would simply strike $2.9 million from the USDA agricultural research service's buildings and facilities account. This is the amount that is recommended on page 28 of the committee report for the relocation of the USDA/ARS lab currently situated in Orlando, FL. Even though this is a Florida project, I am offering this amendment because, as best I can tell, this change of location project is just not ready at this time. It's not ripe. Before we spend this money for this important research investment, we need to complete the investigation of the best site.

The issue here is quite simple: There is currently an ARS station in Orlando that, according to USDA, is no longer viable because the facility "is within the city limits, has urban encroachment, lacks adequate field plots * * * is antiquated, and lacks facilities needed for State-of-the-art research." I know some members of the Florida delegation would disagree with that finding. In seeking a new ARS site in Florida, the USDA stated that the mission of the new lab would be expanded beyond citrus research—the new lab would study winter vegetables, ornamental plants, and environmental issues of subtropical agriculture, all good worthy purposes as far as Florida is concerned.

So in good faith, farmers from all over Florida set out to proceed through a process of site selection with the USDA—until that process broke down to the point where today, this Member and the people he represents are still without detailed answers and specific response from top USDA officials as to just how their site selection decision has worked. There is a very strong feeling among some parties involved that they were not given an equal hearing to make their case for their proposed sites.

In fact, the consensus of farmers and growers in my district in southwest Florida is that the site tentatively selected will not be able to fulfill key research goals. Instead of being a valuable asset to Florida and other subtropical farming regions, this new facility will likely be limited by its location—in Fort Pierce—to citrus research and constrained by expected commercial and residential development in the area.

Questions to the Department of Agriculture concerning both the Fort Pierce site and the site selection process remain unanswered despite continued queries from local farmers, news media, and my office.

I am not here today to add to an intra-Florida dispute. I'm here to stop one. I raise this amendment as an urgent plea to those involved in determining locations of USDA facilities to be fair and to operate in the sunlight. We'd like some specific answers. Without answers and without a chance for an equal-time fair hearing, southwest farmers/growers have come to the unpleasant conclusion that the site selection for the new ARS lab was based on flawed information. And, given that conclusion, they believe the project would be better if left unfunded until the process can be re-evaluated. This amendment will not harm Florida. The current lab remains in Orlando. It will benefit our State, research, USDA, farmers, growers, and eventually consumers—by giving us a chance to analyze the best place to get the strongest return on our 2.9 million dollar investment.

Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to have a process of reconsideration, and to those concerned with this legislation, I would be happy to say that I would be very glad to withdraw this amendment if I could get some assurance that the USDA would be willing to have an opportunity for those who feel they have been left out to be included in the process to be sure a fair conclusion was reached.

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

Mr. GOSS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's request is reasonable, and I think I would be willing to state on the record at this point that I will work with the minority leadership as well to set up meetings with the appropriate USDA officials so that people in the communities affected have a chance to understand the thinking behind this decision and to state their concerns and give that opportunity for a hearing.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for that assurance, because along with that assurance and the very kind help we have had from our colleagues from Florida who are on the appropriating and authorizing committees, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEWIS] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON], we have good assurances, but we have not gotten the action.

I think with that extra assurance I am satisfied we can go forward and provide a reasonable explanation.

I do not know how this is going to come out. That is not my job. I want to make sure that the equal opportunity hearing process is there, and the gentleman has assured me on that point.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH SERVICE

For payments to agricultural experiment stations, for cooperative forestry and other research, for facilities, and for other expenses, including $171,304,000 to carry into effect the provisions of the Hatch Act approved March 2, 1887, as amended, including administration by the United States Department of Agriculture, penalty mail costs of agricultural experiment stations under section 6 of the Hatch Act of 1887, as amended, and payments under section 1361(c) of the Act of October 3, 1980 (7 U.S.C. 301n.); $18,809,000 for grants for cooperative forestry research under the Act approved October 10, 1962 (16 U.S.C. 582a–582–a7), as amended, including administrative expenses, and payments under section 1361(c) of the Act of October 3, 1980 (7 U.S.C. 301n.); $28,157,000 for payments to the 1890 land-grant colleges, including Tuskegee University, for research under section 1445 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3222), as amended, including administration by the United States Department of Agriculture, and penalty mail costs of the 1890 land-grant colleges, including Tuskegee University; $50,070,000 for contracts and grants for agricultural research under the Act of August 4, 1965, as amended (7 U.S.C. 450i); $114,000,000 for competitive research grants under section 2(b) of the Act of August 4, 1965, as amended (7 U.S.C. 450i(b)), including administrative expenses; $5,551,000 for the support of animal health and disease programs authorized by section 1433 of Public Law 95–113, including administrative expenses; $2,168,000 for supplemental and alternative crops and products as authorized by the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3319d); $400,000 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, as amended (7 U.S.C. 3318), to remain available until expended; $475,000 for rangeland research grants as authorized by subtitle M of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977, as amended; $3,500,000 for higher education graduate fellowships grants under section 1417(b)(6) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977, as amended (7 U.S.C. 3152(b)(6)), including administrative expenses; $1,500,000 for higher education challenge grants under section 1417(b)(1) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977, as amended (7 U.S.C. 3152(b)(1)), including administrative expenses; $1,000,000 for a higher education minority scholar program under section 1471(b)(5) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977, as amended (7 U.S.C. 3152(b)(5)), including administrative expenses; $4,000,000 for grants as authorized by section 1475 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 and other Acts; $6,825,000 for sustainable agriculture research and education, as authorized by section 1621 of Public Law 101–624 (7 U.S.C. 5811), including administrative expenses; and $20,827,000 for necessary expenses of Cooperative State Research Service activities, including coordination and program leadership for higher education work of the Department, administration of payments to State agricultural experiment stations, funds for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which $10,550,000 shall be for a program of capacity building grants to colleges eligible to receive funds under the Act of August 30, 1890 (7 U.S.C. 321–326 and 328), including Tuskegee University, of which not to exceed $100,000 shall be for

employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109; in all, $428,586,000.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. FAWELL

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I will ask unanimous consent to offer en bloc amendments, which are at the desk, which combine the separate amendments pertaining to the special research grants on page 14 and the building and facilities on page 17.

□ 1400

Mr. Chairman, I have two separate amendments which I could proceed with, but it would be much easier for all of us if I simply combined the two.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent in that regard.

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I reserve that right only in an effort to have the gentleman agree with us on a limitation of time of debate. We had talked about 30 minutes, total, 15 minutes to each side. If the gentleman would agree with that limitation, I would remove my reservation of objection.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I think that is a reasonable request.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. Chairman, is my unanimous-consent request in order to limit the time of debate on these amendments offered en bloc, and all amendments thereto, to 30 minutes, 15 minutes for the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] and 15 minutes in opposition?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would inquire first: Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] to consider the amendments en bloc?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Next, is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] to limit the time for debate on these amendments to 30 minutes?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendments offered en bloc are considered as read.

There was no objection.

The text of the amendments is as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. FAWELL: Page 14, strike line 25 and all that follows through the semicolon on page 15, line 2.

Page 16, line 24, strike "$428,586,000" and insert "$378,516,000".

Page 17, strike lines 1 through 9.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the unanimous-consent request, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] is recognized for 15 minutes, and a Member in opposition will be recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment, along with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY], on behalf of the porkbusters coalition to eliminate earmarked funding in the agricultural appropriations for 100 cooperative State research service projects totalling approximately $88 million.

The porkbusters have sought elimination of these grants before. As in previous years, we primarily object to the fact that none of these projects are specifically authorized by law. This year we have a new porkbuster trying to cut these projects, and we welcome him; he is the President of the United States.

Please let me read to my colleagues what President Clinton said about these grants earlier this year in his budget, in the section about "Programs that Should be Eliminated."

I quote:

USDA/Cooperative State Research Service earmarked research grants. Congressional earmarking of CSRS research funding has increased in recent years. These grants were not peer-reviewed, competitively awarded or specifically authorized. And many of the research projects funded could be financed by agribusinesses that benefit from the research.

The President goes on, and I quote:

The USDA/CSRS earmarked facilities construction. The CSRS buildings and facilities account has become a main example of congressional earmarking of scarce Federal research dollars. The projects funded are often not high national priorities and would be better funded by States or agribusinesses that directly benefit from them.

Mr. Chairman, I could not have said it any better.

Our amendment eliminates 71 earmarked special research grants totalling over $50 million, including: $250,000 for wool research; $750,000 for potato research; $187,000 for small-fruit research; $185,000 for low-bush blueberry research.

We also eliminate all 29 buildings and facilities earmarked, totaling $37 million, including $2.3 million for the Center for Food Marketing at St. Joseph's University.

None of these earmarks, to the best of our knowledge, has been requested by the administration; none has, I can say that definitely, none has been requested by the administration.

If the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. Chairman, is going to earmark specific projects, then we believe they should be specifically earmarked, earmarked for funding by the authorizing committee, the agriculture authorizing committee.

These rules assure that projects will be carefully considered by Congress and taxpayers' funds will not be wasted. None of these 100 projects has a specific authorization.

Mr. Chairman, opponents of this amendment will try to argue that these grants are authorized. In fact, the 1990 farm bill gives the Secretary of Agriculture, the authority to make grants. The bill does not specifically authorize any grants at any location. The Secretary of Agriculture, not Congress, not the Committee on Appropriations, is given the authority to select what grants are made.

Further raising our suspicions about these projects is that they are all earmarked in the committee report for specific locations. The porkbusters coalition is a bipartisan group of 72 Members of Congress and 11 taxpayer organizations. I cannot stress the following point enough: We do not question the merits of these projects. We are questioning the way in which they are being funded in violation of established procedures.

Opponents of our amendment will argue that we do not need to cut $87 million from the bill because the bill is already under the President's request. But as has been pointed out, this bill is $10 billion more in budgetary authority over the 1993 appropriated level.

Mr. Chairman, I know that a cut like this is hard for all of us when there is a project affecting our area or our State. But if we cannot cut earmarked spending in an appropriations bill such as this $87 million or $88 million that has not been authorized, we shall never, I think, begin to win back the confidence of the people of this country.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The gentleman usually comes to the floor to oppose this spending, under the guise that it is unauthorized. He cannot do that today. All of the spending which the gentleman seeks to strike with his amendment is authorized spending.

So the gentleman has now changed his approach. He is saying it is not specifically authorized. In other words, there is not a specific dollar amount authorized in law.

I will concede in most cases that is true. What we have done, through the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, is to work with the universities and affected entities to make certain that the dollar amounts put into research are reasonable amounts of money. I think the gentleman's approach is extremely, extremely shortsighted. If you picked up the morning newspaper, yesterday or this morning, you will find headlines suggesting this: "Pesticide risk may be higher in children," in the Washington Post. In the Wall Street Journal, "Pesticide Use Would Be Cut Under the U.S. Plan."

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, the largest single area of agriculture research that will be cut by the gentleman's amendment is on the use of agricultural chemicals. We are trying,

through the subcommittee, to take very seriously the health risks being imposed on American citizens, particularly on children, from agricultural chemicals.

What the gentleman is attempting to do is to cut that research. He suggests we have not done it his way. I would suggest to him we have followed the law, we have followed the authorization language. Over one-third of the research grants in this package were requested by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. All of the grants are authorized. The funding level of $50 million on the actual research is more than $23 million below last year's appropriation.

If you go through these, as the gentleman has, you may find some funny names of agricultural research projects like pink bollworm. All of these sorts of things bring giggles to some people when they think about money being spent for these purposes. I would tell you that each and every one of these is deadly serious.

When we went after the pink bollworm problem that affected the cotton crop in California, we literally saved truckloads of agricultural chemicals from being applied in connection with this past.

□ 1410

The people in California can be grateful for that research effort. It was money well spent.

I would say at this point that all Members should take very seriously our responsibility to reduce the deficit, but I urge them to understand this is authorized. We are below last year's spending and we should defeat the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I strongly oppose this cutting amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL].

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY].

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Fawell amendment. This amendment strikes over $87 million in spending from the bill for 100 special research grants and buildings and facilities of the Cooperative State Research Service. These projects are not specifically authorized by law and in all but a few cases were not requested by the President. Our porkbusters legislation has for the last 3 years sought to rescind previously appropriated funding for these projects.

Mr. Chairman and colleagues, many of these projects are meritorious and deserve funding and others probably should not be funded. Since these funds are not awarded on a competitive basis after peer review we can not be entirely certain about the nature of the projects funded. Elsewhere in the bill funds are made for competitive grants and, I suggest, that these funds, if eliminated by this amendment, could be transferred to the competitive grants program when the bill is in conference.

The President himself included these earmarks in his spending reduction recommendations and suggested that they could be funded by agribusiness or others. And of the 71 special grants, only 9 were requested by the administration, and the administration requested no—zero—funding for the building and facilities account.

If these projects deserve funding, let them compete openly for funding. Today, by passing this amendment we can take a step to end earmarking of research grants and reduce the deficit at the same time.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of the amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH].

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Fawell en bloc amendments.

First, I want to point out we are not trying to pull a fast one on the authorizers. This year the subcommittee instituted a performance evaluation criteria to gather more information about the need for the research, its estimated cost to the Federal Government, scientific endorsement, and to eliminate duplication if similar research is being done elsewhere.

Second, in his "Dear Colleague" the gentleman mentions that the President wants to eliminate many of the earmarked research grants. I would like to point out that the amount of funding for discretionary funding in this bill is $160 million less than the President requested.

The moneys in these accounts provide funding for important research projects such as water quality, climate change, low-water tolerance landscaping, and research in biochemistry and biology. Many of these projects are at smaller universities that otherwise could not compete with the resources at the larger, more prestigious schools. One of the effects of the gentleman's amendment would be to directly disadvantage smaller institutions.

The projects the gentleman is arbitrarily striking are very legitimate, needed projects. I urge my colleagues to defeat the amendment.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY].

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL].

It is fairly early in the appropriations process, but to be honest we seem to be more ready to look at the prospect of cutting than I have seen in my short time here in the Congress.

In the energy and water bill, for instance, except for the super collider and some other things that we took care of, it appears to be a pretty good bill.

Virtually everything was authorized. Even those items that were questionable seem to have some good arguments backing them up.

I honestly thought we had turned a corner, but when you look at this bill, I see that I was probably wrong.

Most of these, maybe all of these 71 special research grants appear not to have undergone peer review. None of them seem to have been competed, neither have the 29 building and construction projects earmarked in this legislation.

We simply have to take the word of the appropriators that these are the best places for us to spend $87 million. Get that, $87 million. Now, that may not sound like much when we talk about billions around here, but it is quite a chunk of change.

Without saying anything for or against these grants, the idea of including 71 earmarks without any kind of review is simply the same old way of doing things. Let us see if we can change. One way to begin that change is to support the Fawell amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to my friend and colleague on the subcommittee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. THORNTON].

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendments offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] and in strong support of this fine measure brought forward by the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. Chairman, not enough credit has been given the Cooperative State Research Service for the great strides we have made in the production of the abundant supply of high-quality food produced by America's farmers for domestic consumption and export.

There remains much to be done to increase production capacity and broaden our understanding of health as it relates to nutrition. Specifically, this bill contains $500,000 as a catalyst for nutrition research. Some of this research will be conducted at the Arkansas Children's Hospital, the fifth largest pediatric hospital in America, serving children in Arkansas, southern Missouri, east Texas, Oklahoma, Mississippi, Tennessee, and Louisiana. This research is accomplished through cooperation with the University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences, the National Center for Toxicological Research, and the John L. McClellan Veterans Hospital.

Researchers and investigators clustered at these institutions provide a critical mass to study the significant detrimental impacts of pesticides,

chemical substances, and environmental toxins on pregnant women and developing children and adolescents. This is a highly efficient use of limited resources.

We spend hundreds of millions of dollars researching cancer and how pesticides may induce tumors. Even though we know that pesticides kill bugs by attacking their nervous systems, we spend relatively little to study these neurological effects on humans.

This proposed research addresses two areas about which we know little, namely the effect of nutrition on development and the effect of toxins on developing nervous systems. It is not enough to keep children alive, we need to make sure their capacity to live a full and rewarding life is not impaired. Preventive health care saves money.

Who in this Chamber can look into the eyes of poorly nourished mothers and children and fail to understand the need for this research. Please vote against this crippling amendment, not just because it damages this program, but because it damages children.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in answer to several of the points that have been made, I think it is very important that we understand that the authorization which my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, has referred to is authorization of some years back which made it very clear that it was not the Appropriations Committee that was supposed to be doing the earmarking, but the Secretary of Agriculture.

The same is true in regard to the facilities grants. So I think that is important, from a legal viewpoint, though I still believe that we ought not to have any Appropriations Committee simply adding earmarks without the benefit of a specific hearing and a specific authorization.

□ 1420

The arguments here are, also, I must point out, contrary to our own President. The President has made it very clear that, and I am using his words here: "These grants have not been peer reviewed. They have not been competitively awarded. They have not been specifically authorized."

Well, that is important to me, it is important to the taxpayers, it is important to the President of these United States. He went on to say that many of the research projects funded could be financed by agribusinesses that benefit from this research.

Now I do not quarrel though with the substance of these grants. As my colleagues know, we do have some very compelling scenes, as the previous speaker just referred to, but it must be understood that we are also talking about blueberry bushes and a lot of other things that need, I think, if they are going to be specifically authorized, the additional input of the authorizing committee. We should not give this kind of authority over to just the Appropriations Committee.

I want to also mention that the Citizens Against Government Waste are strongly supporting this particular amendment, and a number of the other of our taxpayer entities that watch what Congress is doing. But I think it is awfully important to realize that by arguing this case my colleagues must understand that there is a very broad blanket authorization.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS].

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. This amendment would drastically affect the Center for Southern Crop Improvement at Texas A&M University.

Mr. Chairman, these are the talking points for the Center for Southern Crop Improvement:

Mission of center is genetic improvement of commercial crops. Merges traditional crop breeding and molecular biology to exploit new tools of gene identification, manipulation, and transfer.

Breeding is one of the most important factors in increasing the quality and yield of U.S. crops.

Problem: The breeding process is slow and inefficient. Solution: Add molecular breeding to provide a more targeted approach and accelerate the process.

Engineered crops will have such traits as drought tolerance, disease resistance, cotton fiber quality, and food safety. This program is cost effective, proactive approach to our farming problems. If we are successful in designing crops that are drought resistant and so forth, the Federal Government will save millions of dollars in farm program expenses.

Crops targeted by research include cotton, sorghum, rice, wheat, peanuts, trees, grass, and vegetables.

No overlap—research does not cover any crops presently targeted by the USDA plant genome project.

The university is providing over half the funds for construction of this facility. This is a one-time expense for a long-term project.

Information exchange and technology transfer, accomplished through computer networks, visiting scientist, and symposia, will be shared in a fast, efficient manner.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, in 1 minute, these research projects have already been cut by the subcommittee by $23 million. There is a general authorization for most of these projects that frequently are competitively awarded. Many Members have made the point that the super collider crowds out basic research. Well, this is basic research; this is basic research for farm products, to make them more competitive, to make them safer and cheaper, to develop agriculture, to provide for nutrition research on food facts, and which impacts on insulin levels, to help cure heart disease and chronic illnesses, with a direct impact on millions of diabetics who depend on insulin.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, these projects that are in Louisiana are matched with local funds, and they are not in my district.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, normally I would be standing and agreeing with my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FAWELL), regarding his efforts on pork busting, but today I find myself in a unique position being the chair of the appropriate subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture that is responsible for seeing that the problems that we are talking about here today do not occur, and we have had an excellent working relationship with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations already this year. We have held hearings in our subcommittee and are beginning to look at this question, and the more I have looked at it, the more I find that the facts do not always bear out what we would like to believe were there.

There is no statement of research priorities in the 1990 farm bill, nor in any farm bill. Neither is there a statement within USDA as to overall research priorities. That is correct. There is the implication though that these special projects are not competitively awarded, nor peer reviewed. This is not entirely correct. Not only are these projects peer reviewed, but they are reviewed in an ongoing manner that surpasses the renew process of many of the so-called competitively awarded research grants. To eliminate all special grants would effectively kill several of the very useful projects.

Mr. Chairman, I wish that we had more time to talk about the specifics, but in this one case our subcommittee is looking, I say to the gentleman from Illinois, at this very question. I know the gentleman from Illinois will be very happy with the results, what the Committee on Agriculture does in arriving at the spirit of what the gentleman is trying to do here today.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I, perhaps, can shed a little light on one project that would help in understanding the total thing.

First of all, earmarking. I do not understand how one can avoid some earmarking and get some continuity over time. The project I talk about is an environmental simulator at the University of Wyoming. It has been going on now for several years. It has passed a critical review of the Department of

Agriculture. It has been in there for 2 years in which they have done planning and design. This request is to do blueprinting and to continue construction.

We talk about pork barrel. I do not know quite what pork barrel means. It depends on one's point of view, I suppose, but in this case 50 percent of the funding is to come from the Federal Government and 25 percent from the State and 25 percent from the private sector. It is matching funds. The State legislature has considered the State's share and is involved in that, and the foundation is raising the money.

My point is that of course we think it is a useful project, but the fact is it is joint funding, the fact is it has gone on for several years. I do not see how we can continue to have continuity unless there is some direct appropriation to propositions of this kind.

I am a little surprised that my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] is as interested in the President's remarks. He always does not put quite as much credence into what the President says as we are today.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I do want to reiterate that nobody is questioning the substance of these research grants. I want to make that perfectly clear.

What we are saying is that they have not gone through the process. To simply give carte blanche authority to the Appropriations Committee to simply pass out these earmarks as they see fit is just an open invitation to more and more waste. What that means is that there may be a whole bunch of other projects that are better than what we have here, but they just maybe do not have the knowledge or the wherewithal to be able to have their day in court. The authorizing committee is there for a purpose, and I am glad to hear that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] has pointed out that the authorizing committee is going to take a look at this.

But I do want to point out that of all the cuts that the President has suggested, he zeroed in on these grants and he did have rather strong language that the record in this area on these particular grants and building facilities have not been very good and that they ought to be discontinued, and it has been one of the clear areas where President Clinton asked for a repeal of those kinds of spending programs. We certainly, I think, should listen to what the President does have to say on this subject.

We certainly are reminded every day of all of the points that he is making, and certainly, when it comes to specific cuts like this, I do not think he would have written that language if he did not feel, upon evaluation, that with all due respect that this part of the grants program should be questioned.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

□ 1430

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would point out that this bill is already further below the President's budget than any appropriation bill produced by any appropriation subcommittee this year.

One study that would be eliminated by this amendment is the study of the National Cheese Exchange. It is the study of the manipulation going on of pricing at that cheese exchange right now which is estimated to have cost farmers across this country more than $1 billion because of the monopolistic manipulation by one of the agribusiness giants in this country. I should not name him until the study is complete.

But it seems to me that if you want to satisfy the giants of agribusiness, you will vote to eliminate that study. If you want to protect small farmers throughout this country who are trying to get fair markets without manipulation, you will not savage the study of the cheese exchange.

If I were a farmer today, I would want to know who was really behind the decision to eliminate the study.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, once again, I repeat, these projects would be better funded by the States or the agribusinesses that directly benefit from them. That is President Clinton's statement.

I have had many townhall meetings as of late. One person asked a very compelling question. He said, "Congressman FAWELL, you went into office in 1985, and there have been all kinds of promises of trillions of dollars of deficit reduction. And all we got since 1985 are trillions of dollars of new debt."

That constituent was absolutely right. He pointed out also, "Why is it, Mr. FAWELL, that you cannot balance budgets? Aren't there programs there questionable enough that you can do something about them?"

Of course, we all know he is right. If we could rise to the occasion and take a superconducting super collider and evaluate it and believe that even though it has been fully authorized and peer reviewed and scientifically studied that we can eliminate it, why, oh why, oh why can we not cut these grants. I know how important they are to your districts. I have suffered where my district does not get something I would like to have, and it hurts. But the people back home would like to see a signal on our part that we can do some cutting, where it might be some pain for us, yes, in our States or our district, but just once be able to say yes, we can cut something like this.

When we can join hands with the President and work with him on something like this, on both sides of the aisle, I think we would send a very nice signal to the people back home.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, Congressman FAWELL's amendment to cut the agricultural research, building, and facilities budget by $88 million has merit. But it also has faults. I am voting "no" on the amendment because agriculture needs new research information as much or more than any other sector of this country's industrial complex.

In general, the pork in H.R. 2493 is most often not the funding for research, but the naming of the States and congressional districts where the research will be conducted. Also, it is poor public policy to direct $37.7 million for buildings and facility improvements to a State or a congressional district just because that Congressperson has influence. Also, in this bill taxpayer's dollars are obviously spent on some research projects because of selfish interests and special interest lobbyists' pressures.

As a farmer concerned about a strong and viable agricultural industry, I will continue to urge that we prioritize research needs by credible evaluation. Decisions to make research grants to a university or unit should take into account the costs of competing bids, availability of research facilities, local contributions to the project, and performance evaluations to ensure credible research. This particular vote on the Fawell amendment was difficult for me because I do object to the pork barrelling, and I do object to the Appropriations Committee taking over the authorizing functions of the standing committee on Agriculture. Writing law in an appropriation bill too often shortchanges the thorough evaluation and an opportunity for public comment in a standing committee.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to oppose the Penny-Fawell amendment to the Agriculture appropriations bill. This amendment is once again misdirected by those representing the so-called porkbusters coalition.

It is interesting that one of the examples of the research grants mentioned in a recent "Dear Colleague" and touted as a waste of money is $25,000 for wool research. Let me explain to my colleagues the purpose of this money and its importance to our wool producers. This is money that is shared by Montana State University, the University of Wyoming, and Texas A&M.

The research is directed at providing standardized information on the quality of U.S. wool clips. This research is working with technology developed in Australia which allows for the electronic measurement of wool fibers. Our international competitors routinely provide this information to buyers and as a result get higher prices and build more buyer confidence in

their wool. Until recently our producers have been doing fiber measurements by hand, or frankly not at all which leaves the buyers to guess about the quality of the wool clips. The loss of the Federal money will bring the instrument testing to a halt and it will certainly foreclose U.S. efforts to make our wool more marketable at home and abroad.

By the way, I might remind my colleagues that the appropriation of these research dollars came about as a result of the decision by the previous administration to close a Federal wool research laboratory in California. It was determined that a more cost effective way to get information would be to provide research grants to the selected universities. We are now in the third year of that effort.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. REED].

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLIETTA].

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2493, the agriculture and rural development appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994 and in opposition to the Fawell amendment.

First, let me commend my good friend Chairman DURBIN for his leadership in his first term as chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee. He faced a real challenge putting this bill together in light of difficult budget constraints.

I thank him for his consideration and the funding provided for the Center for Food Marketing at my alma mater, St. Joseph's University in Philadelphia. For three decades, Saint Joseph's has played an important role in food marketing education.

St. Joseph's has made a unique contribution to the advancement of our agricultural economy by concentrating on the marketing of commodities and products.

Today, the Center for Food Marketing at Saint Joseph's is the only industry-supported endeavor of its kind in the Nation.

It helps food growers and producers remain aware of consumer demands, market patterns and enable them to coordinate production decisions with marketing decisions. This is vital.

The Center for Food Marketing is just one good and vital project targeted by the Fawell amendment. I urge my colleagues to defeat the Fawell amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BLACKWELL].

Mr. BLACKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and in support of H.R. 2493, the agriculture and rural development appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994.

I also wish to express my satisfaction that the subcommittee included funds, for the fourth consecutive year, for the Center for Food Marketing at St. Joseph's University, in Philadelphia.

Located near the port of Philadelphia, one of the Nation's more important points of commerce for agricultural and other products, St. Joseph's University has long been considered the academic home of the U.S. food industry.

The importance of this resource to the industry itself is evidenced by the private sector participation and support that St. Joseph's food marketing department has enjoyed over its three decades of operation.

I am firmly convinced that the Center for Food Marketing will further assist the U.S. Department of Agriculture in meeting its mission in the food marketing area by helping farmers, farm cooperatives, and others in the food industry to be more responsive to market trends and more competitive nationally and internationally. St. Joseph's University's proposal to establish the center has been reviewed favorably by USDA, and it has met the subcommittee's criteria for funding.

I commend the subcommittee for its support of this worthy project, and the new chairman's careful efforts to ensure that all research grants included in the bill are important to the mission of the USDA.

I urge defeat of the Fawell/Penny amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER].

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. NEAL].

Mr. NEAL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to comment on the value of what we are talking about here. The author of the amendment has said several times he does not argue with the value, but he wants it done a different way. I want to point out that the project that I know the most about has been authorized. This kind of research on human nutrition has been authorized because it was recognized that there is this incredibly important link between nutrition and health.

Mr. Chairman, I am against pork, as I know the gentleman is. But everything we spend money on is not pork. What we are talking about here is something that will save hundreds of millions of dollars of American money. It will save incredible amounts of human suffering. I know that to be true of the other projects that are in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this project is advised by a distinguished panel of scientists, and I oppose the amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. THURMAN].

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES].

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, generally I am with my dear colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL]. But, the gentleman does not have his heart obviously in this particular amendment. He cannot. Because these projects are meritorious projects, and they are generic in many instances. The IR–4 project is an interregional project. I think $10 million was requested. It was shaved down to a little over $6 million.

Mr. Chairman, you cannot have it both ways. We want pesticides for minor crops that are safe, or we do not. What the gentleman would do would be to knock out the $6 million in there for the IR–4. Frankly, we have 1,200 applications right now that we cannot reach at the Environmental Protection Agency. That means every year farmers have to go through the same routine. They often use pesticides after going through a lengthy process that we do not know very much about on minor crops.

In addition to that, there is a planned bioscience facility project at Rutgers University that I am very familiar with. It is an ongoing project that has been tested, proven, is wanted, and it deals with the very thing we are all talking about, making pesticides safe.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, let me close by saying this: The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES] has hit the nail on the head. The research we are talking about here is critically important for the safety and health of the American people. To suggest that it is somehow politically oriented I think does a great disservice.

We have three pages of authorizing legislation behind the projects that the gentleman seeks to strike with his amendment.

Let me put it in this context as well: We are talking about $50 million in agricultural research. The total amount spent by the Department of Agriculture this year is $1.1 billion for agricultural research. That research serves an industry which accounts for 17 percent of the gross domestic product of America. This is money well invested.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] does understand that these projects are authorized, that we are below last year's level of spending, that we are in fact addressing serious concerns about pesticides and public health, and I hope that all of my colleagues would join me in resisting the gentleman's amendment.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman's desire to reduce spending. I agree with him that we must focus on spending reductions as the primary tool for deficit reduction. But I would point out to the gentleman that funding for special research grants in this bill has been cut by nearly a third, from $73 million in fiscal year 1993 to $50 million in fiscal year 1994. I wonder how many programs in the 13 appropriations bills that we will vote on have received cuts in excess of 30 percent.

The amendment would eliminate all funding for the special research grants program. Such a move implies that there is no significant value in agricultural research. As those of us who represent agricultural districts know, however, research has played a critical role in making the United States the world's leader in agricultural production. The complete elimination of special agricultural research grants would undermine one of the most successful and competitive sectors of our economy.

I would like to assure my colleagues that at least one item in the amendment, $185,000 for lowbush blueberry research, merits the funding that it has received. This research proposal was peer reviewed by the interdisciplinary research council at the University of Maine, and by the Maine Blueberry Advisory Committee, which was established by Maine law and includes many members with extensive scientific and engineering expertise.

Lowbush blueberries account for 50 percent of the total blueberry crop in all of North America, clearly indicating that the research will be conducted on a crop of national importance. Lowbush blueberries are unique in that they are essentially wild blueberry plants—they are not hybrids created in a lab. Thus, any other blueberry research will not provide much useful information to help ensure the continued productivity of this unique domestic crop.

The centerpiece of this research proposal is the reduction of pesticide, fungicide, and herbicide use in the lowbush blueberry industry. It therefore seeks to make lowbush blueberry cultivation more environmentally sustainable. I would venture to guess that the overwhelming majority of my colleagues support additional research on sustainable agricultural techniques to reduce the impact of agriculture on the environment.

Perhaps most importantly, the lowbush blueberry industry and the State of Maine have already agreed, as they have in the past, to contribute $400,000 to the research effort. Indeed, the industry established an internal tax in 1945 to help fund research. In those days, research was funded solely by the industry. But as regulations and world competition increased, the industry recognized that it alone could not fully fund its research needs, and it sought the partnership of the State of Maine and the Federal Government. And I will note that in this partnership, the State and the private sector carry most of the load.

Mr. Chairman, I think the committee has done a good job of cutting spending for special research grants. If every program in every appropriations bill were cut by the same magnitude as this program, we would see dramatic reductions in Federal spending.

I ask my colleagues to defeat the amendment.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Fawell-Penny amendment to eliminate funding for special research grants and facilities in the Cooperative State Research Service.

During my service during the past 2 years on the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, I listened to hours of testimony from Members of Congress and farmers from across our Nation. Virtually without exception, they presented convincing stories about the need for research in an area of special need to their State or region. As I examined these cases more closely, I found few frivolous requests—in fact, I generally discovered solid and worthwhile proposals.

Let me cite a case study, because one of these projects that the Fawell-Penny amendment seeks to eliminate is one that I sought and was pleased to have the committee provide.

Nearly 3 years ago, I was approached by pork producers from my congressional district. North Carolina has been very successful in recent years in increasing pork and poultry production. But current practices were simply inadequate for handling the estimated 24 million tons of manure and litter generated by these thriving industries each year.

Working with North Carolina State University, the pork and poultry industries worked out a 3-year research plan to develop innovative technologies for managing animal and poultry wastes to recover energy and nutrients, recycle wastes into useful products, and reduce environmental hazards.

A skeptic might ask: If this research is so important to North Carolina, why not let them pay for it? Well, North Carolina and the affected industries have indeed put up money—$400,000 from the North Carolina General Assembly, and $245,000 from the pork and poultry industries. But the Federal funding we are seeking plays an important role in leveraging the available funds and turning this into the full multidisciplinary research program envisioned—one that is likely to pay off with real techniques and solutions, which can be put to use by farmers and rural residents in North Carolina and other States.

This is the story of just one special grant, but I suggest that each of these grants has a similar story. Remember, the Clinton administration itself recommended $34 million in this special grant category, as did the Bush administration before it. But the subcommittee has acted responsibly to examine our commitment in this area and bring in a recommendation about 15 percent below the level in the House bill last year.

I would also remind those who criticize these projects as noncompetitive that the subcommittee has proposed more than a $16 million increase in competitive research grants under the National Research Initiative—to $114 million, more than twice the amount recommended in the special grant area—and has steadily increased funds for competitive research each of the last several years.

In short, I believe there is room as well as need for both competitive research, and research of a regional or State-specific need as reflected by these special research grants. I commend Chairman DURBIN and the other subcommittee members for the care and attention they have given to setting priorities in this area, and I urge my colleagues to defeat the Fawell-Penny amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 88, noes 343, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 291]

AYES—88

Andrews (ME)	Hastert	Moorhead
Andrews (NJ)	Hefley	Murphy
Applegate	Herger	Nussle
Armey	Hoekstra	Packard
Baker (CA)	Hoke	Penny
Ballenger	Hunter	Petri
Bilirakis	Hyde	Porter
Bliley	Inglis	Quinn
Burton	Inhofe	Ramstad
Callahan	Jacobs	Rohrabacher
Castle	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Coble	Kasich	Royce
Cox	King	Santorum
Crane	Klug	Schaefer
Cunningham	Knollenberg	Schenk
DeLay	Kyl	Sensenbrenner
Doolittle	Lazio	Shaw
Dornan	Levy	Shays
Dreier	Linder	Shuster
Dunn	Maloney	Solomon
Fawell	Mann	Stearns
Fingerhut	Manzullo	Stump
Fowler	Margolies-Mezvinsky	Talent
Frank (MA)	McCollum	Taylor (MS)
Gallegly	McInnis	Walker
Goodling	McKeon	Weldon
Goss	Mica	Young (FL)
Grams	Miller (FL)	Zeliff
Hancock	Molinari	Zimmer
Harman		

NOES—343

Abercrombie	Blackwell	Clayton
Ackerman	Boehlert	Clement
Allard	Boehner	Clinger
Andrews (TX)	Bonilla	Clyburn
Archer	Bonior	Coleman
Bacchus (FL)	Borski	Collins (GA)
Bachus (AL)	Boucher	Collins (IL)
Baesler	Brewster	Collins (MI)
Baker (LA)	Brooks	Combest
Barca	Browder	Condit
Barcia	Brown (CA)	Conyers
Barlow	Brown (FL)	Cooper
Barrett (NE)	Brown (OH)	Coppersmith
Barrett (WI)	Bryant	Costello
Bartlett	Bunning	Coyne
Barton	Buyer	Cramer
Bateman	Byrne	Crapo
Becerra	Calvert	Danner
Beilenson	Camp	Darden
Bentley	Canady	de la Garza
Bereuter	Cantwell	de Lugo (VI)
Berman	Cardin	Deal
Bevill	Carr	DeFazio
Bilbray	Chapman	DeLauro
Bishop	Clay	Dellums

Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Duncan
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Faleomavaega (AS)
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Grandy
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hansen
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hutchinson
Hutto
Inslee
Istook
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Michel
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Norton (DC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Watt
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—8

Blute
Henry
McMillan
Reynolds
Skeen
Underwood (GU)
Waxman
Wilson

□ 1501

Messrs. SWETT, KIM, McHUGH, and PAXON changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. ZIMMER, CUNNINGHAM, SHAW, McCOLLUM, and STEARNS changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendments were rejected.

The result the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For acquisition of land, construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities and for grants to States and other eligible recipients for such purposes, as necessary to carry out the agricultural research, extension, and teaching programs of the Department of Agriculture where not otherwise provided, $37,750,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b).

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

Mr. Chairman, recent testimony before the House Agriculture Subcommittee on Department Operations and Nutrition, which I chair, indicates that many of our Nation's agriculture research facilities are in severe disrepair.

I offer this discussion right after the previous vote in which we had discussions about whether or not these projects were authorized or not authorized. I am not sure that all of the Members understood all of what we were trying to say from the Agriculture Committee standpoint.

We have many facilities that are in disrepair, yet the dollars available to meet them are few and far between. Unfortunately, as their budget pie gets smaller, we do have the need to prioritize. This is a very difficult process that we must go through.

This problem has been pointed out repeatedly in reports by the National Academy of Sciences, the National Science Foundation, the Office of Technology Assessment, and the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges.

The House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry have also held hearings highlighting the magnitude of this problem.

The Department of Agriculture's Users Advisory Board has called for instituting a system linking the placement of facilities to a set of strategically developed consensus priorities. A 1989 User Advisory Board report called for the establishment of a bipartisan review panel similar to the Military Base Closing Commission, which we are all very familiar with, to determine national agricultural research facility needs and make recommendations for closing, consolidating, renovating, and building facilities.

Section 1674 of the 1990 farm bill authorized the formation of such a commission. However, this Commission has yet to be funded in the appropriations process.

The gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] and myself wrote a letter to the chairman, asking that this be funded. It was not, and I yield to the chairman for a response as to why he chose not to fund this Commission.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding. We do not question the importance of a review process to determine the highest priority in scientific research spending. Our subcommittee is working with Secretary Espy in an effort to reorganize the U.S. Department of Agriculture, as is the gentleman from Texas.

What I hope we can do is to come together at both the authorizing and appropriating level to establish a procedure for evaluating the current research capacity of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and to set priorities for future agriculture research and construction.

I believe this is consistent with what the authorizing committee was seeking, and I look forward to working with the gentleman from Texas to achieve that end.

Mr. STENHOLM. I concur in that, and I also will not offer at this time the amendment that I had intended to offer, but will look forward to working with the chairman, with the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture to achieve the intent that the gentleman has just stated. And I believe this will also meet the objectives as previously stated by our colleagues, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY].

I look forward to working with the gentleman on that, and we will be reporting legislation later this year along those lines, with the gentleman's cooperation.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXTENSION SERVICE

Payments to States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, Micronesia, Northern Marianas, and American Samoa: For payments for cooperative agricultural extension work under the Smith-Lever Act, as amended, to be distributed under sections 3(b) and 3(c) of said Act, and under section 208(c) of Public Law 93–471, for retirement and employees' compensation costs for extension agents and for costs of penalty mail for cooperative extension agents and State extension directors, $274,582,000; payments for the nutrition and family education program for low-income areas under section 3(d) of the Act, $64,961,000; payments for the pest management program under section 3(d) of the Act, $8,459,000; payments for the farm safety and rural health programs under section 3(d) of

the Act, $2,698,000; payments for the pesticide impact assessment program under section 3(d) of the Act, $3,363,000; payments to upgrade 1890 land-grant college research and extension facilities as authorized by section 1447 of Public Law 95-113, as amended (7 U.S.C. 3222b), $7,901,000, to remain available until expended; payments for the rural development centers under section 3(d) of the Act, $938,000; payments for a groundwater quality program under section 3(d) of the Act, $11,234,000; payments for the Agricultural Telecommunications Program, as authorized by Public Law 101-624 (7 U.S.C. 5926), $1,206,000; payments for youth-at-risk programs under section 3(d) of the Act, $10,000,000; payments for a food safety program under section 3(d) of the Act, $1,975,000; payments for carrying out the provisions of the Renewable Resources Extension Act of 1978, $3,341,000; payments for Indian reservation agents under section 3(d) of the Act, $1,750,000; payments for sustainable agriculture programs under section 3(d) of the Act, $2,963,000; and payments for extension work by the colleges receiving the benefits of the second Morrill Act (7 U.S.C. 321-326, 328) and Tuskegee University, $25,414,000; in all, $420,785,000: *Provided*, That funds hereby appropriated pursuant to section 3(c) of the Act of June 26, 1953, and section 506 of the Act of June 23, 1972, as amended, shall not be paid to any State, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, or the Virgin Islands, Micronesia, Northern Marianas, and American Samoa prior to availability of an equal sum from non-Federal sources for expenditure during the current fiscal year.

Federal administration and coordination: For administration of the Smith-Lever Act, as amended, and the Act of September 29, 1977 (7 U.S.C. 341-349), as amended, and section 1361(c) of the Act of October 3, 1980 (7 U.S.C. 301n.), and to coordinate and provide program leadership for the extension work of the Department and the several States and insular possessions, $8,380,000.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY

For necessary expenses of the National Agricultural Library, $17,682,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $35,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $900,000 shall be available pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 2250 for the alteration and repair of buildings and improvements.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR MARKETING AND INSPECTION SERVICES

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Marketing and Inspection Services to administer programs under the laws enacted by the Congress for the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Food Safety and Inspection Service, Federal Grain Inspection Service, Agricultural Marketing Service, and Packers and Stockyards Administration, $691,000.

ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, including those pursuant to the Act of February 28, 1947, as amended (21 U.S.C. 114b-c), necessary to prevent, control, and eradicate pests and plant and animal diseases; to carry out inspection, quarantine, and regulatory activities; to discharge the authorities of the Secretary of Agriculture under the Act of March 2, 1931 (46 Stat. 1468; 7 U.S.C. 426-426b); and to protect the environment, as authorized by law, $439,042,000, of which $91,460,000 shall be derived from user fees deposited in the Agricultural Quarantine Inspection User Fee Account, and of which $4,938,000 shall be available for the control of outbreaks of insects, plant diseases, animal diseases and for control of pest animals and birds to the extent necessary to meet emergency conditions: *Provided*, That if the demand for Agricultural Quarantine Inspection (AQI) user fee financed services is greater than expected and/or other uncontrollable events occur, the Agency may exceed the AQI User Fee limitation by up to 10 per centum, provided such funds are available in the Agricultural Quarantine Inspection User Fee Account, and with notification to the Appropriations Committees: *Provided further*, That no funds shall be used to formulate or administer a brucellosis eradication program for the current fiscal year that does not require minimum matching by the States of at least 40 per centum: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for field employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $40,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for the operation and maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed four, of which two shall be for replacement only. *Provided further*, That, in addition, in emergencies which threaten any segment of the agricultural production industry of this country, the Secretary may transfer from other appropriations or funds available to the agencies or corporations of the Department such sums as he may deem necessary, to be available only in such emergencies for the arrest and eradiction of contagious or infectious disease or pests of animals, poultry, or plants, and for expenses in accordance with the Act of February 28, 1947, as amended, and section 102 of the Act of September 21, 1944, as amended, and any unexpended balances of funds transferred for such emergency purposes in the next preceding fiscal year shall be merged with such transferred amounts.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For plans, construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities, as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 2250, and acquisition of land as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 428a, $10,145,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b).

FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE

For necessary expenses to carry on services authorized by the Federal Meat Inspection Act, as amended, and the Poultry Products Inspection Act, as amended, $516,738,000, and in addition, $1,000,000 may be credited to this account from fees collected for the cost of laboratory accreditation as authorized by section 1017 of Public Law 102-237: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for field employment pursuant to section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $75,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2250) for the alteration and repair of buildings and improvements, but the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 per centum of the current replacement value of the building.

FEDERAL GRAIN INSPECTION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the United States Grain Standards Act, as amended, and the standardization activities related to grain under the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, as amended, including field employment pursuant to section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $20,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $11,554,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2250) for the alteration and repair of buildings and improvements, but the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 per centum of the current replacement value of the building: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided by this Act may be used to pay the salaries of any person or persons who require, or who authorize payments from fee-supported funds to any person or persons who require nonexport, nonterminal interior elevators to maintain records not involving official inspection or official weighing in the United States under Public Law 94-582 other than those necessary to fulfill the purposes of such Act.

INSPECTION AND WEIGHING SERVICES

LIMITATION ON INSPECTION AND WEIGHING SERVICES EXPENSES

Not to exceed $42,784,000 (from fees collected) shall be obligated during the current fiscal year for Inspection and Weighing Services: *Provided*, That if grain export activities require additional supervision and oversight, or other uncontrollable factors occur, this limitation may be exceeded by up to 10 per centum with notification to the Appropriations Committees.

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE

MARKETING SERVICES

For necessary expenses to carry on services related to consumer protection, agricultural marketing and distribution, transportation, agricultural cooperatives, and regulatory programs, as authorized by law, and for administration and coordination of payments to States; including field employment pursuant to section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $90,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $61,614,000; including $2,346,000 for the Wholesale Market Development Program for the design and development of wholesale and farmer market facilities for the major metropolitan areas of the country: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2250) for the alteration and repair of buildings and improvements, but the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 per centum of the current replacement value of the building.

Fees may be collected for the cost of standardization activities, as established by regulation pursuant to law (31 U.S.C. 9701).

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Not to exceed $55,953,000 (from fees collected) shall be obligated during the current fiscal year for administrative expenses: *Provided*, That if crop size is understated and/or other uncontrollable events occur, the agency may exceed this limitation by up to 10 per centum with notification to the Appropriations Committees.

FUNDS FOR STRENGTHENING MARKETS, INCOME, AND SUPPLY (SECTION 32)

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Funds available under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c) shall be used only for commodity program expenses as authorized therein, and other related operating expenses, except for: (1) transfers to the Department of Commerce as authorized by the Fish and Wildlife Act of August 8, 1956; (2)

transfers otherwise provided in this Act; and (3) not more than $10,309,000 for formulation and administration of Marketing Agreements and Orders pursuant to the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and the Agricultural Act of 1961.

PAYMENTS TO STATES AND POSSESSIONS

For payments to departments of agriculture, bureaus and departments of markets, and similar agencies for marketing activities under section 204(b) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1623(b)), $1,735,000.

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses for administration of the Packers and Stockyards Act, as authorized by law, and for certifying procedures used to protect purchasers of farm products, including field employment pursuant to section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $5,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $12,194,000.

FARM INCOME STABILIZATION

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AND COMMODITY PROGRAMS

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for International Affairs and Commodity Programs to administer the laws enacted by Congress for the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Foreign Agricultural Service, and the Commodity Credit Corporation, $563,000.

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary administrative expenses of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, including expenses to formulate and carry out programs authorized to title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1301-1393); the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1421 et seq.); sections 7 to 15, 16(a), 16(f), and 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 590g-590o, 590p(a), 590p(f), and 590q); sections 1001 to 1004, 1006 to 1008, and 1010 of the Agricultural Act of 1970, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1501 to 1504, 1506 to 1508, and 1510); the Water Bank Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1301-1311); the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2101); sections 202(c) and 205 of title II of the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act of 1974, as amended (43 U.S.C. 1592(c), 1595); sections 401, 402, and 404 to 406 of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2201 to 2205); the United States Warehouse Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 241-273); title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985, as amended (16 U.S.C. 3811 et. seq.); and laws pertaining to the Commodity Credit Corporation, $732,467,000; of which $730,842,000 is hereby appropriated, and $1,036,000 is transferred from the Public Law 480 Program Account in this Act and $589,000 is transferred from the Commodity Credit Corporation Program Account in this Act: *Provided*, That other funds made available to the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service for authorized activities may be advanced to and merged with this account: *Provided further*, That these funds shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $100,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds made available under this Act shall be used (1) to influence the vote in any referendum; (2) to influence agricultural legislation, except as permitted in 18 U.S.C. 1913; or (3) for salaries or other expenses of members of county and community committees established pursuant to section 9(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, for engaging in any activities other than advisory and supervisory duties and delegated program functions prescribed in administrative regulations.

CORPORATIONS

The following corporations and agencies are hereby authorized to make expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to make contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for such corporation or agency, except as hereinafter provided:

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATING EXPENSES

For administrative and operating expenses, as authorized by the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1516), $290,116,000; *Provided*, That not to exceed $700 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses, as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1506(i): *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act may be used to offer a Federal crop insurance policy in counties on crops where a loss ratio, that has already been recalculated pursuant to law to reflect the premium rates issued by the Corporation for the 1993 crop year, is in excess of 1.10 more than 70 percent of the years that a policy has been offered since 1980: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act may be used to pay operating and administrative costs that exceed 31 per centum of premium to insurers of policies on which the Corporation provides reinsurance, except to reimburse said insurers for excess loss adjustment expenses as provided for in the Standard Reinsurance Agreement issued by the Corporation.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against this paragraph for the reason that it legislates in a general appropriation bill.

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

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against this paragraph for the reason that it legislates in a general appropriations bill. The language against which this point of order is made is the last two provisos appearing on page 29, line 16 through page 30, line 4.

The first proviso is objected to in that it imposes a new duty on the Secretary that directs him how to manage the crop insurance program such that crop insurance coverage will be denied to all producers and farmers in a county where the loss ratio is in excess of that set by the Appropriations Committee. If a producer that farms in a county that is determined by the Secretary or the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation [FCIC] to have a loss ratio in excess of that set forth in this proviso by the Appropriations Committee, he or she is denied crop insurance coverage no matter whether their individual loss ratios are as good as in any county in the State that is eligible for crop insurance under this proviso. Thus, this language discriminates against some producers in certain counties who have perfectly good loss ratio records. Also, this first proviso is a legislative direction rather than a negative limitation on spending (Deschler's Precedents, chapter 26, section 36.19).

It is submitted that the above-quoted proviso is legislative language that interferes with an executive official's discretionary authority (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 12, 1975, p. 6338). It is also submitted that this proviso which restricts executive authority to incur obligations in certain counties for Federal crop insurance is legislative in nature and not a limitation on funds. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 13, 1987, p. 19507.)

Moreover, limitation language in a general appropriation may not be such as when fairly construed changes existing law (See Hind's Precedents IV, 3976-3983) and the legislative language may not be such as to justify an executive officer in assuming an intent to change existing law (Hind's IV, 3984; Cannon's VII, 1706).

In a letter dated June 23, 1993, the Office of Management and Budget urges the committee to "support (the President's) April 8th budget proposal* * *". It is submitted that the administration's statement may be recognized as an intent to restrict executive discretion to a degree that may be fairly termed a change in policy rather than matter of administrative detail (Cannon's VII, 1691).

It is submitted that the committee was legislating and setting policy as noted by the comments in its report accompanying the bill explaining its provisos (p. 59) where it indicates: "This approach only eliminates the most egregious policies and allows the Corporation the opportunity to revise or delete that county crop policy after fiscal year 1994." The Federal Crop Insurance Corporation may be said to be able to reclaim its discretion in fiscal year 1995 and possibly extricate itself from the legislative policy set in this proviso but in doing so it must assume certain duties.

As parliamentary precedents state, "the power of limitation is solely a negative power, capable of setting up a barrier, not a positive power, capable of creative functions" (Hind's IV, 3956). This proviso sets policy, is directive in nature and constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill.

The second proviso has the committee placing a cap of 31 percent on the base amount received by reinsurance companies for reimbursement of expenses.

Meanwhile, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation on June 4, 1993, forwarded to its reinsured companies the revised 1994 sales and service contract that was to be returned by July 1, 1994. That contract provided 32¼ percent on the base amount received by reinsurance companies for reimbursement of expenses.

These 1994 contracts, some of which we are told have been returned to FCIC by the reinsured companies, have not yet been signed by a representative of the Corporation. However, we are told that they carry an effective date of July 1, 1993, and when, as and if they are signed by a Corporation representative after July 1 they will be retroactive to July 1, 1993.

No one knows which insurers will be willing to enter into such contracts if they are reduced for reimbursement of expenses from 32¼ to 31 percent. So that it is uncertain, but probable, that this proviso will directly interfere with executive discretion in establishing reinsurance agreements. In the event the ruling here were to rely on the abortion amendment to a general appropriations bill cited 126 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 20, 1980, the interference here is more direct in the exercise of executive discretion than it was in that case.

It is also pointed out that the situation under this proviso must inevitably interfere with the contractual obligations of the Corporation and its insurers in that negotiations must occur over the changes necessary in agreements of reinsurance thus placing an additional duty on the Corporation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge you to sustain this point of order.

□ 1510

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Chair to deny the gentleman's point of order.

The language in this bill was very carefully drawn to be a limitation on funds in the act and places no additional duties on the executive branch.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will rule on the point of order made by the gentleman from Kansas.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] makes a point of order against the last two provisos in the paragraph appropriating administrative and operating expenses for the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation on the grounds that they constitute legislation on an appropriations bill. As for the argument that the first proviso imposes a new duty on the Secretary of Agriculture or the Corporation to manage the crop insurance program in counties that exceed a certain loss ratio, the text of the paragraph itself notes that this loss ratio has already been calculated. Further, the committee report indicates that these ratios are in documents provided to the Appropriations Committee. Therefore, no new duties are required of the executive branch to perform new calculations, nor is the proviso an affirmative direction to manage the program in a certain manner. Since the calculations have already been performed, it should be clear in which counties and for which crops are funds being limited. In the opinion of the Chair, the proviso interferes with executive discretion only to the extent of appropriating for part of an authorized purpose, which is a decision well within the perogative of the Appropriations Committee.

Turning to the second proviso, the gentleman from Kansas argues that limiting funds in the act to pay administrative costs in excess of 31 percent of premiums interferes with the contracting authority of the Corporation. Currently contracts negotiated by the Corporation permit a higher percentage amount for payment of administrative expenses.

The Chair cites the ruling carried at chapter 25, section 10.2 of Deschler's Procedure where an amendment denying the use of funds to pay administrative expenses in connection with any Federal employees health benefit plan that covered certain abortions was held not to constitute legislation since the amendment did not directly interfere with executive discretion in contracting to establish such plans. It is permissible by limitation to negatively deny the availability of funds although discretionary authority may be curtailed and contracts may be left unsatisfied. A similar contractual interference argument was made in the crop insurance context in the precedent carrie in volume 8 of Deschler's Precedents, chapter 26, section 67.11 where the Chair overruled a point of order limiting funds to formulate a crop insurance program that does not meet its operating expenses from premiums. This was held to be a proper limitation restricting the availability of funds and in order as a limitation.

Accordingly, the Chair overrules the point of order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DE LA GARZA

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DE LA GARZA: On page 30, lines 3 and 4, insert after "Corporation" the following: ": *Provided further*, That the second proviso shall not apply in any county affected if the Corporation has implemented a non-standard classification system in such county for those individual farms that have experienced excessive losses since 1980 under which the premium rates, notwithstanding the provision of section 508(d) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, are increased over comparable rates effective for the 1993 crop, or the insured yields are decreased from comparable yields for the 1993 crop, or a combination of both, by an amount or amounts sufficient to ensure that an estimated loss ratio will not exceed 1.1 for the crop produced on such farms during the 1994 crop year".

Mr. DE LA GARZA (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, this relates to the subject matter discussed in the point of order.

As reported by the Committee on Appropriations, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation would be prohibited from offering crop insurance for purchase in counties with histories of excessive losses.

□ 1520

Unfortunately, the bill would penalize some good farmers based on the excessive insurance claims of some of their less fortunate neighbors. My amendment allows the Crop Insurance Corporation to continue to offer insurance policies in counties with excessive loss ratios if the corporation has established a program whereby individual farmers pay premiums for coverage more in line with their individual histories.

I believe this approach is more equitable to the individual producers, and this agreement has been worked out in cooperation with Members of the minority, with members of the subcommittee and the gracious cooperation of the Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ENGLISH], chairman of the subcommittee with jurisdiction.

Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to rise in very strong support of the amendment as offered by the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee in behalf of the Agriculture Committee.

Without question, we do have some problems in crop insurance of people who have been abusing the programs. We also have instances where, quite frankly, people have been attempting to grow some crops that probably should not be grown there. This really remedies the situation. It deals with it on a farm-by-farm basis. It takes into account and recognizes in those areas where we have had very high losses, unrealistically high losses, that under those circumstances that farm will be judged on that farm's experience. It takes into account and recognizes that the other body, when they insisted back in the 1990 farm bill that we place limitations as to how much of an increase can be made each year with regard to rates, was mistaken, and lifts

that and allows under these circumstances, in these cases where we have these extraordinary losses, that in fact the Federal crop insurance can raise those rates to meet the losses that are experienced.

Or, on the other hand, they have the ability to reduce yields. That, I think, is very logical and very fair, and one which I think without question the farmers of this country can live with and at the same one that is fair to the taxpayers as well.

I want to commend the chairman of the Agriculture Committee for bringing it forth.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, this is a program that needed attention. This is a program we needed to revisit. We have done that.

I would have hoped that we could have had a more comprehensive approach to it, but under the circumstances this, hopefully, takes care, in the meantime, of the situation we find ourselves in.

The authorizing committee will continue oversight and will continue addressing this very serious matter because it is life or death for many of the producers who make us the best fed Nation in the world for the least amount of disposable income. And they certainly need this tool to manage their resources in order that we might continue to do that for the American people.

I would hope that my colleagues would support the amendment.

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

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GRANDY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, let me encourage my colleagues to support the chairman's amendment to the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee's language. I might say, Mr. Chairman, I originally intended to offer an amendment to strike this provision because I thought, although well-intended and probably correct from a policy point of view, it took a meat-tax approach to a problem that has plagued the Agriculture Committee and people who have worked in crop insurance for some time. It penalizes both bad producers and good producers. I think what the chairman has done has found a way to put the problem on the farm and not across the county where indeed there might be successful producers punished with unsuccessful producers.

But there was also a problem here that I think goes to our question of savings. CBO has scored the language that is in the committee print as a savings. The Office of Management and Budget disagrees. While they acknowledge there would probably be a $25 million savings from the crop insurance that would not be extended to those counties, there is under farm law a provision which mandates the Secretary of Agriculture to provide disaster payments to producers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] has expired.

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

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I continue to yield to my friend.

Mr. GRANDY. I thank the chairman for his generosity.

To continue with this point, in the 1990 farm bill there is a provision that mandates the Secretary of Agriculture to provide disaster payments to producers who are prevented from planting because of drought, flood, or other natural disaster. OMB has concluded that this would result in a net payment of $75 million in disaster payments to those counties that would lose crop insurance, resulting in an increase in spending, between $40 and $50 million.

Of course, CBO will, obviously, determine the scoring here. But I think it bears the committee's attention that we may not be saving money.

Under the provisions altered by the chairman, we run much less of a risk of having this become a spending provision as opposed to a savings provision.

I might just say, as a former member of the Committee on Agriculture, Mr. Chairman, we have spent approximately $25 billion between 1980 and 1990 in disaster assistance either through crop insurance or disaster loans.

Seventy-six percent of that has been in disaster loans.

If we want real savings, we should find better ways to manage risk. I think the chairman has begun the process. I hope it will continue in the authorization committee.

I will not offer my amendment, and urge my colleagues to support the chairman of the Agriculture Committee and hope that the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations will accept the amendment.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I will not take the 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is precisely the thing I was referring to under general debate when we talked about the law of unintended effects. And when we get into the business of the appropriators legislating in regard to the pasture of the authorizing committee, they have put forth—"they" meaning the Appropriations Committee—with understandable concern with respect to the Federal Crop Insurance Program, a major change in crop insurance in this year's appropriations bill. This proposal reduced the insurance company's reimbursement from 32¼ percent to 31, even though existing contracts are out in the field with farmers with their insurance companies. And, too, they require the counties that had the higher than 1.1 loss ratio for a crop would be excluded from crop insurance for that crop. Nobody could argue against that.

But here is the problem: Individual farmers in the affected counties who have maintained their losses below the 1.1 level—no real problem—will lose their insurance along with the problem farmers. So it was unfair, it was very discriminatory.

Now, the amendments to the 1990 farm bill have already been ratcheting down the company reimbursements from their original level of 34 percent. The further arbitrary steep drop to 31 percent will throw some companies out of the program—when a more gradual decline might have been acceptable.

Also, many of the insurance agreements for 1990 have been signed, and as I indicated in my point of order and also during general debate. I would have supported Mr. GRANDY's amendment.

I think the chairman's amendment is a good amendment. It makes a reform measure that would have had unintended effects, that would have been very damaging, a little better.

What we have done here is we have allowed farmers under this program, farmers who do not have any egregious activity under this program, they have a bum deal instead of no deal. Hopefully, we can work it out with the Appropriations Committee, and with the Senate. For 12 years we have been trying to reform this program so it would work in high-risk farm country, as well as in Illinois, where the gentleman resides, and where, due to crop diversity and rainfall and climate, crop insurance works far better than on the Great Plains.

□ 1530

I have a little feeling about this, obviously, and would hope that we could work together as we try to improve the Crop Insurance Program.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, a moment ago a point of order was raised against the language provided by the Appropriations Committee on limitations on the amount of loss that crop insurance might pay. We all recognize we have a real problem. We have had that problem for quite some time.

The point of order was not sustained. The language was not legislation, but limitation; but Mr. Chairman, quite honestly without any question if the point of order was raised here, this would be legislation on an appropriations bill. Of course, it was offered by the chairman of the authorizing committee. I am not going to object to it,

but it clearly is legislation on an appropriations bill if you want to raise that technicality.

But what I am going to question, Mr. Chairman, and I will recognize the gentleman from Texas to answer my question, the concern was that we are penalizing good farmers in an area of a county that had sever losses under the language in the appropriations bill.

Now, it seems to me that my interpreting this language, this year right now we have had some farmers already who have suffered losses in the Midwest along the Mississippi River from floods that never had a loss before, or at least had not had a loss in a good many years.

There is a possibility that occurred just this last weekend in my area of farmers being wiped out from hail, hail the size of golf balls, that stripped corn, stripped beans in the field. They've got a loss. They have not usually had this hail loss, but they would be denied under the gentleman's amendment, as I interpret it, next year insurance because they had a 1-year loss. Now, we at least averaged it over a 10-year period.

Am I wrong about that? Am I misinterpreting this?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. No, that is not accurate, I would inform my colleague. What this does it brings it back to the individual farm, rather than for the county.

Mr. MYERS of Indian. That is what I am speaking about, one farmer.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. But one that if they already have the insurance, they are grandfathered.

Second, that is the reason for the amendment, that the history will be on the individual farm, not in the county, because the gentleman has, as I am sure I have, counties where half the county is always in drought or flood and the other half not, so the history would be on the individual farmer.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. That is what I was thinking about, too, on the individual farmers.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. The farmer who has historic losses.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Historic in 1 year. Are they increased over comparable rates effect for the 1993 crop or the insured deals are decreased for comparable yields for the 1993 crop? What does that mean? Are we talking about 1 crop-year?

Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma. I would point out to the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, this is a proviso that takes place in regard to the language of the appropriations bill. In other words, before this proviso even comes into play, we are talking about counties that in 10 out of the last 13 years have had a ratio of 1.1 to 1 or greater, so you have to have a period, you are taking all the language you have in the bill, 10 out of the 13 years, then of those counties that meet that criteria the 10 out of the 13, if the Secretary does not take action to adjust in the last year, adjust the rates up on those individual farms to where those ratios are; in other words, where you had the big losses within that big county, then this would take place.

What this is an effort to do is to try to target the actions by the Appropriations Committee to a farm-by-farm basis, instead of applying it to every farm in the county, but before it can be applied to any farm in any county, first of all they have to meet the criteria that was laid out by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. So if I am correct in the interpretation here, a farmer within a county would also have to have severe loss, would have to meet that 70 percent, but a farmer after that is met in the county, then each farmer—the good farmers could be left out?

Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma. That is exactly the point.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Is that what the gentleman is attempting to do? If that is the attempt, then I have no objection.

Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma. And let me also say this. It also takes into account where you have a farmer who is a bad farmer, because it is going to jack up his ability to recover.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I should say an unlucky farmer instead of a bad farmer. I am sensitive about that.

Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma. Well, in Oklahoma we did not have any unlucky ones. I was not too sure about other areas of the country, but I think it is a very discriminating targeted approach to those people who have either abused the program, or quite frankly who have long histories of losses that need to be dealt with from a taxpayers' standpoint.

I think what it does, it singles those out and leaves the good farmers alone. It would not apply to the gentleman's farmers.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Well, to clarify this, I know a lot of good farmers who had bad luck because of weather, primarily. That is what we are trying to cover with insurance.

If that is what it does, then I have no objection.

Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, just very quickly, one other point that I would make is many of the losses that we have had occurred in the last decade, but this bill takes that into account.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

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

Let me say at the outset that I support the amendment offered by the chairman of the Agriculture Committee.

I have heard expressions on the floor concerning the role of the Appropriations Committee as against the role of the authorizing committee.

I would hope that what we are doing today is evidence that both committees working together can improve a work product to the point where it achieves the end we are seeking.

This Appropriations subcommittee faces the responsibility of paying for authorized programs. I can tell you that, as members of this subcommittee reviewed the performance of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, we came to the conclusion that this was not an insurance program, this was a disaster, a disaster which had cost the American taxpayers $2.9 billion over the last 10 or 12 years.

Let me give you one year as an example. In 1991, we ended up paying to the companies that wrote the insurance $248 million for expenses. We then turned around and lost $965 million, and then declared a bonus to the insurance companies of another $42 million.

Now, I would suggest to you that no bonus under any normal business circumstances would have gone to any business or insurance operation with that kind of experience.

The reason we put a 70-percent threshold in this provision in the appropriations bill was to catch the most extreme cases, the habitual losers who year in and year out plant a crop in a county and it fails.

Now, I have to tell you in all candor that there are farmers who are gaming the system. They are not farming the land. They are farming the Federal Treasury. I have no sympathy for those individuals. They have found ways to plant follow-on crops, to plant program crops in counties where they will never grow, and the farmer knows it, the growing season is not long enough, there is not enough rain, but as long as Uncle Sam will write an insurance policy, they are in business.

We want to put an end to this abuse. It costs taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars.

I believe what the chairman of the Agriculture Committee has done with this amendment is to focus on farms, rather than counties, and I accept that; but I would like the chairman to answer a question.

I want to make certain that it is our mutual understanding that we will not through this amendment create the shell game which we have had in many circumstances where farmers will start using their sons' names on programs or a wife's name or a corporation name and somehow evade the close scrutiny

which the gentleman is seeking with this amendment.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, let me assure the gentleman that we have addressed that issue in the program crops. I do not know that it has been a major issue in crop insurance, but we will have very, very active vigilance over this program. We will join together with the gentleman to see that no program with this or any other program can be utilized by someone beyond the legislative intent and for the reason for which the legislation is in place.

Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURBIN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma. One further point. I think the Chairman makes a very good point on that.

I would again want to stress and make sure that everyone understands, in this case we are not talking about a farmer. We are talking about farms, so it is a specific piece of real estate. It does not matter who owns it. It does not matter who they sell it to. It does not matter who comes in and becomes a partner. It is that farm and the experience of that farm that we are going by.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION FUND

For payments as authorized by section 508(b) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, $235,794,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b); of which $47,072,000 is to reimburse the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation Fund for agents' commissions and loss adjustment obligations incurred during prior years, but not previously reimbursed, as authorized by section 516(a) of the Act, as amended.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION FUND

REIMBURSEMENT FOR NET REALIZED LOSSES

For fiscal year 1994, such sums as may be necessary to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for net realized losses sustained, but not previously reimbursed (estimated to be $20,896,614,000 in the President's fiscal year 1994 Budget Request (H. Doc. 103-3)), but not to exceed $18,000,000,000, pursuant to section 2 of the Act of August 17, 1961, as amended (15 U.S.C. 713a-11).

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE FOR HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT

For fiscal year 1994, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not expend more than $4,000,000 for expenses to comply with the requirement of section 107(g) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 9607(g), and section 6001 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 6961: *Provided*, That expenses shall be for operations and maintenance costs only and that other hazardous waste management costs shall be paid for by the USDA Hazardous Waste Management appropriation in this Act.

TITLE II—CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment to administer the laws enacted by the Congress for the Forest Service and the Soil Conservation Service, $578,000.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

CONSERVATION OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses for carrying out the provisions of the Act of April 27, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 590a-590f) including preparation of conservation plans and establishment of measures to conserve soil and water (including farm irrigation and land drainage and such special measures for soil and water management as may be necessary to prevent floods and the siltation of reservoirs and to control agricultural related pollutants); operation of conservation plant materials centers; classification and mapping of soil; dissemination of information; acquisition of land by donation, exchange, or purchase at a nominal cost not to exceed $100; purchase and erection or alteration or improvement of permanent and temporary buildings; and operation and maintenance of aircraft, $588,262,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b); of which not less than $5,820,000 is for snow survey and water forecasting and not less than $8,214,000 is for operation and establishment of the plant materials centers: *Provided*, That except for $2,399,000 for improvements of the plant materials centers, the cost of any permanent building purchased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost of constructing a water supply or sanitary system and connecting the same to any such building and with the exception of buildings acquired in conjunction with land being purchased for other purposes, shall not exceed $10,000, except for one building to be constructed at a cost not to exceed $100,000 and eight buildings to be constructed or improved at a cost not to exceed $50,000 per building and except that alterations or improvements to other existing permanent buildings costing $5,000 or more may be made in any fiscal year in an amount not to exceed $2,000 per building: *Provided further*, That when buildings or other structures are erected on non-Federal land that the right to use such land is obtained as provided in 7 U.S.C. 2250a: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation may be expended for soil and water conservation operations under the Act of April 27, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 590a-590f) in demonstration projects: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225) and not to exceed $25,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That qualified local engineers may be temporarily employed at per diem rates to perform the technical planning work of the Service (16 U.S.C. 590e-2).

RIVER BASIN SURVEYS AND INVESTIGATIONS

For necessary expenses to conduct research investigation, and surveys of watersheds of rivers and other waterways, in accordance with section 6 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act approved August 4, 1954, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1006-1009), $13,482,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $60,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

WATERSHED PLANNING

For necessary expenses for small watershed investigations and planning, in accordance with the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1001-1008), $9,721,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $50,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

WATERSHED AND FLOOD PREVENTION OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses to carry out preventive measures, including but not limited to research, engineering operations, methods of cultivation, the growing of vegetation, rehabilitation of existing works and changes in use of land, in accordance with the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act approved August 4, 1954, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1001-1005, 1007-1009), the provisions of the Act of April 27, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 590a-f), and in accordance with the provisions of laws relating to the activities of the Department, $228,915,000 to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b), of which $40,386,000 shall be available for the watersheds authorized under the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936 (33 U.S.C. 701, 16 U.S.C. 1006a), as amended and supplemented: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $22,881,000 shall be available for emergency measures as provided by section 403-405 of the Agriculture Credit Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2203-2205), and not to exceed $200,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That $4,000,000 in loans may be insured, or made to be sold and insured, under the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund of the Farmers Home Administration (7 U.S.C. 1931): *Provided further*, That not to exceed $1,000,000 of this appropriation is available to carry out the purposes of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (Public Law 93-205), as amended, including cooperative efforts as contemplated by that Act to relocate endangered or threatened species to other suitable habitats as may be necessary to expedite project construction.

RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses in planning and carrying out projects for resources conservation and development and for sound land use pursuant to the provisions of section 32(e) of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1010-1011; 76 Stat. 607), the provisions of the Act of April 27, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 590a-f), and the provisions of the Agriculture and Food Act of 1981 (16 U.S.C. 3451-3461), $32,945,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b): *Provided*, That $600,000 in loans may be insured, or made to be sold and insured, under the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund of the Farmers Home Administration (7 U.S.C. 1931): *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $50,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

GREAT PLAINS CONSERVATION PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry into effect a program of conservation in the Great Plains area, pursuant to section 16(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as added by the Act of August 7, 1956, as amended (16 U.S.C. 590p(b)), $25,658,000, to remain available until expended (16 U.S.C. 590p(b)(7)).

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE

AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry into effect the program authorized in sections 7 to 15, 16(a), 16(f), and 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act approved February 29, 1936, as amended and supplemented (16 U.S.C. 590g–590o, 590p(a), 590p(f), and 590q), and sections 1001–1004, 1006–1008, and 1010 of the Agricultural Act of 1970, as added by the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1501–1504, 1506–1508, and 1510), and including not to exceed $15,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the United States, $194,650,000, to remain available until expended (16 U.S.C. 590o), for agreements, excluding administration but including technical assistance and related expenses (16 U.S.C. 590o), except that no participant in the Agricultural Conservation Program shall receive more than $3,500 per year, except where the participants from two or more farms or ranches join to carry out approved practices designed to conserve or improve the agricultural resources of the community, or where a participant has a long-term agreement, in which case the total payment shall not exceed the annual payment limitation multiplied by the number of years of the agreement: *Provided*, That no portion of the funds for the current year's program may be utilized to provide financial or technical assistance for drainage on wetlands now designated as Wetlands Types 3 (III) through 20 (XX) in United States Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Circular 39, Wetlands of the United States, 1956: *Provided further*, That such amounts shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other conservation materials, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out approved farming practices as authorized by the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, as determined and recommended by the county committees, approved by the State committees and the Secretary, under programs provided for herein: *Provided further*, That such assistance will not be used for carrying out measures and practices that are primarily production-oriented or that have little or no conservation or pollution abatement benefits: *Provided further*, That not to exceed 5 per centum of the allocation for the current year's program for any county may, on the recommendation of such county committee and approval of the State committee, be withheld and allotted to the Soil Conservation Service for services of its technicians in formulating and carrying out the Agricultural Conservation Program in the participating counties, and shall not be utilized by the Soil Conservation Service for any purpose other than technical and other assistance in such counties, and in addition, on the recommendation of such county committee and approval of the State committee, not to exceed 1 per centum may be made available to any other Federal, State, or local public agency for the same purpose and under the same conditions: *Provided further*, That for the current year's program $2,500,000 shall be available for technical assistance in formulating and carrying out rural environmental practices: *Provided further*, That no part of any funds available to the Department, or any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting a part of such Department, shall be used in the current fiscal year for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any person who has been convicted of violating the Act entitled "An Act to prevent pernicious political activities" approved August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in accordance with the provisions of title 18 U.S.C. 1913 to have violated or attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Member or through the proper official channels; *Provided further*, That not to exceed $15,000,000 of the amount appropriated shall be used for water quality payments and practices in the same manner as permitted under the program for water quality authorized in chapter 2 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985, as amended (16 U.S.C. 3838 et seq.).

FORESTRY INCENTIVES PROGRAM

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, to carry out the program of forestry incentives, as authorized in the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2101), including technical assistance and related expenses, $12,820,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized by the Act.

WATER BANK PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry into effect the provisions of the Water Bank Act (16 U.S.C. 1301–1311), $18,620,000, to remain available until expended.

EMERGENCY CONSERVATION PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry into effect the program authorized in sections 401, 402, and 404 of title IV of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2201–2205), $10,000,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized by 16 U.S.C. 2204.

COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROGRAM

For necessary expenses for carrying out a voluntary cooperative salinity control program pursuant to section 202(c) of title II of the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act, as amended (43 U.S.C. 1592(c)), to be used to reduce salinity in the Colorado River and to enhance the supply and quality of water available for use in the United States and the Republic of Mexico, $13,783,000 to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b), to be used for investigations and surveys for technical assistance in development conservation practices and in the preparation of salinity control plans, for the establishment of on-farm irrigation management systems, including related lateral improvement measures, for making cost-share payments to agricultural landowners and operators, Indian tribes, irrigation districts and associations, to local governmental and nongovernmental entities, and other landowners to aid them in carrying out approved conservation practices as determined and recommended by the county ASC committees, approved by the State ASC committees and the Secretary, and for associated costs of program planning, information and education, and program monitoring and evaluation: *Provided*, That the Soil Conservation Service shall provide technical assistance and the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service shall provide administrative services for the program, including but not limited to, the negotiation and administration of agreements and the disbursement of payments: *Provided further*, That such program shall be coordinated with the regular Agricultural Conservation Program and with research programs of other agencies.

CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the conservation reserve program pursuant to the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831–3845), $1,743,274,000, to remain available until expended, to be used for Commodity Credit Corporation expenditures for cost-share assistance for the establishment of conservation practices provided for in approved conservation reserve program contracts, for annual rental payments provided in such contracts, and for technical assistance.

WETLANDS RESERVE PROGRAM

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the Wetland Reserve Program pursuant to subchapter C of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3837), $44,450,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Secretary is authorized to use the services, facilities, and authorities of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the purposes of carrying out the Wetlands Reserve Program.

Mr. DURBIN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of title II be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1540

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order against title II?

If not, are there any amendments to title II?

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—FARMERS HOME AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR SMALL COMMUNITY AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Small Community and Rural Development to administer programs under the laws enacted by the Congress for the Farmers Home Administration, Rural Electrification Administration, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, and rural development activities of the Department of Agriculture, $583,000.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

RURAL HOUSING INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For gross obligations for the principal amount of direct and guaranteed loans as authorized by title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, to be available from funds in the Rural Housing Insurance Fund, as follows: $2,550,000,000 for loans to section 502 borrowers, as determined by the Secretary,

of which $750,000,000 shall be for unsubsidized guaranteed loans; $35,000,000 for section 504 housing repair loans; $16,300,000 for section 514 farm labor housing; $573,900,000 for section 515 rental housing; $600,000 for site loans; and $166,863,000 for credit sales of acquired property: *Provided*, That up to $50,664,000 of these funds shall be made available for section 502(g), Deferral Mortgage Demonstration.

For the cost of direct and guaranteed loans, including the cost of modifying loans, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as follows: low-income housing section 502 loans, $366,360,000, of which $12,225,000 shall be for unsubsidized guaranteed loans; section 504 housing repair loans; $13,671,000; section 514 farm labor housing, $8,394,000; section 515 rental housing, $311,972,000; and credit sales of acquired property, $25,397,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, $396,161,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DE LA GARZA

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DE LA GARZA: On page 42, after line 26, insert the following:

RURAL DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, except section 722, the Secretary may transfer funds from the Farmers Home Administration in this Act to fund the Rural Development Administration, as authorized by law.

On page 43, line 1, insert before "FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION": "RURAL DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION AND".

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, this is another one of the amendments where we had to work out, hopefully, a viable alternative to that which was in the Appropriations Subcommittee's legislation. This amendment, which has been developed in consultation with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], simply authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer funds necessary to fund the Rural Development Administration from funds appropriated to the Farmers Home Administration. This will provide funding for the agency for fiscal year 1994, and I believe that it is acceptable to the subcommittee leadership.

Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I would only like to say, Mr. Chairman, that I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] as he presented it on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture. I think that the approach that we are taking here, as I understand it, is to, in effect, make certain that the Rural Development Administration continues, and the question remains with regard to regional offices, and this amendment will, in effect, allow the regional offices, the elimination of regional offices, to continue as was provided for under the appropriations bill. But it would leave standing the Rural Development Administration as it is and gives the authority to the Secretary to transfer funds from the Rural Development Administration and Farmers Home Administration to establish, after April 1, 1994, any other entity that may be created through the Secretary's reorganization plan, whatever that may be.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to say that I think that this deals with a concern that has been expressed pertaining to the regional offices, and I think that this in fact is a solution that we can all agree with and live with until we have the Secretary's reorganization proposal and that has been dealt with.

So, I strongly support the amendment as it stands, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to conduct an inquiry with the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ENGLISH] preferably because we have had some conversation with respect to another issue. I do not know if this is identical to the issue we have discussed previously or exactly what the impact that would have on the Farmers Home low, and moderate and assisted housing provisos, if any.

Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, this would have no impact with regard to that. The question that we have before us, as presented by the appropriations bill and what the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture is attempting to deal with, is the complete elimination of the Rural Development Administration as it stands. What this amendment does is it brings home and really targets the thrust of the appropriations bill's effort, namely, toward the regional Rural Development offices that were established. They were not a part of the original Rural Development legislation contained in the 1990 farm bill, and so this would in effect, on April 1, 1994, subject those offices to being closed unless the secretary, along with the Congress, should act to either reestablish them or establish some other format.

It also provides that the funds that are being appropriated would go to the Rural Development Administration and Farmers Home Administration from which the secretary could use those funds in establishing some other reorganized effort. But it has absolutely no bearing with regard to those entities that are contained in the Farmers Home Administration today.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ENGLISH].

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

Mr. Chairman, let me say at the outset that I support this amendment, and I believe that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA], and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ENGLISH] are seeking to do with this amendment is to make certain that the concept of a Rural Development Administration survives.

I will say to my colleagues that there are some differences of opinion among members of the subcommittee as to the future and the efficacy of this agency. It has a lot to do with the fact that somewhere along the line we established some seven regional offices across the United States. Those regional offices became a new layer of approval, for those communities which are seeking water and sewer grants through the Farmers Home Administration. What we did, in fact, by creating those regional offices was to create a new level of bureaucracy, a new stage in the approval process and a great inconvenience to a lot of small communities that are seeking to improve their water and sewer facilities.

So, we tried through the Subcommittee on Appropriations to eliminate the RDA. We heard from the administration that their concept of a Rural Development Administration was being pursued as part of reorganization. That is why I have acceded to the request by the Committee on Agriculture to continue the work of the agency, but to eliminate the regional offices.

Mr. Chairman, the net impact of this, as I understand it, is that those who are working with RDA will be also working in the same offices with folks from the Farmers Home Administration, which means that State by State each community can still continue to work with the State Farmers Home Office and the representatives of RDA to get the job done.

Mr. Chairman, it will cut down on paperwork, it will cut down on the time for approval, and I think, in cutting this redtape, that we will, in fact, serve these communities better.

I commend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA]. I support the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, given the colloquy I have just heard and the comments from the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee, I wonder if he could respond to a question from me regarding the duties that had been contemplated to be pursued by the district office director. If the district office is eliminated, will, for the most part, those decisions then be taken by the State director of the Farmers Home Administration in conjunction with the RDA, or will they be elevated to the national level?

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

Mr. BEREUTER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] that it is my understanding that the RDA employees who are working on those approvals will now be back in the State offices of Farmers Home so that the communities, as they come with their applications, will be coming to a familiar surrounding, meeting with people from Farmers Home, and finding people from RDA present to go ahead and approve their grants and loans and to move them forward.

□ 1550

I think I heard the gentleman earlier express similar concerns that we had really created some distance here and another step in the process. I think what the gentleman from Texas has done is to back up and go back to the State Farmers Home offices as the situs for that decision.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments. It is my judgment that is the right direction. I wanted to just assure that we were not elevating more decisions to the national level, but were indeed returning them to the State level.

Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEREUTER. I would be pleased to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I think there is a very important point to be made, though. Each State today, we do have people from the Rural Development Administration, people who had formerly been a part of the Farmers Home Administration. They are still in the same offices, but they are people who are a part of the Rural Development Administration. So it should be understood that what this amendment does is not to change anything with regard to the divisions within the state of duties for the Rural Development Administration as opposed to the Farmers Home Administration from what they are today. What the distinction is that will be made is that there will be no regional office.

We would anticipate that the Secretary would have his proposals for reorganization in the very near future. I am hopeful that I can speak on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, that I think you can expect that we will move expeditiously with regard to those recommendations, and this issue of reorganization is going to be solved before April 1, 1994, and we have finally eliminated the funding for these regional offices.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the distinguished gentleman for his comments. I do understand, and thought I did understand correctly, the point the gentleman was making. But my point is that none of the decisions now being contemplated to be pursued by the regional or district office director would be elevated to Washington. Instead they would be returned to RDA personnel in the States, working in conjunction with the Farmers Home Administration. Is that the understanding of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ENGLISH]?

Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma. If the gentleman will yield further, I want to make sure the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] understands perfectly clear. The Washington office today and before the RDA, and with the Farmers Home Administration, makes decisions. Many of these decisions are elevated from the Farmers Home Administration today, and they have been in the past, to the Washington office to be made.

Now, if the gentleman is asking, is this going to change decisions that are made, say, as they were in the past at the Farmers Home office, or at the State personnel for the Rural Development Administration, I think that will continue as it is.

But all of these are subject to approval obviously to the Washington office, whether it is Farmers Home or Rural Development. It always has been.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would say I had hoped that we might be moving toward a decentralized decisionmaking instead of elevating or moving toward more centralized decisionmaking. But I have some concerns on the basis of what I am hearing from the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ENGLISH].

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

Mr. BEREUTER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS], the ranking member on the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Two years ago we decided that we would go forward with the RDA, the Rural Development Administration, and we put the rural development programs in that category, under that banner. Then, in keeping with that, in terms of the decentralized policy the gentleman is recommending, we established the regional offices in Massachusetts, South Carolina, West Virginia, Missouri, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Oregon. The gentleman knows that the regional office that serves us in Kansas and Nebraska is in St. Joseph, MO.

Now, 2 years later, we are saying whoops, we are not going to do that, after they are up and running, after we have a sign on the door, after we transferred Farmers Home employees over to the RDA and people moved from, say, Topeka to St. Joseph, all of a sudden we are now saying no, we are going to close down the regional offices.

Now we are going to wait, I do not know how many more months, maybe 3, 4, 5, or 6, for Secretary Espy, and he should have the green light to do what he wants to do in regard to rural development.

My question is, do we have the money to do this, to go back in and either keep the regional offices, if the Secretary wants that, or to move the regional office capacity to the State office of Farmers Home. I do not know.

But it seems to me that if we went down the road or, down the RDA road, and we established seven regional offices 2 years ago, and now they are just up and running, we should not be saying we are going to do away with them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] has expired.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me it could conceivably be that after we set them up 2 years ago, and now they are up and running, and then we close them down, the Secretary could say we are going to establish a new RDA office and we will have to do it again.

I just do not think this is the right way to run this operation. I think the Secretary should have the freedom to do whatever he would like, or the flexibility to do whatever he would like.

We should ask the chairman of the subcommittee what he expects will happen to the regional offices. I have an amendment that I can offer at the end of this bill that would simply strike line 7 through 10 that call for the defunding of the regional offices, and they would continue at least until the Secretary would make up his mind. I am undecided as to whether to offer the amendment or not.

Mr. BEREUTER. Did the gentleman say defunding the regional offices?

Mr. ROBERTS. Yes. It would strike the Appropriations Committee's decision to terminate the regional offices after they are up and running for 2 years.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would hope we could have some clarification if we are going to have active regional offices or decentralized RDA decisionmaking at the State level.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of title III be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the remainder of title III is as follows:

RENTAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

For rental assistance agreements entered into or renewed pursuant to the authority under section 521(a)(2) or agreements entered into in lieu of forgiveness or payments for eligible households as authorized by section 502(c)(5)(D) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, $417,523,000; and in addition such sums as may be necessary, as authorized by section 521(c) of the Act, to liquidate debt incurred prior to fiscal year 1992 to carry out the Rental Assistance Program under section 521(a)(2) of the Act: *Provided*, That of this amount not more than $5,840,000 shall be available for debt forgiveness or payments for eligible households as authorized by section 502(c)(5)(D) of the Act, and not to exceed $10,000 per project for advances to nonprofit organizations or public agencies to cover direct costs (other than purchase price) incurred in purchasing projects pursuant to section 502(c)(5)(C) of the Act: *Provided further*, That of this amount not less than $109,258,000 is available for newly constructed units financed by section 515 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, and not more than $5,214,000 is for newly constructed units financed under sections 514 and 516 of the Housing Act of 1949: *Provided further*, That $297,211,000 is available for expiring agreements and for servicing of existing units without agreements: *Provided further*, That agreements entered into or renewed during fiscal year 1994 shall be funded for a five-year period, although the life of any such agreement may be extended to fully utilize amounts obligated.

RURAL HOUSING VOUCHER PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to operate a rural housing voucher program as authorized by section 542 of title V of the housing Act of 1949, as amended, $25,000,000, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture.

SELF-HELP HOUSING LAND DEVELOPMENT FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For direct loans pursuant to section 523(b)(1)(B) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1490c), $622,000.

For the cost of direct loans, including the cost of modifying loans, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, $23,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct loan program, $14,000.

AGRICULTURAL CREDIT INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For gross obligations for the principal amount of direct and guaranteed loans as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1928–1929, to be available from funds in the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund, as follows: farm ownership loans, $634,624,000, of which $556,543,000 shall be for guaranteed loans; operating loans, $2,750,000,000, of which $1,800,000,000 shall be for unsubsidized guaranteed loans and $250,000,000 shall be for subsidized guaranteed loans; $4,909,000 for water development, use, and conservation loans, of which $2,012,000 shall be for guaranteed loans; Indian tribe land acquisition loans as authorized by 25 U.S.C. 488, $1,163,000; for emergency insured loans, $100,000,000 to meet the needs resulting from natural disasters; and for credit sales of acquired property, $147,566,000.

For the cost of direct and guaranteed loans, including the cost of modifying loans as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as follows: farm ownership loans, $34,080,000, of which $20,870,000 shall be for guaranteed loans; operating loans, $119,985,000, of which $9,360,000 shall be for unsubsidized guaranteed loans and $29,425,000 shall be for subsidized guaranteed loans; $506,000 for water development, use, and conservation loans, of which $43,000 shall be for guaranteed loans; Indian tribe land acquisition loans as authorized by 25 U.S.C. 488, $229,000; for emergency insured loans, $26,060,000 to meet the needs resulting from natural disasters; and for credit sales of acquired property, $22,405,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, $275,392,000.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For gross obligations for the principal amount of direct and guaranteed loans as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1928 and 86 Stat. 661–664, as amended, to be available from funds in the Rural Development Insurance Fund, as follows: water and sewer facility loans, $835,000,000, of which $35,000,000 shall be for guaranteed loans; community facility loans, $325,000,000, of which $75,000,000 shall be for guaranteed loans; and guaranteed industrial development loans, $298,762,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available in this Act may be used to make transfers between the above limitations.

For the cost of direct and guaranteed loans, including the cost of modifying loans, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as follows: direct water and sewer facility loans, $111,040,000; direct community facility loans, $24,125,000; guaranteed community facility loans, $3,803,000; and guaranteed industrial development loans, $2,778,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, $58,194,000.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of direct loans $56,000,000, as authorized by the Rural Development Loan Fund (42 U.S.C. 9812(a)): *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans of not to exceed $100,000,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct loan programs, $1,481,000.

STATE MEDIATION GRANTS

For grants pursuant to section 502(b) of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1987, as amended (7 U.S.C. 5101–5106, $2,963,000.

RURAL WATER AND WASTE DISPOSAL GRANTS

For grants pursuant to section 306(a)(2) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1926), $450,000,000, to remain available until expended, pursuant to section 306(d) of the above Act: *Provided*, That of this amount, $25,000,000 shall be available for water and waste disposal systems to benefit the Colonias along the U.S./Mexico border, including grants pursuant to section 306C: *Provided further*, That, with the exception of the foregoing $25,000,000, these funds shall not be used for any purpose not specified in section 306(a) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act.

VERY LOW-INCOME HOUSING REPAIR GRANTS

For grants to the very low-income elderly for essential repairs to dwellings pursuant to section 504 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, $25,000,000, to remain available until expended.

RURAL HOUSING FOR DOMESTIC FARM LABOR

For financial assistance to eligible nonprofit organizations for housing for domestic farm labor, pursuant to section 516 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1486), $11,000,000, to remain available until expended.

MUTUAL AND SELF-HELP HOUSING

For grants and contracts pursuant to section 523(b)(1)(A) of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1490c), $12,750,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b).

SUPERVISORY AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

For grants pursuant to sections 509(g)(6) and 525 of the Housing Act of 1949, $2,500,000, to remain available until expended.

RURAL COMMUNITY FIRE PROTECTION GRANTS

For grants pursuant to section 7 of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (Public Law 95–313), $3,500,000 to fund up to 50 per centum of the cost of organizing, training, and equipping rural volunteer fire departments.

COMPENSATION FOR CONSTRUCTION DEFECTS

For compensation for construction defects as authorized by section 509(c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, $500,000, to remain available until expended.

RURAL HOUSING PRESERVATION GRANTS

For grants for rural housing preservation as authorized by section 552 of the Housing and Urban-Rural Recovery Act of 1983 (Public Law 98–181), $23,000,000.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

For grants authorized under section 310B(c) and 310B(j) (7 U.S.C. 1932) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to any qualified or private nonprofit organization, $35,000,000: *Provided*, That $500,000 shall be available for grants to qualified nonprofit organizations to provide technical assistance and training for rural communities needing improved passenger transportation systems or facilities in order to promote economic development.

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT GRANTS

For grants for pollution abatement and control projects authorized under section 310B(b) (7 U.S.C. 1932 of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, $3,000,000: *Provided*, That such assistance shall include regional technical assistance for improvement of solid waste management.

EMERGENCY COMMUNITY WATER ASSISTANCE GRANTS

For emergency community water assistance grants as authorized under section 306B (7 U.S.C. 1926b) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, $10,000,000.

OUTREACH FOR SOCIALLY DISADVANTAGED FARMERS

For grants and contracts pursuant to section 2501 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279), $3,000,000, to remain available until expended.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration, $600,000: *Provided*, That no other funds in this Act shall be available for this Office.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Farmers Home Administration, not otherwise provided for, in administering the programs authorized by the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1921–2000), as amended; title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1471–1490o); the Rural Rehabilitation Corporation Trust Liquidation Act, approved May 3, 1950 (40 U.S.C. 440–444), for administering the loan program authorized by title III–A of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Public Law 88–452 approved August 20, 1964), as amended, and such other programs which the Farmers Home Administration has the responsibility for administering, $729,749,000; of which $35,552,000 is hereby appropriated, $374,255,000 shall be derived by transfer from the Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account in this Act and merged with this account, $261,158,000 shall be derived by transfer from the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account in this Act and merged with this account, $57,294,000 shall be derived by transfer from the Rural Development Insurance Fund Program Account in this Act and merged with this account, $1,476,000 shall be derived by transfer from the Rural Development Loan Fund Program Account in this Act and merged with this account, and $14,000 shall be derived by transfer from the Self-Help Housing Land Development Fund Program Account in this Act and merged with this account: *Provided*, That not to exceed $500,000 of this appropriation may be used for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $4,368,000 of this appropriation shall be available for contracting with the National Rural Water Association or other equally qualified national organization for a circuit rider program to provide technical assistance for rural water systems.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

To carry into effect the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U.S.C. 901–950(b)), as follows:

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND TELEPHONE LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Insured loans pursuant to the authority of section 305 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U.S.C. 935), shall be made as follows: 5 percent rural electrification loans, $125,000,000; 5 percent rural telephone loans, $125,000,000; cost of money rural telephone loans, $198,000,000; municipal rate rural electric loans, $600,000,000; and loans made pursuant to section 306 of that Act, $933,000,000; to remain available until expended.

For the cost, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, including the cost of modifying loans, of direct and guaranteed loans authorized by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U.S.C. 935), as follows: cost of direct loans, $36,265,000; cost of municipal rate loans, $46,020,000; cost of money rural telephone loans, $40,000; cost of loans guaranteed pursuant to section 306, $11,184,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, $29,982,000.

RURAL TELEPHONE BANK PROGRAM ACCOUNT

The Rural Telephone Bank is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds available to such corporation in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out its authorized programs for the current fiscal year. During fiscal year 1994 and within the resources and authority available, gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans shall be $199,847,000.

For the cost, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, including the cost of modifying loans, of direct loans authorized by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U.S.C. 935), $40,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the loan programs, $8,794,000.

DISTANCE LEARNING AND MEDICAL LINK PROGRAMS

For necessary expenses to carry into effect the programs authorized in sections 2331–2335 of Public Law 101–624, $10,000,000, to remain available until expended.

RURAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For loans authorized under section 313 of the Rural Electrification Act, for the purpose of promoting rural economic development and job creation projects, $13,025,000.

For the cost, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, of direct loans, $3,381,000.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For administrative expenses to carry out the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U.S.C. 901–950(b)), and to administer the loan and loan guarantee programs for Community Antenna Television facilities as authorized by the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1921–1995), and for which commitments were made prior to fiscal year 1994, including not to exceed $7,000 for financial and credit reports, funds for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $103,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $38,776,000; of which $29,982,000 shall be derived by transfer from the Rural Electrification and Telephone Loans Program Account in this Act and $8,794,000 shall be derived by transfer from the Rural Telephone Bank Program Account in this Act: *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act may be used to authorize the transfer of additional funds to this account from the Rural Telephone Bank: *Provided further*, That none of the salaries and expenses provided to the Rural Electrification Administration, and none of the responsibilities assigned by law to the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration may be reassigned or transferred to any other agency or office.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order to the remainder of this title?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURTON of Indiana: Page 50, line 19, strike "$35,000,000" and insert "$20,750,000".

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment be limited to 30 minutes, 15 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] and 15 minutes in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. On this amendment and all amendments thereto, time will be limited to 30 minutes, equally divided between the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN]

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON]

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to this debate with great interest, and I would just like to make a couple of points. This bill is almost $10 billion, or 16.2 percent, above fiscal year 1993. While I understand that about $8.8 billion of that is due to the shortfall in the Commodity Credit Corporation, there still is room to cut some of the spending in this bill.

There has also been an increase in entitlements, or what I believe is an entitlement, regarding the child nutrition programs, or about $671 million.

We as a country cannot sustain these kinds of increase in appropriation bills indefinitely. I mean, this is an increase of 16.2 percent in 1 year.

Last year the food stamp part of this bill went up by about 20 percent. Fortunately, the food stamp program did not increase to that extent this year.

But nevertheless, we have had quantum leaps in expenditures in this particular appropriation bill in the past. So we have to start making some economies.

The amendment that I have before the body right now would save only about $14.25 million. Granted, that is just a drop in the bucket, but it is a step in the right direction.

This amendment deals with rural development grants. Some of the examples of how the money would be spent are contained in the report language in this legislation. I cannot understand why we are spending money for Kentucky Public Television, some industrial parks in the country, and immigration counseling in Arizona.

We have about 2.2 to 2.3 million illegal aliens coming across the border per year right now. I was just in Mexico City and found that out last week. About half of them are being sent back. So we are having an increase of about 1.1 to 1.2 million illegal aliens coming into the country right now. And I cannot believe that the people of this country want us to be spending rural development money for immigration counseling in Arizona or any other State. They want to keep the illegal aliens and the illegal immigrants from coming into this country in the first place, and I doubt seriously if the amount of money appropriated in here would really be able to counsel many of those illegal aliens coming into the

country or deal much with the immigration problem.

□ 1600

So I would just like to say to my colleagues, the bill contains $35 million for rural development grants. Last year it was $20.75 million. All I am doing is reducing it to last year's spending level. This is not a cut below last year. It is just taking it back to last year's spending level.

That would reduce the spending in this bill by $14.25 million. I think it is a reasonable thing to do, and I urge my colleagues to take a hard look at this amendment and support it.

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in opposition to the amendment. I think it should be noted, for the record, that the Clinton administration has requested more funds for this program than the subcommittee has appropriated. The Clinton administration believes that as part of rural development that these grants are essential to put people back to work and to help small businesses.

I will concede the gentleman from Indiana has accurately described part of one of the grants. It is true that the Southern Kentucky Rural Economic Development Center is asking for help through a Rural Development Grant for the development of public television. What the gentleman did not mention is that this grant is being used as part of a rural technology facility. It is our understanding that the information which is going to be transmitted through this public television will not only provide education for people in rural areas but also job training, which is a very efficient and effective way of providing service in this day and age.

I represent an area which is by and large rural. My largest town, outside of my home town of Springfield, IL, is 22,000 population. There are not many like it. There are very small communities in very isolated counties.

They are desperate, absolutely desperate to find jobs to keep the high school kids graduating in those counties at home. Ask any Congressman representing a rural area, "What is the biggest heartache," and he will tell my colleagues, it is the fact that the kids are leaving the rural areas. There are no opportunities there. There is nowhere to turn.

What the President is trying to do and what this committee is trying to help him do is to provide some economic assistance.

Let me give an example of some areas that we have funded through the Rural Development Grants. Incubator projects in smaller communities, these, in fact, are buildings where small businesses, which otherwise would not have the wherewithal, can come together under one roof and get started, little mom-and-pop ventures that sometimes blossom into good businesses with a good payroll.

They need a helping hand. And in rural America, there are very few places to turn.

What we are trying to do with the Rural Development Grants is to give to those rural communities that otherwise would be out of business an opportunity to get started.

I have heard many things said about opportunities since I started in this Congress. The question is whether or not we are willing to provide some $14 million in seed money for this kind of opportunity.

If Members will read through the committee report on the Rural Development Grants, they will find communities like the Upper Peninsula of Michigan, which suffers from chronic economic distress, facing the potential closing of an Air Force base. It comes and asks for some help to establish a business incubator so they can get 20 loans in that community, 20 small businesses started.

I do not know how many will succeed. I guess the odds are basically against them. But we believe, as the Clinton administration does, that investing in training, in education, in economic development, and in helping small businesses, is money well invested.

That is why I would ask the Members of the Committee to think long and hard about cutting this amount of money. It may be appealing to cut $14 million, but a small amount of money given to a rural community may be all that it needs to really help and get the businesses moving, to provide jobs for the kids to stay in the communities to build their lives around these towns which have been so good to their parents and grandparents.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I do not know how this country has survived for over 200 years without the Government, the Federal Government, providing money for projects sufficient as those just illuminated by my colleague.

I mean, it seems to me, when I listen to the other side argue on these issues anymore, that without Big Brother in Washington, DC, providing the money for these projects, the whole country is going to go down the tubes.

I think exactly the converse is true. We have a $4.35-trillion debt, quadrupled in the last 10 years. And it is because Government spending has gone completely out of control.

Every time we come up with an amendment to cut Government spending, I hear from my colleagues on the other side, Government has to spend more to provide more jobs.

Whatever happened to the free enterprise system? Rather than have the Government do this, why not provide tax credits to the business community in this country so they can hire those who are unemployed, those who do not know useful skills, to get them off of welfare? Give them tax credits, have them hire the unemployed, teach them useful skills and make them taxpayers instead of tax recipients.

A lot of what the gentleman said I agree with. We need to do what we can to stimulate the private sector, to create jobs in these rural communities. But we can do that without the Government paying the tab, picking up the costs of these things.

That is the thing that got us in this mess in the first place. We go on and on and on.

Here we are now, public television is supposed to be supported by private sector monies, by corporations, by monies other than the Federal Government.

Here we are, the Federal Government is going to pay for public television in a rural area in Kentucky. Immigration counseling in Arizona, again, I will not reiterate what I said before. I do not think that is a necessary expenditure for this. Industrial park in some parts of the country. Why does not the local community, the State of that area where that industrial park is going to be located, pay for that? Instead, here we are, the Federal Government, Big Brother is going to take care of it and solve the problem.

My colleagues, we have to draw the line somewhere. We have to start setting priorities around here, saying that the Government can only do so much, because we cannot do something for small business, for the people of this country, unless we first take it away from the taxpayers.

We cannot spend money unless we first take it out of the pockets of the people in this country. Or worse yet, not take it out of their pocket, just dig the deficit hole deeper that they and their kids are going to have to repay. That is the problem.

So although this is a modest amendment, only cutting $14.25 million, it goes to the basic problem that we have. This is, Government cannot do it all and Government should be doing a lot less.

We should be stimulating the free enterprise system with tax credits, tax incentives and other ways rather than the Federal Government paying the tab.

The taxpayers cannot afford it. The deficit cannot afford it, because that is going to be paid for not only by the taxpayers, in the form of higher interest payments and so forth, but by the future generations of this country.

So we have to start drawing the line and cutting out some of these projects.

Granted, the intention, the intention of the majority is right. It is a well-intentioned approach.

The fact is, it is the wrong way to do it. The way to do it is not take taxpayers' dollars and pay for these things. It is to create incentives for the private sector to do it.

There is a better way to do this than what we are talking about here. I urge my colleagues to join with me in cutting this $14.25 million.

Let me just end up by saying one more thing. We are not cutting below last year's spending level. Last year we spent 20.75 million for rural development grants. I am just taking it back to that level. We are not cutting below last year. It is a freeze of last year's spending level.

This is a $14.25 million increase. I do not think we can afford it right now. We should be prioritizing our spending and, therefore, we would not need this increase.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. PASTOR].

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, my colleague on the other side of the aisle brought up a project from Arizona. I would like to explain it to him.

I agree with him. There are other ways of doing it. But we have not done it. Earned income tax credit is something I support. I know he probably supports it also. But we cannot get it through these two bodies.

So what is the second thing we can do? Yuma, AZ, is located on the Mexican border, and we have a nonprofit organization that is funded by foundation money that is trying to assist Americans who reside in this particular area and people who are here through the Amnesty Program, make sure that they go through the process to make them citizens. So the services that he talks about is because they are here through the Amnesty Program, which is a program passed by Congress. But it is not limited to Immigration and Naturalization.

This area is populated by low income, seasonal farm workers and migrant workers. Many of these people, who are Americans, also want to share in the American dream.

□ 1610

This nonprofit organization provides counseling and self-help, housing, it helps these people take advantage of some of the programs that Farmers Home has. It also helps those who want to become businesspeople, also to help them in the process, so it is an organization that is attempting to help people of less means. The majority are Mexican-Americans, many if not all are Americans, and those that wish to become Americans.

I would urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment, because what they are doing is providing people, at least in different parts of the country, means to achieve the American dream.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN].

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I really wanted to maybe enter into a dialog with my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON]. While he was speaking about the idea that we should just let agriculture kind of take care of itself, I happened to be reading an article by Gov. Mario Cuomo talking about what New York was doing about defense contractors that were losing their jobs, the businesses and the employees were losing their jobs, as a result of the end of the cold war, and what it meant to employees in that State. There was an interesting phrase in it. I thought I could equate it perhaps in a discussion with my colleague about what he was saying.

The Governor said:

> Obviously, business partnerships and unemployment are costly enough, in this case costly enough to counter any laissez faire argument for letting industrial Darwinism take its course.

I wondered if maybe that is not what the gentleman is saying, by having no U.S. Government involvement in agriculture. If I may just finish for a second, it seems to me that the issues that the gentleman raised and the specific projects he pointed out, I understand that also there is local involvement, local money as well as perhaps even State funding, of which I am not aware, so I could not speak to that.

However, I understand in Yuma, for example, there is some local funding done and certainly local people giving their time. I was very interested in whether or not the gentleman did not see at least some role for the U.S. Government, rather than letting agricultural Darwinism take its course.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLEMAN. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. When the gentleman says "industrial Darwinism" or "agricultural Darwinism," he is talking about letting an evolutionary process take place, I guess?

Mr. COLEMAN. Yes, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I am not suggesting that. I am saying there is a better way, and the better way is to have tax incentives for the private sector or the free enterprise system to hire the unemployed and teach them useful skills by giving them incentives to do so through the Tax Code.

I think that is far more useful than for us to continue to take money out of the taxpayers' pockets and dig this deficit into a bigger problem.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman, I do not think it is all one side or the other. In truth, I think some of the very programs that were highlighted in some of the explanations we had from the chairman in fact indicate it is not just one way or the other, that in fact we can do some of both, and I would hope in terms of unemployment particularly in agriculture that the gentleman would see the efficacy of these programs.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I do not believe that all of the rural development grants that we have been giving in this country are bad. What I was saying is that during a time of fiscal problems in this country, that we should not be having increases in the programs.

Last year we spent $20.75 million, and I think that is adequate right now. By prioritizing these programs, and if the ones that the gentleman is talking about in Arizona or Pennsylvania or Kentucky, if they are meritorious, then put them in as a top priority, but do not add additional spending at a time when it is fiscally very difficult to do it.

In addition, I think we should try to come up with incentives for a private sector to be doing more in this area and creating incentives for them to take over these responsibilities, rather than have the taxpayer do it.

All I am saying is, let us freeze it at last year's spending level, at $20.75 million. I think that is a reasonable request.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from the great State of Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. Actually, it is the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Chairman, do I understand correctly that the gentleman is not cutting one dime below where we were last year, that he is going to spend exactly the same in this account as we were spending last year?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Yes, it is in effect a freeze, my amendment.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, so what the committee has decided to do is go substantially above the freeze, is that correct?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. It is going to go up by about 70 or 80 percent over the last year, 70 percent.

Mr. WALKER. And if I understand correctly, what we have just heard argued here as the reason for doing that is because if we make Government bigger, the country gets better, and the

more we spend in Government and the bigger Government gets, the better the country gets; that bigger Government leads, and I have a little bit of a problem with that, coming from an area that has been fairly successful in agriculture, where we are very proud of many of the rural areas.

What I have found is that Government is generally interfering with what we attempt to do in those rural areas, not helping. I wonder if the gentleman has found some of the same kinds of things in Indiana?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I think not only in the area of agriculture, but in almost every area of Government, we see the Federal Government taking over a bigger and bigger share of the responsibility. I think that in large part is the reason why we have these huge deficits, because we are spending more and more and more money trying to solve more problems with Federal taxpayers' dollars with new programs and entitlements we are coming up with, and we see it as just exacerbating the problem instead of solving it.

It seems to me the best way to do it is to get back to the good old free enterprise system with some stimulation, if necessary, by the Federal Government, instead of us taking over the responsibilities.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, most of what Government brings with it is taxation, regulation, and litigation. In rural areas in particular that becomes very difficult to deal with. If what we are constantly doing is having to hire lawyers in order to deal with the Government, if what we are constantly faced with is higher taxes, if what we are having to deal with is higher taxes on the farm or business because of what Government is doing, if what we are faced with is volumes and volumes of regulations, so that we can participate in the latest Government program that the Government says is going to do us good, the fact is that the Government is undermining what is going on in rural areas, not helping it.

I would suggest that the gentleman is absolutely right, that in this particular case that there may be some good being done with these programs, but that good can be done within a freeze, that we do not need to add the additional money.

I would hope that the House would endorse the gentleman's amendment, would support it, so that we can hold this account to a freeze level this year, do those things which are absolutely essential, prioritize within the program, but let us not spend more money.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, just a couple of brief points I would like to make on this. One is on the question of tax credits.

Let it be understood that the extension of tax credits has exactly the same budget consequence as the use of RDA funds. It is a matter of whether the Government is going to stimulate economic development or not.

Second, let us understand that the RDA funds are not gifts. This is not a gift horse. This is a matter of leveraging private as well as local funds in order to expand economic opportunities in rural areas.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] suggested that we need to prioritize the use of our dollars. He is exactly right. We need to prioritize the use of the limited resources we have in this Government to create the infrastructure that makes it possible for free enterprise, private enterprise, to expand job opportunities. That is exactly what the RDA program is designed to do. Every other Western industrialized nation is much more aggressive than we are in this regard.

Mr. Chairman, there is no gift horse involved. This is the use of our limited dollars to help create an environment where free enterprise and private business can take off. For that reason, I think it is a very good program; a very small program, but a good one.

If there are those who believe this program interferes with economic development in their areas, there are many of us who would be glad to have their share of RDA funds.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, will the Chair inform us how much time remains, please?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] has 6 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BAESLER].

Mr. BAESLER. Mr. Chairman, the mention of Kentucky does not happen to be in my district, so I am not speaking on this particular project, but I do not think anything facing this Congress or anybody else in the next several years will be as important as what happens in rural development.

I think the discussion of priorities does bring home the point that we have to make how we are going to stimulate the economies in rural development a priority.

□ 1620

We are not just talking about agriculture, and I think that is what has been talked about, because a lot of rural America has nothing to do with agriculture. It has to do with people who live in the country, and manufacturing and so forth. And I will allow how you try to leverage money with business and so forth. But in rural America you have one more problem that you do not necessarily have in urban America. In rural America we very seldom have the private interests that are going to put the money in to stimulate the communications, or stimulate the hospital systems or whatever.

I do not think there is anything we can do in this Congress for the next 10 years, 15 years, that is going to be more important than to try to put more and more seed money into how do we give those people in rural America the same opportunities that people in the more populated areas have. And therefore, that is why I oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there are areas where the Federal Government should be involved. Infrastructure is one of them. We need good roads, we need good bridges, we need highways so that the commerce of this country can get its job done. That is a legitimate function of Government. I support that.

But there are other areas where Government should be limited in its involvement, and this is one area where I think Government should be limited.

I understand we have differences of opinion, but I feel very strongly about this. One of the previous speakers said that tax credits or tax incentives are coming out of the Treasury, so it is a wash as to whether we do that or do what is advocated with this spending for the rural development grants.

Let me just say that tax credits overall and tax incentives for the private sector to hire the hard-core unemployed, and to hire the welfare recipients, and to hire those who are in abject poverty, and find them jobs, and teach them useful skills, sure, it would cost some money in the short run, but in the long run, those people getting those welfare benefits would no longer be recipients, and they would be taxpayers. And statistics show that the people who get off of welfare and start getting a job, and start paying taxes are not a drain on the Treasury. They are a real plus. And in the short run those tax incentives to the private sector, to the businessman who would teach them useful skills is a great incentive, whereas continued Government subsidies and Government support just digs us deeper and deeper and deeper in the same hole.

For example, last year we increased food stamp moneys by 20 percent in 1 year. Food stamps went up 20 percent in 1 year in this agriculture bill last year. How is that solving a problem? It is not. Whereas if we had had some kind of a program to create tax incentives to teach those unemployed useful skills and get them employed by industry, we could have gotten them off of the welfare rolls, and instead of food stamps, and unemployment compensation and other things going up, we

probably would have had it going down. And it would have been less of a drain on the Treasury.

Each 1 percent of unemployment costs the taxpayers $41 billion in this country.

So let me just say there are times when the Government should be involved. Infrastructure is one of them, because we have to have that infrastructure to make sure that commerce moves in this country. But we must minimize the role of Government.

If Members do not believe that, just look at the last 20 years. Government has gotten more and more involved with entitlements, more Government programs, more Government regulations, and we are strangling the free enterprise system. If Members do not believe it, go and talk to any businessman who provides jobs, those jobs going overseas, out of the country so that we have to start making hard choices and prioritize spending.

That is why I say right here we are not cutting the spending, we are just freezing at last year's spending level, and that is not too hard to swallow. Prioritize these programs and spend money on the ones that are most important.

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, had I just parachuted into this Chamber half an hour ago and listened to this debate, I might have a much different attitude than I do. But I have been around here for the past week or so while we have been debating whether we are going to spend $40 billion on a can in space or $12 billion on a ditch in Texas. Now the gentleman tells me that $14 million to try to create jobs in the poorest, most economically distressed parts of America is wasteful spending.

The gentleman yielded to his friend from Pennsylvania who said government brings us taxation, regulation, and litigation, and he voted as fast as he could for the space station. And a lot of Members voted as fast as they could for the super collider. I do not want to drag that debate into this one, other than to put it into some context.

For many communities, the space station and the super collider was jobs, and they voted that way, and they rationalized it in their minds, that someday, this might deliver for them. I want to tell the gentleman that for a lot of small counties and towns that I represent, and for Members from other rural areas represented, this program provides jobs, and we are asking for $14 million. The contractors on the space station lose that in pocket change each month. We are asking for this to create jobs, my colleagues.

I share with you, the depression, the consternation over food stamps. We are putting $28 billion for food stamps in this bill. We cannot touch it. It is mandatory spending.

One out of every 10 American citizens now has food stamp coupons. Why? Because over the last 4 years we have had the slowest job creation and the slowest economic growth of any time in the last half century.

How are we going to turn it around? I hope we will turn it around by helping small businesses get started. I hope we will follow the mandate of the Rural Development Grant Act which says we are going to focus on educational instruction and job training instruction. Give the kids I represent in Calhoun County, a small rural county that I represent, a chance to grow up in Campsville, a chance to grow up in Brussels where their parents did because there are jobs there. Give us a little bitty piece, a little slice of your space station. Let us have a little bit of economic development for rural America. Do not deny us in the name of deficit reduction $14 million when we turn around and cast billions of dollars out on a theory in space and a hole in Texas.

I honestly believe this is not an unreasonable amount. The President wanted $51 million. We gave him $35 million. We cut back from what he requested. I do not think it is an unreasonable increase.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself my remaining time.

All those who applauded, I want them to listen to this. This is very important. The gentleman well knows that the money spent for the super collider and the space station would not have gone for deficit reduction if it had been cut out. It would have been spent for another part of the bill. You were not going to take that money and use it for deficit reduction. It was going to go for some other public housing project or something else, and you know it. And so that is a red herring. That money was not going to be spent for anything except what was going to be put in that bill by the conferees.

The space station and the super collider, that money was not going to be cut out of spending in any way, shape, or form, and everybody in this Chamber knows it. So do not use that as a red herring, because that is what the gentleman is doing.

The second thing I would like to say is that we do have to economize. We do have to prioritize. Where we can cut spending we should. If we could have cut the money for the super collider and the space station and used it to reduce this horrible deficit, a lot of us would have voted for it, but we did not want to cut those and have it used for more social welfare programs that are creating tremendous dependency on this Government.

Give us an opportunity to cut spending and use it for deficit reduction by the rules coming out of the Rules Committee, and we will do it. But you do not bring rules to the floor that will allow that money to be used for deficit reduction. If we cut it, then it goes for other spending programs, or some other spending programs, some other entitlement, some other social program or welfare program, and it is wrong.

This is a freeze at last year's level. It is a good amendment, and I hope my colleagues will vote for it.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA].

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time and just wanted to mention that when I showed my chart earlier, Agriculture has turned back $57 billion in the past 12 years. It is not like we have not been responsible. It is not like we have not done our jobs.

Keep in mind, $57 billion has been turned back to the Federal Government by Agriculture in the past 12 years. I would say this is a pretty good job in trying to reduce the burden of the deficit in this country.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 145, noes 288, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 292]

AYES—145

Allard	Dunn	Jacobs
Andrews (TX)	Ewing	Johnson, Sam
Archer	Fawell	Kasich
Armey	Fields (TX)	Kim
Bachus (AL)	Fish	King
Baker (CA)	Fowler	Klug
Ballenger	Franks (CT)	Knollenberg
Bartlett	Franks (NJ)	Kolbe
Barton	Gallegly	Kyl
Bentley	Gekas	Lazio
Bilirakis	Geren	Levy
Bliley	Gilchrest	Lewis (FL)
Bonilla	Gilman	Linder
Bunning	Gingrich	Livingston
Burton	Goodlatte	Machtley
Buyer	Goss	Mann
Callahan	Grams	Manzullo
Calvert	Greenwood	McCandless
Camp	Hancock	McCollum
Canady	Harman	McInnis
Castle	Hastert	McKeon
Coble	Hefley	Meehan
Collins (GA)	Herger	Meyers
Combest	Hobson	Mica
Condit	Hoekstra	Michel
Cox	Hoke	Miller (FL)
Crane	Horn	Molinari
Cunningham	Houghton	Moorhead
DeLay	Huffington	Morella
Diaz-Balart	Hunter	Myers
Doolittle	Hyde	Nussle
Dornan	Inglis	Oxley
Dreier	Inhofe	Packard
Duncan	Istook	Pallone

Paxon
Penny
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Ramstad
Regula
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Slattery
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Talent
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Walker
Weldon
Wolf
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—288

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Baker (LA)
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crapo
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
de Lugo (VI)
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Faleomavaega (AS)
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gillmor
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Grandy
Green
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hansen
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Hoyer
Hughes
Hutchinson
Hutto
Inslee
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McKinney
McNulty
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Norton (DC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Rose
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schenk
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Underwood (GU)
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—6

Blute
Henry
Matsui
McMillan
Rostenkowski
Skeen

□ 1650

Mr. BAKER of Louisiana changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. POMBO, GILCHREST, and SLATTERY changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1650

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ZIMMER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ZIMMER: Page 53, line 17, strike "$125,000,000" and insert "$25,000,000".

Page 53, line 18, strike "$125,000,000" and insert "$25,000,000".

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make sure that title III is open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, title III is open to amendment at any point.

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

Mr. ZIMMER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 30 minutes, 15 minutes controlled by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] and 15 minutes by me, which I will make available to both sides of the aisle.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have no objection to that. Frankly, I do not know whether we will even use 15 minutes on this side.

Mr. DURBIN. Well, if we could agree to that unanimous-consent request, then maybe we could do with even less time.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the unanimous-consent request, the time will be limited to 30 minutes on this amendment and all amendments thereto, 15 minutes on each side equally and evenly divided.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, there is a saying here in Washington that old Government agencies never die. They don't even fade away, and there is no agency for which this could be more true than the Rural Electrification Administration.

The REA was conceived by Franklin Delano Roosevelt in 1935 at a time when rural America did not have electricity and did not have telephone service. Its mission was to electrify the areas of rural America that did not have any hope of getting electricity, and later that mission was extended to cover telephone service as well.

The REA has been a tremendous, unqualified success. There is virtually no one in America today who does not have electricity and does not have telephone service, yet the REA continues to live on.

The REA in 1944 began a program of making loans to telephone companies and electric cooperatives at what was then the Treasury rate of interest, which was, believe it or not, 2 percent per year. That is a sobering thought to those of us who think we have reached Nirvana at a 7-percent Treasury bond rate.

But the REA continues in 1993 to lend money at 2 percent and at 5 percent and at other rates that are well below the market rate for loans. Many of the borrowers of these loans are companies that simply do not need a taxpayer subsidy. They are the utilities that serve Vale and Aspin and Hilton Head, SC. They are subsidiaries of major telephone corporations that are listed on the New York Stock Exchange.

The program has simply gone on too long and the subsidies are simply unjustified.

Now, I recognize that in the process of drafting the reconciliation bill this year the Agriculture Committee has made a valiant effort to try to rationalize and modernize this program, but it has not gone even as far as President Clinton has asked. President Clinton made a special point of mentioning the REA in his budget address. He pointed out that as a resident of Arkansas he knew the importance of the REA, but even in Arkansas they had to make some sacrifices.

The President proposed that the most generous loan subsidy program of the REA be reduced to $25 million a year for 5-percent loans to electric cooperatives, another $25 million a year this year for loans to telephone companies, $25 million and $25 million.

The bill before us has increased those loan levels by $100 million each. So

there is $125 million in the current legislation for 5-percent loans to electric cooperatives, and $125 million for subsidized loans at 5 percent to telephone companies.

My legislation would simply reduce those amounts to what the President asked for.

There are many of us who believe the REA has outlived its usefulness and should be abolished, but this bill would not go anywhere near abolishing the REA. It would not decapitate the REA. It would not even give it a haircut. It would just give it a light trim.

I think putting it in line with what the President asked is the least that we can do.

I believe that with the $25 million loan ceiling we would give an incentive for the REA to make sure that those 5-percent loans go only to borrowers who need the money, who need the subsidy, and that we stop subsidizing those who do not need a taxpayer subsidy.

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ENGLISH].

Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I want to say right off that this amendment is very misguided.

I would make the point that we have reduced in the reconciliation bill the 5-percent loans for REC's from $625 million down to $125 million. That is a reduction.

For rural telephone companies, we have reduced the loans from $239 million down to $125 million. That is a reduction.

We have done away with all the 2-percent funds to help people who are having hardships.

And let me point out one other thing. We are going after those who need it the most. This particular amendment would strike at the very heart of those who can least afford it.

Let me point out what the criteria is to be eligible for one of these 5-percent hardship loans in States that you must have significantly higher rates than the average of all utilities in the State. It must also serve consumers whose incomes are below the State average.

This is going to those who can least afford a rate increase.

Let me say also, the issue and the point was raised with regard to urbanized areas. There is a provision that is in the reconciliation that denies the use of these loans in any urbanized area. This goes to the most rural, to the poorest of the poor. That is who this is aimed at.

There are those who have for some time, Mr. Chairman, been making the point that telephone cooperatives should not receive assistance. Well, let me make the point that people in rural America deserve the same opportunities that people who live in urban areas do.

Let me also point out there is no more in the way of assistance in helping those people living in rural areas than in urban areas. In fact, there is far less.

□ 1700

All this provision does is to strike at the very heart of those people who are the poorest of the poor, living in the most rural areas, those who are truly in need of hardship assistance.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, what the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ENGLISH] failed to point out, although he is correct that the amount for the 5-percent loan program is reduced from the last appropriations bill—what the gentleman failed to point out is that there is a brandnew subsidized loan program included in this legislation, a program that I have not proposed to cut, for $600 million in subsidized loans at the rate available to municipalities. That is roughly 6 percent.

So, there is only, as a practical matter, there is only going to be a modest increase in the amount of the loan interest for those who will avail themselves of the program, and there has not been a reduction.

Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I would simply make the point that the legislation the gentleman is referring to saves $150 million. This program has been cut, interest rates have been raised, we have done away with 2-percent money, we have reduced the 5-percent money, we have put REC's and rural telephone companies on the same level as municipalities. They get the same rate. We are treating them fairly.

The thing I have a difficult time understanding is why the gentleman would target and strike out at those who are in the greatest need, those who are truly hardship cases, those people who are living in the most rural areas who have the highest rates, those people who can least afford it. I have a very difficult time understanding why in the world we want to rip the rural electric service and telephone service away from those people who are so desperately in need and most of whom, I might say, are elderly.

Mr. ZIMMER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, the fact is this is not a program for rural individuals. It is a program for rural companies, in this case rural telephone companies and rural electric cooperatives, and the gentleman could not deny that there is a brandnew $600 million loan program, a subsidized loan program, because there is. The fact is that $25 million is being left in each program for true hardship loans. Up until now the loans have been on a first-come-first-served basis. We do not know even what kind of hardship, if any, these loans respond to. The President has estimated we would need $25 million in each category to deal with the problem.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the gentleman on this side of the aisle follow the lead of our President and follow his guidance.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] both for yielding time and for bringing this important amendment to the floor and to the attention of our colleagues.

Mr. Chairman, everyone here wants to cut the deficit. Everyone here wants to avoid raising taxes. It is impossible, however, to do either of these if we do not cut Government spending. Cutting Government spending, particularly unnecessary and wasteful Government spending, ought to be what this Congress is all about.

One of the most wasteful programs in Government identified by scores of journalists, and political commentators and economists across America is the one targeted by my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER]. This indefensible program maintained by the REA will cost an extra $200 million to taxpayers already in hardship unless the Zimmer amendment passes.

Mr. Chairman, the original purpose of the REA was to extend electricity and telephone service to rural areas that did not have it. First America accomplished the goal of getting electricity to the Nation's farms. Second, we tackled the job of bringing telephone service to them, and they have got it, and yet this agency lives on extending, I should add, a subsidy that was not intended in the original program. When Congress authorized REA to make 2-percent loans, that was about equivalent to the cost of the funds to the Government. Today, fixed by law, these loans are extended at subsidized cut rates.

Mr. Chairman, the President of the United States, Bill Clinton, offered the Zimmer amendment as one of his only specific cuts in his overall budget. The President's budget request says that what we should do is get rid of the cut-rate loans for all but hardships and that, yes, we should make hardship loans at cut rates amounting to $25 million for telephone service and $25 million for electric utilities. That is precisely what the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] will do.

The fiscal year 1994 budget request from President Clinton said, "Let's raise the rate to 7 percent," still an attractive rate for all the rest of these loans, "and reserve the 5-percent cut rate for the hardship loan, $25 million each in the case of electric utilities

and telephones." That makes a good bit of sense, Mr. Chairman. The net result is we will save $200 million for taxpayers, $200 million for taxpayers who are themselves in hardship, with the passage of the Zimmer amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is the right thing to do. It will cut Government spending that is unnecessary and wasteful, and I urge my colleagues to vote aye on the Zimmer amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I would like to commend in particular the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ENGLISH] as chairman of the Subcommittee on Environment, Credit, and Rural Development for putting together very meaningful reform of the rural electric association system, a reform that will produce $35 million in savings in fiscal year 1994 and $150 million over 5 years.

Mr. Chairman, I know of no program in the Federal budget which has been the subject of more inaccurate reporting or downright distortion than the REA. To hear some say it, the REA exists to deliver cheap electricity to the wealthy. The truth is the REA helps bring electricity to largely below-average-income families in the most rural areas of this country. In fact, the new restructuring of the REA already approved by the House institutes means testing to make sure only those rural electric co-ops truly needing the assistance can access the 5-percent money targeted by the gentleman's amendment. To qualify, the rates for these associations have to be 20 percent above the statewide electrical average, and the average consumer has to be below average in income.

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

Mr. POMEROY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY] have an estimate of the percentage of rural co-ops that would qualify for that so-called hardship status?

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I do not have, except their rates have to be 20 percent over average in their median income of their consumers below the statewide average. The gentleman's amendment has targeted those REA's serving the most rural and impoverished populations in this country.

Mr. ZIMMER. So, the gentleman does not know what percentage of all electric co-ops would qualify for hardship. I dare say that the constituents of mine in New Jersey are spending far more than 20 percent of the statewide average in most States for their electricity.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I believe that one of the reasons that the gentleman from New Jersey is heartfelt and well-meaning, but totally misguided in his amendment, is confused on this subject, is because he does not know the difference between selling electricity in New Jersey, the district he represents, and a rural State like North Dakota, the district I represent. In the district of the gentleman from New Jersey the average electric utility has more than 75 consumers per mile of line. In North Dakota the average is 1.6 consumers per mile of line. In terms of per capita income, Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman's district in New Jersey has a per capita income of 30,000 per year. In North Dakota it is less than half of that, $15,000 per year. Finally, in terms of revenue per mile of line, in my friend from New Jersey's district the average investor-owned utility collects more than $143,000 of revenue per mile of line. In North Dakota the average rural electric co-op collects less than $3,000 per mile of line.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to consider these numbers when they vote on this amendment to further cut the REA. When asked to step up to the plate and do their fair share for deficit reduction, rural America has never shied away. In fact, beginning with the 1994 budget agreement, no sector of our budget has proportionately taken a bigger hit, including defense and agriculture.

□ 1710

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, just in response to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY], although it may sound like a contradiction in terms, there is such a thing as rural New Jersey, and I live there on a farm in a very rural community. I know what the problems of rural America are. Certainly we are not as sparsely populated as your State, but the question that I raise and I hope perhaps the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ENGLISH] can answer it, is how many utilities, what percentage of all the utilities, would qualify for this so-called hardship status.

Mr. Chairman, I will sit down and let the gentleman use his time.

Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I would be delighted to respond. Obviously that depends on the number of cooperatives that are able to qualify under a very limited hardship criteria. I might also point out that would vary from time to time. It is not going to be the same in any one year.

Mr. Chairman, let me also make the point that we have some 5 billion dollars' worth of tax breaks we are giving to the investors in utilities. I do not hear anybody talking about that. We have some 800 million dollars' worth of breaks that are going to municipals. I do not hear anybody talking about that. And I have just been informed by the Banking Committee that private banks, for instance, are borrowing from the Federal Government, some at 3 percent loans. I certainly do not hear anybody talking about that.

I still wonder why in the world with this amendment we are targeting those that are the neediest of the needy, some of our most senior citizens, people living in the most rural areas of this country. That is what this amendment targets, those people who are truly in hardship, that meet the hardship criteria. I do not understand why we are talking about those people.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, am I to understand this is coming out of my time?

The CHAIRMAN. It is indeed. You yielded to him.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I did not. I said I would sit down and let him use his time.

Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey has 2 minutes left.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the precious balance of my time.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I would encourage my colleagues to watch out for pickpockets from Oklahoma.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana [Ms. LONG].

Ms. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER], but I do commend him for his efforts at deficit reduction.

I simply want to make two points: one of the points I want to make is that virtually all electric consumers receive some kind of federal subsidy, whether it is an investor-owned, municipal-owned, or rural electric. And the rural electric consumer actually receives the smallest subsidy per consumer, about half of what the municipal electric consumer receives. And I want to make the point that it is per consumer.

The second point I want to make is that further cuts in rural electric programs would threaten the ability of rural electric utilities to provide the quality electric and telephone service at an affordable cost. I do urge my colleagues to defeat the Zimmer amendment.

Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. LONG. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to make a couple of further points. The point I would like to make is that sometime ago we agreed in this country to provide universal service. The people, whether they lived in rural areas or urban areas, would all have the same opportunities, that we would have access to the same kinds of services.

The fact of the matter is, that goal still has not been reached. People who are living in the most rural areas of

this Nation, people who are senior citizens, people who quite frankly are among the poorest of the poor of this country do not have the same access, the same opportunities, that people who live in urban areas have.

There are, as I mentioned, rather sizeable subsidies that are granted by this country to those who live in urban areas. To pick out those people who live in the most rural areas and are poorest I think, quite frankly, is misguided at best.

I would hope that this Congress, this House, would strongly oppose this amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON].

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, it is not often that I get up and speak in opposition to an amendment offered by my good colleague from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER]. I usually, frankly, support his amendments.

But I would like to plead with my colleagues to recognize that this is not the time nor the place nor the way to do what the gentleman wants to do—1993 is very different from 1935 when the rural electric programs were created. There is no mistake about that. That, however, is very different than suggesting that there is no need for rural electric programs today.

Very frankly, the farm today is dramatically different than it was in 1935. Part of the problem we have in Wisconsin, for example, is that whether we like it or not, the average farm that used to be 30 cows, by the year 2000 is going to be someplace between 85 and 100 cows.

To be honest, we need to rewire every farm in rural Wisconsin in order to maintain the kind of current that is going to go through those lines to deal with modern dairy facilities. So this is a very different scenario.

The second thing is, the gentleman is right. There are some problems with the program as to who is eligible and who is not eligible. We made some changes from a reconciliation perspective to meet our reconciliation instructions. We did not during that time attempt to do a full-blown review in reform of REA.

I would hope at some point we would look at the REA eligibility formulas. But if you heard me earlier here this afternoon, I suggested that authorizing language and changes ought to be done by the authorizing committee. This is not the time nor the place to do that.

So we have made dramatic changes. There is a role for REA. There is a dramatic role for REA in the 1990's, to help our farmers compete in the 21st century.

I have to tell Members, if we are going to cut farm program supports by $3 billion in reconciliation, we have got to then give them the infrastructure to compete successfully in a world market economy.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. CLYBURN].

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my honorable colleague, Mr. ZIMMER, of New Jersey.

As a member of the Congressional Rural Caucus' Executive Committee, I am proud to serve as an advocate for rural needs, and I oppose this amendment on several grounds.

First, the loan and subsidy levels for the Rural Electrification Administration have already been reduced as part of the Omnibus Reconciliation Act.

To cut funding for the REA by an additional 400 percent is asking an unfair sacrifice from programs which serve to provide a basic commodity to rural citizens.

Second, electric cooperatives presently receive a subsidy which is half that of municipal utilities. An insured loan program reduction from $125 million to $25 million will adversely affect rural residents who are already bearing a greater utility cost than urban dwellers.

And third, unlike other programs in the Agriculture Department, this program benefits all rural residents, not just farmers.

If this amendment is adopted, not only will rural citizens in my own district be affected, but many other rural areas in the country as well, many of which are more isolated than any part of South Carolina.

I suggest to my colleagues that they consider the impact of this proposed reduction, and vote against the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, as with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON], it is rare that I stand up here and oppose an amendment that cuts this type of money. But this program has worked. From 1933 until now, it is still working.

In my State, we are the most rural of all States. And not many of you in this body have ever had just but one phone in your town, one phone that works sometimes. We all now have phones in every one of my small villages because of REA.

But we do not all have electricity. Not many of you have had to use Coleman lanterns. I have. Many of my people are still using Coleman lanterns. And I am suggesting this is not the place to cut money with a program that works very effectively for the rural people of this great Nation.

I think this amendment is misplaced. Very frankly, it is not the appropriate way to cut a program that has worked successfully. We have not lost money under this program. It has been one of the most successful programs of all and has provided a great service to the majority of the rural people of this great Nation.

But this Nation is not all urban now. We still have vast areas, unpopulated areas, such as Wyoming, Montana, and Colorado, but most of all we have it in Alaska.

So I am asking my colleagues to oppose this amendment. It is a bad amendment. It is wrong. It is wrong this time, it will be wrong next time.

This is one of the times I suggest, respectfully, look at the success of this program and what it has brought to the rural people of America, and keep the REA still working for Americans. Let us not support this amendment.

□ 1720

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Let me make this clear. This proposal is not to kill REA. The proposal is to make a very modest cut in the least defensible part of REA.

This is not a subsidy to needy individuals. It is a subsidy to utilities, many of which are highly profitable. And I believe a majority of the utilities eligible for loans from the REA would meet the so-called hardship requirement. Nobody in favor of this legislation has given any indication otherwise.

All we are asking is that this level of subsidy be cut to the level requested by President Bill Clinton. That is all we are asking, and we are not touching the $600 million of low-cost subsidized loans at the current rate of roughly 6 percent that these same utilities would be able to avail themselves of under a brand new lending program.

How can we even begin to say we are serious about cutting the budget deficit, if we cannot make the most modest, most sensible kinds of cuts, cuts that have been endorsed by the President, cuts that are really more modest than we need to make in this program?

I agree that other utilities are subsidized by the public. I will support any effort of any of the proponents of the REA or anyone else to cut those other subsidies. But subsidies to one class of utility certainly do not justify subsidies to others. This is one of the least defensible forms of subsidy.

Let us start modifying, modernizing, and reforming this relic of the New Deal. It has served its purpose. It has now become a burden to the taxpayers.

We can make some real progress by simply adopting this very modest amendment to save a few bucks for the taxpayers who are subsidizing the rich as well as the needy under this program.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA].

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I am amazed at how enthusiastically most of my friends on that side have embraced President Clinton and his recommendations. Would that they would do so throughout the rest of the year.

Finally, someone once said, "The finest things in life are a good wife, a bathroom inside the house, and electricity."

Vote against this amendment, because this will nullify that great desire of an American out in the rural countryside.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT].

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Chairman, this is not a Republican versus Democrat issue. It is an urban versus rural issue.

My friends, we need each other in this country. But sometimes we do not understand each other.

I have and a great many of my colleagues over the years from rural areas have supported urban areas in the kinds of things that they have, their special needs, problems of urban decay, problems of housing decay, problems of transportation gridlock, problems of crime.

We have problems in rural America, too. They are different kinds of problems. What we need is your understanding for our problems, jsut as we try to give you our understanding for your problems.

Very frankly, this amendment, quite unintentionally, is nevertheless a gratuitous attack on rural America.

I ask my colleagues, urban and rural throughout the entire body, both sides of the aisle, to not participate. Vote against this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ZIMMER).

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 117, noes 314, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 293]

AYES—117

Andrews (NJ)
Archer
Armey
Baker (CA)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bellenson
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Boehner
Burton
Canady
Cardin
Collins (GA)
Condit
Coppersmith
Cox
Crane
Cunningham
DeLay
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Eshoo
Fawell
Fish
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Geren
Gibbons
Gingrich
Goss
Greenwood
Hancock
Harman
Hefley
Herger
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Huffington
Hughes
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kim
King
Klein
Knollenberg
LaFalce
Lazio
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Linder
Machtley
Mann
Margolies-Mezvinsky
McCollum
McHale
McKeon
Meehan
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Neal (MA)
Nussle
Packard
Pallone
Paxon
Porter
Portman
Quinn
Ramstad
Reed
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Saxton
Schenk
Schroeder
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Solomon
Stark
Stump
Talent
Torkildsen
Visclosky
Walker
Waters
Weldon
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—314

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andr ws (ME)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Bateman
Becerra
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Blackwell
Bliley
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Buyer
Byrne
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cantwell
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crapo
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
de Lugo (VI)
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Faleomavaega (AS)
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Grams
Grandy
Green
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Houghton
Hoyer
Hutto
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kildee
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
Kyl
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McHugh
McInnis
McKinney
McNulty
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Michel
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (NC)
Norton (DC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Pombo
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ravenel
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schaefer
Schiff
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Slattery
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Underwood (GU)
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walsh
Washington
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—8

Bishop
Blute
Henry
McMillan
Montgomery
Santorum
Skeen
Skelton

□ 1746

Mr. PENNY and Mr. KLUG changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. HANCOCK and Mr. BARTON of Texas changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, during Rollcall Vote No. 293 on H.R. 2493, the Zimmer amendment, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURTON of Indiana: Page 51, strike lines 13 through 17.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I do not know if the chairman of the subcommittee would like to limit debate on this amendment, but if he does, I will entertain that suggestion.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman be kind enough to suggest a time limitation?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. How about the same as before, 15 minutes on each side.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 30 minutes, 15 minutes controlled by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] and 15 minutes by myself.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, it is not compulsory that we use that much time?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's point is well taken. The time is maximum and not minimum.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

If I may I would like to have the attention of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN]. This does not pertain to my amendment, but when the gentleman gets a chance to respond I know he will. There is a section on page 117 that I wish the gentleman would take a look at, at the bottom of the page which deals with the WIC Program and is appropriating $8 million to promote breast feeding in America. I would like to know more about that program and whether or not that is absolutely a necessary program.

My amendment, Mr. Chairman, deals with a new program that was started last year. Last year I objected to this program because it was creating another program that was going to spend money.

□ 1750

This program deals with outreach to socially disadvantaged farmers and rangers, and we started out with $1 million, and at that time the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA], the chairman of the authorization committee, came to the floor and tried to explain to the body what a socially disadvantaged farmer and rancher is. I hope when he has time he will try to do that again today.

Somebody submitted to me that a socially disadvantaged farmer is somebody who could not get a date for the barn dance. I do not know whether that is correct or not, I say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA], but he might check that out.

All kidding aside, all kidding aside, Mr. Chairman, we do not need any new programs even if it is only for $1 million or $3 million. This is the way spending gets out of control. We start with a program that we do not need and we spent $1 million, and then the next year we triple it. This year we are talking about $3 million.

We did not need the program last year at $1 million. We certainly do not need the program this year for $3 million.

I submit that this is a very small cut, but it is one that should be made. We should cancel this program, because I do not see that it has any real socially redeeming value.

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, and my colleagues, the legislation has a definition for socially disadvantaged. It states:

As used in this section, the term "socially disadvantaged group" means a group whose members have been subjected to racial or ethnic prejudice because of their identity as members of a group without regard to their individual qualities.

As I explained to the gentleman last year, these are groups that were denied equality and justice because of their color or their ethnic background, and henceforth were not allowed to get all of the advantages that others had in regards to bank loans or in regards to buying plots of land or in regards to even buying farms in some areas of the country.

Those are the ones that we are talking about.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Did we not pass a civil rights act in both 1954 and 1964 that provides that it is illegal to discriminate on the basis of race or ethnic background? Then why do we need this?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Because this group got put into this situation prior to the civil rights act, and the civil rights act, in fact, does not address that. If the gentleman feels that everyone who has been deprived of justice, because of the legislation that we passed that everything has been corrected, it has not, and this is an additional provision of law dealing solely with those involved in agriculture. Unfortunately, even though to this day, if the gentleman would read what has happened in employment at one of the foremost hamburger chains, the gentleman will know that discrimination is still here, and it is still happening.

Let me add in response to the first question that the gentleman posed about promoting breast feeding, I will leave that to the members of the subcommittee, but I would say that it is the way God intended it to be.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. God did not charge $8 million for that to be done.

Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, you know, what we did last year is we started a new program for socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers, and we put a million dollars in it because we were supposed to help them because it was racial or ethnic prejudice against them in their ability to buy land or a farm or do other things that relate to agriculture or ranching.

Now here we are back a year later, we are going to spend $3 million for this, and under the law, they have the right to go to court, to have the Justice Department come in and make sure that they are not treated unfairly. This has been done time and time again.

The gentleman just talked about some ethnic minorities being so-called mistreated at, I think it was, a Denny's restaurant at one time. There was legal action taken immediately, and that was changed in just a matter of days.

I do not know why we have to come up with another program when the laws have already been changed by the courts and by this body and the other body about 30 years ago.

And what do we do? We come up with another program that started at $1 million last year, and now we are going to raise it to $3 million.

How much is it going to be next year? Six million? That is precisely the problem we have in this body, we come up with some new kind of idea that is going to solve some social program, and before you know it it is costing us $50 million, $100 million, $200 million. Is it any wonder this country is in the deficit and debt position we are in?

We just keep coming up with program after program after program, many of which are not even necessary. I submit to my dear friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA], this is not a necessary program. We have civil rights laws, civil rights court decisions that have been rendered that make it illegal for anyone to discriminate against people to buy a house, a farm, or anything else, and this is just redundancy in the law, and it is a waste of taxpayers money.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Obviously we have a difference of opinion on this issue. But the gentleman insists that if there is a law, everything is corrected.

There is a law against murder. There is a law against stealing. There is a law against robbing banks. And it has not stopped people from committing these crimes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to prolong this debate. I just wanted to say that I think anybody who is thinking rationally knows that we have civil rights laws to deal with these problems, and to come up with a new program to deal with socially disadvantaged farmers or ranchers, I mean, where are we going to go with this thing? Are we going to go to socially disadvantaged schoolteachers, socially disadvantaged filling-station owners, socially disadvantaged restauranteurs? How far does this go?

We have civil rights laws to deal with this. I think that is enough. We do not need to come up with new programs that are going to dig us into a deeper and deeper deficit hole.

We spent $1 million last year, and we are tripling it. It is just simply not necessary.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, I am speaking on behalf of the disadvantaged farmers in the United States.

In 1982, the Civil Rights Commission issued a report entitled "The Decline of Black Farming in the United States." The Commission predicted that unless immediate action was taken to address the serious problems of discrimination and neglect, there would be no black farmers by the year 2000. We cannot let this happen.

The rate of black farm loss relative to the loss of other farmers has increased from 2½ to 3¼ percent.

We need to reach out to these groups which have historically been neglected, and ensure that we are inclusive, rather than exclusive, in all aspects of our program delivery. Barriers that prevent the full participation of underserved groups need to be overcome.

The problem is most serious in our small rural communities in the Southeast, communities where poverty is already highest and where few other industries exist to replace the key economic role of farms.

In 1990, as a Member of Congress, Secretary Mike Espy sponsored legislation to supply urgently needed assistance to minority farmers. That legislation was included in the 1990 FACT Act. It did not receive an appropriation until fiscal year 1993, and then only one-tenth of the amount allocated.

The time to act is now.

Just last week, Mr. Chairman, I had farmers come up from the eleventh district of Georgia to visit with Secretary Espy. They expressed their disappointment at always being promised assistance for their farms and never receiving what they need to keep their farms running.

I urge you to keep the $3 million for the Outreach and Assistance Program for Socially Disadvantaged Farmers and Ranchers, authorized in section 2501(a) of the 1990 farm bill.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 178, noes 251, answered not voting 10 as follows:

[Roll No. 294]

AYES—178

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeLay
Derrick
Dickey
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Emerson
Everett
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gilchrest
Gingrich
Glickman
Goodlatte
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Green
Greenwood
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hoagland
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Houghton
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Leach
Levy
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Machtley
Mann
Manzullo
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Meehan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Murphy
Myers
Nussle
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Penny
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Royce
Sangmeister
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shuster
Sisisky
Slattery
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sundquist
Talent
Taylor (MS)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Valentine
Walker
Weldon
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—251

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Blackwell
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Cantwell
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
de Lugo (VI)
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Ewing
Faleomavaega (AS)
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Hoyer
Hughes
Inslee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Norton (DC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shays
Shepherd
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (TX)
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Underwood (GU)
Unsoeld
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—10

Andrews (TX)
Barca
Blute
Henry
Kleczka
Martinez
McMillan
Moran
Santorum
Skeen

□ 1819

Ms. CANTWELL and Mr. SMITH of Texas changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. McINNIS, DOOLITTE, GILCHREST, BILBRAY, and TAYLOR of Mississippi changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BARCA. Mr. Chairman, during rollcall vote No. 294 on H.R. 2493 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted "no."

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title III of the bill?

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IV—DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR FOOD AND CONSUMER SERVICES

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Food and Consumer Services to administer the laws enacted by the Congress for the Food and Nutrition Service, $554,000.

FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE

CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751–1769b), and the applicable provisions other than sections 3 and 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1773–1785, and 1788–1789); $7,497,131,000, to remain available through September 30, 1995, of which $2,727,022,000 is hereby appropriated and $4,770,109,000 shall be derived by transfer from funds available

under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c): *Provided*, That funds appropriated for the purpose of section 7 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 shall be allocated among the States but the distribution of such funds to an individual State is contingent upon that State's agreement to participate in studies and surveys of programs authorized under the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, when such studies and surveys have been directed by the Congress and requested by the Secretary of Agriculture: *Provided further*, That if the Secretary of Agriculture determines that a State's administration of any program under the National School Lunch Act or the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (other than section 17), or the regulations issued pursuant to these Acts, is seriously deficient, and the State fails to correct the deficiency within a specified period of time, the Secretary may withhold from the State some or all of the funds allocated to the State under section 7 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 and under section 13(k)(1) of the National School Lunch Act; upon a subsequent determination by the Secretary that the programs are operated in an acceptable manner some or all of the funds withheld may be allocated: *Provided further*, That only final reimbursement claims for service of meals, supplements, and milk submitted to State agencies by eligible schools, summer camps, institutions, and service institutions within sixty days following the month for which the reimbursement is claimed shall be eligible for reimbursement from funds appropriated under this Act. States may receive program funds appropriated under this Act for meals, supplements, and milk served during any month only if the final program operations report for such month is submitted to the Department within ninety days following that month. Exceptions to these claims or reports submission requirements may be made at the discretion of the Secretary: *Provided further*, That up to $3,849,000 shall be available for independent verification of school food service claims: *Provided further*, That $1,706,000 shall be available to provide financial and other assistance to operate the Food Service Management Institute.

None of the funds in this Act may be used to require schools participating in the school lunch program to offer students fluid whole milk as otherwise required by 42 U.S.C. 1758(a)(2).

SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out the special milk program, as authorized by section 3 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C 1772), $20,277,000, to remain available through September 30, 1995. Only final reimbursement claims for milk submitted to State agencies within sixty days following the month for which the reimbursement is claimed shall be eligible for reimbursement from funds appropriated under this Act. States may receive program funds appropriated under this Act only if the final program operations report for such month is submitted to the Department within ninety days following that month. Exceptions to these claims or reports submission requirements may be made at the discretion of the Secretary.

SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL FOOD PROGRAM FOR WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN (WIC)

For necessary expenses to carry out the special supplemental food program as authorized by section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786), $3,210,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 1995, of which up to $4,000,000 may be used to carry out the farmer's market coupon program: *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available to pay administrative expenses of WIC clinics except those that have an announced policy of prohibiting smoking within the space used to carry out the program.

COMMODITY SUPPLEMENTAL FOOD PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out the commodity supplemental food program as authorized by section 4(a) of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (7 U.S.C. 612c (note)), including not less than $8,000,000 for the projects in Detroit, New Orleans, and Des Moines, $104,500,000 to remain available through September 30, 1995: *Provided*, That none of these funds shall be available to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for commodities donated to the program.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the Food Stamp Act (7 U.S.C. 2011–2029), $28,136,655,000: *Provided*, That funds provided herein shall remain available through September 30, 1994, in accordance with section 18(a) of the Food Stamp Act: *Provided further*, That $2,500,000,000 of the foregoing amount shall be placed in reserve for use only in such amounts and at such times as may become necessary to carry out program operations: *Provided further*, That funds provided herein shall be expended in accordance with section 16 of the Food Stamp Act: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be subject to any work registration or work fare requirements as may be required by law: *Provided further*, That $345,000,000 of the funds provided herein shall be available after the Secretary has employed the regulatory and administrative methods available to him under the law to curtail fraud, waste, and abuse in the program: *Provided further*, That $1,091,000,000 of the foregoing amount shall be available for Nutritional Assistance for Puerto Rico as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 2028, of which $12,472,000 shall be transferred to the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service for the Cattle Tick Eradication Project.

FOOD DONATIONS PROGRAMS FOR SELECTED GROUPS

For necessary expenses to carry out section 4(a) of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (7 U.S.C. 612c (note)), section 4(b) of the Food Stamp Act (7 U.S.C. 2013(b)), and section 311 of the Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended (42 U.S.C. 3030a), $218,641,000, to remain available through September 30, 1995.

For necessary expenses to carry out section 110 of the Hunger Prevention Act of 1988, $40,000,000.

THE EMERGENCY FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983, as amended, $40,000,000: *Provided*, That, in accordance with section 202 of Public Law 98–92, these funds shall be available only if the Secretary determines the existence of excess commodities.

For purchases of commodities to carry out the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983, as amended, $80,000,000.

FOOD PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

For necessary administrative expenses of the domestic food programs funded under this Act, $107,767,000; of which $5,000,000 shall be available only for simplifying procedures, reducing overhead costs, tightening regulations, improving food stamp coupon handling, and assistance in the prevention, identification, and prosecution of fraud and other violations of law: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $150,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

Mr. DURBIN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title IV be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order to title IV?

Are there any amendments to title IV?

□ 1820

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VOLKMER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOLKMER: Page 59, delete lines 1 through 4.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 40 minutes, 20 minutes per side, 20 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER], and 20 minutes to be controlled by myself.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The debate on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] will be limited to 40 minutes, 20 minutes on each side, the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that 10 minutes of my time be allocated to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON] and that he be in control of that 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, for the edification of those in the House who have not studied the appropriations bill that is now before us, on top of page 59 is the language that is attempted to be struck. That language reads:

None of the funds in this Act may be used to require schools participating in the school lunch program to offer students fluid whole milk as otherwise required by 42 U.S.C. 1758(a)(2).

Now the present school lunch law provides that lunches served by schools participating in the school lunch program under this act shall offer students fluid whole milk and fluid, unflavored, low fat milk. So, today, as a student goes in to get his lunch, he has the full range of milk available to him: Whole milk, 2 percent, 1 percent or skim milk, and 1 percent unflavored chocolate milk. Under the amendment as in the bill, as provided in the bill, the school districts would be able to contract when the contract for the milk with the local fluid processors to have only 2 percent, 1 percent or 1 percent chocolate, no whole milk. In my area of the district of Missouri about 40 percent of the people still drink whole milk. Forty percent, I assume, of the students drink whole milk. The 2 percent or 1 percent is not acceptable to them. It is not flavored to the flavor that they like.

Our young people eat and drink based on flavor, on taste, and I am afraid that they will say, "I don't want that 2 percent, I don't want 1 percent. I'm going to drink something else." They are not going to get their milk. If they do not get their milk, they do not get the calcium, the vitamin A and other ingredients that are necessary in that milk.

Mr. Chairman, I say: "Let them have the choice. If they are used to drinking whole milk, let them drink the whole milk. If they want 2 percent, they can have the 2 percent. It's there. Or if they want the skim, it's there. If they want the chocolate milk, and most of them drink the chocolate milk, let them do it."

Now the whole milk has been required since the mid-1970's in the school lunch program. There have been no problems with it. There has been a general concern from some nutritionists as to the fat content of whole milk. But I want to point out to my colleagues that that 8 ounces that that student gets, the fat content in the whole milk is 8 grams. When one drinks 2 percent, they are getting 5 grams. So there is only 3 grams difference in the fat content, and, when he eats the hamburger, or whatever, with it, that fat content is insignificant in difference. So, let him use what he is used to using at home.

I ask, "Why can't he have the right to be able to choose to have whole milk if that's what he wants," and I would like to point out that the amendment in the bill, the language in the bill, does not change the law. The law is still the same. So, school districts are technically still required to furnish whole milk because that is what the law says.

Now, if they are required, but do not have the funds to do it, it is going to create problems for them. I do not think that this bill is the appropriate place in order to change the school lunch program. That is under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and Labor, and I think that they are the ones, and we will hear later from the subcommittee chairman of the elementary and secondary education part of the Committee on Education and Labor.

As my colleagues know, I think that we should encourage kids to drink milk. They need it for calcium formation. They need it for their bones. I do not think we should be in the position of telling them that they do not have to drink whole milk or they should not drink whole milk when their parents are telling them it is O.K. to drink whole milk. I do not think we should pit children against parents. I believe that they should all again, as I say, have a choice, and I believe that children will drink whatever they are used to drinking at home, what they are used to, and, if they are used to 2 percent or skim milk, that is what they are going to drink in school. If they are used to drinking whole milk, they should have the right to drink that whole milk in school.

The gentleman, under his provision, would permit the school districts not to furnish whole milk so that children out there who want whole milk would not be able to get it. I think that they should be given that opportunity, and so I reserve the balance of my time and ask the House to adopt the amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, politicians in America can withstand almost any criticism, but I do not believe any of us could withstand the criticism that we oppose giving milk to children. So, as one great politician once said, "Let me make one thing perfectly clear."

I am in favor of school children across America, not only continuing to drink milk, but encouraging them to drink more. I do agree with my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER]. Children in their formative years need the calcium and vitamins in milk, and we should do everything in our power to encourage that more milk be consumed.

So why do we have this language in the appropriations bill? First, Mr. Chairman, let me tell my colleagues a story.

Several months ago, Mr. Chairman, I visited a grade school in Liberty, IL. The principal of that grade school is the sister-in-law of the famous Giants and Cubs pitcher Rich Rueschel from Camp Point, IL. She took me around and said, "Would you like to eat lunch with the kids," and I did. We had a good time, and afterward the nutritionist from the school came down and sat with me.

Mr. Chairman, I said, "You won't believe this, but one of my responsibilities in Washington is to fund your program. Got any complaints?"

She said, "Mr. Chairman, there is something that no school nutritionist can understand: Why do you continue to send us information on dietary guidelines for children in America? Why do you continue to tell us to reduce the fat content in the diet of a child in America and at the same time have a provision in the law which requires every school to buy the highest fat content milk available, fluid whole milk?"

I said, "I don't know. Let me check on it."

Mr. Chairman, I looked at the legislation, and I looked at the existing statute. It is clearly the only exception in the school lunch program. We do not tell the school districts whether they should buy creamy peanut butter or chunky peanut butter. We do not tell them whether they ought to buy peach slices in light syrup or heavy syrup. But we do require them to offer fluid whole milk.

I would suggest to my colleagues that that decision and that law is based not on nutrition, but on some other consideration.

□ 1830

Perhaps it has something to do with the dairy program. Now, let me tell you what our language in the appropriation bill would say to every school district in America. It would say, you may decide to offer whole milk to your kids, that may be what they prefer over 2 percent or chocolate milk or something else, but we are not going to require it of you. If you should decide that your kids get along just fine with the low-fat milk product and they will use it and will continue to get the calcium and vitamins they need, make that decision at the local level, in the cafeteria where the kids are going through the line. We are not going to second-guess you here on the floor of the House of Representatives in Washington.

What we are suggesting today is entirely consistent with modern thinking on nutrition, to get kids in the formative stages of their lives thinking in terms of a healthy diet. It is tough enough. I can tell you that from visiting this cafeteria, and I will bet if you have visited, you have seen them, too, the kids with the candy bars, eating the junk food that all of us are prone to do from time to time.

When we have a school lunch program sponsored by this Federal Government, we cannot be so inconsistent as to say, on one hand make it low-fat, and, on the other hand, you must require fluid whole milk. What we are saying is this: "School districts, nutritionists, make the best nutrition decision. We will not second-guess you. We want kids to drink milk, but we will not force fluid whole milk on you."

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

69-059 O—97 Vol. 139 (Pt. 10) 39

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment, and I plead with my colleagues to simply listen to present law. I want to read this to you:

"Lunches served by schools participating in the school lunch program under this act shall offer students fluid whole milk and fluid unflavored low fat milk."

That is the law today. What does that law say? It says that when you are designing your school lunch program, you must have every option. You must have the whole milk, if a young person wants it, and you must have the low fat.

We are not mandating. We are not mandating. We are not mandating that every schoolchild in America ought to have whole milk. Where does this come from? What nutritionist would get up and tell us that we mandate that every school student must drink whole milk? Nothing of the sort.

That is why this amendment is essential, because the bill seeks to say that we are not going to allow schools to be required to offer students a choice.

Now, you and I both know, most young people probably do not want whole milk, and I guess most of us do not want whole milk, and we are not trying to insist that they do. But consider that young kid that gets up in the morning and does chores before he goes to school. He goes to school, he then goes out and plays football, and then he goes to play at practice that evening. Let us say he is six foot two, 180 pounds. You are going to tell this kid he has to drink low fat milk? You are going to say, "No, that is not what I am doing at all."

But it is. Here is why. The reason this language is put into law is because if you do not have this in the law, when a school board takes bids from their local milk distributor for milk for the school lunch program, those milk distributors must offer a bid based totally on 1 percent milk, because that is the way they get the low bid.

Now, then what happens? The school board is required by law to take the low bid. So all of a sudden if you do not have this language, you have created the scenario where no young student in any school in the United States will be able to get anything but 1 percent milk, and 1 percent milk is allowed under the program today.

So I would suggest to Members that in simply trying to make a choice, we ought to adopt this amendment.

Second, the reason I got up earlier and objected to what was happening in this bill is because this does not belong in an agriculture appropriations bill. This is under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and Labor that has responsibility for the child nutrition programs in this country.

In this Congress, Mr. Chairman, the second session of this Congress, the Committee on Education and Labor must reauthorize those child nutrition programs. I have already been, and I know the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] and others have been, in countless discussions already on trying to deal with the issue of fat content in our school lunches. And I find it fascinating.

Mr. Chairman, there is no place in present law that puts a limit on the fat content in a school lunch. So what we are going to try to do here today is something that is simple and easy and wrong, because we think we are going to get at the fat content of that school diet.

We are not going to do that at all. All we are going to do is say to the kid, "You cannot have whole milk, but you can have all the fat in hotdogs or all the brownies or all the candy bars or anything else that you want." That does not make any kind of sense.

So I plead with my colleagues, whether you are for low fat, you are for 1 percent, you are for 2 percent, or you are for whole milk, that whatever you are for, simply adopt this amendment to preserve that choice.

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

Mr. GUNDERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I would just guess that the words "shall offer" are mandatory. If it were permissive it would say "may offer." We are requiring that lunches served by the schools participating in the school lunch programs "shall offer."

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, that is exactly all it is. It is available. It is the student's choice. After the first week the school knows how many want whole milk, how many want 1 percent, and that is what they offer for the rest of the year. It did not cost them a dime.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, in my opening remarks I failed to mention that this amendment is being cosponsored by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education that has jurisdiction over the School Lunch Program.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] aware that the National School Lunch Program is under the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor?

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

Mr. KILDEE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, yes, I am.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the gentleman is aware of that. I am Chairman of that subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] further aware that the issue of requiring whole milk to be offered as part of a school lunch will be thoroughly reviewed by my subcommittee next year in the course of the reauthorization of the School Lunch Program?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, if the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] says that is the case, I believe it.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, very good. I want to assure the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] that we intend to have a number of hearings on the school lunch program next year, at which time we will have very distinguished nutritionists testify as to what the school lunch should be, and we would be most happy to have the nutritionist of whom the gentleman spoke testify at those hearings.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to invite her to attend.

Mr. KILDEE. I would like to have her testify.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, how much time does each side have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] has 16 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON] has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, let me just join the chairman of the subcommittee in opposition to this amendment. This amendment is a good example of my observation that every bad piece of legislation precipitates the need for another bad piece of legislation.

The fact is we have a very elaborate milk program that raises the price of milk to our Nation's schoolchildren, and at the same time creates a surplus of milk.

Now, the surplus of milk is an embarrassment to the people who are proponents of the milk program. So now they come back and say we will now mandate the requirement that whole milk, with its high cholesterol and high fat content, be consumed by the Nation's schoolchildren, instead of the more healthy low-fat milk.

□ 1840

It is a perfect example of the point I made earlier, that every piece of bad

legislation precipitates the need for additional bad legislation.

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

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman aware that the Volkmer-Gunderson amendment saves $2 million for the taxpayer?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN].

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I served on a school board before I came here, and I can tell Members that school boards view this requirement which is in the law as a mandate. They are mandated to offer a certain kind of milk.

We do not mandate them to offer a certain kind of pizza or a certain kind of roast beef, but we are mandating them to offer a certain kind of milk.

What I am hearing from home is "Stop the excessive mandates on things that affect the ability of local school districts to offer the kind of education they want to their kids."

I think this amendment is wrong on that ground. Let me tell Members a couple of things.

The patterns are set early in life. Eat a lot of fat as a kid and you grow up chubby, like me and like a lot of other Members in this room. Those patterns are set because of taste. And when those patterns are set by requiring whole milk, primarily only whole milk in a lot of school districts, I grant my colleagues, the chocolate milk is being offered as well, that kids learn to like the taste of it and drink it for the rest of their lives.

There is no question that whole milk is much higher in fat than skim milk or 1 percent milk or 2 percent milk. I am saying that the kids ought to be able to make the choice. But the school district ought not to be required to do this. This ought to be a subject that the kids ought to do it.

I think it was the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON] who was talking about this. In my school district, if our school district attempted to foist a certain kind of milk on kids only and the kids would not like, they would come down to the school board meeting and they would say, "No, we want you to offer all sorts of milk in addition to the one type of milk."

I think this is a matter of choice. I am not telling my colleagues this is the most perfect way to legislate. But whether this amendment wins or loses, I guarantee them that it will offer a constructive move toward trying to modify the whole subject of diet for children in future years.

Diets are set at an early age, not later. There is almost nothing we can do as adults to control our cholesterol and our fat content. But we can do a lot for our kids.

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

Mr. GLICKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I want to concur in the arguments that the gentleman has made regarding this issue. It seems to me that the appropriate way to deal with this is to allow the school districts to decide the type of milk to offer to the students.

In a district like mine, they are certainly going to continue to offer a lot of whole milk because in southeastern Minnesota that is what most of the kids are going to drink. In the other suburban districts, in order to get the kids to drink milk, it may have to be 1 percent or 2 percent, but I want these kids drinking milk. And I think the gentleman is making the exact argument that needs to be made.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, this is an issue of freedom of choice, as far as I am concerned. I would urge that the amendment not be adopted.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] is recognized for 1 minute and 30 seconds.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I just came over here to tell the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA], I keep my eye on him all the time because the Committee on Agriculture keeps trying to fool with the school lunch program. He and I have jurisdictional discussions.

I have been watching the wrong guy. Now all of a sudden, the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies is going to write policy.

The gentleman who was just in the well, pointed out the problem of trying to legislate during an appropriations bill. He says that the law requires that whole milk be available in the school lunch program. That means to get the money that we send out every year to the schools to run the school lunch program, they will make whole milk available. They do not have to give it to everybody, they will make whole milk available. They do not have to give it to everybody, but it will be available.

That law will not be changed by this amendment. What we would produce is an interesting situation where the law will still be in place but we are going to cut off the money to pay the local school districts to buy the milk.

What are they going to buy it with? They are going to take the other subsidy we give them to run the program and buy whole milk, if they choose to do so.

One more thing I think is being overlooked, because we are in the wrong forum at the wrong time, this law was not put in place with the kid who had a mother who pays attention to whether they have skim milk, 2 percent or some kind of milk every day in mind. It was put in place with what in most parts of the country is a majority of kids who go to school without any parent caring if they ever have a glass of milk that day or from homes that never have a fresh bottle of milk in the refrigerator every day.

This program was started out to supplement the diet of kids who otherwise will not get a decent minimum, minimum, not maximum, but minimum standard of eating.

This bill does not, should not be debated on the floor. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] will be holding hearings. All of my colleagues could express their opinions at those hearings.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me get some of the trivial issues that I heard discussed out of the way. I heard someone mention "You are mandating."

Let me tell Members about school lunches. I did not visit occasionally. I spent 20 years eating school lunches with schoolchildren. That was part of my job, and I insisted that all the other administrators did the same.

Mandates? What they were mandated to eat is basically what you sent. What you sent is surpluses.

Someone mentioned peanut butter. Is there anything fatter than peanut butter and more fat content?

Lord. We tried to make peanut butter candy. We tried to put peanut butter in apples. We made peanut butter every way one could think, celery, because we had surplus peanut butter that we had to feed to our kids.

My brother, little brother is chubby. My older brother is not chubby. I am not chubby. We all ate the same thing. So we can get the chubbiness out of the road as part of this discussion.

Second, I asked, why did this ever get into an appropriations bill. It was said, "Well, some nutritionist said, 'You tell us to feed fat-free food and then you send us a mandate like this'."

Again, I ate the lunches for 20 years: Hot dogs, hamburgers, peanut butter, cheese, all fat-free food is what we were sending them and what we were eating.

Let us keep in mind several other things. A good nutrition study indicated that we have to be very, very careful when we are dealing with young children, when we are talking about strict diet in relationship to fat content. We better be very, very careful, because what will happen in the future

could be very devastating in relationship to their livelihood and their life in the future.

But let me go back to the initial issue that my chairman talked about and the subcommittee chairman talked about. This will be reauthorized next year, the School Lunch, Child Nutrition Program. That is where we have the hearings. That is where we hear what the people have to say pro and con. And then that is what the committee recommends to the entire conference, after we have our hearings and after we markup our legislation.

Let us not try to legislate this poorly, at any rate, on an appropriations bill. I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by the two gentlemen and hope it will pass overwhelmingly.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Volkmer/Gunderson amendment to strike language from the Agriculture appropriations bill which would eliminate language in our child nutrition laws requiring programs to offer whole milk as an option in school lunch and other child nutrition programs.

I have several concerns about the addition of this amendment to the Agriculture appropriations bill. First and foremost, this is an issue which should rightfully be debated in the context of the reauthorization of the child nutrition programs next year—after we have held hearings on the subject and have a better sense of all the issues involved.

According to Penn State Farm Economics—February 1992—whole milk is still the clear unflavored favorite among Pennsylvania schoolchildren. If we suddenly remove this option, can we be assured that schoolchildren will begin drinking lowfat milk, that they will continue to take advantage of this one important source of nutrition?

Mr. Chairman, we must remember that in 1992 over half of the children participating in the school lunch and breakfast programs were receiving free and reduced-price lunches. Since one of the main forces behind the creation of the child nutrition programs was to provide nutritious meals to those children who may not be receiving adequate nutrition at home, there is good reason to ensure they are eating well at school. While some children may not need the additional fat and calcium they receive from whole milk, there are others, especially children in elementary grades, who can benefit from whole milk.

According to a study published by the American College of Nutrition, strict adherence to low-fat, low-cholesterol diets in childhood may result in nutritional growth failure. If we eliminate whole milk as a required option for school lunch and school breakfast programs, we could be eliminating one vital source of nutrition for our Nation's schoolchildren.

Mr. Chairman, whole milk is not forced upon our Nation's schoolchildren. In many schools, a few cartons of whole milk are mixed in with cartons of lowfat and chocolate milk and children are allowed to choose the type of milk they wish to drink with their meal. Since we do not have all of the facts on this issue and there have been no hearings held in the committee of jurisdiction which could provide us with sound information on the beneficial/harmful effects of whole milk on our Nation's children, I believe we should delay the debate on this issue until next year when the Committee on Education and Labor considers changes to the child nutrition laws. I encourage my colleagues to support the amendment to strike this provision from H.R. 2493.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, clearly change is difficult. But this committee and this legislation achieves rather remarkable changes for the Congress of the United States.

It achieves changes in the way we have been doing business for many, many years. This bill gets rid of the people that measure the stems on pickles. We have been paying them to do that for many years. This bill gets rid of the programs that measure the flow of catsup, how fast catsup flows downhill. This bill gets rid of the programs for people to sip tea and have been doing it since the Revolutionary War. Remarkable change.

This bill even got rid of the Agriculture Year Books for which nobody wanted but every Member wanted to send to somebody.

□ 1850

Now we come to the last vestige of historic change in this legislation; that is, getting rid of the mandates on school districts and parents and children who want to decide what kind of milk they want to drink, want to partake in, because this is what current law requires, is that the school district offer, not out of generosity, it is a must offer: "You must offer this milk. Therefore, you must buy this milk." If you choose by a vote of the student body or any other means, you still must offer that milk.

We like to talk about this country as a country that can change. This is a mandate. This is a mandate that people see no sense in. They know what is good for their children. Their children know what they like or do not like. We think we should let them make that determination.

The school lunch program that the gentleman previously in the well talked about is not the school lunch program of today. He is right, he was eating them 20 years ago and that is what they were like. Today we spend a fortune trying to educate school nutritionists, school food service workers, principals and teachers and children about good nutrition, and then we find out that because of the special interests we are going to force whole milk on them, when all of the dietary guidelines published by this government and private and nonprofit organizations, health organizations, tell us that is not what we want to do.

Band together, I would say, have some courage and get rid of the mandate. Such as it is up here, I would say to the Members, and have the courage not to put a mandate on the school districts that they must buy this. Relieve the bureaucratic pressure the bureaucratic pressure. This will be a matter of great conscience, because this is what we must do.

Let the parents decide. Let the students decide. Let local school agencies decide. Why should the Federal Government mandate this in this program when they mandate it nowhere else?

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

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, the law only says that the school district has to offer it, not buy it.

Mr. MILLER of California. I would say to the gentleman, they do not get the milk free. The gentleman is requiring the school districts to purchase the milk.

Mr. VOLKMER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, no, that is wrong. The law does not say that, I would state to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman if he would tell me how he would offer it if he did not purchase it for the purposes of offering it.

I would say to the Members, historic change is upon us. We need to see if we can face down these special interests.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLER of California. We need to see if we can bring ourselves together to vote against the mandate.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, in a spirit of comity and friendliness, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment, and with all due respect to my friend, the gentleman from California, he is one of the Members that does not understand dairy policy. There is a story, somebody said, that there are only five people in America that understand dairy policy, and those five people are lying. This might be what is going on here today.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. It is in the best interest of the country to retain the requirement that whole milk be served in school lunch and breakfast programs. Prior to making any substantive changes we should evaluate the financial effect on farmers and taxpayers, as well as the nutritional data for problems related to calcium deficiency.

Mr. Chairman. We are not forcing whole milk on children with this amendment—we are keeping whole milk as an option. School food service

directors may also offer low-fat, skim, or chocolate milk—whatever appeals to students' taste. The problem is that without a whole milk requirement, many school lunch contractors will not include whole milk in their bids. Many people, students included, prefer whole milk. We should give them that choice.

From a nutrition standpoint, professionals are not in agreement on the potential long term effects of whole versus low-fat milk. What they do agree on is that milk is an essential ingredient in our children's diet if they are to grow into healthy adults. Milk contains 300 milligrams of calcium and is dense in other important vitamins and minerals. That is why we have a milk component in our schools.

Let us put this in perspective, one glass of whole milk contains about the same amount of fat as one tablespoon of salad dressing and fewer calories than non-diet soft drinks. It is not Congress' responsibility to debate the merits of three grams more or less of fat in our children's diets. We should be grateful that our children are drinking milk and developing good lifelong nutrition habits.

Finally, children participating in school lunch programs are not the only people that would be adversely affected by passage of this legislation without the amendment. Our Nation's dairy farmers and taxpayers would take one more financial hit that they can ill afford. I suggest that this issue reaches into the agriculture policy arena and its financial and nutritional ramifications should be fully evaluated before consideration.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH], a member of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, the cycle is complete: Motherhood is under attack, Chevrolets are being made offshore, apples have alar, and we are banning whole milk from schools.

I would say to the Members, this current language requires that the school districts offer milk to their kids. They can make it whole milk, they can make it low-fat milk. The choice belongs to the children.

As has been stated over and over again, if the school district makes the choice, the kid's choices are not respected. The school district is going to make that choice. They are going to choose low-fat milk.

If they grow up on a dairy farm and like the taste of whole milk, they are not going to be able to have it. Is that fair? Should we be passing legislation that denies the kid a glass of nice whole milk? I do not think so. Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I really respect my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH], but when he said that this amendment bans whole milk in schools, please. We give the schools the choice to buy what they think is best for their kids. If they decide that whole milk is what is best for their rosy-cheeked farm boys and farm girls in upstate New York or Minnesota, they can make that choice.

The law mandates the schools to offer whole milk. It takes away their choice of whether they are going to offer it and mandates it. That is the difference.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. In theory, the gentleman is right. In practice, it does not work that way. The problem is, if we do not mandate schools have to offer low-fat and regular milk, in the bid process the distributor is only going to offer a bid based on 1-percent milk. The school is required to accept the lowest bid, so if we do not mandate this, I hate to say it, the school board has no choice.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS].

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding. I am not sure I want to get into this milking contest here. I am not sure whether this afternoon this debate is concerned about the dairy interests, the welfare and the health of the child, or making a decision in Washington that a local school board rightfully should be making.

It is kind of a mix here. I am not going to make the case whether whole milk or low-fat milk is best. As a kid, I drank milk by the gallons, literally, every day. It was whole milk, yes. It was not pasteurized, it was not homogenized. In fact, I milked it myself, and I may be not exactly the most slender person here, but I am not a pudgy one, either, so I am not sure we are chasing the right rabbit here, to use an old Hoosier vernacular.

Mr. Chairman, I am shocked when I hear the discussion that we cannot trust the school board back home to make decisions for our children, that we can make a better decision here on the House floor than the local school board. I share the same experience our chairman has in visiting a school cafeteria or a school lunch service, and I have had nutritionists and those who serve the line tell me, "Why can't we get milk the kids will drink?"

It is true, a little one drinks any milk stuck in front of them. However, as they get older and become teenagers they start worrying about that waistline. They start worrying about the fat content. Then they want the low fat.

Are we concerned about, really, today in this discussion, making decisions back there. The school board is just as concerned, more concerned, because it is their children being served there.

Why do we not let the language stay in here in the bill, as this committee has offered it? We have heard a lot of discussions through the years about freedom of choice on this floor. That is all this is, is freedom of choice for the child and the local schools, the local school board, to make that decision. There is nothing wrong with this language. Let us defeat this amendment.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment. The issue of diet and the diet of young people and the generally inadequate diet that currently exists in school lunch programs throughout the country is in fact an issue of serious consequence and must be looked at in a serious and comprehensive way.

My understanding is, in fact, that is what the proper subcommittee is going to be doing. When the gentleman talks about freedom of choice, that is exactly what the issue is, the question who has the choice. What the gentleman is saying is that he wants the school districts to be able to ban whole milk for the children. In my State of Vermont, most of the people, the adults, like whole milk. The kids like whole milk. We do not want to see that option banned.

Our feeling is that the kids of America should be allowed the option of choosing whole milk, and that option should not be taken away from them. That is why I strongly support this amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve my remaining time to close debate. I believe I only have a minute or two remaining, so I would defer to my colleague.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], who is a member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

□ 1900

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time. I would like to thank both the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], and note that

all of these Members are members of the Committee on Education and Labor that deals with children.

Is this a great conscience issue? No. As President Clinton said, "It's the economy, stupid." Is this going to change the world any? No; but it is an issue that saves $2 million according to CBO.

My wife is a principal. My children prefer totally nonfat milk. We prefer them to have that. My wife also has a child in her school that is bulimic, and she is required to drink whole milk. This gives her the option, and the family the choice to offer that.

It is an amendment that offers a child a choice of the type of services, not just nonfat, not just 2 percent, not just chocolate, but whole milk. The whole milk mandate would eliminate those choices.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will inform the controllers of time that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] has 1½ minutes remaining, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] has 3½ minutes remaining and has the right to close debate, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON] has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to strongly reconsider this appropriations provision to eliminate the requirement that whole milk be offered to students in the National School Lunch Program. And I urge their reconsideration for reasons of public health.

I share the desire to reduce the fat intake of our children to improve their health. But it could be that fat in milk is not the culprit. I would like you to consider the scientific evidence that whole milk may actually be an essential source of nutrients that are important to the long-term heart healthy goals we all seek.

Dr. David McCarron of the Institute for Nutrition and Cardiovascular Research at the Oregon Health Sciences University has shared some very interesting data with me. The Framingham family study reported 2 years ago at the American Heart Association meetings and published last year in the Journal of the American Medical Association identified milk consumption as the most important predictor of lower blood pressures in 3- to 5-year-old children. Earlier reports from a multicenter study in the Southeast demonstrated that fluid milk intake was the nutritional factor that accounted for the blood pressure differences between white teenage girls and their African-American counterparts. One might argue that these nutritional benefits of milk will remain even if we consume low- or non-fat milk. Not true. Other scientific studies have specifically identified the fat components of milk as being essential for these cardiovascular benefits.

Whole milk needs to be retained in the school lunch program for the health of our youngsters. We should not be embarking on a change in the foods our children eat when the published scientific data supports just the opposite.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself my remaining 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make two points in the close of this debate. We can get in all kinds of side debates, but there are really two issues here.

Present law requires that schools offer whole milk and low-fat milk. We think that is proper. We think that ought to remain in effect.

Second, if you want to get at the issue of fat content in school lunches, and it is a legitimate issue, probably there are other parts of the dairy diet that we ought to be eliminating, not the milk. But also, the Committee on Education and Labor could do this next year in the second session of this Congress. Next year if in the agriculture appropriation bill the Education Committee has not done its job, then do this to us. But for gosh sakes, give the authorizing committee the chance to work out the negotiations that are already underway to try to reach an agreement on both sides of this issue.

If Members are for an authorizing committee, if they are for choice, vote "yes" on this amendment.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield my remaining 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], who is a cosponsor of the amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I think kids ought to drink low-fat milk, but some will not drink any at all if they are not offered a choice. The issue is very simply whether kids will have a choice or whether they will not.

Without this amendment, they will not have it. I urge Members to vote for the amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I have worked in and around legislative bodies for many years, and this debate is a good indication of what usually happens. In a bill spending some $70 billion with many complex issues, we find the level of interest and participation really high on things we understand, like drinking milk. And so as parents, as those who work with school districts, and as those concerned about our kids, we come together in a debate, which I think has been interesting, and I think is also very important.

It is true that the present law does not force fluid whole milk on children, but it does force fluid whole milk on school districts, which was the point my school nutritionist was making. Why do you mandate our school districts such as Liberty, IL, buy a product that we do not think is the healthiest product to serve our kids? And that is why this language is in the bill.

I have heard a lot of things said about the appetites of kids and their taste, and if they grow up with fluid whole milk at home they will want it at school. The nutritionists will know that. The people running the school lunch program will know that. If they are conscientious men and women, they will provide the milk that the kids will drink, and if they are not drinking it, they will ask why.

There is one thing that has been kind of lurking in this debate that I find curious. There seems to be a suggestion here, primarily from people about my age or older, that kids need more fat in their diet. I would like to find any nutritionist in America who agrees with that premise. My kids, like every kid, are going to be exposed to more sources of fat in their diet than they know what to do with. We now know from a nutritional viewpoint, and from a health viewpoint, we should start off early suggesting to them to reduce the fat content in their diet.

Then there is this interesting provision where people say, now if this Durbin amendment, the one in the committee bill goes through, it is going to cost us $2 million. Follow me for a minute here, folks. Do you know why it is going to cost $2 million? Because the butterfat that you are not squeezing down the throats of kids is going to turn into butter that is purchased as part of price supports through the Commodity Credit Corporation, and that is going to cost us $2 million. I agree with that, but I think healthier kids are worth $2 million, and I think it is basically sensible for us to say to the school districts, you pick out what is most nutritious for our kids.

So many of our conservative Members, and my friend, JOHN MYERS, who is a true conservative, have stood up and said let the decision be made at the local level. But a lot of other Members have taken the microphone this evening and said no, we know better in Washington or the dairy industry knows better. We will tell you what kids really want.

I think what kids really want are adults who are thoughtful and will make choices to help them grow up and be healthy and strong.

If you listen to this debate, I am afraid we have a pure generational break here. A lot of younger folks and a lot of folks in support of nutrition would find an awful lot of the elements of this debate very humorous.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2493, the Agriculture appropriations for fiscal year 1994 bill. In keeping with our commitment to reduce the deficit, mandatory spending in this package is $6.5 billion less than the amount requested by the administration and $160 million less than the amount requested by the administration in discretionary spending.

Much has already been said about the contents of this Agriculture appropriations package—what it will do and whom it will serve. Sixty cents of every dollar in this budget goes to domestic food assistance programs. The committee, in keeping with the administration's commitment to assist the less fortunate, has increased high priority programs, while making deep cuts in many other areas.

While the domestic feeding assistance, Forest Service, foreign food aid areas of this agriculture appropriations bill are worthy and necessary components of this legislation, I would like to stress that it is the agriculture part of this Agriculture appropriations bill that deserves the applause.

As the Representative at Large from North Dakota, a State known for its contribution to agriculture, I would like to highlight some facts about agriculture that are rarely understood by the majority of Americans.

Agriculture is the largest single sector of the American economy—comprising 18 percent of our economy—despite the fact that only 2 percent of our population is directly engaged in farming. Agriculture creates tidal waves of robust economic growth throughout many other sectors of the economy—food merchandising, rail, road and water transportation of commodities, value-added processing, farm equipment and machinery production and merchandising, distributing, inputs and equipping processing, transportation, merchandising—all of which let our main street stores stay open—not just in the agricultural Midwest, but in every city and town in this country. Twenty million American workers are employed due to agriculture.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 2493, not just H.R. 2493, the Agriculture appropriations bill, but H.R. 2493, the Agriculture jobs bill.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Fawell amendment. This amendment would eliminate millions of dollars in research grants that are designed to improve agriculture, expand our knowledge about human health and nutrition, and protect consumers.

Mr. FAWELL argues that these grants are not authorized. That is not the case. These grants are authorized under Federal law and the research is carried out by the agricultural experiment stations of the 50 States, and by approved schools of forestry, land-grant colleges, and other eligible institutions.

I would like to take a moment to tell my colleagues about the process surrounding the Cooperative State Research Grants Program. Two points should be made to begin with. First, the amount made available for special research grants is $23 million less this year than in last year's bill. Second, those grants in the program that the committee chose to continue to fund were level-funded—there were no increases.

That is proof of the chairman's commitment to ensure that the grants funded under this program truly deserve funding and that the program is handled with real fiscal restraint.

I can tell you that when I asked the chairman and the committee for consideration of a program in Connecticut that would provide $50,000—a very modest grant—for research into the cultivation of a shrub that produces the anticancer drug taxol it was no pro forma process. Mr. DURBIN insisted that an application be filed, that detailed supporting documents be submitted, and that letters of support be included. Then, and only then, was this project seriously considered.

This project will look into the possibility of cultivating taxol commercially. All information gained by the research will be public, and the result could well be both a new crop for sustainable agriculture and an inexpensive source of a vital anticancer drug.

This taxol project, and the other research projects in this program, are solid scientific efforts that undertake important research which might otherwise not be done. The committee has handled the funding of these grants with great care and scrutiny. I urge Members to support these grants and the excellent work they do, and opposed the Fawell amendment.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Fawell/Penny amendment to eliminate funding for specific research projects and facilities contained in the Cooperative State Research Service [CSRS] special research grants section.

During these difficult budget times, it is tempting to support efforts to reduce Federal spending. I have supported such efforts in the past and I will continue to do so where it makes sound policy sense. It does not make sense, however, to eliminate research programs and facilities that will help us to understand and preserve our coastal environment. Increased development and population pressures on our coastal resources stress the need for expanding coastal programs to address these needs.

These types of investments are not only investments in our future, they are also direct investments in our communities. In Rhode Island alone, our fishing industry, beaches, and navigable waters serve as a backbone to our State's economy. Looking beyond Rhode Island, initiatives such as the Coastal Institute will assist the U.S. aquaculture industry which is lagging behind the rest of the world. This multibillion-dollar industry can be important to the Nation's general economy and to the rural communities in which it is typically located.

The Congress has long recognized the unique contributions that the land-grant university system makes to our Nation. Individual State universities make contributions in research and teaching which extend well beyond State boundaries. Many of the issues debated in Congress, such as wetlands and coastal policy, aquaculture, and the export of environmental technology can only be resolved with the research which will be provided by the Coastal Institute and other similar initiatives.

Initiatives such as the Coastal Institute represent an investment in our environment, our communities, and in our Nation's international competitiveness.

The citizens of Rhode Island, who are still struggling to lift themselves out of a devastating recession, have clearly demonstrated their support for the Coastal Institute On Narragansett Bay by providing $12.6 million in bonding authority toward this effort. Congress has already provided $2.85 million toward this project.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the Fawell/Penny amendment.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Agriculture appropriations bill and in opposition to the Fawell amendment. This bill includes $37.8 million in funding to the Cooperative State Research Services Building and Facilities Program. This program provides funding to build scientific facilities around the country. One facility that has received funding, the New York Botanical Gardens in the Bronx, is a leading research center for horticulture and botany. The botanical garden offers research facilities to scientists from around the United States and the World to benefit humanity.

The Bronx botanical garden is a beautiful facility used by the general public. In addition to the beautiful parks and observatory, educational programs are offered to teach children and adults about the environment and earth sciences.

This program is essential. It is one of the few resources available to the free standing scientific community to acquire the necessary facilities. It is not pork barrel spending. The funding for these projects is granted on a merit basis and is subject to competitive reviews by scientific colleagues. The projects themselves are evaluated by a governmental review process, the results of which are reported back to Congress. The New York Botanical Garden has recently received a favorable review. It would be a travesty to cut off successful programs with proven results that emphasize research and education and play such significant roles in our communities.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote against the Fawell amendment.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Durbin amendment and would like to take this opportunity to briefly comment on the merits of the Market Promotion Program [MPP]. As my colleagues know, the primary objective of this cost-sharing program is foreign market development for U.S. agricultural products. This program, which has been operating for 7 years, has been touted as the most effective of all the agricultural export promotion programs at a relatively small price. Even conservative estimates by the U.S. Department of Agriculture show that from 1986 to 1988, U.S. agricultural exports attributable to MPP rose from $2 to $7 for each dollar funded.

The Market Promotion Program is not only cost effective but a proven success. The program has helped expand U.S. exports of high-value agricultural products which have nearly doubled since the program began. High-value products constitute the fastest-growing component of the world's agricultural trade and by the end of this century are expected to represent at least three-quarters of world trade. More than 80 percent of MPP funding is targeted toward building exports of high-value products.

Also, the program has helped create nearly $2.2 billion in increased economic activity and generated an estimated 1,062,000 full-time jobs, including 632,000 jobs in the non-farm sector. Available funds have been matched by producers. Reducing or eliminating MPP will make it more difficult to compete in the international marketplace and result in the loss of jobs. The MPP helps counter unfair trade practices and subsidized foreign competition, especially by the European Community which spends billions to protect and increase its market share. Reduced export demand could also

trigger higher outlays under various farm programs to protect farm income.

The USDA has worked hard to institute a number of management changes in the past year to make sure that the MPP is operated effectively and efficiently. USDA's Foreign Agriculture Service [FAS] has put in place a new allocation to target MPP funds to where they will get the most for their money and phase out programs that are not as cost effective.

I want to cite a couple of examples from my home State of California as to how effective this program has been. For avocadoes, the primary export market is Japan where avocados were virtually unknown prior to the start of the California Avocado Commission's program with the USDA. With the aid of MPP, they have increased their shipments to Japan by 190 percent from last year. MPP builds in-country partnership and provides a strong foundation for long-term business.

The California wine industry has been able to penetrate foreign markets despite significant trade barriers. Since the inception of the MPP program in 1986, sales have increased 325 percent in volume. An astounding 103 wineries were active in the 1991 program. Wineries that export have increased to 135 from 26 in 1986.

In sum, the MPP has helped open new export markets, expanded U.S. agricultural exports, countered unfair foreign competition, supported farm income, increased jobs, and increased interest in export opportunities for new companies and products. I urge my colleagues to continue to support this vital agricultural program.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Cooperative State Research Service funds a number of special research grants that benefit all Americans. One is the pesticide clearance [IR–4] program, for which $6,750,000 is included in this bill. The IR–4 program works with growers and agrichemical companies to coordinate the submission of registration of pesticides to EPA.

This project between USDA, EPA, State agricultural experiment stations, growers, and agrichemical companies is especially important to Florida growers. Most Florida farm products, including citrus, are considered minor crops under the law. Obtaining EPA approval for pesticides to be utilized on minor crops has been difficult over the years. Today, we have a backlog of applications for products to protect crops from disease and pests. Many of these chemicals, which will help ensure safe, wholesome, and nutritious fruits and vegetables, will be unavailable for application to minor crops without the support of the IR–4 program.

Commissioner Bob Crawford, of the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services, supports the IR–4 program, and I concur with his assessment for the need to continue this funding, which incidentally is more than $3 million below the fiscal year 1994 request.

Another grant within the Cooperative State Research Service concerns the $3,320,000 for tropical and subtropical research. This program, which first was authorized in the Food for Peace Act of 1966, has been developing strategies that enhance tropical agricultural systems by finding new foods and markets for tropical agricultural products and improving food quality and safety for people in the tropics.

I am proud of the work that the University of Florida's Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences [IFAS] and its collaborators in Guam, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands has done over the years in meeting real-world challenges that face American communities in the Caribbean and Pacific. The list of successes resulting from this research range from heat-tolerant tomatoes to virus-resistant papayas and melons.

Now, the efficient production of citrus could be threatened by the introduction of severe new strains of citrus tristeza virus that could affect sour orange rootstock. I urged the committee to address this concern, and I am pleased that the report specifically mentions research on this virus. However, if this amendment is adopted, this research may not move forward.

Mr. Chairman, I have another reason for supporting tropical and subtropical research and for opposing this amendment. If by chance the North American Free-Trade Agreement [NAFTA] should be approved, we can expect a flood of agricultural products from Mexico. American consumers will demand that this produce be safe and that agricultural pests and infestations kept to a minimum.

I fear that a reduction in tropical and subtropical research may put us in a health and safety disadvantage vis-a-vis agricultural products that may come from the tropical regions of Mexico.

Under these circumstances, I cannot support the Penny-Fawell amendment.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Chairman, as other members of the Agriculture Committee have expressed today, I, too, am concerned about authorizing language that is contained in this agricultural appropriations bill. It is an improper use of the appropriations process, and it is bad policy.

First, this bill seeks to eliminate the Rural Development Administration. New Members need to understand the history of RDA and that the House Appropriations Committee attempted to kill it in its fiscal year 1992 spending bill. At that time, the House wisely chose not to eliminate this agency that was created by the 1990 farm bill. Members need to know this new agency represents no new money; it is budget neutral, and actually, as I will point out later, will save money.

Now, the Committee on Appropriations indicates that RDA adds a layer of bureaucracy. Nothing could be more wrong, and in fact, Secretary Edward Madigan planned a consolidation of Federal economic development within State area offices prior to leaving office. Of course, Secretary Espy's recommendations have not been forwarded to the Congress, but I understand they will be coming sometime later this summer or early fall. As a member of the Committee on Agriculture, Mr. Espy was very supportive of RDA.

I should point out that the Office of Management and Budget, in opposing the committee's provision, indicates that fully funding RDA would allow for closing of FmHA district offices and quoting from a letter from Leon Panetta to Chairman NATCHER full funding would "eliminate the duplication of field structures that currently exists because the RDA has not been fully funded."

The regional offices are a focal point for economic development; to be sure, they are not business as usual. Rural areas have changed. The Federal bureaucracy, some rural interest groups, and the Appropriations Committees would be better off if they understood that. RDA will allow all rural citizens to participate in development, not just a select few.

Mr. Chairman, rural areas, especially those dependent on agriculture, need economic development. The Farmers Home Administration indicates that 60 percent of its borrowers need off-farm income to qualify for loans; 54 percent of farmers and ranchers who borrow from the cooperative Farm Credit System need off-farm income to support themselves and their families.

A separate agency devoted entirely to rural economic development is logical, efficient, and vitally important to rural Americans. A separate agency, the Farmers Home Administration, devoted almost exclusively to lending to farmers can better serve American agriculture—making better loans and servicing them properly. That's good for farmers and American taxpayers.

A second matter of concern is the committee's approach on crop insurance. In opposing this provision, none of us on the Agriculture Committee is saying the multi-peril crop insurance program does not need more reforms. We are saying that for all its inadequacies it is a risk management tool that farmers can take to the bank. In fact, lenders want to see farmers using crop insurance. It makes a better crop loan.

The Appropriations Committee's approach, however, makes a county by county reduction in the availability of multi-peril crop insurance if an area has a loss ratio of greater than 1.1 for 70 percent of the time the program has been available in a county. On the face of it, it appears to be sound policy: the committee seems to be saying let's quit subsidizing producers who are obviously farming the system. But what about producers whose individual production histories are better than the arbitrary cutoff the committee has written in to the bill? They no longer will have crop insurance available.

Not only that, the Secretary of Agriculture would be required to make certain disaster payments to producers who cannot buy crop insurance. This is unsound policy and obviously has not been thought out by our friends on the Appropriations Committee. OMB Director Leon Panetta corroborates my statement. Triggering mandatory disaster assistance would result in an estimated $75 million in payments to producers who could not get crop insurance as a result of this provision. That means this provision creates additional spending of $50 million.

Mr. Chairman, the authorizing committees continue to work on reform of crop insurance. Legislation is contained in both budget bills. Reform amendments were included in the 1990 farm bill. Better tracking of participants, a more rational approach to yield histories, better pricing policies will make this a better product for producers and sound Federal farm policy.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to Representative ARMEY's amendment to H.R. 2493 to eliminate funding for the Market Promotion Program.

The district I represent, Marin and Sonoma Counties in California, is famous worldwide for its excellent wines. The Market Promotion Program [MPP] has enabled the wines of my district and all of California to successfully compete in the international market.

Although California's wines are competitively priced and are of the highest quality, they cannot survive in the world market without MPP due to unfair trade barriers and other disadvantages. The European Community is heavily subsidized through export refunds and domestic price support programs that allow European Community wine producers to lower costs and absorb high tariffs. However, the wine industry receives no production subsidies from the U.S. Government. MPP is not a subsidy—it is a program aimed at making U.S. exports successful in international markets.

With the help of MPP, wine export sales grew from $27 million in 1985 to $175 million in 1992. Clearly, this shows that MPP is a proven success and is crucial to the future well-being of our growing wine industry.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote no on the Armey amendment.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to Representative ARMEY'S amendment to H.R. 2493 to eliminate funding for the Market Promotion Program.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 292, noes 137, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 295]

AYES—292

Ackerman
Allard
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barca
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blackwell
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Brewster
Brooks
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cantwell
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Collins (GA)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Cooper
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Cunningham
Danner
de la Garza
de Lugo (VI)
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
English (OK)
Everett
Ewing
Faleomavaega (AS)
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Fish
Flake
Ford (MI)
Fowler
Frost
Gallegly
Gekas
Geren
Gilman
Gingrich
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grandy
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hayes
Hefner
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kildee
Kim
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kyl
Lancaster
LaRocco
Leach
Lehman
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Machtley
Manton
Manzullo
Martinez
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCrery
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Miller (FL)
Mink
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Neal (NC)
Norton (DC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Ravenel
Regula
Richardson
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shaw
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Upton
Valentine
Velazquez
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Washington
Watt
Weldon
Wheat
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (AK)
Zeliff

NOES—137

Abercrombie
Andrews (ME)
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Barlow
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Boucher
Browder
Brown (FL)
Byrne
Canady
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Clement
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Condit
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Crapo
Darden
Deal
DeLauro
DeLay
Derrick
Dicks
Doolittle
Durbin
Engel
English (AZ)
Eshoo
Evans
Fawell
Fingerhut
Foglietta
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Furse
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Glickman
Grams
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastert
Hastings
Hefley
Hoagland
Hoyer
Hughes
Inglis
Jacobs
Johnson, Sam
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
King
Klein
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lantos
Laughlin
Lazio
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lowey
Maloney
Mann
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Matsui
McCandless
McCollum
McCurdy
McDermott
Meehan
Meek
Michel
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Moakley
Moran
Morella
Myers
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Orton
Owens
Pastor
Pelosi
Penny
Porter
Poshard
Ramstad
Reed
Reynolds
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Sabo
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sharp
Shays
Skaggs
Slattery
Smith (IA)
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Synar
Torricelli
Underwood (GU)
Unsoeld
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Waxman
Whitten
Wyden
Yates
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—10

Blute
Brown (CA)
Conyers
DeFazio
Henry
McMillan
Santorum
Skeen
Torres
Young (FL)

□ 1926

Mr. KLEIN, Mr. MORAN, and Mrs. LOWEY changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Ms WOOLSEY, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, and Messrs. PETERSON of Florida, BILBRAY, PALLONE, SERRANO, and SAXTON changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendents to title IV of the bill, the Clerk will read title V.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title V be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The text of title V is as follows:

TITLE V—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Foreign Agricultural Service, including carrying out title VI of the Agricultural Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1761–1768), market development activities abroad, and for enabling the Secretary to coordinate and integrate activities of the Department in connection with foreign agricultural work, including not to exceed $128,000 for representation allowances and for expenses pursuant to section 8 of the Act approved August 3, 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1766), $117,812,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available to obtain statistics and related facts on foreign production and full and complete information on methods used by other countries to move farm commodities in world trade on a competitive basis: *Provided further*, That in addition, funds available to the Department of Agriculture shall

be available to assist an international organization in meeting the costs, including salaries, fringe benefits and other associated costs, related to the employment by the organization of Federal personnel that may transfer to the organization under the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 3581-3584, or of other well-qualified United States citizens, for the performance of activities that contribute to increased understanding of international agricultural issues, with transfer of funds for this purpose from one appropriation to another or to a single account authorized, such funds remaining available until expended: *Provided further*, That the Office may utilize advances of funds, or reimburse this appropriation for expenditures made on behalf of Federal agencies, public and private organizations and institutions under agreements executed pursuant to the agricultural food production assistance programs (7 U.S.C. 1736) and the foreign assistance programs of the International Development Cooperation Administration (22 U.S.C. 2392).

None of the funds in the foregoing paragraph shall be available to promote the sale or export of tobacco or tobacco products.

GENERAL SALES MANAGER

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the office of the General Sales Manager, $9,158,000, of which $4,866,000 may be transferred from Commodity Credit Corporation funds, $2,792,000 may be transferred from the Commodity Credit Corporation Program Account in this Act, and $1,500,000 may be transferred from the Public Law 480 Program Account in this Act. The General Sales Manager shall obtain, assimilate, and analyze all available information on developments related to private sales, as well as those funded by the Corporation, including grade and quality as sold and as delivered, including information relating to the effectiveness of greater reliance by the General Sales Manager upon loan guarantees as contrasted to direct loans for financing commercial export sales of agricultural commodities out of private stocks on credit terms, as provided in title I and II of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978, Public Law 95-501, and shall submit quarterly reports to the appropriate committees of Congress concerning such developments.

None of the funds in the foregoing paragraph shall be available to promote the sale or export of tobacco or tobacco products.

PUBLIC LAW 480 PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For expenses during the current fiscal year, not otherwise recoverable, and unrecovered prior years' costs, including interest thereon, under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1691, 1701-1715, 1721-1726, 1727-1727f, 1731-1736g), as follows: (1) $450,446,000 for Public Law 480 title I credit, including Food for Progress credit; (2) $45,927,000 is hereby appropriated for ocean freight differential costs for the shipment of agricultural commodities pursuant to title I of said Act and the Food for Progress Act of 1985, as amended; (3) $821,570,000 is hereby appropriated for commodities supplied in connection with dispositions abroad pursuant to title II of said Act; and (4) $280,083,000 is hereby appropriated for commodities supplied in connection with dispositions abroad pursuant to title III of said Act: *Provided*, That not to exceed 10 per centum of the funds made available to carry out any title of said Act may be used to carry out any other title of said Act: *Provided further*, That such sums shall remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b).

For the cost, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, of direct credit agreements as authorized by the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, and the Food for Progress Act of 1985, as amended, including the cost of modifying credit agreements under said Act, $346,889,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the Public Law 480 title I credit program, and the Food for Progress Act of 1985, as amended, to the extent funds appropriated for Public Law 480 are utilized, $2,536,000.

SHORT-TERM EXPORT CREDIT

The Commodity Credit Corporation shall make available not less than $5,000,000,000 in credit guarantees under its export credit guarantee program for short-term credit extended to finance the export sales of United States agricultural commodities and the products thereof, as authorized by section 211(b)(1) of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5641).

INTERMEDIATE EXPORT CREDIT

The Commodity Credit Corporation shall make available not less than $500,000,000 in credit guarantees under its export guarantee program for intermediate-term credit extended to finance the export sales of United States agricultural commodities and the products thereof, as authorized by section 211(b)(2) of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5641).

EMERGING DEMOCRACIES EXPORT CREDIT

The Commodity Credit Corporation shall make available not less than $200,000,000 in credit guarantees under its Export Guarantee Program for credit expended to finance the export sales of United States agricultural commodities and the products thereof to emerging democracies, as authorized by section 1542 of Public Law 101-624 (7 U.S.C. 5622 note).

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION EXPORT LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For administrative expenses to carry out CCC's Export Guarantee Program, GSM 102 and GSM 103, $3,381,000; to cover common overhead expenses as permitted by section 11 of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act and in conformity with the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, of which not to exceed $2,792,000 may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for the salaries and expenses of the General Sales Manager, and of which not to exceed $589,000 may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for the salaries and expenses of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service.

SCIENTIFIC ACTIVITIES OVERSEAS (FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

LIMITATION ON EXPENSES

For payments in foreign currencies owed to or owned by the United States for research activities authorized by section 104(c)(7) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704(c)(7)), not to exceed $1,062,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $25,000 of these funds shall be available for payments in foreign currencies for expenses of employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), as amended by 5 U.S.C. 3109.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there points of order against title V?

If not, are there amendments to title V?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KASICH

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KASICH: Page 66, line 11, strike "$346,889,000" and insert "$317,800,000".

Mr. KASICH (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1930

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I come to the floor with an amendment that again draws attention to a problem that we have had in this Congress for a long time, but frankly you get tired of talking about it because we never seem to get anything done about it. We are back to foreign aid one more time.

I want to tell you, you might recall earlier this year I came with an amendment on the Agency for International Development that has been running programs that have not met with success. There have been failures. There have been great difficulties with that program. I want it to be restructured. I want it to be fixed. I want it to work.

We did not win that amendment down here, although we made some progress in that area, still not where we want to be.

I came back about 2 weeks ago with an amendment on the World Bank. Almost 37.5 percent of their projects have been deemed failures by their own internal audits. Their programs are being opposed by virtually every environmental group in this country.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am back here today to talk about the Public Law 480 program, a law that was designed initially to alleviate world hunger in times of disaster and famine. It is a program that has value, obviously, but we also have in the first section of this program an opportunity for countries to be given very low interest loans for purposes of buying our agricultural products. It sounds like it is a good idea, but I want to tell you, it has really missed the course of action that it was intended to achieve.

Let me explain basically what this Public Law 480 program is doing. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] has graciously agreed to cooperate in terms of what I want to do to fix this program, but let me explain to you what we do under Public Law 480.

Do you know that we are making low interest loans to El Salvador and we ship nonfat dried milk to El Salvador and we destroy their domestic industry, so when El Salvador wants to ship products out of their country in order to raise their standard of living, they cannot do it because we have destroyed their domestic marketplace, believe it

or not, by shipping our products into their country with low interest loans, and we have been destroying that part of their economy.

In Egypt the same thing happens. For those who look at what happens in Egypt, bread is a big deal in Egypt. We send all this wheat over there to Egypt at these very low prices and we destroy their domestic operation so that they cannot ever get themselves in a position of stability based on some exports because we send our stuff in and destroy their domestic economy. It just does not make any sense.

Now in El Salvador as of May 14, 1993, we are sending things in there right now that are destroying part of their domestic economy. We send in there right now oil seed which destroys their ability to have an effective oil seed domestic industry and they go out of business and they cannot export.

But this is what I really want to read to you today, because as you all know, we have been engaged in a very terrible dilemma for the United States in the world. When you think about the people over there in Somalia, do you realize that Somalia can be placed on the list of a country that has had its domestic agricultural production destroyed by cheap food exports from our country?

Let me just read a little bit out of the New York Times of January 13, 1993. It talks about a lady who has corn stacked in barrels, corn stacked in sacks, corn to be tossed away as chicken feed. This lady in Somalia was producing a bountiful harvest of corn 4 months ago.

Now, listen to this, but when she took her crop to the market she found that the infusion of food from relief agencies was cutting demand. With food prices falling in a bottomless tumble, no merchant wanted to risk buying her corn and then seeing the prices plummet still lower. Piles of corn already gone bad that had been thrown on a tarpaulin for chicken feed, this is a paradox of famine and famine relief.

Listen to this. The international charity that stops starvation eventually can become a problem in itself, threatening to destroy what little remains of the local farm economy, and it goes on and on about the fact that our exports are destroying their economy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] has expired.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. THOMAS of California. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman trying to make the point that we should allow a free agricultural market in Somalia, when in fact food was used as a weapon and denied to people, and the food that we brought in was an attempt to break that food control weapon and that the gentleman would have preferred to see a free market in agriculture in Somalia, is that the point the gentleman is trying to make?

Mr. KASICH. I would respond to the gentleman, the point I am trying to make is that we create a situation that violates our own policy under Public Law 480.

You see, there is supposed to be a determination made that food aid will not create disincentives to local food production.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Continuing my reservation, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman is going to use his 3 minutes to indicate that the humanitarian food aid to Somalia disrupted the local market and therefore we should not have done it, I may be constrained to object.

Mr. KASICH. Let me say to the gentleman, of course I am not suggesting that we not send food around the world in times of natural disaster, but our policy has got to be carefully devised so that in the process of making low credits available to foreign governments that we did not encourage them to export so many goods that we begin to destroy their markets.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Could the gentleman make his point in 2 minutes?

Mr. KASICH. I certainly could.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] may proceed for 3 additional minutes, one of which he has already consumed. He has 2 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. KASICH. So what I am suggesting, and I have reached some agreement with the gentleman from Illinois, is that we send a letter to the Department of Agriculture and we make the case that we abide by the law and that our food aid will not create disincentives to local food production, and that we do not destroy domestic economies in El Salvador, in Somalia, in Egypt, or in any country around the world.

Obviously, Public Law 480 is a viable program, but it has got to be used to guarantee that we help people in times of crisis.

And second, that it is compatible with their ability to help themselves.

I am willing to withdraw this amendment for purposes of writing to the Secretary of Agriculture and trying to make Public Law 480 work as it was intended.

We do not want to get people on a foreign aid fix where they cannot begin to develop their own economies.

I know that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture shares a lot of the concern I have on this program, as he commented last year on the amendment that Congressman MILLER and I offered, but we have got to get serious about making foreign aid work the way it is intended to. We just cannot seem to get it done here, and perhaps this letter to Secretary Espy would be a step in the right direction.

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

Mr. KASICH. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I would just say that I believe the gentleman from Ohio has raised a valid point. I think we should follow through and I am going to encourage the minority leadership on the subcommittee to join me with the gentleman from Ohio and send a letter not only to Secretary Espy, but also to the Department of State to try to determine whether or no our policy is consistent with making certain that there is an indigenous agricultural sector left behind after we have provided humanitarian relief.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] is withdrawn.

Are there further amendments to title V?

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE VI—RELATED AGENCIES AND FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Food and Drug Administration, including hire and purchase of passenger motor vehicles; for rental of special purpose space in the District of Columbia or elsewhere; and for miscellaneous and emergency expenses of enforcement activities, authorized and approved by the Secretary and to be accounted for solely on the Secretary's certificate, not to exceed $25,000; $867,339,000, of which not to exceed $54,000,000 in fees pursuant to section 736 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act may be credited to this approriation and remain available until expended: *Provided*, That fees derived from applications received during fiscal year 1994 shall be subject to the fiscal year 1994 limitation: *Provided further*, That none of these funds shall be used to develop, establish, or operate any program of user fees autorized by 31 U.S.C. 9701: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act may be used to pay for expenses of the Board of Experts on Tea.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For plans, construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities of or used by the Food and Drug Administration, where not otherwise provided, $8,350,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b): *Provided*, That the Food and Drug Administration may accept donated land in Montgomery and/or Prince George's Counties, Maryland.

RENTAL PAYMENTS (FDA)

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For payment of space rental and related costs pursuant to Public Law 92–313 for programs an activities of the Food and Drug Administration which are included in this Act, $48,575,000, of which $15,000,000 shall be retained by the Food and Drug Administration for repairs, improvements, and non-recurring repairs as determined by Food and Drug Administration: *Provided*, That in the event the Food and Drug Administration should require modification of space needs, a share of the salaries and expenses appropriation may be transferred to this appropriation, or a share of this appropriation may be transferred to the salaries and expenses appropriation, but such transfers shall not exceed 5 per centum of the funds made available for rental payment (FDA) to or from this account.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SERVICE

PAYMENTS TO THE FARM CREDIT SYSTEM FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE CORPORATION

For necessary payments to the Farm Credit System Financial Assistance Corporation by the Secretary of the Treasury, as authorized by section 6.28(c) of the Farm Credit Act of 1971, as amended, for reimbursement of interest expenses incurred by the Financial Assistance Corporation on obligations issued through 1993, as authorized, $62,696,000.

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), including the purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles, the rental of space (to include multiple year leases) in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; and not exceed $25,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109; $47,485,000, including not to exceed $700 for official reception and representation expenses.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Not to exceed $40,426,000 (from assessments collected from farm credit institutions and from the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation) shall be obligated during the current fiscal year for administrative expenses as authorized under 12 U.S.C. 2249.

Mr. DURBIN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title VI be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there points of order to title VI of the bill?

Are there amendments to title VI?

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. Within the unit limit of cost fixed by law, appropriations and authorizations made for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1994 under this Act shall be available for the purchase, in addition to those specifically provided for, of not to exceed 657 passenger motor vehicles, of which 653 shall be for replacement only, and for the hire of such vehicles.

SEC. 702. Funds in this Act available to the Department of Agriculture shall be available for uniforms or allowances therefor as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901–5902).

SEC. 703. Not less than $1,500,000 of the appropriations of the Department of Agriculture in this Act for research and service work authorized by the Acts of August 14, 1946, and July 28, 1954, and (7 U.S.C. 427, 1621–1629), and by chapter 63 of title 31, United States Code, shall be available for contracting in accordance with said Acts and chapter.

SEC. 704. No part of the funds contained in this Act may be used to make production or other payments to a person, persons, or corporations upon a final finding by court of competent jurisdiction that such party is guilty of growing, cultivating, harvesting, processing or storing marijuana, or other such prohibited drug-producing plants on any part of lands owned or controlled by such persons or corporations.

SEC. 705. The cumulative total of transfers to the Working Capital Fund for the purpose of accumulating growth capital for data services and National Finance Center operations shall not exceed $2,000,000: *Provided*, That no funds in this Act appropriated to an agency of the Department shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund without the approval of the agency administrator.

SEC. 706. New obligational authority provided for the following appropriation items in this Act shall remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b): Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, the contingency fund to meet emergency conditions, and Integrated Systems Acquisition Project; Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, salaries and expenses funds made available to county committees; Foreign Agricultural Service, Middle-Income Country Training Program; higher education graduate fellowships grants under section 1417(b)(6) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977, as amended (7 U.S.C. 3152(b)(6)); and capacity building grants to colleges eligible to receive funds under the Act of August 30, 1890, including Tuskegee University.

New obligational authority for the Boll Weevil Program; up to 10 per centum of the Screwworm Program of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service; funds appropriated for Rental Payments; and higher education minority scholars programs under section 1417(b)(5) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977, as amended (7 U.S.C. 3152(b)(5)) shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 707. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 708. Not to exceed $50,000 of the appropriations available to the Department of Agriculture in this Act shall be available to provide appropriate orientation and language training pursuant to Public Law 94–449.

SEC. 709. No funds appropriated by this Act may be used to pay negotiated indirect cost rates on cooperative agreements or similar arrangements between the United States Department of Agriculture and nonprofit institutions in excess of 10 per centum of the total direct cost of the agreement when the purpose of such cooperative arrangements is to carry out programs of mutual interest between the two parties. This does not preclude appropriate payment of indirect costs on grants and contracts with such institutions when such indirect costs are computed on a similar basis for all agencies for which appropriations are provided in this Act.

SEC. 710. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, commodities acquired by the Department in connection with Commodity Credit Corporation and section 32 price support operations may be used, as authorized by law (15 U.S.C. 714c and 7 U.S.C. 612c), to provide commodities to individuals in cases of hardship as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 711. None of the funds in this Act shall be available to reimburse the General Services Administration for payment of space rental and related costs in excess of the amounts specified in this Act; nor shall this or any other provision of law require a reduction in the level of rental space or services below that of fiscal year 1993 or prohibit an expansion of rental space or services with the use of funds otherwise appropriated in this Act. Further, no agency of the Department of Agriculture, from funds otherwise available, shall reimburse the General Services Administration for payment of space rental and related costs provided to such agency at a percentage rate which is greater than is available in the case of funds appropriated in this Act.

SEC. 712. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used to reduce programs by establishing an end-of-year employment ceiling on full-time equivalent staff years below the level set herein for the following agencies: Food and Drug Administration, 9,824; Farmers Home Administration, 12,225; Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, 2,550; Rural Electrification Administration, 550; and Soil Conservation Service, 14,177.

SEC. 713. Funds appropriated by this Act shall be applied only to the objects for which appropriations were made except as otherwise provided by law, as required by 31 U.S.C. 1301.

SEC. 714. None of the funds in this Act shall be available to restrict the authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation to lease space for its own use or to lease space on behalf of other agencies of the Department of Agriculture when such space will be jointly occupied.

SEC. 715. None of the funds provided in this Act may be expended to release information acquired from any handler under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended: *Provided*, That this provision shall not prohibit the release of information to other Federal agencies for enforcement purposes: *Provided further*, That this provision shall not prohibit the release of aggregate statistical data used in formulating regulations pursuant to the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended: *Provided further*, That this provision shall not prohibit the release of information submitted by milk handlers.

SEC. 716. Unless otherwise provided in this Act, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used by the Farmers Home Administration to employ or otherwise contract with private debt collection agencies to collect delinquent payments from Farmers Home Administration borrowers.

SEC. 717. None of the funds in this Act, or otherwise made available by this Act, shall be used to sell loans made by the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund. Further, Rural Development Insurance Fund loans offered for sale in fiscal year 1994 shall be first offered to the borrowers for prepayment.

SEC. 718. None of the funds in this Act may be used to establish any new office, organization, or center for which funds have not been provided in advance in Appropriations Acts,

except the Department may carry out planning activities.

SEC. 719. None of the funds in this Act shall be available to pay indirect costs on research grants awarded competitively by the Cooperative State Research Service that exceed 14 per centum of total Federal funds provided under each award.

SEC. 720. Appropriations to the Department of Agriculture for the cost of direct and guaranteed loans made available in fiscal years 1992, 1993, and 1994 shall remain available until expended to cover obligations made in fiscal years 1992, 1993, and 1994 for the following accounts: Rural Development Insurance Fund Program Account; the Rural Telephone Bank Program Account; the Rural Electrification and Telephone Loans Program Account; and the Rural Economic Development Loans Program Account.

SEC. 721. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, all loan levels provided in this Act shall be considered estimates, not limitations.

SEC. 722. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, none of the funds in this Act may be used to operate the seven regional offices of the Rural Development Administration after April 1, 1994.

SEC. 723. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall be used to pay the salaries of personnel who carry out a Market Promotion Program pursuant to section 203 (7 U.S.C. 5623) of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978, with respect to tobacco or if the aggregate amount of funds and/or commodities under such program exceeds $147,734,000.

SEC. 724. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall be used to enroll in excess of 50,000 acres in the fiscal year 1994 Wetlands Reserve Program, as authorized by 16 U.S.C. 3837.

SEC. 725. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall be used to enroll additional acres in the Conservation Reserve Program authorized by 16 U.S.C. 3831-3845.

SEC. 726. Such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1994 pay raises for programs funded by this Act shall be absorbed within the levels appropriated in this Act.

Mr. DURBIN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title VII of the bill, through page 79, line 3, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there points of order to title VII?

Are there any amendments to title VII?

□ 1940

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT: Page 71, after line 18, insert the following new section:

SEC. 701. (a) COMPLIANCE WITH BUY AMERICAN ACT.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the funds the entity will comply with sections 2 through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a-10c; popularly known as the "Buy American Act").

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS; REQUIREMENT REGARDING NOTICE.—

(1) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—In the case of any equipment or product that may be authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided using funds made available in this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving the assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

(2) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In providing financial assistance using funds made available in this Act, the head of each Federal agency shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in paragraph (1) by the Congress.

(c) PROHIBITION OF CONTRACTS WITH PERSONS FALSELY LABELING PRODUCTS AS MADE IN AMERICA.—If it has been finally determined by a court or Federal agency that any person intentionally affixed a label bearing a "Made in America" inscription, or any inscription with the same meaning, to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in the United States, the person shall be ineligible to receive any contract or subcontract made with funds made available in this Act, pursuant to the debarment, suspension, and ineligibility procedures described in sections 9.400 through 9.409 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

Mr. TRAFICANT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, this provision has been accepted and worked out, and this is the buy American compliance. The language has been worked out with both the minority member and the chairman.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Chairman, I reviewed this amendment. I am in full agreement with it, and I will accept this amendment.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the distinguished ranking member, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS].

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] for yielding. The gentleman from Ohio has discussed this amendment, as he has other bills, appropriations that have been considered this year. It is the same language, and we accept it.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if somebody would be kind enough to tell us what this amendment is and what it does.

The CHAIRMAN. Would the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] care to explain the amendment?

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, what this amendment says is the funds available under the bill shall comply with the Buy American Act. Anybody that would receive money under here, it is the sense of Congress that they should, in fact, be encouraged to buy American products. That is the encouragement of the U.S. Congress, and, if there is a fraudulent label, in fact this bill says they would not be eligible to bid or to be receiving any grants or assistance under the act this year and would have to come back to the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] for that explanation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ARMEY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ARMEY: Page 78, line 17, strike "$147,734,000" and insert "$1".

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment eliminates the $147,734,000 in funds for the market promotion program.

Supporters of the market promotion program tell us its purpose is to promote the sale of American agricultural products abroad. To that end, USDA would spend—in this bill—$147 million of the taxpayer's money to underwrite the advertising expenses of trade associations and big companies. Without the MPP, its supporters argue, these companies would not advertise overseas—costing them exports and American jobs.

A few weeks ago, representatives of an association which receives funds under the MPP came to my office to explain the virtues of the program. They argued, perhaps correctly, that the $1 million in Federal funds generates $60 million in sales overseas—$60 dollars in sales for every dollar in advertising. A good investment. My question to them, and my question to the program's supporters, is why won't they make this same investment if the taxpayer doesn't.

The answer, Mr. Chairman, is that of course they will. Advertising makes common business sense. And why with a $300 billion budget deficit and an increasing tax burden would we pay companies do to what they would otherwise do anyway?

Let us take a look at some recent MPP recipients: Miller Beer, McDonald's, Pillsbury, M&M/Mars, Sunkist,

Campbell's Soup. Are we to believe these companies will not advertise without a Federal subsidy?

General Mills, home of the famous Betty Crocker, has an advertising budget of one-half of a billion dollars. McDonald's, another MPP recipient, has an advertising budget of three-quarters of a billion dollars.

I am not here today to attack big business. But I cannot justify to my constituents taking their hard-earned money for corporate welfare.

Now I know Members do not want to vote for my amendment. I'm sure they've received letters and phone calls from these companies who feel strongly about not having their handout taken away. But, Mr. Chairman, I wonder about our commitment to deficit reduction if we cannot take Betty Crocker, Ronald McDonald, and Pillsbury Dough Boy off the dole.

Mr. Chairman, Betty Crocker can get by without a Federal handout. General Mills will continue to export and continue to advertise when it makes good business sense. And the taxpayers can save $147 million.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHUMER AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ARMEY

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, along with the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. MACHTLEY], I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCHUMER as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. ARMEY: Page 78, line 17, strike "$147,734,000" and insert "$90,000,000".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DURBIN TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHUMER AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ARMEY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DURBIN to the amendment offered by Mr. SCHUMER as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. ARMEY: In the substitute offered by Congressman Schumer, strike "$90,000,000" and insert "$127,734,000".

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized so I may describe to Members where we stand at this moment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, there is an amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] which would eliminate the funding for the market promotion program. It would strike all of the $147 million 734 thousand which we appropriate in the bill.

There is a substitute for that amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] and the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. MACHTLEY] which would strike $57 million 734 thousand, leaving a balance in the fund of $90 million.

Then there is an amendment to that substitute which I am offering that would reduce the total amount from $147 million to $127 million 734 thousand which will, as I understand it, proceed as follows:

If we can reach a unanimous-consent agreement, which I hope we can, at the end of the debate, the Members will be allowed to vote in succession, first on my amendment which would cut $20 million from the program, then if it fails, on the $57 million cut by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], and the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. MACHTLEY], and finally, should that fail, on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] to completely eliminate the program, and I, as part of the unanimous-consent request, would like to make the following suggestion: that these amendments and all amendments thereto, if there can be any, would be limited in terms of debate to 45 minutes, 15 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], 15 minutes by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], and 15 minutes shared by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] and myself.

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

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would inquire if we could make it 8:30, a time certain. Everybody knows what is in these amendments.

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

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, at this point, with 15 minutes a side, I think the timekeeper can keep track a little more easily.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the problem is we would not end at 8:30.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish it could be earlier than that.

□ 1950

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, under my reservation let me say the arrangement, of course, is acceptable. But I think it is only fair for us to recognize that in my generosity, I do leave one dollar in the program. I would not want anybody to think I was harsh in my treatment of market promotions.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for not taking my words down. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of the right to object.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of the right to object.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. There will be a 45-minute time limitation, 15 minutes on each side. The order of voting will be first on the Durbin amendment to the Schumer substitute, then on the Schumer substitute, as amended or not amended, for the Armey amendment, and then on the Armey amendment itself.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this program is a lightning rod. Every year we get embroiled in a deep debate over a program which at its peak was appropriated $200 million in a $70 billion budget, for the reasons previously stated by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY]. And I think those reasons are very valid.

In fact, all of the members of the subcommittee thought the reasons so valid that last year we included language in the committee report on the Market Promotion Program to specifically address the concerns of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] and the concerns of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

Mr. Chairman, let me tell Members what we are facing here. We are attempting to promote agriculture exports from the United States. We are not working in a vacuum. Other countries are promoting exports to the United States and to other countries where we would also like to export. Those countries that are encouraging their exports are using every trick in the book, every incentive, and every subsidy to do so.

The Market Promotion Program is an attempt to provide some funds for American agricultural exporters so that they can be competitive in a world market.

Does it work? You bet it does. We took this subcommittee to Mexico to investigate NAFTA and spent a Sunday morning in the largest outdoor wholesale market in Mexico City. As you went from one produce stand to the other, you noticed an interesting symbol that suggested certain produce sold in that stand was grown in the United States, apples and pears for example.

What we found was that, in fact, by promoting the export of American apples to Mexico, we had cornered the market. Mexican salesmen, one after the other, told us that the preference of consumers in Mexico was for our produce, because we were promoting through the apple industry and the growers our produce overseas, and it was working.

We had in fact closed down the Mexican market. If they had the money and had the choice, they picked the American apple.

We went to the largest supermarket in Mexico City, to the produce section. I want to tell Members, you would find American produce and products in every direction. Specifically the symbol appeared again from our Market Promotion Program encouraging people to buy pears grown in the United States.

What I am trying to tell Members is that the money invested in this program is paying off in terms of exports.

Have there been abuses in the program? You bet there have. And this subcommittee told the administrators of this program last year we were sick and tired of spending scarce funds for corporations which could afford to promote their own products. We found it totally unacceptable for them to use these funds to promote products not grown in the United States, and we thought they should focus their dollars on promoting small- and medium-sized exporters, and particularly value-added products creating jobs in the United States.

At its high point we spent $200 million helping everyone from almond growers to apple growers to large corporations get into markets overseas and sell American products. We have now reduced that amount to $147 million, and, with this amendment that I am offering, we will reduce it another $20 million.

But, please, do not believe that we can walk away from the world market, step away from market promotion, and be good competitors. We can straighten up this program, and we should. But the bottom line is that to create jobs in America, we need more exports, to improve our balance of trade and to get people back to work.

Mr. Chairman, I think the Market Promotion Program is a valid way to do that. Other speakers I believe will stand before you and give specific examples of why they think it is, too.

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

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BILBRAY].

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, subsidized advertising is the effect of the Agriculture Department's Market Promotion Program. In 1992 the Department dispensed $200 million in public funds for private advertising.

The Market Promotion Program hands out taxpayer dollars to some of the largest and most successful corporations in America.

Last year, McDonalds received $465,000 for ads and counter displays to promote Chicken McNuggets to customers around the world.

Campbell Soup received $450,000 from the Government to remind the Japanese, Koreans, Argentinians, and Taiwanese to drink V-8 Juice.

Seagrams & Sons received $146,000 to sell its whiskey in Europe and the Far East.

Market Promotion Program dispensed $8.52 million to sell U.S. salmon.

Last year, Sunkist growers received almost $10 million to sell citrus; it used its Market Promotion Program money for poster promotions.

The following companies received more than $1 million for brand name promotions under the Market Promotion Program:

Sunkist Growers—$9.9 million; Blue Diamond, almonds—$6.2 million; Gallo Wine—$5.1 million; Sunsweet growers, prunes—$3 million; Sunmaid of California, raisins-$3.6 million.

Does this explain the marvelous, but expensive claymation raisins??

Pillsbury Co., processed corn—$2.9 million; John West Foods, United Kingdom, Alaskan salmon—$1.8 million; Tyson Foods, poultry—$1.1 million.

The Wine Institute which represents the California wine industry is slated to receive $14.3 million this year.

It would be one of the program's largest beneficiaries.

Since 1985 in the early days of this program, the General Accounting Office [GAO] has criticized the program for giving away money haphazardly.

According to GAO, in 1991 the Market Promotion Program's $200 million was more money than the Commerce Department spent on all of its export promotion programs combined.

This program is almost a metaphor of what is wrong when it comes to the Federal budget.

These are subsidies to some of the largest corporations.

It is a matter of priorities. At a time when we are running the huge deficits that we are running today, it would be better to save the $200 million.

Last June the Agriculture Department performed a cost benefit analysis:

It found that the program's benefits were offset by its costs to the American consumers and taxpayers.

The program is welfare. And we are robbing Peter to pay Paul.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7½ minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [MACHTLEY], to use as he may choose.

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from New York for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to use some of my time to explain to Members who may not be aware, what is happening here. We have three amendments. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] wishes to, with the exception of $1, zero out this entire program. Our amendment attempts to take the moneys which have been allocated in last year's budget to these large foreign corporations and to these large U.S. corporations, and take that money out. It is about $57 million.

Mr. Chairman, the Market Promotion Program was started with good intentions. Today it has $147 million in it, and that is not small potatoes to people back home.

It was the follow-on program to the TEA Program, which was the target export assistance program. But over the years it has grown and grown, and now it is the recipient tonight of the first Lester H. Pork Award.

As I was campaigning for Congress in my first term, I had a small piglet. As this piglet grew, it became the symbol of pork in Congress. And if there is any deserving program of this award, this is it.

In 1992, you have heard what has taken place. Sunkist juiced the program for $9.9 million. Ernest & Julio Gallo wined and dined this program for $5.1 million in promotional moneys. Dole was on the dole for $3 million. Pillsbury received lots of dough, $3 million worth. Tysons Foods wasn't chicken, they took $1.1 million. M&M, that wonderful candy that gets our kids juiced up, too, $1 million to help promote their products overseas. And Campbell Soup heated up their skillet for $450,000.

Even McDonald's, who has paid wonderful ballplayers like Larry Bird and Michael Jordan millions of dollars to promote their program, was paid $465,000 to promote Chicken McNuggets in Asia.

□ 2000

That is not Air Jordan. That is airhead promotion.

As a nation, we have got to get control of these budgetary items which are driving constituents crazy. They ask, "Where is the fiscal responsibility?" People do not mind paying taxes, if they know that their moneys are going to be well spent. But when we give these large corporations this kind of money to promote their products, they are saying, "What is going on in Washington?"

In 1992, of the 200 U.S. companies with the largest advertising budgets, 13 of them received a total of $9 million to promote their products. That is $700,000 on average for each of these corporations. But the average advertising budget for these 13 firms was between $45 million and $538 million. This is a lot of money.

But the money that we are giving them, we do not even know if it went to advertising, because there is no guarantee, no way to audit that this money is, in fact, used in advertising.

GAO reported that during 1992, the 50 companies that received the most money collected $48.5 million. And of these 50 companies, only 11 were the small companies, the needy, who this program was designed to help. And they only received $8.5 million.

That means in 1992, $40 million went to these large companies who can well afford to promote their products overseas.

That is not all. We want to promote our U.S. products, and that is a fair

goal for this program. But what has happened?

The Cotton Council, last year, received $48.8 million from our U.S. Federal Government to promote cotton around the world. That is almost $50 million. How much of that $50 million did U.S. companies get? Not $48.8, not $40 million, not $10 million, not $1 million. In fact, almost all of this money, as we can determine it, went to foreign companies who are already trying to sell U.S. cotton in foreign markets.

This was not a way to help U.S. companies. This was a way to help subsidize foreign companies, which is absolutely the wrong thing for our Nation to be doing at this time.

It is the intent of Congress to help those who are needy. It is not the intent of Congress to prop up these large corporations. We do not want to zero out this program, in fairness to the program, because there are some needy companies who are receiving some very good support for promoting their products overseas.

What the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] and I are trying to do is take that money, the $57 million, which is going to the large corporations as well as to foreign corporations, and take that out, to send this USDA program a very strong message that the taxpayers are not going to subsidize for promotional activities large U.S. corporations. We want the money to go to small corporations.

Now, I am greatly impressed with the attempt of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] to zero it out, and that would not be the worst vote in the world, frankly. If Members feel that this gross excess of paying for large corporations ought to just be totally zeroed out, that is a fair assessment. I would not dissuade anyone from voting for that.

Myself, I would like to take a more reasonable, middle-of-the-road approach, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] and I have talked. We said, "Let's send a strong message. Let's take the amount of money that we think is being wastefully spent and let's take that out of this appropriations bill."

Because it is an appropriations bill, some Members may be saying, "Why don't you just pass language that says you can't use it in large corporations?" But because it is an appropriations bill, we do not have that right. We can only extract money from the appropriation process, hoping that the USDA is going to understand that, in fact, we are not going to continue to subsidize these large corporations and foreign national corporations.

The taxpayers of this Nation are on the tax rack. They have been stretched. We are asking them to give in and give us more tax dollars.

Members here have said we need tax dollars to reduce our deficit. I do not think anyone in this Chamber can go to a town meeting and say that all of these moneys that are being spent on large corporations and foreign corporations is well-spent money. I do not think it will stand the light of day.

So I would respectfully suggest that my colleagues, as they come in here, either take a position that we are going to send them a strong message or cut out the whole program.

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

Mr. MACHTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has made a very strong argument to me for the position of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

What, in his amendment, would differentiate it so it would justify the $90 million?

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Chairman, what I have suggested is that there are a lot of small corporations who are, in fact, receiving money. I think we should help promote the small corporations, the needy farmers, but not indefinitely.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, could the gentleman tell me, my question was, could the gentleman tell me how his amendment is drafted to see that that happens so that we do not have the situation as he described?

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

Mr. MACHTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to answer the gentleman from Hawaii. I think the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. MACHTLEY] and I believe that the Armey amendment is a good amendment. It is just that experience has shown us in the past that when we try to eliminate the program, we do not get enough votes to pass it.

We are trying to eliminate a good chunk of the program, particularly that part that goes to big companies that can well spend their own advertising dollars and let the little farmers get their share.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. MACHTLEY] has expired.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER].

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman I rise today in support of the Armey amendment to strike funding for the Market Promotion Program.

This program is nothing more or less than corporate welfare, tens of millions of dollars to the world's wealthiest corporations, some of which are not even American.

Continuing this spending program, my colleagues is nuts. Blue Diamond Nuts, to be exact.

Mr. Chairman, the Federal budget deficit is fatter than the Pillsbury Dough Boy, who incidentally has been enlarged to the tune of over $8 million taxpayer dollars since 1986 when this program was first cooked up. Because of schemes like this Congress is much like the proverbial free spending sailor drunk on the Gallo wine. Gallo, of course we subsidize by $14.5 million.

Some try to candy-coat this handout by saying that Mars Candy Corp. could not advertise their M&M's by themselves. That is just not true, they and others, like Bartles & Jaymes, have effective and memorable ads.

This program is one big lemon, in fact it is a $66 million sweet lemon to the Sunkist Corp. But it is a bitter seed caught in the throat of the working men and women of America. Who are paying the bill, but getting none of the juice.

This program would be great if money grew on trees like these Sun Sweet Prunes you and I have been advertising.

We keep hearing about the tough choices, but this is not one of those tough choices. This choice is easy. Take Dole Pineapples and these other multi-million-dollar corporations off the dole.

Federal spending should be frozen instead of spreading taxpayer largess to, among others, Tyson's Frozen Foods.

One of the corporations receiving funds under this nutty program is General Mills, whose Keebler elves have been caught with their little hands in America's cookie jar. I say to my colleagues that we must end this program because the sad fact is that America's cookie jar is empty.

Support the Armey amendment, don't be a Tyson's Chicken.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER].

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Durbin amendment. The Market Promotion Program is critical to the continued expansion of U.S. agricultural exports and is one of the few Government programs that actually works.

Virtually all of this funding is used to combat unfair trade practices, and the amount we are spending is a small percentage of the huge subsidies that are paid by the Europeans.

Our trading partners would love to see the funding for this program reduced.

The fact is, the Market Promotion Program has proven to be an effective program and method of expanding our agricultural exports. It has sustained thousands of American jobs and has greatly contributed to the reduction of our trade imbalance.

For every $1 in MPP funding, sales of U.S. exports increase by between $2 and $7. Ultimately, the increased economic activity created by the Market Promotion Program supports between 11,000 and 28,000 American jobs through expanded exports.

The argument has been made that the types of promotional activities implemented through the MPP will go on regardless of government funding.

□ 2010

However, my colleagues should understand that the participants match the Government funding on a one-to-one basis. Again, this argument ignores the fact that the program is targeted towards nations which utilize unfair trade barriers, such as Japan and the European Community. To cite just a few examples of MPP success stories:

Exports of prunes to the EC increased 65 percent.

Exports of peaches to Japan increased by 126 percent.

Exports of walnuts to Japan increased by over 200 percent.

I urge my colleagues to support economic growth and jobs by supporting the Durbin amendment.

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

Mr. HERGER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the Durbin bill and congratulate the gentlemen on his statement.

Mr. Chairman, American agricultural exports account for about $40 billion in annual sales. Agriculture provides a positive balance of payments in the U.S. trade account of approximately $17 billion.

Future growth in U.S. agriculture will depend on export growth. Expansion of agricultural exports is critical for related sectors of the economy.

Each U.S. dollar of agricultural exports generates an additional $1.59 in economic growth. Every $1 billion in agricultural exports maintained 27,000 jobs.

MPP will be even more important if an agreement is reached on the Uruguay round of GATT. Marketing assistance has already been ruled to be an acceptable form of government assistance under GATT.

According to the USDA, "the European Community, our main competitor in the high-value market, paid out direct subsides of nearly $1.5 billion to producers and exporters of high-value products."

The Armey amendment would eliminate one of the few programs that will remain to combat the practices of our competitors. Virtually every other country has developed programs similar to MPP. If the Armey amendment is adopted we are essentially telling our Nation's farmers that we will once again turn our backs on them.

Let us understand what we are talking about here. MPP is a Government subsidy. But, it is a subsidy that is designed to combat foreign competitors who are far more heavily subsidized than U.S. agriculture. MPP is used to open new markets and keep them. We cannot unilaterally eliminate our support for U.S. businesses overseas.

It is no secret that other countries have far more significant barriers to trade than the United States does. We should not ignore this fact. Our Government has a role to play in helping U.S. businesses compete and win in the international marketplace. MPP is a tool that has been used successfully for this purpose.

The House has already passed a permanent reduction of the MPP program as part of the budget reconciliation bill. The farm bill authorized level is $200 million. The House reconciliation bill reduced the authorized level to $147,734,000—a $53 million reduction.

MPP funds are matched on a one-to-one basis. Products supported must be predominantly grown or manufactured in the United States.

MPP does support small farmers and small business. To the contrary, small businesses accounted for 84 percent of the 287 participants in the MPP fiscal year 1992.

In addition to these existing requirements, the committee has included report language steering the program to concentrate, to an even greater extent, on small- and medium-sized businesses, and new-to-export participants. Further, the committee report supports requiring larger companies to provide matching funds in exess of 50 percent.

This program has been implemented under previous administrations with a great deal of success. I acknowledge that improvements can be made to the program and rather than eliminate it entirely, I would ask the gentleman to give the new administration the opportunity to make improvements in the MPP before we cast it aside.

THE CALIFORNIA PRUNE INDUSTRY

The California prune industry has been a real success story in export markets. They attribute their success to the marketing assistance programs sponsored by the USDA.

Since 1986, when a marketing assistance program—the Targeted Export Assistance Program—was first established under the 1985 farm bill, the value of prune exports has increased by 65 percent to $135 million in fiscal year 1992.

In my district in Tehama County, we have 9,000 acres of prunes grown by 200 to 250 farmers who employ anywhere from 1 to 30 people. These people are not large corporations. They are small growers who represent one thriving industry in a county that has 15 percent unemployment.

California prunes would not be where they are today without MPP assistance. Exports are their life blood, and current projects suggest that current efforts in support of prune exports, including MPP, will break the $200 million export value mark by the end of this decade.

MCDONALD'S EXAMPLE

Many Members have used the McDonald's example as evidence of abuse and corporate welfare in MPP. I think members simply do not understand how the MPP works.

The purpose of the Market Promotion Program is to open up new markets for U.S. agricultural products overseas. As everyone knows, McDonald's has thousands of stores overseas. At the same time, these stores are not required to purchase U.S. products, and in many cases they do not.

McDonald's has 42 stores in Singapore and 59 stores in Hong Kong. Even though McDonald's has its own poultry processing plant in Malaysia, all 101 stores in Hong Kong and Singapore use only U.S. poultry and egg products. Why? Because of the MPP.

U.S. poultry exporters were able to use MPP funds as leverage to require McDonald's stores in Singapore and Hong Kong to buy U.S. poultry products. MPP was used to advertise jointly McDonald's Chicken McNuggets and the U.S. poultry industry. As a consequence of McDonald's accepting this advertising arrangement, which used MPP funds, the American poultry industry locked these stores into buying U.S. products for one year.

These 101 stores bought over 12 million dollars' worth of U.S. poultry products in 1991, which supported over 3,780 American jobs. This growth started from zero American sales in both markets just 3 years earlier.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLEY].

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Armey amendment. This amendment would eliminate funding for the Market Promotion Program [MPP]. I believe that the MPP is one of the most successful programs administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture [USDA].

The population of the United States will increase by 30 million over the next 20 years, at the same time the world population will increase by 2 billion. Clearly, we must gain access to this huge world market in order to remain competitive. We can do that through trade agreements and export assistance programs, such as the MPP.

I am a strong supporter of the Market Promotion Program [MPP] and believe that we should be directing more Federal resources toward this type of program and away from prices- and income-support farm programs. The future success of American agriculture lies in our ability to compete in international markets. That is why I am a strong supporter of export assistance programs, the North American Free-Trade Agreement, the GATT talks and the President's work with Japan.

The MPP, originally the Targeted Export Assistance [TEA] Program, was created to provide assistance to agricultural commodities facing unfair trade barriers. The program was very successful and many commodity groups used the program funds to break into difficult markets, such as Japan. In 1990, Congress expanded the TEA program, renamed it the Market Promotion Program, and allowed a wider range of commodity groups to apply for funding. However, commodities facing unfair trade practices are given higher priority for funding.

The Market Promotion Program has been extremely successful in meeting its goals of creating, expanding, and maintaining export markets. The USDA estimates that each dollar of MPP funding results in an increase in agricultural product exports of between $2 and $7.

Let me give the Members a real-life example of the positive results from the MPP. The California Table Grape Commission provided me with information regarding their experience with

the MPP and the Targeted Export Assistance [TEA] Program. During the 6 years that they have participated in the program:

Offshore exports have grown 208 percent, from 2.5 million boxes to nearly 8 million boxes of grapes.

Export value has increased 233 percent, from $28 million to $93 million.

The industry has established a new record for grape exports each year of its participation in TEA and MPP, despite fluctuations in crop size, grape quality, market conditions, price, and other factors.

Clearly, the funds awarded to the Table Grape Commission have been successfully used to expand markets.

Congressman ARMEY has consistently criticized the use of MPP funds for branded advertising. MPP funding is awarded to commodity groups or cooperatives and not to corporations. While many commodity groups work with large corporations, the companies themselves do not apply for funding. The goal of the program, to promote U.S. agricultural commodities, is being met by using established and trusted brand-named products. Even more importantly, the American farmers who grow the commodities have benefited.

A good example of the use of a branded promotion program to increase the sales of a U.S. commodity is the California wine industry. Wineries in California only own about 12 percent of the wine grapes crushed each year, the remaining 88 percent is purchased under contract from thousands of grape growers. Increased sale of wine benefits each and every one of these farmers. Without MPP and the ability for wineries to participate in the program, these farmers would not be able to increase the export of their product. The wine industry must compete with a European wine industry that receives over $2 million in subsidies each year. Prior to the TEA program the U.S. wine industry was unable to mount serious promotion effort in any foreign market because of these subsidies.

Mr. Chairman, it would be a mistake to allow the vocal critics of the MPP to eliminate this successful program based on a few newspaper articles or isolated cases of poor judgment. I urge my colleagues to oppose the Armey amendment and continue to support a program that directly addresses the unfair trade practices facing American farmers in the international market.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS].

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, the largest single agricultural sale in the history of our country was that where we were able to sell to the Soviet Union *x* thousands, millions, and billions of dollars' worth of grain. The second largest was the one that preceded it. All of that was accomplished without one penny of investment or taxpayers' money in advertising of product that was there for the world to see.

In short, what we want to do with our agricultural products is simply expose them to the world. We do not need to subsidize advertisement thereof. Everyone knows that the United States is the breadbasket of the world and nothing more needs to be advertised than the product itself.

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

Mr. GEKAS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, as a Representative from the breadbasket, there is a big difference between raw commodities, which are the wheat sales to the Soviet Union; processed foods; specialty crops; value-added crops, all of the exports we are talking about with the promotion program.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, seizing back my time, it is an example of a tremendous sale without the need for advertisement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. DURBIN. Would the Chairman be able to tell us the amount of time remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] has 2½ minutes remaining, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] has 5½ minutes remaining, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] has 7½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Utah [Ms. SHEPHERD].

Ms. SHEPHERD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Armey amendment to strike funding for the Market Promotion Program. I do this with reluctance because of my great respect for the judgment of Chairman DURBIN and this program's many supporters.

I support this amendment for two reasons. First, the Market Promotion Program is simply fueling the cynicism of American taxpayers. It has been the pariah of newspaper columnists and television newsmagazines for months, and it has become a lightning rod striking at a massive sense of unfairness our constituents feel. The good it does cannot possibly compensate for the citizen cynicism it fuels.

Second, and more important, the Market Promotion Program is simply bad policy. While the Federal Government has a legitimate role in promoting exports for American companies, we should accomplish that goal through technical assistance and by helping companies navigate through the labyrinth of foreign bureaucracies and international trade rules. We should not do it by subsidizing corporations for activities which they should and can do for themselves. Finally, nonagricultural products account for 90 percent of U.S. exports, but only 10 percent of the Federal Government's export promotion funds. The priority given to the MPP is simply unwarranted in today's fiscal climate.

The Market Promotion Program makes no economic sense, and it certainly does not make sense to taxpayers, so I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER].

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard some wonderful things about the Market Promotion Program, and I do not doubt that they are true. If they are as true as I think they are, then it makes sense to continue the program, but to fund it privately.

If we are causing a great increase in the sales of the commodities that are being promoted, then it is in the interest of the bottom line of every one of the exporting companies to fund this program themselves. American industry, American farmers, producers and processors fund billions and billions of dollars' worth of marketing in this country because it redounds to their benefit and goes right to their bottom line. Why the Federal Government should do something that private enterprise can do perfectly well for itself escapes me.

It is a good program, but it is not appropriately a Federal program. That is why we should support the Armey amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Arkansas [Ms. LAMBERT].

Ms. LAMBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge my colleagues to oppose Representative ARMEY's amendment to eliminate funding for the Market Promotion Program.

Based on all the media reports and overblown rhetoric, I can understand why some Members may be skeptical about this program, but let me tell you how U.S. production agriculture has benefitted from the MPP.

I represent a district that is largely agricultural and grows more rice than any other district in the Nation as well as a large percentage of the Nation's cotton.

Through the MPP, United States rice has increased market share in Turkey, Saudi Arabia, and managed to maintain a presence in the European Community, where they subsidize market promotion at nine times the rate that we do.

United States cotton has benefited as well, making noticeable increases in the Japanese market. Increased exports of these commodities and others

contribute to agriculture's positive trade balance, boost farm income, and helps to maintain a U.S. presence in vital foreign markets. The objective of farm policy is to increase farm income through fair competition and market access—the MPP has been effective in this area.

In addition, Members should be aware that MPP funding was cut by $50 million last year and frozen at that level this year. Also, the House Agriculture Committee is reviewing proposals to improve this program.

This year we cut farm programs by $3 billion. If Government intends to continue reduction of farm program payments at the same time that foreign competitors are increasing theirs—then we have a responsibility to help them increase market share and combat unfair trade practices. The MPP has been crucial in this area. Please vote "no" on the Armey amendment.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. INGLIS].

□ 2020

Mr. INGLIS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time and rise in strong support of the Armey amendment to delete funding for this program because I believe, as one of the earlier speakers said, this does very much fuel the cynicism of our constituents to this kind of program.

What I would like to point out tonight is if you take this program and apply an assumption of a 7-percent interest rate to it, in the first year you have interest of $10.29 million, and over a 30-year amortization of this program, in 1 year this program will cost the American people $456.4 million in order to fund this, because the fact is we do not have the $147-some-odd million to fund this program. We are in deficit spending, so part of this we have to assume naturally comes out of that deficit. That means we go out and borrow it.

If we apply a reasonable interest rate of 7 percent over 30 years, this 1 year costs the American people $456 million.

The question I would ask all Members is do they really think that subsidizing Sunkist sales of lemon around the world is justified to the tune of $456 million for the American family to pay for that kind of subsidy for this 1 year, amortized again over 30 years at a rate of 7 percent?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

I think we are misguided here all of a sudden. We are talking about large companies. Why do we not talk about what this is all about really? We are talking about needy farmers.

Who do Members think benefit from the purchases of McDonald's potatoes? Is it someone in Bangkok? Who would sell American potatoes in Bangkok if it were not McDonald's?

We are talking about helping agriculture, and it works.

Simply this: For every dollar spent we are returned $7.

Two examples very quickly. First, the pear program. We are selling pears in 27 countries now around the world. In 1992 the pear export value was $43 million. And we used $1.1 million of market promotion money. That is a $34 to $1 return.

Wood products. In 1986 when we started market promotion, we had $2.65 billion of exports of wood products. In 1992 we had $6.74 billion. You think it is not working? It is working. It is a minimal amount of money.

This is a Hobson's choice for me. We ought to be at $200 million. The only other agencies of Government that make any money for us are the IRS, the Forest Service, and the Market Promotion Program.

If you come from an agricultural State you must support at least the Durbin program, you must do that because it works, it pays, and it is beneficial to needy farmers in America.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SMITH], asks us to believe that American pears would not survive in the world market unless they were the beneficiaries of the Market Promotion Program. He further asks us to believe that American pear exporters would not have the business sense to market their pears without a Government subsidy.

Mr. Chairman, if our pear exporters had no more business sense than that, they ought to repair themselves from the pear exporting business.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding the time. I must say it is very rare that I take the well on the same side as the gentleman from Texas. But it is frequent that I take the side of the gentleman from New York, so here I am, encouraging everyone to give the taxpayer a break and vote no, yes, yes.

I think we have got a very excellent example here of corporate welfare, and that is what we ought to call it. They do their own promotion at home. There is nothing wrong with doing promotion overseas. My guess is most of the increase in sales, more of it comes from the falling of the dollar than anything else.

I think it is very important that we say to these large corporate folks that it is time that they do this themselves. They do it here. Of course they can do it. They are geniuses at doing it.

But I think the interesting thing for this body to keep clearly in mind is that they are going to have two choices. If they do not want to totally zero out the program, them Members can certainly go with the Schumer amendment which says you cut it in half, and you do not give funding to corporations who hire more than 500 people. Corporations hiring more than 500 people are not ma and pa farms. They are probably not growing pears. What are they? They are very large corporate giants.

I love the way we always do this in the name of saving the family farmer, and we get out the violins, and we do everything. But this is their corporate sponsor. If you figured all of these things that they were selling overseas and what percentage of it ever got to the farmer, it is micro-mini. They are doing this because there is big profits in it. They are going to do this if we do not give them this money, because they certainly are not going to give up the kind of money they can get in these huge export markets.

The gentleman from New York, Mr. SCHUMER, cuts out the huge multinationals that are feeding at this trough. So if you only want to go halfway, go that way.

But I think you should vote no, yes, yes, and give the taxpayer a break.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from Indiana was going to yield 1 minute of his time to me for purposes of controlling the time.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. DURBIN] and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control that time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT].

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Market Promotion Program [MPP]. Contrary to popular belief by some members of this body, MPP is one of the most effective trade programs at the Department of Agriculture. By eliminating the Market Promotion Program, Congress will be sending a message to Americans and American business that we can do without $1.4 billion in exports generated by this important program.

The Market Promotion Program is designed to assist in the promotion of U.S. agricultural products. This program promotes American food and American farm products, not individual company names. By making foreign consumers aware of the quality and competitive price of U.S. food and agricultural products, U.S. exporters can penetrate markets barriers that have been difficult to break down.

For the United States to be successful in foreign markets, two things are

required. First, the U.S. industry must be economically competitive, and we are. Second, our trade policies and programs must also be competitive, and this is where we fail. It is a fact that for American farmers to compete and maintain profitability in a global market, the U.S. must promote its agriculture products abroad. However, U.S. producers often find themselves competing not with their foreign agriculture counterparts but with foreign governments. The European Community for example, subsidizes their wine industry $2 billion annually, the government of France spends $229 million on the promotion of agriculture products and the Australian Government contributes $226 million to promote agriculture products such as dairy, wine, brandy, and processed meats.

By eliminating funding for the Market Promotion Program you will be sending a message to the American farmers that what is appropriate in another country may not be appropriate in this country. Congress will be saying that you can go out on your own and compete in a world market against foreign governments and fend for yourselves. If United States is serious about establishing fair trade and has the political resolve to establish its position in world trade, the Market Promotion Program is the right vehicle to use.

Any diminishing support for major export initiatives such as the MPP that are put in place to demonstrate U.S. determination regarding agricultural trade reform will be interpreted as a weakening in American support. A reduction in financial support for MPP would be a clear signal to the European Community, and others that their best strategy would be to wait for further erosion in U.S. trade position. We must continue the expansion of U.S. agricultural exports or we will fail as the bread basket of the world.

To those of you who intend on voting for the Armey amendment in the name of deficit reduction, I tell you this is not the case. If we are going to improve our economy, we need to support programs that improve our balance of trade. The MPP is one program that has a proven track record in doing so. Let us be clear on the ramifications of this amendment. This amendment will increase our trade deficit, as well as our budget deficit. If you vote for this amendment, you are turning your backs on American farmers and a successful program. I am sick and tired of this body turning its back on our people.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume on this tragic battle of brother against brother, friend against friend, and roommate against roommate. It is a sad day here.

I rise to join my colleagues, Mr. ARMEY, Mrs. SCHROEDER, and Mr. MACHTLEY in urging a significant cut in the program.

To explain again, Schumer-Machtley cuts funding by $57.7 million, a reduction of 40 percent from last year's level, and that amount represents all of the money in MPP grants that have gone to large corporations, both domestic and foreign, those with over 500 employees.

All of us, Mr. ARMEY, Mrs. SCHROEDER, myself, Mr. MACHTLEY, urge a no, yes, yes vote.

I have been a long-time critic of the program, and I have worked with DICK ARMEY on many occasions to cut funding. The reason Mr. MACHTLEY and I offered this substitute, with the support of Mr. ARMEY, is not because we feel that the amendment is too Draconian, but because the substitute amendment has the best chance of passing.

□ 2030

The program began in 1985 as the TEA program, Targeted Export Assistance, and it was so badly mismanaged and unfocused that its name was changed to MPP, but a rose by any other name is a rose, and a lemon by any other name is still a lemon, and I say to my colleagues that this is a lemon.

With all the priorities we have and all the cuts that we have had to make, do we want to subsidize big business to advertise when they are already spending their own money? Do we want to subsidize Sunkist and Mars and McDonald's and Tyson's and Pillsbury and Dole's and Fruit of the Loom, Ocean Spray? Of course not.

So I say to my colleagues that I have nothing against McDonald's or any of the other blue-chip companies that have received grants, but it seems odd to me that corporations which grace the pages of Fortune magazine are receiving Government grants under a misguided assumption that they cannot afford to market their products overseas without special taxpayer help. In fact, in 1992, 13 of the corporations that received MPP grants already had advertising budgets in excess of $45 million, and MPP just keeps giving these grants away, more and more and more.

Over the 7-year life of MPP since we started to try and cut the program, Sunkist has received $67 million, Blue Diamond $36 million, Gallo $16 million, M&M, Mars, $4 million, and the list goes on and on. One-third of the grants went to corporations of 500 employees, $17 million to foreign-owned corporations.

The amendment that I have offered with the gentleman from Rhode Island cuts out the amount of those, not the little farmers who get it, but the big agribusiness companies that do.

In 1989, here is an example, here is a good example of how this program works, get this, in 1989 MPP awarded $3 million to the California Raisin Advisory Board to market and sell raisins in Japan. What a fiasco. The Raisin Board had the highly successful American Claymation Quartet of dancing raisins on Japanese TV. However, the raisins sang in English, because, as it turns out, the ads are not bilingual. Unlike most campaigns, these ads were not tested before they were aired, but just were put on during the campaign. They discovered, as they ran the ads, that children, the Japanese children, did not understand the dancing raisins who were babbling in a foreign tongue, and they frightened children. Because the raisins were singing in English, viewers could not tell that they were raisins, and most Japanese viewers thought they were dancing potatoes or dancing chocolates.

This is what we subsidize with your taxpayers' money.

Maybe if the Raisin Board were spending all of their money on this instead of getting a subsidy to help them, the ad campaign would have been better researched.

In closing, let me quickly list some of the other problems with this program. First, the same corporations get the grants from MPP every year. Second, the Department of Agriculture has still, after all of these years of criticism, not developed criteria to determine if MPP's funds are well spent. MPP does not know if the companies actually need the money, and it is said that this program was originated, because in the Ag Committee, the wheat farmers were getting theirs, the cotton farmers were getting theirs, but there were certain people, particularly in the fruit and vegetable industry, who were not getting any subsidy, so they came up with a subsidy still today in search of a rationale.

For these reasons, I urge a no, yes, yes vote, as does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER], the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. MACHTLEY]; no on Durbin, yes on Schumer, yes on Armey. We can save the taxpayers significant money, and not hurting the little farmer, but yet stopping these subsidies to agribusiness at a time when we have a huge deficit. We can do no less.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from downtown New York City does not understand that a lot of these farmers——

Mr. SCHUMER. I take back my time. I would say to the gentleman that those remarks were often made by a former Member from Montana. He always called me the gentleman from New York City, and I did not appreciate it.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that however the Armey amendment is amended, the Members should vote against it. If we want a viable agriculture in this country, we need a strong export marketing program. If the MPP needs changes to make it more effective and efficient, make the changes, do not scrap a program that is working well and can do better. Vote "Yes"—"Yes"—"No."

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Durbin amendment and against the Armey and other amendments.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR].

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Durbin amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. PASTOR].

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the Durbin amendment.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, this Member rises in strong opposition to amendments which would eliminate or radically reduce funding for the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Market Promotion Program [MPP].

If the other agricultural producing nations of the world did not grossly and unfairly subsidize the production and sale of agricultural products, this Member would be more than willing to support the distinguished gentleman from Texas' amendment. Unfortunately, free and fair trade does not exist in world agricultural trade. Even with the Market Promotion Program, U.S. producers are being badly out-subsidized by their competitors, including some of the very aggressive member countries of the European Community, which in 1990 spent a total of nearly $1.5 billion in promoting high-value agricultural products throughout the world, and that figure is separate from their export subsidies for food and other agricultural products.

Mr. Chairman, competition for agricultural markets in bulk commodities, intermediate, and high-value products is a high-stakes battle for good-paying jobs here in the United States in part, because of agricultural export programs like MPP, the U.S. agricultural industry currently enjoys an $18 billion trade surplus. With the help of the MPP, U.S. high-value agricultural exports have expanded by 75 percent over 7 years. However, this incredible growth and even the current export level cannot be guaranteed in the face of stiff competition from other nations. If the United States unilaterally abolishes our agricultural export promotion efforts, agriculture—like many other U.S. industries—could add to, rather than subtract from, our chronic trade deficits.

Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, MPP is an important export tool and a good lesson for other export related industries; MPP enables our agricultural industry to sell directly to the consumers of some of the world's most protected markets. In Taiwan and Korea for example, MPP circumvents a host of trade barriers by creating consumer demand for United States products. This foreign consumer demand in turn leads to a relaxation and reform of the tariff and nontariff barriers which deny consumers in those countries access to U.S. exports.

This Member acknowledges that MPP is not perfect and agrees that certain reform of the MPP is necessary to ensure that it does not allow Federal dollars to replace rather than augment private sector market development efforts. Nevertheless, as the General Accounting Office suggests in its June audit of the program, while reform of the program may be necessary, elimination of the program could substantially affect our ability to compete for lucrative and emerging markets throughout the world.

Mr. Chairman, this Member urges his colleagues to vote "no" against the Armey amendment. If we choose to learn from and improve this important agricultural export promotion program, it could indeed become an excellent model for export promotion efforts in other industries as well.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, on that point, I appreciate what the gentleman has said about the use of this program to open up access to a market, and that is really the more appropriate use, and I would like to see the program better designed to focus on that. Perhaps if we can adapt the $20 million cut proposed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], it will send a signal to the industry to work with us for that kind of reform in the program to make it target more efficiently on those problems.

Mr. BEREUTER. I urge support of the Durbin amendment.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS], the ranking Republican on the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Durbin amendment and in opposition to the amendments offered by the instantly and self-declared Secretaries of Agriculture, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

The Market Promotion Program has come in for more than its fair share of unfair criticism from the press and self-appointed critics who do not understand the benefits that the program brings to this country.

The $147.7 million appropriated last year for MPP supported the expansion of exports for over one hundred varieties of U.S. fresh and processed agricultural commodities. These export efforts include small-scale regional organizations' efforts to enter the export market.

USDA estimates that MPP adds about $2.2 billion in additional economic activity for the U.S. economy and directly supports 38,000 jobs on and off the farm. This comes out to about $4,000 per job. Compare that to the tens of thousands per job contemplated in the President's job creation stimulus package. According to USDA for every $1 spent on MPP, sales of U.S. agriculture products increased from $2 to $7.

Our agricultural exports, which are carrying $17 billion annual balance of trade surplus, are operating in a highly competitive environment. The EC is spending nearly $1.5 billion to subsidize the export of similar fresh and processed foods. The MPP, at less than 10 percent of the EC subsidy level, is the lever needed to keep out successful agricultural exports viable in a highly subsidized marketplace.

The regulations governing the MPP have been tightened in recent years, and the subcommittee of jurisdiction on the Agriculture Committee is now considering the value of several further reform proposals.

If the United States can afford to throw away over $2 billion in export sales and the loss of tens of thousands of jobs, then the House should vote for this meat ax approach to legislative reform. If, however, you believe that we should be strengthening our exports and the growth of domestic jobs, should vote against this ill-conceived amendment and let any necessary reform come from careful deliberation.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Chairman, this committee recognized that there were some problems with the MPP. We spent considerable time on the Foreign Agricultural Service, but we also recognize that this has been the best program for export of agricultural products we have had.

The criticisms have been against big corporations. The Members here have not realized that they are manufacturers or processors, and they are going to do business in these countries already. They are going to buy the raw products for somebody else in the world. The only way they get this money is to buy from American producers, American farmers, American ranchers. This is what helps American farmers is to give the money here to the MPP.

You are missing the vote here if you vote for the last two amendments. Support our chairman. It is the right thing to do to help farmers.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEHMAN].

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I cannot believe what I am hearing on this floor.

Agriculture is one of the few things in this country that actually has a trade surplus. This program is one of the reasons for it. Do away with this program and you start turning things the other way immediately.

Let me tell you something else: I am tired of hearing the talk on this floor that this is protecting a bunch of big farmers. Yes, there are some big farmers, but what some people on this floor are attempting is to destroy this program by tying everybody up in that little ball and saying that is what is wrong. Most of the people who benefit from this program are little guys. Most of them are living on the edge just like everyone else in this country. This program keeps them afloat. It is good for this country and the balance of trade. Let us keep it.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Market Promotion Program and to oppose the Armey amendment which seeks to eliminate funding for this program.

As we know, the Market Promotion Program [MPP] provides funding to trade groups to help promote American farm goods overseas. The program has breathed new life into a variety of agricultural exports, including many from California such as walnuts, raisins, citrus, and almonds that do not get the bulk of farm support provided in this country. A major goal of MPP is to promote quality U.S. products abroad by establishing and expanding markets for U.S. goods. In fact, 80 percent of MPP funds are used to promote high-value agricultural products, which create jobs and revenue for our Nation. This program has been highly effective in promoting U.S. agriculture products in foreign markets. The U.S. Department of Agriculture estimates that for every $1 of promotional assistance, between $2 and $7 is returned.

The program has been criticized for giving Government subsidies to large corporations. The purpose of MPP is to promote U.S. agricultural products overseas. Large corporations, with their highly visible brand names, are able to establish positions of strength in foreign markets. This position of strength in turn allows the small farmers to enter into the market which they would not have been able to enter into otherwise. Without programs such as MPP, even large corporations would be at an unfair disadvantage to the trading practices of other countries. U.S. companies would find themselves competing against foreign governments such as the European Community which for example, subsidize their wine industry at $2 billion annually. In order to level the playing field for U.S. companies to compete in the world markets, we need to promote programs such as MPP.

I ask my colleagues to recognize the significant value this program offers and the proven effectiveness of its operation. Let's put competitiveness first and allow this program to continue to offer the same outstanding return for investment it has in the past. While some improvements may be warranted, the program should be given the credit it has earned, and its success should not be rewarded by creating barriers that inhibit it. In this competitive environment, we need to preserve whatever tools we have available that will promote a level playing field and spur economic production in this country.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO].

□ 2040

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, in this age of $300 billion deficits, we have a Government program of $147,734,000 additional that is flying under false pretenses and false colors. The program is masqueraded as a program of support for American farmers.

But as we have demonstrated here tonight, it is a program of corporate welfare, with such beneficiaries of the program as McDonald's Corp., and others, all of whom have overseas advertising budgets of their own, more than sufficient to buy this entire Government program.

These large corporate giants do not need the scarce advertising dollars of American taxpayers, even the tax dollars of those small farmers who the pretension is that this program serves, to subsidize the advertising budgets of large corporations and agribusiness.

I have brought forth an amendment, which is a thoroughgoing amendment that would reduce this charade down to $1 to the American taxpayers. If you are thorough in your understanding of how unnecessary this program is and your desire to eliminate it, save your vote for the Armey amendment.

Mr. SCHUMER and Mr. MACHTLEY have offered a responsible amendment that says pare down the charade by $57,734,000, and spend only $90 million of the taxpayers' money in support of the advertising budgets of these large megacorporations. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], who also has reservations about the program, as does this President and our previous President, the CBO and the GAO, is more timid. He says let's give them a little message, let us cut their $147 million budget by a scant $20 million. If you are timid, if you lack resolve, if you do not understand or if you do not care, vote for the Durbin amendment. I would suggest that most of my colleagues will quite rightfully vote "no" on Durbin and save their effort to vote "yes" on Schumer/Machtley and then subsequently "yes" on Armey.

If we cannot begin the process of deficit repair by ending or at least substantially cutting these programs that are a charade, that fly under false colors, that do not benefit those whom they purport to benefit and in fact tax those very same people to benefit people whose own advertising budget is more than enough to buy the program, we cannot begin.

Vote "no" on Durbin, "yes" on Schumer, "yes" on Armey. Do the right thing by your children.

I thank my colleagues for their many fine accolades this evening.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I thank the gentleman. I would just reiterate the comments of my colleague from Texas [Mr. ARMEY]. The bottom line here is not whether this money might do a little good in some extreme sense but whether at a time when we are cutting so many other things and debating whether we have enough money for vital necessities, if we can afford to spend the kind of money we are on subsidizing big corporations to advertise abroad; according to the GAO, which has done numerous studies, there is no bang for the buck here. It has never been proven in any way that the advertising actually increases sales, et cetera. The Schumer amendment eliminates it for big corporations, the Armey amendment for all of them.

I join my colleague from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] and the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] and the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. MACHTLEY] in urging a "no yes yes" vote.

If you are serious about deficit reduction, this is an easy vote.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Durbin amendment.

Since its inception, the Market Promotion Program [MPP] has been essential in helping U.S. agriculture build, maintain, and expand overseas markets for many agricultural commodities, especially high-value products, and countering unfair and often subsidized foreign completion. MPP has also contributed to agriculture's positive trade balance, generated billions of dollars in economic activity, and created thousands of additional jobs. It has also been extremely cost-effective

The program has been administered on a cost-shared basis with participants required to contribute their own resources and efforts. Available funds have been more than matched by producers and their associations, cooperatives and other organizations. As such it has been one of the best examples of what an effective public-private partnership can achieve.

Some important facts to consider about MPP: has increased U.S. agriculture exports as much as $1.4 billion annually or more; export of high-value products have nearly doubled since program began; generated nearly $2.2 billion in increase economic activity; created an additional 38,000 tax-paying jobs largely in the food processing, manufacturing, and transportation sectors; it has helped generate over $250 million in additional Federal tax revenues more than offsetting its current cost of $147.7 million.

In 1992, the EC spent nearly 5 times as much as the United States to encourage agricultural production and to protect and increase its share of the world market.

While U.S. agriculture still remains at a disadvantage, MPP has helped counter this unfair competition. It has also helped United

States efforts to reduce trade barriers by creating increased consumer awareness and demand for United States agricultural commodities within selected countries, such as Japan.

Eliminating MPP would cripple U.S. agriculture's marketing efforts overseas and reverse the gains made in recent years.

Overseas markets cannot be maintained in the face of intense government subsidized foreign competition without a long term commitment with respect to U.S. policy.

Now is not the time for the United States, particularly with ongoing GATT negotiations, to retreat in its efforts to meet such competition and achieve a more level playing field for U.S. agriculture.

For all these reasons, I urge the members to continue to support the Market Promotion Program.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remaining time.

Mr. Chairman, this has been a good, important, and timely debate, but I urge the Members of the House to wake up to the reality of what American exporters are facing. We are now losing our shirts to European exporters because they are getting governmental assistance to invade markets where we want to sell American products, American agricultural products that help farmers, American high-value products that employ people in your districts.

I urge you, do not toss out the market promotion program; join with us in reforming it. If you want to cut the program but not kill it, your vote is "yes-yes-yes." "Si, si, si; oui, oui, oui; yes, yes, yes, cut the program, don't kill it."

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, there has been some discussion here that on the vote for Durbin and "no-no," if Durbin passes, his was an amendment to a substitute offered by Mr. SCHUMER. Am I correct?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Then there would be no vote on Schumer except as amended by Mr. DURBIN?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. SCHUMER'S was a substitute for——

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. ARMEY'S amendment.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. So there would be no vote on Armey. Am I correct? Because you are not going to vote on it if Durbin passes.

The CHAIRMAN. There would be a vote on Armey, as amended by Schumer, as amended by Durbin.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. But it will be a vote on Durbin all the way, so you have the same vote.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct, which would result——

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, if I want to vote to leave the program as it is without any cuts, am I correct that we vote "no" on Armey, as amended, or substituted?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry. The Chair thinks it is obvious to every Member what needs to be done to defeat all of these amendments. So that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

For what purpose does the gentleman from California rise?

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. THOMAS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Thomas of California moves that the committee now rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be striken out.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] has offered a preferential motion, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] has risen in opposition.

The gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] will be recognized for 5 minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to take this time to put in focus the discussion that we have just been through.

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

Mr. THOMAS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CANADY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas which would eliminate the Market Promotion Program—a program which is essential to expanding markets for American agricultural products around the world.

If we pass this amendment we will strike a blow against American agricultural producers who are struggling to sell their products in countries that have erected numerous barriers to American agricultural products.

A vote for this amendment is a vote to keep American agriculture at a disadvantage in foreign markets.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out in particular that the Market Promotion has given the Florida citrus industry the opportunity to penetrate foreign markets that have traditionally been closed to our products.

Every $1 million in MPP support to the Florida citrus industry translates to over $3 million in exports and over $6 million in the generation of additional economic activity.

The Market Promotion Program is the one program that helps level the playing field for Florida citrus producers and others in foreign markets.

As we consider this amendment, we need to keep in mind that the European Economic Community in 1992 spent nearly five time as much as the United States to support agricultural production, and to increase the European share of the world market.

The Market Promotion Program is essential to counter such efforts abroad.

I urge all my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Chairman, most of this discussion has focused on some colorful use of agricultural words, used as pejoratives.

To a certain extent, the debate has turned on a GAO study on the market promotion program. The title of this very short study is "Effectiveness of Market Promotion Program Remains Unclear." The basis of that analysis was five case studies in the Japanese market.

What you need to know, for example, is that that case study did not cover pistachios.

Now, about 500 growers produce all of the pistachios in the United States; 100 percent of the market promotion money is spent generically in promoting pistachios. In Japan they have gone from a 10-percent penetration to a 24-percent penetration of the market. So what? Who is the primary competitor around the world to American pistachios? Iran. Iran spends hundreds of millions of dollars subsidizing the sale of their pistachios.

□ 2050

If we do use the market promotion program to assist pistachio growers, the subsidized Iranian pistachios blow them out of the marketplace. That was not commented on by the folks who want to look at the so-called corporate giants.

How about avocados? My friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania said that we do not need to tell people what to do with food products. Everybody knows what wheat is.

I have to tell you, there are a number of folks who do not know what avocados are or how to eat them, and that is true of a number of specialty agricultural products.

When the Agricultural Commission began its market promotion in Japan, 100 percent of the money spent on generically promoting avocados, there was zero understanding of what avocados were, zero sales of avocados. Today 5 million pounds of avocados are sold in Japan and there is a 98-percent understanding of what an avocado is in the greater Tokyo market where the penetration has been.

You may snicker at a comment like that, but it is a positive balance of payments that was not there before.

A number of specialty agricultural products are moved in this fashion.

You talked about support of Gallo. Over 50 percent of the wine exported is

by Gallo, the $16 million spent on behalf of the wine industry, not just California but all over the United States, is up against the European community subsidies of their wine sales worldwide of $2 billion.

Now, sure, we should complain about their $2 billion, but what we should not do is unilaterally disarm in this fight for markets around the world.

One of the criticisms from the GAO is that there is no requirement for small or medium businesses. This is not a business program. It is not under the Department of Commerce. It is to move agricultural products.

Let me tell you, if you want to sell eggs in Japan, you do it through a cooperative promotion with McDonald's on Egg McMuffins. That is how you move agricultural products.

And by the way, there is no requirement for small businesses. But over 80 percent of businesses in this program are under 500 employees.

Some of the companies that were not mentioned by the cynics, small Vermont maple syrup producers, Maine lobstersmen, Ben & Jerry's.

How about Newman's Own? When you read their products, they say every penny raised goes to charity.

We are moving those products to the market through the market promotion program.

No foreign companies are banned from the program. The opponents talk about 30 percent of the companies being foreign firms, What they haven't told you is that 95 percent of them are in four products: cotton, rice, soybeans, and peanuts, products that are used in the production of other products. Over 200 of these companies use U.S. cotton to create clothing.

If you can move the Japanese to produce underwear that increases from 30 percent cotton to 90 percent cotton content, one, they do not squirm as much, and two, we are moving U.S. product, U.S. cotton. That is what we are supposed to be doing. Our job is to move high-value products.

Now, under this program $147 million gets you $2.2 billion. We should be doing more of this not less.

The President has said, "I want this program to be funded at $148 million."

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] has said that we will trim $20 million.

Please, do not in your ecstasy of having fun with this program destroy it by voting for the Armey amendment.

Do not vote to kill the program by striking the funds in the Armey amendment. If you must, vote for the shot across the bow represented by the Durbin amendment.

We have had our fun. Now let us get serious. This is a positive program that promotes U.S. products. Please support it with your vote.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. If I understand that correctly, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California has offered a motion to rise, which I am now speaking against?

The CHAIRMAN. To strike the enacting clause, the gentleman's motion is that the Committee rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation to strike the enacting clause. It is a preferential motion, and for that reason he was recognized.

Mr. DURBIN. Well, Mr. Chairman, I certainly oppose the motion offered by the gentleman from California.

I would like to say in closing, those who want to cut the market promotion program and not kill it should vote yes, yes, yes.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, with a motion to strike the enacting clause, if we were to rise, we would strike this entire bill, is that not correct?

The CHAIRMAN. If the House ratified the motion, it would strike the entire bill. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ARMEY. So if we vote yes on this motion—

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee would rise, and then in the House vote on the recommendation to strike the enacting clause.

Mr. ARMEY. That is correct, but if we should pass the motion to rise, we would in fact kill this entire bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ARMEY. We would thereby have won for ourselves the opportunity to do this whole thing over again.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from California for his generosity.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my preferential motion.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion is withdrawn.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, my inquiry is that we now return to the procedure by which we will have a vote first on the Durbin amendment to the Schumer (and Machtley) amendment for the Armey amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. ARMEY. And this then is the procedure we will follow?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. ARMEY. There will be three votes.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, as a Member who is a student of the rules of the House, I am a little confused on just what the procedure is.

I think I heard my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] say that if you want to save as much of the program as you can, you would vote yes, yes, no.

Therefore, I guess conversely the most draconian cut would be to vote no, no, yes. Is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct, while that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SOLOMON. That is what I thought, Mr. Chairman, and I thank the Chair.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY]. The Marketing Promotion Program [MPP] is nothing but a welfare handout for the rich.

I have frequently said that big Government really helps only the bureaucrats who work for it and big business. I find it ridiculous that we are giving hundreds of millions of taxpayers dollars to mega-corporations like Pillsbury, Sunkist, Gallo wines, Dole, Nabisco, Quaker Oats, Burger King, Welch's, Ocean Spray, Hershey, M&M Mars, Del Monte, and many others.

Mr. Chairman, this is money spent for advertising overseas. It is surely something we cannot afford when our Government is broke and over $4 trillion in debt.

When Government gets too big, only big businesses are able to comply with all the rules, regulations, red tape, and qualify for all the lucrative Government contracts.

These programs also benefit bureaucrats with larger staffs, and offices, and more paper work and power to justify their existence.

Mr. Chairman, in the end Government benefits primarily the wealthy and those with power and influence. This is the true legacy of liberalism, welfare for the rich.

The small businesses which are able to survive get the leftover crumbs while the taxpayers get the shaft.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 2(c) of rule XXIII, the Chair will reduce

to not less than 5 minutes the time for any recorded vote that may be requested on the other pending amendments, without intervening business or debate.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 330, noes 101, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 296]

AYES—330

Abercrombie
Allard
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Bateman
Becerra
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blackwell
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonior
Boucher
Brooks
Browder
Brown (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Buyer
Byrne
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
de Lugo (VI)
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Everett
Ewing
Faleomavaega (AS)
Farr
Fazio
Filner
Fish
Flake
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Inglis
Inslee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
Kingston
Klein
Klink
Klug
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Lehman
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Livingston
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Norton (DC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Sisisky
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Swift
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Underwood (GU)
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Velázquez
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walsh
Washington
Watt
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—101

Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Archer
Armey
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Bellenson
Bentley
Bilbray
Bonilla
Borski
Brewster
Burton
Cardin
Clement
Coble
Collins (MI)
Coppersmith
Crane
DeLay
Engel
Evans
Fawell
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Fingerhut
Foglietta
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Gekas
Gillmor
Grams
Green
Hefley
Hochbrueckner
Hyde
Inhofe
Istook
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Kennedy
King
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lazio
Levin
Levy
Linder
Lipinski
Lloyd
Machtley
Mann
Manton
Markey
McCollum
McInnis
Meehan
Miller (CA)
Molinari
Morella
Nadler
Orton
Owens
Petri
Porter
Quillen
Rangel
Reed
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Royce
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Skaggs
Solomon
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Sundquist
Swett
Synar
Torkildsen
Vento
Visclosky
Walker
Waters
Waxman
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—8

Blute
Henry
Martinez
McMillan
Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Santorum
Skeen
Wilson

□ 2116

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. FINGERHUT changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. KASICH, Mrs. ROUKEMA, and Messrs. BACHUS of Alabama, CLAY, PALLONE, HOAGLAND, and DREIER changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment to the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment, as amended, offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, if I could have the indulgence of Members for just a moment, I would like to clear up the parliamentary situation so they can know what it is they will be voting on. I understand the circumstances are very complicated. Let me, if I can, just explain quickly what has happened.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman will state it in the form of a parliamentary inquiry, then the gentleman will be in order and the Chair will respond.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, am I correct in my understanding that the parliamentary situation is that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] has successfully amended the Schumer substitute for the Armey amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ARMEY. And in that case, now the Schumer substitute for the Armey amendment would cut $20 million from the $147 million of MPP?

The CHAIRMAN. The correct response is the Durbin amendment has been adopted by the Committee. The Schumer substitute has been amended by the Durbin amendment.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, am I correct in understanding that for those Members who wish to vote for the Armey amendment, their only opportunity to do so will be by defeating this substitute as amended by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN]?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has correctly stated a parliamentary inquiry, and the gentleman has made his point.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

□ 2120

Mr. THOMAS of California. If the Schumer amendment is passed, is it not a substitute for the Armey amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. THOMAS of California. And, therefore, if the Armey amendment, as substituted by Schumer, is voted on, we will be voting on the Armey amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. As amended, that is correct.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, my parliamentary inquiry is on the basis not of my need to know, because I know

what I am doing, but many colleagues are asking me, if we wish to have a vote on the Armey amendment as propounded, to totally cut this, we must defeat the next vote; is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of California. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, if a vote is ordered on the Armey amendment, could it be reduced to 5 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. Both the votes, if ordered, will be reduced to 5 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, in order to cut the program but not to kill it, the vote is yes, yes; is that correct, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has not stated a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment, as amended, offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 2(c) of rule XXIII, this vote will be reduced to 5 minutes.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 337 noes 90, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 297]

AYES—337

Abercrombie
Allard
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Bateman
Becerra
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blackwell
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Buyer
Byrne
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
de Lugo (VI)
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Dreier
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Faleomavaega (AS)
Farr
Fazio
Filner
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Inglis
Inslee
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
Kingston
Klug
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Livingston
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Norton (DC)
Nussle
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ravenel
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Snowe
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sundquist
Swift
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Traficant
Tucker
Underwood (GU)
Unsoeld
Upton
Velázquez
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Watt
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—90

Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Archer
Armey
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Beilenson
Burton
Cardin
Coppersmith
Crane
DeLay
Dornan
Duncan
Fawell
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Fingerhut
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Gekas
Gibbons
Green
Harman
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Hyde
Inhofe
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
King
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lazio
Levy
Linder
Lipinski
Lloyd
Machtley
Mann
Manton
Markey
McCollum
Meehan
Miller (CA)
Molinari
Morella
Nadler
Petri
Porter
Quinn
Ramstad
Reed
Ridge
Rohrabacher
Royce
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skaggs
Smith (TX)
Solomon
Stark
Studds
Swett
Synar
Taylor (NC)
Torkildsen
Valántine
Vento
Visclosky
Walker
Waxman
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—12

Blute
Carr
Gutierrez
Henry
Martinez
McMillan
Oberstar
Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Santorum
Skeen
Towns
Wilson

□ 2128

So the amendment as amended, offered as a substitute for the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 2130

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], as amended.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. In accordance with clause 2(c) of rule XXIII, the Chair announces that the vote will be reduced to 5 minutes.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 406, noes 25, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 298]

AYES—406

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Archer
Armey
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Ballenger
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blackwell
Bliley
Boehlert
Bonilla
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Byrne
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Combest
Condit
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
de Lugo (VI)
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon

Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Faleomavaega (AS)
Farr
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kreidler
Kyl
LaFalce
Lambert
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Norton (DC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (WY)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Underwood (GU)
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Waxman
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—25

Applegate
Baker (LA)
Boehner
Bonior
Clayton
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Crapo
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Gilchrest
Grandy
Herger
Horn
Houghton
Kopetski
Lancaster
Packard
Quillen
Rose
Smith (MI)
Smith (OR)
Sundquist
Thomas (CA)
Watt

NOT VOTING—8

Blute
Henry
Martinez
McMillan
Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Santorum
Skeen
Wilson

□ 2137

Mr. THOMAS of California changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

□ 2140

Mr. Chairman, unbeknownst to the public, [Mr. ZIMMER] and I are not being allowed to offer an amendment zinging the beekeepers' subsidy. Some might ask is this pork or is this honey?

Now, I do not begrudge the beekeepers, but I do bee—get it, do bee, I do begrudge the rules for not allowing us to offer our amendment.

In fact, some might even ask is our amendment to bee or not to bee.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge everyone to oppose the motion to rise in order to support the amendment Congressman ZIMMER and I intend to offer to prohibit any USDA funds from going to administer the honey price support program.

The honey program's flaws were made widely known by our dearly departed Silvio Conte. Silvio was a grizzly bear himself who I am sure liked honey but had a severe distaste for the honey price support program. Although I am only a cub when compared to him, I want to help carry on his ferocious opposition to this program.

The honey program is a supersweet deal for the small number of honey producers, but it stings the taxpayers and the consumers of honey.

You would have to have a bee in your bonnet not to see the flaws of the honey program. The program artificially raises U.S. honey prices at the expense of the U.S. consumers and at the expense of honey producers' ability to compete with foreign honey.

In fact, the General Accounting Office has recommended that this program be eliminated. The GAO determined that this program no longer was needed to serve its original purpose of maintaining enough bees for fruit pollination. The GAO found that this program now primarily serves the interests of large beekeepers who are interested in producing honey, not in pollinating crops.

In 1990, the Congress was all abuzz about this program, when the big bears on the Senate side voted to exterminate this program. In 1992, a majority of Senators also voted to end the program as part of the fiscal year 1993 Agriculture appropriation bill. Only minor changes to the program were made in 1990, and none in 1992.

Now is the appropriate time to reexamine the benefits of this program. Since debate on the farm bill in 1990, our deficits have grown to more than $300 billion. As the House stated during the balanced budget debate, we have to make tough choices about which programs provide the most benefits to our country. I do not think that the honey program, which benefits only about 1 percent of the Nation's beekeepers to the detriment of nearly everyone else, makes the cut.

I do not think the honey program is good farm policy. The 1985 and 1990 farm bills attempted to improve the honey industry's competitiveness in world markets, notwithstanding the fact that the program was not even originally intended to assist the honey market. While Government purchases of honey are thankfully down from the mid 1980's, efforts to reform have failed to curb increasing U.S. imports of cheaper foreign honey and decreasing U.S. honey exports. Even this year, House Agriculture Committee members have noted low-cost Chinese honey imports. I refuse to believe that American bees are less competitive than Chinese bees. The problem is that our price supports force domestic honey prices flying too high. I must conclude that this program is too flawed to fix.

Now even the Democrat's senior most papa bear, President Bill Clinton, has targeted the honey program for elimination. Following up on his campaign pledge, President Clinton in his February 17 budget proposal proposed to stop putting beekeepers hand in the honey jar. Clinton defended this deficit cutting proposal stating:

> There are roughly 3,500 individuals enrolled in USDA's honey program. These represent slightly more than 1 percent of all honey producers in the Untied States. Roughly 350 individuals get over 50 percent of the payments made by the honey program. Due to the large number of pollination services whose bees are not in the program, pollination of the Nation's crops would not be significantly affected by this proposal.

If Congress adopted this proposal, the President has estimated it would save $32 million over 4 years. In its 1993 deficit options book, the Congressional Budget Office stated eliminating this program would save about $60 million over 5 years.

Instead of the business as usual approach to tinkering around the edges of this flawed program adopted by the House Agriculture Committee in the deficit reconciliation package which passed the House, the people are demanding real change. In order to reduce the deficit, we need to cut spending first. We need to eliminate wasteful Federal programs. If we cannot crush that huge honey jar of Federal subsidies to follow through on one single program elimination which even the President has advocated, how can the American people take our deficit reduction efforts seriously?

It's time to vote to zap the honey program completely, once and for all.

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

Mr. UPTON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, after combing through this bill we asked to bee able to offer this honey of an amendment, but we were told to buzz off.

Mr. UPTON. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, it is unbeelievable. This is a real zinger to the taxpayers.

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, we have gotten ourselves into a sticky situation. The taxpayers are telling us to mind our own beeswax, and they are telling us they are tired of being stung.

Mr. UPTON. Reclaiming my time, I can drone on and one about this program. Even the GAO has recognized that this program should be eliminated as it no longer has served its purpose of maintaining enough bees even for pollination.

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ZIMMER. This program is honeycombed with waste. During last year's campaign, Bill Clinton was buzzing about how he was going to eliminate this honeypot of a program. But it seems that in order to get votes for his reconciliation bill he made a beeline for the exit with his sweet campaign promise.

Mr. UPTON. Reclaiming my time again, even my fondest friends of Bill Clinton have a bee in their bonnet about this program, and about some of the promises that the President has walked away from.

I yield again to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ZIMMER. I do not mean to beelittle the importance of honey, but all the taxpaying worker bees in America are bugged by this program. It gives them hives. It flies in the face of fiscal responsibility.

Mr. UPTON. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would like to say to my colleagues that the observation by our late colleague, Sil Conte, was correct. We are paying the queen bees of the honey business. The GAO data show that 10 percent of the participants of the honey program receive more than 60 percent of the benefits.

I do not mean to drone on, but Washington, DC, has become the land of milk and honey for every lobby in town, including the killer bee lobbyists.

On behalf of the American taxpayer, who is being swarmed with new tax increases, I have only one question to the queen bees of the business: Honey, can you spare a time?

Mr. UPTON. I yield again to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER].

Mr. ZIMMER. In closing I might just say beeware, this is a real hornet's nest, and hornets do not make honey.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to tell my colleagues that we should defeat the motion to rise, stand, and be counted to allow this amendment to be offered.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UPTON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, as Silvio Conte would say, "How sweet it is. You are a honey of a friend. Buzz off."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1994".

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY) having assumed the chair, Mr. SPRATT, 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. 2493) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a vote on the so-called Volkmer amendment on the dairy issue and on the so-called Armey amendment, as amended by the Durbin amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: Page 59, delete lines 1 through 4.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes any subsequent votes taken on amendments. This is a 15-minute vote to be followed by a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 299, nays 127, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 299]

YEAS—299

Ackerman	Ewing	LaRocco
Allard	Farr	Laughlin
Andrews (NJ)	Fazio	Leach
Andrews (TX)	Fields (LA)	Lehman
Applegate	Fields (TX)	Levy
Archer	Filner	Lewis (CA)
Bacchus (FL)	Fish	Lewis (FL)
Bachus (AL)	Flake	Lewis (GA)
Baesler	Foglietta	Lightfoot
Baker (CA)	Ford (MI)	Livingston
Baker (LA)	Ford (TN)	Lloyd
Ballenger	Fowler	Long
Barca	Frost	Lowey
Barcia	Gallegly	Machtley
Barrett (NE)	Gekas	Manton
Barrett (WI)	Geren	Manzullo
Bartlett	Gilchrest	Mazzoli
Barton	Gillmor	McCandless
Bateman	Gilman	McCloskey
Bentley	Gingrich	McCrery
Bereuter	Gonzalez	McDade
Bevill	Goodlatte	McHale
Bilbray	Goodling	McHugh
Bilirakis	Gordon	McInnis
Bishop	Goss	McKeon
Blackwell	Grandy	McNulty
Bliley	Green	Menendez
Boehlert	Greenwood	Meyers
Boehner	Gunderson	Mfume
Bonilla	Hall (OH)	Mica
Bonior	Hall (TX)	Miller (FL)
Borski	Hamburg	Mink
Brewster	Hamilton	Molinari
Brooks	Hancock	Mollohan
Brown (CA)	Hansen	Montgomery
Brown (OH)	Hayes	Moorhead
Bryant	Hefner	Murphy
Bunning	Herger	Murtha
Burton	Hilliard	Neal (NC)
Buyer	Hinchey	Nussle
Callahan	Hobson	Oberstar
Calvert	Hochbrueckner	Obey
Camp	Hoekstra	Ortiz
Cantwell	Hoke	Oxley
Chapman	Holden	Packard
Clay	Horn	Pallone
Clayton	Houghton	Parker
Clinger	Huffington	Paxon
Clyburn	Hughes	Payne (NJ)
Coble	Hunter	Payne (VA)
Collins (GA)	Hutchinson	Peterson (FL)
Collins (IL)	Hutto	Peterson (MN)
Collins (MI)	Hyde	Petri
Combest	Inhofe	Pickett
Cooper	Inslee	Pickle
Cox	Istook	Pombo
Cramer	Jefferson	Pomeroy
Crane	Johnson (CT)	Portman
Cunningham	Johnson (GA)	Price (NC)
Danner	Johnson (SD)	Pryce (OH)
de la Garza	Johnson, E. B.	Quillen
DeFazio	Johnson, Sam	Quinn
Dellums	Johnston	Rahall
Deutsch	Kanjorski	Ravenel
Diaz-Balart	Kasich	Regula
Dickey	Kildee	Richardson
Dingell	Kim	Ridge
Dixon	Kingston	Roberts
Dooley	Kleczka	Roemer
Dornan	Klink	Rogers
Dreier	Klug	Rohrabacher
Duncan	Knollenberg	Ros-Lehtinen
Dunn	Kolbe	Rose
Edwards (TX)	Kopetski	Roth
Emerson	Kyl	Roukema
English (OK)	Lambert	Roybal-Allard
Everett	Lancaster	Royce

Rush
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shaw
Shuster
Sisisky
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Velázquez
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Washington
Watt
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NAYS—127

Abercrombie
Andrews (ME)
Armey
Barlow
Becerra
Bellenson
Berman
Boucher
Browder
Brown (FL)
Byrne
Canady
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Clement
Coleman
Condit
Conyers
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Crapo
Darden
Deal
DeLauro
DeLay
Derrick
Dicks
Doolittle
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Engel
English (AZ)
Eshoo
Evans
Fawell
Fingerhut
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Furse
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Glickman
Grams
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastert
Hastings
Hefley
Hoagland
Hoyer
Inglis
Jacobs
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
King
Klein
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lantos
Lazio
Levin
Linder
Lipinski
Maloney
Mann
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Matsui
McCollum
McCurdy
McDermott
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Michel
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Moakley
Moran
Morella
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Orton
Owens
Pastor
Pelosi
Penny
Porter
Poshard
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Sabo
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sharp
Shays
Shepherd
Skaggs
Slattery
Smith (IA)
Spratt
Stark
Studds
Synar
Torricelli
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Waxman
Wyden
Yates
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—8

Blute
Henry
Martinez
McMillan
Olver
Santorum
Skeen
Wilson

□ 2204

Ms. FURSE and Ms. SHEPHERD changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. LEHMAN and Mr. TANNER changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). The Clerk will report the final amendment on which a separate vote was demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: Page 78, line 17, strike "$147,734,000" and insert "$127,734,000".

Mr. WALKER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote, after which Members are requested to remain in the Chamber.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 403, noes 24, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 300]

AYES—403

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Ballenger
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Becerra
Bellenson
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Billirakis
Bishop
Blackwell
Bliley
Boehlert
Bonilla
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Byrne
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Combest
Condit
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kreidler
Kyl
LaFalce
Lambert
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (WY)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Velázquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Waxman
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—24

Baker (LA)
Boehner
Bonior
Clayton
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Crapo
Dooley
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Gilchrest
Grandy
Hilliard
Houghton
Kopetski
Lancaster
Lehman
Packard
Quillen
Smith (MI)
Smith (OR)
Sundquist
Thomas (CA)
Watt

NOT VOTING—7

Blute
Henry
Martinez
McMillan
Santorum
Skeen
Wilson

□ 2211

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. MYERS OF INDIANA

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. In its present form, I must be, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MYERS of Indiana moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2493, to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report back the same to the house forthwith with the following amendment:

On page 30, line 21, strike $18,000,000,000 and insert in lieu thereof $13,600,000,000, and on page 79, after line 6 insert the following new section:

SEC. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 5.00 percent.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to recommit be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the hour is late, I recognize. I will not use the 5 minutes.

This is a simple motion. I regret that I must do this. It is a good bill, except it is just too much money.

The bill is $5,880,000,000 above the President's request. It is $9,780,000,000 above last year's budget authorization.

My motion would reduce the Commodity Credit Corporation by $4.4 billion, leaving $13.6 billion.

Back on March 23, Eileen Manfredi of the Congressional Budget Office, a senior principal analyst, testified before the Committee on Agriculture:

CBO's projection for Commodity Credit Corporation outlays shows a decline to $9 billion in 1994.

My amendment would still leave $13.6 billion, a good cushion, and if it is not spent, it will not be appropriated.

It also would cut the other programs in this bill by 5 percent.

Because of the requirements here, so much of this, 80 percent is mandated, we are cutting into the real programs we all would like to vote for. This is a case where we have got to do something about the programs that are mandated. It calls for the need for it. I do not think anyone likes to do it. I am asking you to do it tonight.

If we are really concerned about balancing the budget sometime in the future, we must start tonight.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I hope you will all support this, but I will understand. It is a good program, other than this. Reducing it will not hurt any program that much, by 5 percent.

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, very briefly, the gentleman from Indiana misspoke. The bill is $5.9 billion below the President's request. It is also $248 million below the allocation of the Budget Committee in budget authority.

The 5-percent cut recommended by the gentleman from Indiana would cut into the WIC Program 5 percent. It would also reduce the appropriation for the Food and Drug Administration, where they are trying to catch up with drug approvals and medical devices.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the motion to recommit.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Well, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, remember, we cut $20 million out of the $5.9 billion awhile ago. It is now $5,880,000,000. The gentleman forgot about the $20 million we did reduce from the MPP.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule XV, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of the final passage of the bill, following the vote on the motion to recommit.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 172, noes 255, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 301]

AYES—172

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooper
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeFazio
DeLay
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Everett
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fingerhut
Fish
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goss
Grams
Greenwood
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hayes
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Houghton
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lazio
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Machtley
Manzullo
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Myers
Nussle
Orton
Packard
Paxon
Penny
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Ridge
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Swett
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (WY)
Upton
Valentine
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—255

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Ewing
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Grandy
Green
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamburg
Harman
Hastert
Hastings
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Hoyer
Hughes
Inslee
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha

Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Roberts
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Sundquist
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Vèazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—7

Blute
Henry
Martinez
McMillan
Santorum
Skeen
Wilson

□ 2232

Mr. SMITH of Michigan changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the Chair's prior announcement, this is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 304, noes 119, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 302]

AYES—304

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Baker (LA)
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bateman
Becerra
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blackwell
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Buyer
Byrne
Camp
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crapo
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Grandy
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastert
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Holden
Houghton
Hoyer
Hutchinson
Inslee
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCrery
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schenk
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tauzin
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Velázquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—119

Andrews (NJ)
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Ballenger
Barca
Barton
Bellenson
Bliley
Bunning
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Canady
Castle
Coble
Collins (GA)
Cox
Crane
Cunningham
DeLay
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fingerhut
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goss
Grams
Green
Gunderson
Hancock
Hansen
Hefley
Herger
Hoke
Horn
Huffington
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
King
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lazio
Levy
Linder
Manzullo
McCandless
McCollum
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Murphy
Myers
Nussle
Orton
Packard
Pallone
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Quinn
Ramstad
Rohrabacher
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Smith (MI)
Smith (OR)
Solomon
Stearns
Stump
Talent
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (WY)
Walker
Weldon
Wolf
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—11

Bartlett
Blute
Dingell
Henry
LaFalce
Martinez
McMillan
Rose
Santorum
Skeen
Wilson

□ 2239

Mr. PAXON changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent on official business for rollcall vote No. 295. Had I been present on the House floor I would have cast my vote as follows:

Roll No. 295, "yes" on Mr. VOLKMER'S amendment to delete provisions in the H.R. 2493, the Agriculture appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994, which remove the statutory obligation of school districts to require schools participating in the school lunch program to offer students whole milk.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BLUTE. Mr. Speaker, while I was in Massachusetts assisting my wife, Robi, with the delivery of our son, I missed a series of roll call votes.

On Tuesday, June 29, during further consideration of H.R. 2491, and consideration of H.R. 2493, the Agriculture appropriations bill, I would have voted the following:

Rollcall 284, "aye."
Rollcall 285, "aye."
Rollcall 286, "aye."
Rollcall 287, "aye."
Rollcall 288, "aye."
Rollcall 289, "aye."
Rollcall 290, "no."
Rollcall 291, "aye."
Rollcall 292, "aye."
Rollcall 293, "aye."
Rollcall 294, "aye."
Rollcall 295, "aye."
Rollcall 296, "aye."
Rollcall 297, "aye."
Rollcall 298, "aye."
Rollcall 299, "aye."
Rollcall 300, "aye."
Rollcall 301, "aye."

Rollcall 302, "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I was on leave of absence when rollcall votes occurred in the House of Representatives.

Had I been present, I would have cast my votes as noted for the following roll-call votes which occurred during my absence.

Roll No. 284, Penny amendment to H.R. 2491, VA, HUD Appropriation Act, cut CDBG grants by $50 million, "Nay."

Roll No. 285, Grams amendment to H.R. 2491, VA, HUD Appropriation Act, reduce HUD policy development/research programs by $48 million, "Aye."

Roll No. 286, Kolbe amendment to H.R. 2491, VA HUD Appropriation Act, provide $10 million for HU?D HOPE grants program, "Aye."

Roll No. 287, Hefley amendment to H.R. 2491, VA HUD Appropriation Act, cut $970 thousand for employees detailed to the Office of Science and Technology Policy, "Aye."

Roll No. 288, Klug En Block amendment to H.R. 2491, VA HUD Appropriation Act, delete funds for ASRM, "Aye."

Roll No. 289, motion to recommit, H.R. 2491, VA HUD Appropriation Act, "No."

Roll No. 290, final passage, H.R. 2491, VA HUD Appropriation Act, "Aye."

Roll No. 291, Fawell amendment to H.R. 2493, agriculture Appropriation Act, delete all appropriations for CSRS sepcial research grants and building/facilities, "No."

Roll No. 292, Burton amendment to H.R. 2493, Agriculture Appropriation Act, reduce RDA funding from $35 million to $20.75 million, "No."

Roll No. 293, Zimmer amendment to H.R. 2493, Agriculture Appropriations Act, reduce loan levels for REA hardship loans, "No."

Roll No. 294, Burton amendment to H.R. 2493, Agriculture Appropriations Act, delete $3 million appropriation, for the Outreach for Socially Disadvantaged Farmers program, "No."

Roll No. 295, Volkmer amendment to H.R. 2493, Agriculture Appropriations Act, delete provisions in the bill removing statutory obligation of school districts to require schools participating in the school lunch program to offer students whole milk, "No."

Roll No. 296, Durbin amendment to H.R. 2493, Agriculture Appropriations Act, amending the Schumer substitute amendment to increase funds for the MPP program from $90 million to $127.734 million, "Aye."

Roll No. 297, Schumer amendment as amended H.R. 2493, Agriculture Appropriations Act, See Roll Call No. 296 for explanation,"Aye."

Roll No. 298, Armey amendment as amended to H.R. 2493, Agriculture Appropriations Act, See Roll Call No. 296 for explanation "Aye."

Roll No. 299, Volkmer amendment to H.R. 2493, Agriculture Appropriations Act, delete provisions in the bill removing statutory obligation of school districts to require schools participating in the school lunch program to offer students whole milk, "No."

Roll No. 300, Armey amendment, as amended H.R. 2493, Agriculture Appropriations Act, see Roll Call No. 296 for expl, "Aye."

Roll No. 301, motion to recommit, H.R. 2493, Agriculture Appropriations Act, "No."

Roll No. 302, Final Passage, H.R. 2493, Agriculture Appropriations Act, "Aye."

REPORT ON RESOLUTIONS WAIVING CERTAIN POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST H.R. 2520, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. BONIOR, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103–163) on the resolution (H. Res. 214) waiving certain points of order against the bill (H.R. 2520) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2010, NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE ACT OF 1990 AMENDMENTS

Mr. BONIOR, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103–164) on the resolution (H. Res. 215) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2010) to amend the National and Community Service Act of 1990 to establish a Corporation for National Service, enhance opportunities for national service, and provide national service educational awards to persons anticipating in such service, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

WAIVING CERTAIN POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST H.R. 2492, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS ACT, 1993

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 210 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 210

Resolved, That all points of order against consideration of the bill (H.R. 2492) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 7 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill, all points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], 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, this legislation appropriates funds for the District of Columbia for fiscal year 1994.

The bill supports many important programs here in the District—for police, for teachers, for judges.

One of the most important is a major crime and youth initiative, which is designed to stem the rising crime rate in the District and reach out to young people at risk.

The new program responds to street violence through increased law enforcement, while at the same time establishing preventive, targeted programs for young people and families who need support.

Mr. Speaker, this is a responsible bill in these times of budget constraint. The bill cuts the President's request for the District by $5.1 million.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 210 is an open rule for consideration of H.R. 2492, the District of Columbia appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994.

The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 7 of rule 21, which requires that committee reports be printed at least 3 days prior to consideration of a general appropriation bill.

The rule also waives all points of order against provisions of the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule 21, which prohibits unauthorized appropriations or legislative provisions in a general appropriations bill.

Mr. Speaker, this is a simple, open rule for consideration of the bill, and I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] has described, this rule provides for the consideration of the District of Columbia appropriations bill. It waives the requirement that printed hearings be available 3 days prior to the consideration of the bill. Also, the rule provides waivers against the entire bill for unauthorized appropriations and legislation in an appropriations bill. While it would be preferable for the authorizing committees to complete their work prior to the consideration of the appropriations bills, such is not the case. We cannot delay the appropriation process, and I have no objection to the waivers provided under this rule.

H.R. 2492 provides funding for the Federal payment-in-lieu-of-taxes to the District of Columbia. Also, the bill includes funding for the Federal Government's contribution to police, firefighters, judges, and teachers' retirement funds and for the mayor's youth and crime initiative.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of controversial matters contained in this

bill. The bill repeals the ban on the use of Federal funds to pay for abortions. The bill also allows unmarried couples, regardless of sexual orientation, to register as domestic partners. Domestic partners of D.C. government employees would then be eligible for group health insurance coverage.

Mr. Speaker, if we are going to waive the rules to allow legislative language in an appropriations bill, then I think it is only fair to provide the necessary waivers to proposed amendments to such legislative language. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK] submitted an amendment in the Rules Committee to block the implementation of the domestic partners law, but it was not made in order. This is unfortunate and unfair, and I feel strongly that the Rules Committee should have allowed this amendment.

I am strongly opposed to several provisions of the bill, but this rule allows Members to offer appropriate amendments, and I hope we can make some changes and improvements as we consider this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this rule so we can proceed with the consideration of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee for yielding time to me.

As a ranking member on the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, I rise in support of the rule, although I do have, a number of us have problems with certain issues within the bill.

It is an open rule, and the issues that we do disagree upon will be raised during general debate. We would also offer an amendment following general debate to reduce the appropriation by a certain amount of money.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the rule.

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON].

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, there is always controversy in the House concerning rules, especially points of order, because they are protected in some instances but not in others.

In effect, the House protects legislation on appropriation bills when it chooses. There is no pattern; alas, there is no principle.

Yet tonight, I ask my good colleagues to embrace one principle to which no member in a democratic body can raise a sound objection: That when locally elected officials have enacted a law or decided how their tax-raised dollars should be spent, no Member of this House should seek to countermand the local democratic majority.

69-059 O—97 Vol. 139 (Pt. 10) 40

My friends, the District of Columbia is not an agency of the Federal Government. The District is not a colony of the Congress. The District is an American jurisdiction of 600,000 people who can hold no one in this House, not even me, accountable for local enactments. Only dictatorships allow official action without local accountability. Such a course has no place in this proud and principled House.

Only an accident of timing has allowed a provision mandating costs for rank featherbedding in the D.C. Fire Department to remain in H.R. 2492. The chairman of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia was prepared to raise a point of order that would have ruled out of order a congressional directive to keep the District from cutting its work force, yes, keep the District, which for years has been told to cut its work force, keep the District from doing precisely what the Congress has yelled and screamed that the District should do.

By the time agreement was reached to exclude the provision from the rule to waive points of order, however, the Committee on Rules, which would have ruled otherwise, had already acted.

Therefore, I must offer an amendment and will do so at the appropriate time to strike this mandatory budgetary provision. I will ask my colleagues not to stand in the way of cuts in the D.C. Fire Department, among the most overstaffed in the country.

□ 2250

I will ask the Members not to bar the way when the District is finally willing to cut its work force, as this House has long demanded. I will ask the Members not to reduce democracy to a slogan inapplicable to the Nation's Capital.

If the Members believe in democracy, if they believe that democracy should apply everywhere that flies the American flag, then they will vote for my amendment. May I ask them to vote as well on other issues: To ratify the democratic majority in the District, as they would without thinking elsewhere; to respect democracy in the District, as they would insist on in their own districts.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM LEONARD P. WISHART III, DIRECTOR, NON-LEGISLATIVE AND FINANCIAL SERVICES, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY) laid before the House the following communication from the Director, Non-Legislative and Financial Services, of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR, NON-LEGISLATIVE AND FINANCIAL SERVICES,

Washington, DC, June 25, 1993.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,

Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that the Office of Finance has been served with a subpoena issued by the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

After consultation with the General Counsel to the House, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

Sincerely,

LEONARD P. WISHART III,
Director.

GENOCIDE IN BOSNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise with a great sense of sadness and loss. Sadness because nearly 50 years after the world vowed "never again" we are witnessing genocide in Bosnia. Loss for the Bosnian men, women and children who have suffered so much.

We have all seen and heard the images of horrible carnage—the starvation in concentration camps, desperate refugees packed onto U.N. trucks, innocent civilians killed by Serbian artillery and snipers and the systematic rape of women and girls.

Let there be no doubt that what is happening to the Moslems in Bosnia is genocide. Ethnic cleansing is genocide.

How we respond to crises such as these is a reflection of our character and our very humanity. Frankly I am not encouraged by what I see.

For we pressured the Bosnian Moslems to accept the Vance-Owen peace plan—a plan which, to a large degree, rewarded Serbian aggression. Reluctantly, the Moslems agreed to it thinking that the international community would bring pressure on the Serbs to negotiate a peace. But we failed to take meaningful action.

Next we tried to establish "safe havens," basically ethnic ghettos filled with refugees. Serb artillery made a mockery of this idea in full view of U.N. forces.

Now we are putting pressure on the Bosnians to accept the partition of their country, fully rewarding Serbian aggression, and giving the Moslems just two landlocked areas with a tenuous connection to the sea. This weekend, Serbian and Croat forces joined together in a final drive against Moslems in Maglaj and other cities.

In all fairness, we have taken some positive measures—providing humanitarian relief, enforcing the no-fly zone,

establishing a war crimes commission, and tightening the economic sanctions.

Individuals such as French General Philipe Morillon have bravely stood up to the Serbian butchers. But these acts of courage have been the exception, not the rule.

Why have we not found the will to end the murder, torture, and rape? Have we become numb to human suffering through overexposure on television and in the newspapers? Or is something larger involved here?

I am going to ask a question that makes me extremely uncomfortable—a question that should at least make all of us pause. If the tables were reversed and Moslems were slaughtering Christians or Jews in Europe, would we continue to do virtually nothing to stop it?

Moslem, Jew, Christian, a human life is a human life, murder is still murder, rape is still rape, and genocide is still genocide. Has our moral compass slipped so far that we can permit a nation to be dismembered and an entire people pushed to the brink in full view of U.N. troops?

This weekend we found the will to take bold action against Saddam Hussein. Why can't we find the will to punish Serbia for its reprehensible genocide of Bosnian Moslems?

We can and must do more. The arms embargo on Bosnia should be lifted so that the terribly outgunned Moslems can defend themselves. The embargo has only served to aid Serbian aggression. This is an issue of basic fairness.

Yes the situation is complex, yes there are risks involved, but measures are available that will not get us bogged down in Bosnia. By lifting the arms embargo we will be reaffirming the right of the Bosnians to defend themselves, their children and their homes. This is the very least we can allow them to do.

Future generations will judge us if we lack the courage to stand up to this brutality and aggression. The time for action has nearly passed.

But if we do not act, innocent blood will continue to be spilt. Tears of grief and rage will continue to be shed. When history records that genocide reared its head in Europe, and that the cry for help went forth, will we be able to say that we did all we could?

□ 2300

Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness again this evening that I report that today the U.N. Security Council rejected a resolution to lift the arms embargo on the Bosnian Moslems and authorize air strikes to protect them. Six countries voted for the resolution and nine abstained. Nine sat idly by as homes were destroyed, as women and children were raped, as murders and killings were perpetrated throughout this beleaguered land.

Nine votes are needed for approval of a resolution. The six voting in favor were the United States, I am proud to say, Cape Verde, Djibouti, Morocco, Pakistan, and Venezuela. Those abstaining were Brazil, Britain, China, Russia, France, Hungary, New Zealand, Japan, and Spain.

U.S. Ambassador Madeleine Albright argued that we do not believe that this body should deny the Bosnian Government the wherewithal to defend itself in the face of brutal aggression conducted by the Bosnian Serbs and their backers in Belgrade.

Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a sad day for the world community. I would urge our administration and our President to think long and hard about other approaches and actions that they might take to salvage what is left of a beleaguered land and a tortured people. This is not something that will just go away like many people in our Government and our country wish. We are witnessing brutality on the highest levels and we are standing by and doing nothing.

I am pleased that my colleagues would join me this evening. I would like to yield to two of them this evening who have been leaders in speaking out on this issue from its inception, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCCLOSKEY] and the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. OLVER].

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCCLOSKEY].

Mr. MCCLOSKEY. I thank the gentleman very much. I must say I wholeheartedly agree with about every statement and sentiment in your statement. Quite frankly, it is very similar to what I am about to say, and I must commend you with all my heart for your ongoing leadership in this area. I think it is truly an ongoing crisis that as things get worse, quite frankly, American and Western interests seem to get less.

This is a dark, dark hour for Bosnia—for Europe, and the United States.

The full dimensions of the human, moral, and political catastrophe which is unfolding in the Balkans will eventually dawn on the political establishment in Washington, and on the American people.

The roster of shame for letting this catastrophe unfold will be a long one. It will include decisionmakers and opinionmakers from both sides of the Atlantic, from across the political spectrum, from executive and legislative branches, and from the fourth estate.

We desperately need some plain and honest talk about what is happening on Bosnia.

Never in my political life have I seen such an obscene gap between high-road words and low-road deeds in the policies of Western governments. Never have I seen so much equivocation and obfuscation, so much specious rationalization for moral and political cowardice, or so much energy expended in the hope of evading responsibility. Never have I seen something so immense, so important, get so little attention.

We are witnessing a disaster. It is a human disaster now for the people of Bosnia. It is a moral disaster for the world community. It is a longterm security and economic disaster for the American people.

But Western governments have done so much to obfuscate these high stakes, and to exhaust the psychic energy of Western publics by their handwringing and posturing, that we have to read about this disaster in the back pages of the daily press. This should be a front page headline story, every day.

Here is the truth about Bosnia, and what it means to the West.

In Bosnia, the Bosnian Moslem people are being decimated by a systematic genocide run by the Belgrade regime of Slobodan Milosevic.

The perpetrators of this genocide have killed some 200,000 men, women and children. They have maimed and wounded tens of thousands more. They have systematically raped tens of thousands of women. They have systematically targeted for extermination in death camps the leading strata of Bosnian society. They have systematically destroyed all signs of non-Serb culture in some two-thirds of Bosnia.

By this genocide they mean not only to decimate the Bosnian Moslem people. They also mean to destroy forever the multiethnic and multicultural civilization that was Bosnia Herzegovina, to destroy the Bosnian Government, and to dismantle the Bosnian state.

Milosevic and his thugs are getting away with this genocide. Not only that, Western governments are serving as his military and political accomplices.

We are accomplices because we continue to deny, cover up, and minimize the evidence of this genocide. The U.S. State Department knows that Milosevic is engaged in genocide. But it won't say so because this would increase the pressures to do something.

We are accomplices because we have taken sides militarily with the perpetrators. This is not a case where, as Edmund Burke put it, "The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing." This is a case where "good men" have actually done something—but on the side of evil.

Mark this point well: We are not simply bystanders, as we were for the Holocaust when we did not come to the aid of Europe's Jews. It is not just that we have declined to come to the aid of the Bosnians through military intervention.

We have done worse: We have denied the victims the means to defend themselves, through application and enforcement on Bosnia of the U.N. arms embargo on former Yugoslavia. We have intervened, on the side of genocide.

The Clinton administration has tried to distance itself from this complicity by adopting the position that it favors lifting the arms embargo from the Bosnian Government.

But this is not the administration's real position. It is only the administration's posture, for public relations purposes. When it comes to real action to get the arms embargo lifted from the Bosnian Government, the administration opts out.

I ask here: What efforts did the President or Secretary of State make to win support from our friends and allies for today's effort in the U.N. Security Council to lift the embargo from Bosnia? How many leaders did the President call to press his case? In what way did we show that this is important to us? The answer is that the administration did nothing—as if the illusion of leadership could be preserved by passivity.

We are accomplices because we have taken sides with the perpetrators of the genocide in political terms as well.

We have exerted pressure on the Bosnian Government to accept the ethnic partition of Bosnia. We have legitimized the perpetrators of genocide as the rightful leaders and spokesmen for the Serb people, and as the legitimate subjects of negotiations with the Bosnian Government—which both Cyrus Vance and David Owen have tried mightily to reduce to the status of the "Moslem faction."

Mark this point well too: We have joined Slobodan Milosevic, Radovan Karadzic and their murderous forces in pressing the Bosnian Government to surrender. This is a far more disgraceful surrender than Munich, when war and genocide were still in the future.

And again, the administration seeks to distance itself from complicity by adopting the position that we would have preferred a multiethnic Bosnia—but that if all parties quote genuinely and honestly agree unquote, we will accept partition.

I ask here: How can anyone talk of the Bosnian Government quote genuinely and honestly unquote agreeing to partition, when that government is under relentless military assault and its people have been and continue to be decimated by genocide?

Obviously, one cannot. Doing so is just another way of disguising what we are up to, which is to sell out a sovereign, independent United Nations member state to external aggression.

I made reference earlier to Munich. If Czechoslovakia had fought back against Hitler, no doubt the United Kingdom and France would have written this off a civil war, just as Secretary Christopher has redefined Bosnia as a civil war. But there is another parallel with Munich as well.

When the United Kingdom and France sided with Hitler against Czechoslovakia in 1938, Poland and Hungary also opted to grab small chunks of that state. They were later to become Hitler's victims too.

Now in 1993, Western complicity in Milosevic's aggression against Bosnia has encouraged Croatia—already one of Milosevic's victims—to also take the low road, and seek to grab part of Bosnia. The complicity of Croatian President Tudjman in Milosevic's attack on Bosnia has made Croatia an aggressor even as it remains a victim of Milosevic's aggression.

I have repeatedly condemned Croatia's complicity in the partition of Bosnia directly to Croatian President Tudjman. I believe he and his coterie of advisors from Herzegovina are doing great harm to both Bosnia and Croatia. How ironic that Tudjman could plausibly respond that he was simply cooperating with the Vance-Owen plan, or more recently the Stoltenberg-Owen partition effort.

Croatia was the first state to recognize the sovereignty and independence of Bosnia. It has made a greater effort to help Bosnian refugees, including Bosnian Moslems, than any other country. How tragic it is, and how avoidable it could have been, that Croatia has now become part of the aggression against Bosnia.

There is an unspoken assumption behind the West's appeasement policy toward Slobodan Milosevic, and its support for the partition of Bosnia. That assumption is that Milosevic can be bought off, that if we let him grab and "cleanse" one third of Croatia and two-thirds of Bosnia, he will stop and the crisis will abate and be contained within the borders of what used to be Yugoslavia. In short, the idea is that a "Greater Serbia" means a more stable Balkans.

What a stupid notion.

First of all, Milosevic's goal of an ethnically pure "Greater Serbia" promises unending conflict with its current victims in Croatia, Bosnia, Kosovo, Sandzak, and Vojvodina, and with its future victims in Macedonia. It promises millions more victims of "ethnic cleansing" in all those areas.

Second, the track record over the past 3 years is clear: Milosevic has no bottom line, and the more he gets, the further he pushes on. His regime is growing more fascist, not less.

Third, the gathering clouds of a new genocide in Kosovo are ominously dark and near. Kosovo has been a slow-motion "Krystallnacht" for 3 years now. It is one vast concentration camp, with the pilot light lit in the ovens. The idea that it will be possible to deter Milosevic and his thugs from genocide in Kosovo after letting them get away with it in Bosnia is simply preposterous.

What then does our betrayal of Bosnia mean for the West?

In the Balkans, it means years of conflict in Croatia and Bosnia, and the destruction of democracy in both those states. It means the spread of Milosevic's genocidal aggression to Kosovo, Sandzak and Vojvodina and to Macedonia, and the triggering of the wider Balkan war that Western policy ostensibly aims to deter. In the long run, Milosevic's "Greater Serbia" is doomed to collapse. But its rise and fall will traumatize Southeastern Europe for generations to come.

In Europe, our betrayal of Bosnia makes a mockery of two principles which are crucial to peace and stability, in particular in the area of the former Soviet Union: that genocide will be suppressed, and that cross-border aggression will not be tolerated. It fatally undermines the credibility and authority of two institutions on which transatlantic peace and security are based: NATO and the CSCE.

In the wider world, our betrayal of Bosnia exposes the end of America's military commitment to European peace and security. It reduces the power of the United Nations and the U.N. Security Council to that of the League of Nations in the 1930's. It poisons relations between the West and the Islamic world, and strengthens fundamentalism in the latter. It emboldens aggressors everywhere.

In short, the idea that writing off Bosnia will settle the Balkan crisis is as misguided as it is immoral. The Bosnian people are paying a terrible price for this now. We will all pay a heavy price for it down the road.

What is happening in Bosnia is not something we can afford to treat as a "distraction" from pressing domestic issues, as the President has suggested. It is not something we can afford to sweep under the rug in embarrassment. Bosnia and the Western policy response should be the subject of serious national debate. it is the defining moment of the post-cold war era, and so far it is defining nothing but trouble ahead.

□ 2310

Again, I thank the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my colleague for his articulate and passionate response to the tragedy in the Balkans.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER].

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding. I thank him very much for his leadership that he has continued to provide on this issue. I want to associate myself with the remarks both of the gentleman as the Member from Michigan but also our majority whip, and also the Member from Indiana, who has just given a most articulate discussion about what he sees as the downside of what has happened in the Balkans here and our role in it.

I do not have that kind of a prepared statement here tonight. My statement

is scratched across a page in my frustration and my anger over what it is that has happened. But that is not going to deter me from making a fairly lengthy, perhaps, statement here.

Today it seems to me that the U.N. drove one more nail in the coffin that they, the U.N. themselves, built for Bosnia. Bosnia, a member of the United Nations, probably the most multiethnic, multicultural, multireligious nation within the United Nations at the time of their admission to the United Nations, a nation where there is at least a strong argument that the very membership in the United Nations was afforded to Bosnia in order to give them the protection of international law, the protection of recognition by the whole world community, and then admittance to the United Nations in order to give them protection of international law, and then to have the United Nations be the very instrument of the withdrawal, of the removal, of that international law in that Bosnia was not allowed from the first, from its very admission into the United Nations, to have the very fundamental right to defend themselves as every nation has a right to defend themselves, by the impact of an embargo which had been placed long before, actually months before, the actual admission of Bosnia to the United Nations, but still suffering under that embargo and unable to gain the kind of arms that would allow them to defend themselves.

As I say, they were a multiethnic, multireligious, and multicultural people in Bosnia, all Slavic people, Croats, largely Catholic, Serbs, largely Serbian Orthodox, and the Bosnians, those who called themselves Bosnians, some of whom were Roman Catholics, some of whom were Eastern Orthodox, a great many of them who happened to be Muslims. That people, that intermixed people, 25 percent of the population, has been estimated to have been intermarried among those different ethnic and religious groups. In fact, they all spoke the same language, and the other minorities that were in that country also, the Albanians and the Jews, and sizable populations, interestingly enough, of Slovaks and Hungarians in that country, all part of what was very close to a melting pot there in the Balkans.

Bosnia for 15 months has been under attack by a portion of the Serbian ethnic group, the Serbian nationalists, who want to build a greater Serbia there, and in that period of time we have seen the creation of concentration camps, mass rape used as a policy, the destruction of mosques. One night the five mosques in the district of Bijeljina were destroyed all in one night.

□ 2320

The old and historic mosques in the city of Banja Luka, a community that had nearly equal numbers of Serbs and Moslems in that community before this most tragic war, those old and venerated and historic mosques, hundreds of years old, were destroyed in a single night, simply blown up.

Can you imagine the outrage that we would feel if someone were in this country of ours destroying the religious institutions of one of the ethnic groups within, and what would come of that?

During all of this process when the whole of the Islamic culture in that country, in that country where in fact the Moslems were the largest ethnic group—44 percent at the beginning of this tragic era were Moslems, about 31 percent were Serbian, and about 17 percent were Croatian, with the remainder being of those other ethnic groups which I mentioned—who were part of that mix in the Balkans, their libraries, the people, the whole families who had been taken out and slaughtered, they had lived through that for 15 months while time after time the United Nations has debated whether or not they should be allowed their right of self-defense.

The right of self-defense for a nation, a member of the United Nations, is denied to them totally in this process that has gone on.

Mr. BONIOR. It is quite remarkable, is it not, when one considers what took place tonight? The Security Council of the United Nations, with countries as powerful and renowned as France, Great Britain, Russia, Spain, voted to deny a member nation the right to defend themselves. It is incredibly historic and sad and significant.

And if we let this go without a challenge, without calling to question the moral bankruptcy and, to a large extent, the sovereign bankruptcy of this action today, we will, I think, come to regret this very deeply in the months and years ahead.

Mr. OLVER. I think we will regret it deeply, and it will not take long for us to regret, because what is happening there is a signal to dictators, and people in positions like Milosevic all over the world who have watched already Mr. Tudjman taking over, have gotten the virus, in essence, and decided that, "Well, if they are going to dismember Bosnia," then he is going to get his part of that nation and that portion, more than he was even given that he never deserved in any of the proposals that had come out at earlier times.

It is almost as if these nations have forgotten what their history was. As my colleague from Indiana [Mr. McCLOSKEY] has so carefully pointed out, it should have been Britain and France that were complicit in the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia, that they should be in the forefront of keeping Bosnia from having that right of self-defense.

Looking back even further to those nations, it is such a common thing; when Poland was dismembered by Austria and Russia and Germany in three separate partitions, with no relationship, no consideration for the Poles in that process.

Well, of course that is a couple of hundred years ago, but one hopes that there is human progress. We have a United Nations. We have a United Nations built on principles here of attempting to avoid this sort of thing, and we have lost now, have lost in the severest kind of way, the moral suasion that would be necessary to act effectively.

In fact, that may be the only way that effective action can come because there is only one superpower now, when if there is not leadership with a very clear and very well-driven goal on the part of this country, then I think we are likely to see this sort of thing happen in place after place, which is a heavy burden, but it is a burden that we as the only superpower in this country have to bear, at least in part, for the level of leadership that we provide.

During all of this, during all of these proposals, that while there were resolutions deploring and condemning what has happened over the last 15 months, none of those have been enforced, none of those have been enforced even to the latest point of safe havens, the effort of safe havens.

When the U.N. forces, as the gentleman himself pointed out, have to act in order to be able to move into an area that is supposedly under safe haven, as the Serbian nationalists concentrate and constricted the area and then bombard the civilian populations, first in Srebenica and then more recently in Goradze, which has been virtually out of contact with the outside world for months now and where the Serbians once in a while will let one or two observers in, where those people are without food and medicine as the safe haven; the latest way in which the United Nations has backed off its commitments to the idea of safe havens. There are ghettos, a little bit like Indian reservations that have been built up in our own Nation over a period of time to put the people who are not wanted into.

Mr. BONIOR. Expendable people in expendable places.

Mr. OLVER. People expended in expendable places, in high concentrations. That is one thing that the Serbian nationalists have added to this mix, is that they have then used modern weapons of bombardment against a population which is a United Nations member which has been denied the right to get the very arms to defend itself while the Serbian nationalists have had full access and have had access throughout this 15-month period to the armaments that were available to the old Yugoslavian army, which now is in the hands of Serbia and Montenegro and has been completely at the disposal of the Serbian nationalists, first

as they have attacked Croatia and then as they have attacked Bosnia.

Well, the proposals that have come out as these resolutions have not been enforced, first we remember there was a proposal by the negotiators. Mr. Vance, a man that I have met, that I do not and cannot believe that he would be rewarding aggression in this kind of a way, rewarding genocide in this kind of a way. And Mr. Owen, sometimes called Lord Owen, a term that we do not use much, that certainly implies certain qualities that I do not see in Mr. Owen whatsoever for the activities that he has conducted over the last few months.

In that instance, the Vance/Owen plan awarded 30 percent of the territory of Bosnia to the Croats, of all things, the allies in this multiethnic state of the Moslems of the Bosnian state, part of the Bosnian state, and the allies of the Moslems in Bosnia, awarded 30 percent when they never had more than 17 percent of the population and where they were awarded areas which were majority-Moslem areas, whole districts, whole areas that were vast majority Moslem in their population. Yet that was awarded, even in the earliest of these plans, to the Croatians, while the Serbs were being rewarded for their aggression and for their genocide along the way.

Frankly, I have to ask is there no shame in this whole process? The 44 percent Moslem population which occupied at least 40 percent of the territory and were the more urban areas, lived in the more urban areas, for the most part, in every single one of the plans put forward by the European Community and by the negotiators for the United Nations have been repeatedly placed at disadvantage. They are the United Nations member.

□ 1130

They are the nation that has been recognized by the whole civilized world, the member of the United Nations that has been denied the right to defend itself, and yet they time after time have been put at disadvantage first in that proposal put forward by Vance and Owen, which was indeed flawed.

President Clinton and Secretary Christopher properly showed it to be flawed.

Mr. BONIOR. At its outset, they properly recognized it at its outset, and then of course changed course as this process went on.

Mr. OLVER. Indeed, they recognized that it was flawed at its outset. Then those negotiators moved to the concept of safe havens, safe havens with no enforcement, safe havens that ended up being ever smaller living ghettos for Moslems in Srebrenica, Gorazda, and Tuzla and Zepce and Sarajevo. Each of of those locations ended up as an ethnic ghetto.

Then finally the proposal for the ultimate give-in to aggression and genocide, the proposal for partition into three parts, where indeed each one of the parts would be allowed to ethnic cleanse the areas that they held and where the Moslems would be given no more than 20 percent of the territories in a state that would be completely unviable along the way.

Well, that is where we are at the present time. How did we get there? I want to say something about how we got there, because one can go back and look at this and ask, did it start in 1200 or 1386 when the Turks defeated the Serbs at Kosovo Field in what is now Kosovo, or whether it was in 1571 or it started at the gates of Vienna or started under the Empress Maria Teresa and the movements of people that she caused in that period of time in her reign in the 1700's in order to create a buffer zone against the very Turks that mixed up the populations in a different kind of way than they had been before, or whether in 1878 or 1914 with the start of the First World War, or after that First World War when for awhile there was an effort to put together that kingdom of Slovenia, Croatia, and Serbia, or whether it started in the Second World War when the partisans in the then-Yugoslavia, Moslems, Serbs, and Croats all fought against the Germans, but also fought against each other and created hatreds which simply exacerbated older hatreds. Whatever was the history, and one could go to each one of those places and see one piece of what has finally come about in the Balkans, whatever it was, for a period of time Tito managed to hold things in a repressive state under control in a constitutionally constructed six Republics within Yugoslavia and two constitutionally constructed autonomous provinces within.

In my sense, when Tito died there was always talk about how Yugoslavia would burst apart.

Certainly we could have gone back to think about it at that time and do something to prepare for that, but the real beginning of this, and it will come around to this again, the real beginning was in Kosovo in 1990, 3 years ago, before the attack by the Serb nationalists in Croatia or in Bosnia, but in Kosovo where that population which is 90 percent Albanian, Albanian Moslems almost totally, but 90 percent Albanians, which are an ethnic group that comes from an older group living in that same Balkan area even before the Slavic peoples moves in, even before those majority peoples of Slovania and Croatia and Serbia and Bosnia moved into that part of the Balkans, in Kosovo in 1990 the Serbs put in 100,000 troops and closed the schools and arrested all the leadership.

Since that time they have been repressing that 90 percent Albanian population in that heavily and densely populated autonomous province of Kosovo. I call it Kosovo because that is the Albanian way of pronouncing it, which had had constitutionally within Yugoslavia autonomy. Essentially the autonomy was removed unilaterally by Serbia at that time and that sent a signal to each of the Republics within Yugoslavia to Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia, and Macedonia, that they were going to be the subject of similar kinds of repression.

Indeed, as a followup, Slovenia and Croatia and Bosnia declared independence, as did Macedonia.

The Serb nationalists tried first to attack Slovenia, discovered that there there was no fifth column.

Then they attacked in June 1991 Croatia. It was then that the United Nations if they did not understand what exactly was happening had an obligation to move, and with all the deploring resolutions and all of the condemnation, they did essentially nothing.

The United Nations and the European community as territories within Croatia, some of them heavily Croatian in their population, were bombarded, destroyed, and taken over.

In fact, peace finally came there when the United Nations sent in troops to hold a truce, which ended up being a way for the United Nations forces in Croatia to hold that territory for a greater Serbia, to initially at its very start to reward the aggression and the genocide that was already starting at that time, though it did not yet become as severe as it has in the case of Bosnia.

In fact, that process I believe has ended up with the United Nations forces holding the territory for the Serb nationalists and leaving them free to attack Bosnia some 15 months ago; but by that time they knew because there had been no enforcement of the previous resolutions and no enforcement of the condemnation of the actions on the part of Serbia in supporting the Serbian nationalists who now control one-third of Croatia.

In that process the Serbian nationalists and Milosevic in Belgrade understood perfectly well that there was no will anywhere on the part of the international community to do anything.

Mr. BONIOR. And the question is whether there will be any will on the part of the international community, especially the United States, to stand up in Kosovo if indeed the Serbs press further their onslaught on the Albanians in Kosovo or whether the international community and the United States will stand idly by if Macedonia is threatened. All these questions now rise higher in the eyes of the probability with respect to further Serbian aggression because of the inaction.

In fact, as the gentleman just correctly pointed out, the ironic support that the United Nations has given Serbia through the United Nations troop

deployment in Croatia and through the actions they have taken today and in other days in New York at the United Nations, it is a very frightening thing what path we are on, and for us to stand by and continue to allow this type of aggression, this type of ethnic cleansing, is just a very sad mark on the international community.

Mr. OLVER. Well, I think the gentleman now really has put the mark on it, because it is in fact a sad thing to see the direction in which this is going, because the process that I have described has led, as my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana, has pointed out, to 200,000 plus or minus, not very many minus, perhaps plus slaughtered, human beings slaughtered merely because they were of a different religion in that area.

□ 2340

No other, since Cambodia of a decade or so ago, in the killing fields in Cambodia, or the kind of history that went on in Uganda a matter of maybe two decades ago; no other kind of numbers of that sort on the part of deliberate slaughter of people and a member of the United Nations has occurred. Two million people have been uprooted from homes that they lived in for generations, and sometimes centuries, in the same family. Mosques, virtually every religious institution in the area, destroyed. Churches, by the way, as well, on the part of the Serbian nationalists, Catholic churches in those areas as well. Families, from the youngest child to the oldest, to the oldest fifth generation, slaughtered together, in total, and we have seen it on our TV sets and in our newspapers, and then the last episodes of the concentration of those populations in those safe havens, the declared safe havens by the United Nations in Srebrenica, and in Zapa, and in Gorazda, which have resulted in forces of the United Nations having to ask the Serbian nationalists committing this genocide whether they could go in, and of course that incredible incident of the vice president of Bosnia dragged from a U.N. vehicle under the very eyes—allowed to be dragged by U.N. forces, and shot and executed summarily right then and there, as if he was the criminal, as the President, duly elected, of Bosnia, a member of the United Nations was simply executed by the Serbian nationalists who were—who had gotten hold of that particular U.N. convoy.

Mr. BONIOR. It is an incredible story. I mean, if you were to write this and publish it without having known the facts, or seen it and viewed it, you would say it was preposterous, the irony and the tragedy of what has gone on here, not only to people, but to the established institutions which were supposedly put in place to safeguard the very sovereignty and safety of these people. It is just the most incredible story.

Mr. OLVER. Well, for it to have happened within 50 years of the Second World War in a European country is truly remarkable.

There are some who did not know, and perhaps a great number who legitimately did not know what happened in the 1940's in the slaughter of Jewish people, and Polish people and other lesser peoples, so-called lesser peoples according to the Nazi regime. But in this instance we all know it. We all know it in this country, and every one of the European countries knows what is going on, and in every instance it would appear that there is no will anywhere there to stop this slaughter of Moslems in Bosnia.

And in that process it seems to me that the U.N. has come perilously close to losing moral persuasion, its right to moral persuasion, in other kinds of situations, and it becomes absolutely clear that only the United States is the superpower, and only if we are willing to act and take strong action will we end up getting the kind of action that would be necessary to stop this kind of thing because those nations seem not capable of taking an action that would stop the kind of genocide that has gone on.

And then we come full circle, I think, to Kosovo because, if it is clear that that is going to go on, that there will be no enforcement, that all that they have to do now with Mr. Tudjman in Croatia, seeing the horrible example that has been put forward and seeing that Serbia is going to get away with it, that he then is going to expect to have 30 percent of Bosnia when never at any time did Croatians occupy more than a few rather small districts within that territory, mostly in the southeastern area near the Dalmatian coast and where it never represented more than perhaps 15 to 20 percent of the territory, even though some of those were relatively low-populated areas. Then we are going to see coming back to Kosovo, we are going to see further repression, the killing of people, the driving of the Albanian population out in that area where two million people live, more than two million, and of whom almost two million are Albanians, 90-percent Albanian population in Kosovo, and who would like to be able to practice their autonomy and, perhaps, their independence.

We are going to see it come full circle to Kosovo because there is nothing in any of the actions that have occurred up to now that the United Nations has taken or that the United States has taken that would lend any credence whatsoever to the idea that action would be taken when the exact kind of ethnic cleansing starts for sure in Kosovo, and then what happens when that occurs and in Latvia, where there is nearly 50-percent Russian ethnics in Latvia, largely because 60 years ago large numbers of Latvians were driven out and taken to Siberia, resettled in Siberia, and replaced by Russian ethnics in Latvia. What then is going to happen when that one blows up? There will be no moral persuasion or no position left for the U.N. to take given what they will have done in the Balkans and what they have done in the case of Croatia and Bosnia.

And then what I believe will happen in Kosovo has already started, the kind of repression which leads to genocide in that territory, and I could go on, as the gentleman might suspect, at this stage, that I could for some time, listing other places where the same sort of thing could happen.

Mr. BONIOR. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER] is a fountain of knowledge on this area of the world, and in the history of the Balkans and in southeastern Europe, and more importantly he is a person of compassion and virtue who is willing to stand up and voice his concerns about this moral bankruptcy that we are witnessing, and I thank him for his time and for participating this evening in this special order. Hopefully at some not too distant future the policy of this country will reflect the moral values that we would have hoped would have been evident in the vote that took place today in the United Nations, but, regrettably, was not.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for allowing me to take part in this special order, to join him and my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, in once again speaking about this issue.

The action today in the United Nations once more has denied the right of this member of the United Nations to defend itself. They were admitted to the United Nations after that embargo was placed, and they should have had the right to defend themselves, and it is an outrage that nine members of the United Nations, nine members of the Security Council, would deny them the right to defend themselves.

That is all they have asked. They have never asked for American troops or anyone else's troops to be placed on the ground. They merely asked for the right to defend themselves against genocide, and for that to have been denied to them is unconscionable in the world community, and it will come back to haunt the world community in this next decade in many different ways.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his contribution, and I thank my dear friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCCLOSKEY] for his contribution.

□ 2350

NATIONAL NYSP DAY

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on

Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 88) to designate July 1, 1993, as "National NYSP Day," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but I do yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER], the joint resolution's chief sponsor, to explain this legislation.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like first of all to thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. McCOLLUM] for allowing me to get up and talk about this.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of Senate Joint Resolution 88, designating July 1, 1993, as "National Youth Sports Program Day." I am proud to have introduced this legislation, with strong bipartisan support, in recognition of the accomplishments of this outstanding program.

When I first introduced this bill with the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], we worked very hard with both our staffs working day in and day out to get the necessary 218 cosponsors to bring this bill to the floor.

This year marks the 25th year of existence for the National Youth Sports Program, which is sponsored by the Department of Health and Human Services and the National Collegiate Athletic Association. Since its inception in 1968, this program, through sports instruction and other enrichments, has helped thousands of disadvantaged youth gain much needed support for their overall personal growth and development.

Last year, at 175 selected colleges and universities, more than 69,000 disadvantaged youth aged 10 to 16 received sports instruction, USDA-approved meals, medical examinations, math and science instruction, and education and career counseling. For most of these youngsters, this program provides a first-time exposure to a collage campus, and often results in the necessary encouragement to stay in school.

My alma mater, the University of Notre Dame, which has a long history of supporting community activities, received funding for the first time in 1992 to participate in this very worthwhile program.

I would like to salute the president of that university, Father Edward Monk Malloy, and the director of the program, Demetrius Marlow, for their hard work in bringing a number of disadvantaged youth to the campus, which I visited over the past summer.

I believe that the National Youth Sports Program is a proven, effective tool, designed to help disadvantaged youth break the cycle of poverty.

Passage of this resolution will be a fitting tribute to the efforts of the people associated with the program throughout the country who have helped make the National Youth Sports Program such an extraordinary success. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his explanation. I know that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], who, as the gentleman acknowledged, was a cosponsor of this effort, would have appreciated the opportunity to be here tonight, but he could not be. The gentleman strongly support it, as we all do.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution which designates July 1 as National Youth Sports Program Day in recognition of this outstanding program's 25th anniversary of serving children.

For a quarter of a century, the National Youth Sports Program has been providing at-risk youth aged 10 to 16 with an opportunity to build self-esteem and to aspire for a high school diploma and a college degree. Under the sponsorship of the Department of Health and Human Services and the National Collegiate Athletic Association, this program has proven to be an effective tool to help disadvantaged youth break the cycle of poverty.

Since its creation in 1968 by the President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports and the National Collegiate Athletic Association, this program has helped thousands of disadvantaged youngsters gain much needed support for their overall personal growth and development through sports instruction and other enrichment programs. The program's name does not do it justice because the program involves much more than just sports instruction. While sports may be the way to interest children in participating in the program, once in the door they receive free medical exams; hot lunches; career discussions; and education on important issues such as preventing AIDS and teen pregnancy and the importance of avoiding alcohol and drugs.

As part of the program's comprehensive health care services provided for participating youth, each child receives a medical examination. Last year, more than 71,000 medical examinations were given and as a result, 20,000 children, or 28 percent of the program participants, were referred to physicians for followup attention.

As a complement to the health care services, the National Youth Sports Program serves a hot, U.S. Department of Agriculture approved, meal daily. For many participants, this is the only nutritious meal they receive during the summer months.

With funds provided by the Appropriations Subcommittee on Health and Human Services I serve on, the National Youth Sports Program, has expanded its offerings to provide math and science instruction from professors, utilizing college facilities and resources. Dr. Maurice Nott, the National Youth Sports Program coordinator for the St. Petersburg Junior College, the program in my congressional district, was a pioneer in encouraging the addition of math and science instruction. Over the past 2 years, students tell me that math and science instruction is the program in greatest demand. It has proven to be such a success, and with the addition of funds by our committee, the number of campuses offering math and science programs is expanding throughout our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, for the thousands of youngsters enrolled in the program at college campuses throughout our Nation, this first-time exposure to college facilities and programs has provided the impetus for many of them to stay in school with the hope of pursuing the dream of a college education after graduation from high school. The programs allow these children to realize that they can transcend their surroundings through education, and that they do not have to give up to a life of despair.

Having visited with children participating in the program, I have seen, first hand, the children's excitement and enthusiasm. Last year, more than 69,000 youngsters participated in the National Youth Sports Program at 175 selected colleges and universities throughout our Nation, and I rise to commend the Department of Health and Human Services, the NCAA, and the many people responsible for the program's remarkable success.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House will consider the 1994 Health and Human Services appropriations bill which includes $12 million for the National Youth Sports Program. The committee approved my request to increase funding for the program by $2.6 million over the 1993 level.

It is only appropriate that the House recognize the valuable contribution of thousands of college and university personnel, teachers, and volunteers who have such a tremendous impact on thousands of children every summer. Now in its 25th year, the mark of the program's success is the number of adults who have come back to assist the program after having had the chance to be a National Youth Sports Program participant as a child. They recognize the impact the program had on their lives and want to give back a part of their experience to today's youth.

Mr. Speaker, this is a program which works and which helps children in so many ways. It is a model program which gives hope and encouragement to children throughout our Nation.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 88

Whereas the National Youth Sports Program (hereafter referred to as "NYSP") is a highly effective and comprehensive youth sports and educational instruction program in the United States for economically disadvantaged youth, ages 10 to 16 years old;

Whereas over 69,000 economically disadvantaged young people participated in NYSP last year at United States colleges and universities in 153 cities, 44 States, and the District of Columbia;

Whereas NYSP provides over 70,000 medical and follow-up examinations as well as health instruction by medical professionals to enrolled youth;

Whereas NYSP provides hot United States Department of Agriculture-approved meals and snacks daily to all participating youth;

Whereas the NYSP staff includes professional instructors with undergraduate degrees who offer educational instruction in drug education, AIDS, higher education, nutrition and health, and math and science, and who offer counseling on such topics as career opportunities, teen pregnancy, antigang strategies, and suicide prevention in an effort to promote personal responsibility;

Whereas NYSP is administered by an advisory committee composed of community leaders and college and university personnel, and collaborates with local community action agencies and mayors' offices;

Whereas the NYSP partnership between the public and private sectors ensures that Federal funds are used to provide direct services for youth, that institutions of higher education contribute facilities and personnel and pay the indirect costs of the program, and that public and private businesses donate equipment and supplies; and

Whereas 1993 marks the 25th year that NYSP has provided economically disadvantaged youth with the opportunity to participate in healthy sports activities in order to encourage these youth to build good habits, to direct the competitive urge toward constructive ends, to stimulate the imagination to reach new goals, and to satisfy the human desire to belong: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That July 1, 1993, is designated as "National NYSP Day". The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon State and local jurisdictions, appropriate Federal agencies, and the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL LITERACY DAY

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 213) designating July 2, 1993, and July 2, 1994, as "National Literacy Day," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE], who is the chief sponsor of House Joint Resolution 213, for an explanation.

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend, the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY], for his assistance in bringing this resolution to the floor today, and I thank Representative WYNN for presiding here tonight.

Each year since I began serving in Congress, I have had the privilege of introducing a measure to set aside one day a year, July 2, as National Literacy Day. I appreciate the outstanding show of support I have had from my colleagues with 231 cosponsoring this resolution and for their assistance in drawing attention to one of the most crucial challenges facing our society: the need to impart literacy skills to all of our people.

As a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, I am frustrated by the fact that in a well-education nation like ours, where we have schools and universities that attract students from all over the world, we continue to have 42 million Americans who read at a level less than necessary for full survival needs. I am frustrated by the fact that, as we strive to increase our national competitiveness and create new technologies, we still have 30 million adults who cannot read, whose resources are left untapped, thus preventing them from making a full contribution to society.

I am frustrated too by the fact that each year, the number of illiterate people in the United States grows by 2 million.

Most of us have fond memories of a favorite book, a poem, or a psalm we read as youngsters, opening up new worlds of adventure and stimulating our imaginations, knowledge and understanding. The sad reality is that today, one million children in the United States between the ages of 12 and 17 cannot read above a third grade level.

The price of illiteracy is very high. Consider that 85 percent of juveniles who appear in criminal court are functionally illiterate, and the public must bear the costs of prosecuting offenders and housing them in jail. Illiteracy takes a toll on our Nation's businesses. It has been estimated that the total cost of errors, accidents and missed opportunities in business has reached a staggering $225 billion annually. I believe that we can eliminate illiteracy if we all pull together and make a concerted effort to address the plight of our fellow Americans who are now shut out of the mainstream because they lack the necessary skills to participate in a meaningful way in our society.

We are fortunate to have many hardworking and committed volunteers all across America who are giving up their time to help others acquire reading skills, and we honor them as we commemorate National Literacy Day.

Mr. Speaker, the date of July 2 is special for another reason, as well—it is the birthday of a man who worked tirelessly to promote education and to break down the barriers that kept people illiterate—the late Thurgood Marshall. Justice Marshall's determination to help those who had been shut out of the system for too long prompted him to fight many legal battles.

He successfully argued 29 cases before the Supreme Court before being appointed a Justice himself by President Lyndon Johnson in 1967. His victory in the historic Brown versus Board of Education decision in 1954 captured worldwide attention, and serves as a lasting tribute to this great American, whom we were saddened to lose earlier this year.

Again, I thank my colleagues for their support of this measure and I extend my deepest appreciation to all of the literacy volunteers across this nation who are making such a difference in the lives of so many people.

I hope that literacy tutoring will play a prominent role in President Clinton's National Service plan, so that we can use the talent and energy of our young people to build a better America. On July 2, National Literacy Day, let us resolve to win a victory over illiteracy, a victory that will benefit us all and move this country forward.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 213

Whereas forty-two million Americans today read at a level which is less than necessary for full survival needs;

Whereas there are thirty million adults in the United States who cannot read, whose resources are left untapped, and who are unable to offer their full contribution to society;

Whereas illiteracy is growing rapidly, as two million three hundred thousand persons, including one million two hundred thousand legal and illegal immigrants, one million high school dropouts, and one hundred thousand refugees, are added to the pool of illiterates annually;

Whereas the annual cost of illiteracy to the United States in terms of welfare expenditures, crime, prison expenses, lost revenues, and industrial and military accidents has been estimated at $225,000,000,000;

Whereas the competitiveness of the United States is eroded by the presence in the workplace of millions of Americans who are functionally or technologically illiterate;

Whereas there is a direct correlation between the number of illiterate adults unable to perform at the standard necessary for available employment and the money allocated to child welfare and unemployment compensation;

Whereas the percentage of illiterates in proportion to population size is higher for blacks and Hispanics, resulting in increased economic and social discrimination against these minorities;

Whereas the prison population represents the single highest concentration of adult illiteracy;

Whereas one million children in the United States between the ages of twelve and seventeen cannot read above a third grade level, 13

per centum of all seventeen-year-olds are functionally illiterate, and 15 per centum of graduates of urban high schools read at less than a sixth grade level;

Whereas 85 per centum of the juveniles who appear in criminal court are functionally illiterate;

Whereas the 47 per centum illiteracy rate among black youths is expected to increase;

Whereas one-half of all heads of households cannot read past the eighth grade level and one-third of all mothers on welfare are functionally illiterate;

Whereas the cycle of illiteracy continues because the children of illiterate parents are often illiterate themselves because of the lack of support they receive from their home environment;

Whereas Federal, State, municipal, and private literacy programs have only been able to reach 5 per centum of the total illiterate population;

Whereas it is vital to call attention to the problem of illiteracy, to understand the severity of the problem and its detrimental effects on our society, and to reach those who are illiterate and unaware of the free services and help available to them; and

Whereas it is also necessary to recognize and thank the thousands of volunteers who are working to promote literacy and provide support to the millions of illiterates in need of assistance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That July 2, 1993 and July 2, 1994 are designated as "National Literacy Day", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and include therein extraneous material on Senate Joint Resolution 88 and House Joint Resolution 213, the joint resolutions just considered and passed.

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

There was no objection.

□ 0000

TERM LIMITATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening on special order time to talk about a subject that is very important to the American public but gets very little attention these days, and that is the limitation on terms of we Members of Congress.

Those of us who have served in this body for some time understand the problems and the reasons why the American public are very frustrated with the whole subject of the way we conduct our business here and the fact that their wishes overwhelmingly, in the latest poll, I think 75.6 percent believe that there should be an amendment to the U.S. Constitution to limit the terms of Members of Congress.

Yet, for what reasons are pretty apparent to many of us around here, this subject simply does not get discussed, let alone acted upon.

As a result of that fact, some 15 States have proceeded already in the past few years to enact their own efforts to try to limit the terms of their Congressmen and women who serve in this body. There are several more who are proceeding through an initiative process to do precisely the same thing and, in one case, through a State legislature, to do the same thing for those Congressmen in those States.

That is simply not an acceptable way to ultimately resolve this matter. There needs to be uniformity across the country. There needs to be one constitutional amendment to the U.S. Constitution that applies to every single Member of the U.S. House and Senate that limits the length of time that he or she may serve in this body.

Since 1981, in every Congress I have been here, I have introduced such a resolution for a constitutional amendment. This year that resolution is House Joint Resolution 38. It is for a period of six 2-year House terms and six 2-year Senate terms. Those 12-year terms for each of the bodies is the most commonly accepted numbers of years, though the precise number of years is always subject to debate and concern.

This year, for the first time, we have gone over the 30 to 35 cosponsor number and have now reached the number of 89 Members of the House of Representatives who have cosponsored this resolution for a constitutional amendment. That is far from the number necessary to pass it, which requires, of course, two-thirds in the House and two-thirds in the Senate. But it is a significant measure of the public sentiment and the improvement of the climate for term limits that exists out there today.

The fact of the matter is that despite this increased support and the obvious support in the polls and in the votes that have gone on in the States where this issue has come up in the past couple of years, we still do not have an opportunity in this body to even have a hearing, let alone to get a vote, on this subject.

All of the cosponsors of this amendment, as of several months ago, signed a letter to the chairman of the subcommittee of the Judiciary in the House that holds this particular document and this particular legislative matter, asking, if nothing else, that a simple hearing be allowed during this session of Congress that would let us voice our concerns and bring to the public attention the various arguments of the proponents and the opponents.

And there are people who have legitimate arguments opposed to this. But that has not occurred, and it does not appear that it will occur for the simple reason that the leadership of this Congress does not wish that to happen.

In fact, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives himself, the Honorable Tom Foley has instituted a lawsuit in his home State of Washington attempting to throw out and overturn the actions of that State in limiting the terms of its Congressmen and Congresswomen.

I think that is indicative of the problem that we have in getting anywhere with this issue in this Congress, the way it is presently constituted. For this reason and for the reasons of the concern of these supporters of term limits, who are here and representing the interests of the vast majority of the American people, on Thursday of this week, those of us who are cosponsoring this measure will offer a discharge petition that we hope most of the cosponsors and maybe a sizable number of other Members seeking to have the opportunity given to us to debate this issue and to have it discussed and voted on in hopes that they will sign this discharge petition in sufficient number of 218, which is the majority of the House, to let it come out here and have a vote.

I presume, since we only have 89 cosponsors, that it is unlikely we will achieve the 218 number. But it seems to us that it is absolutely essential that some vehicle be provided, in the absence of at least a hearing, let alone a vote in the committee, to let this particular matter have a day and a say in the House of Representatives.

We are determined to use the means of special order, the means of press attention in every way, from 1-minute speeches or whatever it may take and, yes, perhaps even a rump hearing or two over the course of the next several months to bring the attention of the American public to this issue and to the fact that their voice is not going unheeded, that there are substantial numbers of the U.S. House of both political parties, Republican and Democrat, who believe in this cause and who want to see a constitutional amendment uniformly enacted throughout this Nation and who do understand that it is very, very important.

This evening I am not going into all of the details. I have two or three of my colleagues here tonight who are going to share, though, for a few minutes, some of the arguments, some of the history and some of the rationale behind why we need this.

From my personal perspective, from observing this body for some time, it seems to me that the bottom line reason that kind of sums it all up is that

over the years the Members of the House and the Members of the Senate have become too career-oriented.

If you go back to the history of our great Nation, you will see that the Founding Fathers did not envision serving as long as the Members now serve for the most part. They envisioned a citizen legislator who went to Washington, particularly to serve in the House of Representatives, and that that person serve only a term or two and go home to his or her business and do whatever was left about the way of life that they had come from and that somebody else would take their place here.

In fact, of course, for many years this body did not engage nor did the other body in sessions that lasted more than a month or two. Today Congress has become a full-time job. Whether we like it or not, that is not going to easily be reversed because the business of this Nation and the role of the Federal Government has increased to such a degree that it does require a full-time job for the duration of the service in Congress.

Going along with that over the years is the increasing phenomenon of Members who stay here for long, long periods of time. While some may argue that we do have a turnover percentagewise, that still is fairly high of the total body over a period of 4-to-6 years. Those who are in power in the key positions in leadership and in committee chairmanships and really running the business of the House and Senate have been here for years and years and years.

I might remind my colleagues that Speaker FOLEY, whom I mentioned a moment ago, who is out testing this matter and opposes term limits so much, was first elected in 1964, when the average price of a new Oldsmobile was $3,495.

Chairman JACK BROOKS of the Committee on the Judiciary, the committee where this is bottled up and cannot come out, was elected when Arthur Godfrey was a radio star and the Braves played baseball in Boston in 1952.

□ 0010

All of this was brought out recently in a column that many of the Members may have read in their newspapers by George Will, but it is a fact. We could go on and on with regard to putting this in perspective, but the bottom line is that those who are serving today in this body who control the system, who have not let their amendment see the light of day in terms of debate, let alone in terms of getting action on it, are Members with vested reason for wanting to be here. They are career-oriented.

I would submit that that career orientation is really the root of the problem; that is, the desire of so many Members to get reelected, to stay here, and that desire, whether it is open and apparent to them on the surface, is a very significant reason why so much legislation continues to flow from this body that creates the budget deficits and the tremendous debt this Nation has piled up over the last few years, not to mention the many other inefficiencies and rather strange things that the public continues to see emanate from the bodies of the House and the Senate.

It is, of course, not the only reason that we have a problem. It is not the only reason why we need term limits. There are many more: to energize this body, to have younger and more energetic Members coming in with more regularity, to get the chairmanships of committees in the position where they should be, of new blood and new thoughts and new actions, and yes, to encourage people to run for Congress.

If we had term limits, I am convinced there would be many more people willing to serve if they thought they could come here for a few years, give that service, come out of their business life, give that service and really make a contribution; in other words, be able to get to a position where they could be influential in either being chairmen of the committees, if they are the Majority party, or being the senior Republican or Minority Member, if it is a Democrat, a Democrat who is the ranking Minority member on the committee.

That is not the case presently, and many do not choose to run for Congress, good men and women who otherwise would, in my judgment.

The list of reasons goes on and on. I hope now that, rather than my taking up a long-winded approach to the subject of explaining the history, that I could yield to a couple of my colleagues, and three of them are here tonight. I do not know which one wishes to ask me first to yield to him, but I would be delighted to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield first to my good friend, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. GOSS], who has now arisen.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, let me begin by thanking my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] for allowing me to join him tonight to discuss term limits. He has been a leader and strong supporter of this reform for many years, and I commend him for his efforts to bring the issue to the floor of Congress.

Regrettably, the majority leadership in the House continues to stymie our efforts to get term limits to the floor for debate and a vote. We are here at this late hour, using one of the few avenues available to the minority, because term limits have been repeatedly and deliberately denied a debate or vote during regular business on the House floor. The powers that be in the House have clearly signaled that, on this issue, the people's voice will not be heard. In this case the people's House does not seem to belong to the people. Take back the Government from entrenching leadership.

To many Americans, stonewalling term limits simply does not make sense. Millions of Americans support and voted for term limits last November. Yet from their Congress—and I stress it is supposed to be their Congress, we work for them—they have seen nothing to bring them closer to the goal of national term limits.

Opponents of term limits know they cannot win at the ballot box because of the grassroots support that is the backbone of the term limits movement. Some 70 percent of Americans now back term limits, and that support cuts across party lines, demography and geography. In every State where the term limits issue was on the ballot last November, voters approved them in convincing fashion. In my State of Florida, term limits passed almost 4 to 1. Fifteen States now have imposed term limits on their elected officials. By anybody's judgment, the tide is flooding in.

But instead of hearing and acting on calls for reform, the leadership in Congress seems tied up in a conspiracy of silence. The House Democrat leadership is using its absolute control to block our way and obstruct our progress. It is literally standing on the shore trying to hold back the incoming water.

In at least one instance, the conspiracy of silence has turned into outright defiance. According to published reports, the Speaker of the House, an ardent, outspoken opponent of term limits, has joined in suit against the people of Washington State after they passed term limits last November. The American people are beginning to understand that some very powerful, influential, and senior Members of this body do not want term limits to happen.

Nonetheless, there are things that can and must be done to keep the momentum going. That is why on the first of July, I will join Mr. MCCOLLUM and 87 other Members of Congress in signing a discharge petition to force House consideration of term limit legislation. This petition, if successful, would force legislation out of the Judiciary Committee where it now languishes, and bring it to the floor for a vote.

I urge those watching tonight to call and write their Representatives and ask them to sign this petition. And next fall during election time, I hope they will ask those who wish to represent them where they stand on the issue. Term limits will go as far as we push them, and our success depends on vocal and sustained support from the

American people. If we leave it to the Democrat leaders of the House—we leave it to certain extinction.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I certainly thank him for his leadership on this. We have been here fighting this battle for some time.

The good news this year is that with the freshman class coming in, this new class designed, I think, almost ideally in its composition for reforming the institution, we have gained this additional support and gone up from the 33 cosponsors now to 89 cosponsors. That is the reason.

We have two of that freshman class group here tonight, two of the ones that brought us to this point.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN], one of those Members.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding to me, and as did Mr. GOSS, I congratulate the gentleman on his dedicated leadership to bring this matter not only before the House, but come before the American people.

We hope this little discussion tonight, which will be the first of a number of such discussions, will arouse the American people to write their Representative in Congress and to urge them to support House Joint Resolution 38, which the gentleman from Florida and the cosponsors he has noted, including those here, have supported and endorsed.

Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult when these worthwhile reform proposals that are supported by 70 percent of the American people get bottled up, lost in the cabinets of some of the committees, in this case, the Committee on the Judiciary, made up of very fine people, but there is a difference of view, and every parliamentary device will be used to try to prevent this issue from coming to the floor of the House where the people's representatives could vote it up or down, go on record and let the voters be the judge in the next campaign.

One of the problems that term limits seeks to solve is the fact that in many States the voters simply do not have a choice. They think they have a choice. There may be a Republican competing with a Democrat on the ballot, but usually it is either a safe Democratic seat or a safe Republican seat.

I happen to come from a State that has just that electoral history. I would just like to take a moment to note in the 1980's, under the reapportionment of the 1980 Census, we had five elections for Congress in that decade: 1982, 1984, 1986, 1988, 1990.

Roughly, there were 470 individual elections, the primaries and the generals; 235 primary contests, 235 general election contests. How much change occurred in terms of the clash of ideas with incumbents and challengers that resulted in an incumbent being defeated?

The answer is not very much.

□ 0020

Two Republicans who were incumbents were defeated in the primaries. Four Members of Congress were defeated in the general. Three were Democrats, one a Republican. Now that is not very much change out of 470 potential opportunities. And that is because the State legislature divided the State so that the majority party, the Democratic Party would automatically gain a majority. The Republicans would forever be a minority. If you go to other States, a Republican State legislature does the same thing only in reverse. Republicans are the majority, Democrats are the minority. That does not give the voters a choice.

How can the voters get a choice when it takes millions of dollars in some races to either defeat an incumbent in the primary or to defeat an incumbent in the general, and this body has not acted on effective campaign finance reform? We hope it will in this session, but we have lacked leadership to do that. Certainly the gentleman's proposal is a worthwhile device to say once we get that reform we can also assure that some change will occur.

Many will argue well, that is sad. We love Representative so-and-so, and many are worthy of that devotion. But how can we exist without them? Well, some will remember from history when Henry Clay came here from Kentucky he was elected Speaker his first day in the Chamber during the War of 1812. Did he serve the next 30 years in this Chamber? No. He left for a diplomatic assignment to end the war, and someone else was Speaker. He came back. His colleagues elected him Speaker again, he was such a magnetic force. Again he went away, and it happened three times, and what happened with Clay no one else has ever achieved to be so popular that his colleagues had faith in him and put him in the highest office this Chamber can bestow on one of its Members, and yet he was not a career politician. Indeed, he served in many assignments in the executive branch and the legislative branch. But the people had the choice of sending him here, and he willingly put himself to the test of the people.

There are many others like that, and there is no question we might lose some real statesmen or stateswomen, people that are very wise, very effective, and in many, respected by all of us. And we know a number in this Chamber. We have known a number in every Chamber. But the fact is in America we are not limited on talent. There are people in every city, in every county, in every State that can certainly be the equal of any of us in this Chamber in terms of ability, in terms of dedication, in terms of patriotism, any standard you want to use. Yet many of those people do not want to run for office, given the tremendous structural impediments that face them when they try to take on an incumbent.

Now, we are incumbents, and maybe we are sort of foolish to sit here and encourage challenges. But the fact is that is the basis of our democracy, is to have a contest of ideas and have the willingness of the incumbent and the challenger to debate, to go out and face the people, to raise questions with them. And if we are on the wrong side of an issue, to try to educate the electorate that that was the right decision to make. And certainly when people become entrenched, and we see the entrenchment here. I happen to be 62 years of age. My party, the Republican Party, has only controlled this Chamber for 4 of the 62 years, and for the last 40, one party has controlled this Chamber.

Now there are wonderful people in that party, just as there are wonderful people in our party. But I would argue, as Lord Actin once said, power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely. The fact is no matter what party controls, when you have controlled for 40 years, no matter how hard you try, there is a tendency to say we are living in the best of all possible worlds. What more could you want. We are in charge. And we see that in terms of minority rights in this Chamber. The attempt to take away special orders as we are engaging in now at the beginning of the session, backing off and now other attempts at it. The fact is that would shut off the freedom of not only Republicans but Democrats as we heard earlier this evening discussing one of the crucial foreign policy issues that confront this country in Yugoslavia, Bosnia, Macedonia, Croatia and Serbia.

So we need a device which will assure change in this Chamber.

I am optimistic, because you see those 15 States that face up to the challenge where 2 to 1 in many States the voters said we want this changed.

Now there is one difference between some of those proposals and your proposal, and that is some of them have 6-year limits for the House, 12 for the Senate, two 6-year terms. Your proposal I think correctly has 12 for the House and 12 for the Senate, since we are coequal bodies under the Constitution that make up the Congress of the United States. And there is going to be a very fascinating test that we are put to. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] mentioned that already the clock is running. We face that in California. We have 52 Members in the delegation. I was for term limits. In fact, I first suggested them in 1973 at a meeting Time magazine had.

But the fact is the clock is running, and within 5 years many in this country who are incumbents in this Chamber will have to face the fact that under the laws of their State, if they are not overthrown or sent back by the court for rethinking, they will be leaving this Chamber. And I would hope those who are so dug in already, that they will not prevent your worthy resolution, House Joint Resolution 38, coming out of committee and will realize if they do not let that out of committee those variety of State rulings and laws will affect their political destiny. And it ought to be in their self-interest to get for once constitutional standard across this land so one State could not play off the other as the State of Washington did when it first turned down term limits with ads saying if you have term limits, the Californians will control all of the committees and we in Washington will not.

Despite that scare tactic, the State of Washington had approved an amendment to the Constitution which assured that the Members that represent that State would also be subject to the limits similar to the ones in California and other States that have adopted that.

We also hear that well, you know, we might have able people at all levels. But gee, we ought to keep the ones we have got because they have done so much for us, and we like our Member of Congress; we just do not like all of those others we read about. And you know, if we have all of this change, why the lobbyists will take over, the staff will run us and everything else.

I must say, as I am sure you must think, that sort of bemuses me. Some would argue the lobbyists already control some of the committees and some of the Members. Granted, you see a profile in courage every day here as President Kennedy once said about the United States Senate when you know that Members vote the national interest on many occasions, not simply the parochial State or local district interest. But the fact in term limits would help assure responsiveness not only by Members, but by staff, because often the power of the staff comes with the power the Member has in longevity and seniority, and if you had a turnover you would have fresh faces supporting you at the staff level, or you would have a change in attitude and perception that guided those staff judgments, which often you do not have now.

Mr. McCOLLUM. I would like to comment on what the gentleman is saying, because in the time that I have served here, which is a little longer than he has, I have observed the fact that it is not unusual when a new chairman comes onto a subcommittee or a committee that all of a sudden the whole process just shapes up where it was not before, because he gets in there, and he wants to find out what it is all about. And staff control it less when the new chairman is there than they did when the older or longer term chairman was in there, and he just sort of lets the staff do it, and that is something most people do not see.

I hear that criticism, like you do, every day that that is the thing that will happen that will be so horrible if you adopt term limits, that somehow staff will run this place and not the Congressmen.

□ 0030

It is really just the opposite of that. We will take it back over again.

Mr. HORN. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I happen to be serving on some subcommittees this year where there are new Chairs and new staff members. That does not mean we should get rid of all of the staff when we are lucky enough to be Chairs of a subcommittee, but the fact is that change does occur within the institution. But one of the problems is that we need the turnover to assure that more people have an opportunity to be subcommittee Chairs, to be ranking members in the case of the minority party, and as the gentleman knows, the Republican Conference has adopted just such a rule to put a 6-year limit on the service of ranking members. Hopefully the majority party, the Democratic Party, will also do that with the Chairs.

Because there is talent in this Chamber in depth in a lot of committees, and it seems that over time you get just the result the gentleman mentions, which is the desire to rethink some of the programs, not just take the past and what we approved a year or two or a decade ago for granted, but to challenge and to question regardless of what party is in control of the administration downtown. And that is certainly going to be encouraged when you are trying to represent the people.

And we are in an era of change in this Nation, in the globe at large.

Now, some might say, "Well, would shorter periods of service really gain the goals we are talking about?" Well, I think so. Would we be more responsive to the people? You bet we would be more responsive to the people, because any who came here would have to be sort of like Abraham Lincoln in 1847 when he came here. He only stayed one term, but he made an impact in that one term with the spot resolution that challenged the Polk administration on the conduct of the Mexican War. He was not a silent person in this Chamber.

Other Members we have seen develop, as the gentleman mentioned, recently, DICK ARMEY, who is a good example who made a major contribution as a junior Member and solved a problem that this Chamber had not solved, and that was how do you close a military installation that is no loner needed. The Chamber had not been able to close them, and he thought up a creative process of a Base Closure Commission which we have just all gone through here, appointed by the President, the majority, and the minority leaders of both Chambers, and the way the recommendations work, at last some results occur. That was a creative idea by a fairly junior Member in this Chamber. And that has made a major impact on public policy in this country.

As I mentioned earlier, with the cost of campaign finance, we need these structural changes. We need campaign finance reform, and a lot of us that are here tonight are working for that. But until we get that assured, this is still necessary, and this will be necessary after we get it assured.

So I would like to thank the gentleman again for the leadership in this area and hope that the American people will not just sit there and say, "Well, that is an interesting debate," but will say, "That debate, how it comes out, will make real change in my life," when you are talking about the deficit, when you are talking about health care, when you are talking about economic prosperity, the three issues that practically every Member of this Chamber ran on.

But health care is a good example. We are going to have gridlock, not between parties, not between Congress and the executive, but we are going to have gridlock between interest groups down there at the grassroots, and many subcommittees will consider that. That is because, over time, many Members, regardless of party, have become dug in with certain interests, and it will be hard to change that, because some of them come from very safe districts where only if the people know what is going on will change really come about.

Your proposal will assure that change will be made.

Mr. McCOLLUM. I thank the gentleman very much for coming out tonight and making those observations, and I would like to amplify one of the earlier comments that he made that if this is going to be effective, if we are going to accomplish what we want using this discharge petition and the time we are taking and so forth, we need to have folks who are willing to monitor what their Congressman or Congresswoman is doing in this regard, whether they are cosponsoring this particular resolution, House Joint Resolution 38, which is the number of it, and whether or not they are signing the discharge petition that will be out here on the floor of the House this Thursday and will be here through the duration of the rest of this Congress.

We need for this to be brought up, and we need to have people monitor it, and then hold their Congressman or Congresswoman accountable in the

next election cycle, because it is obvious the numbers have to increase in this body for this to become effective.

But that is the bottom-line reason why we are here.

Mr. HORN. In brief, what you are saying is, "Go to the fax machine, Mr. and Mrs. Citizen, and write your Member a friendly note that you are watching, that you want the support of term limits, and you want a national policy in this area, not simply scattered policies around the country?"

Mr. McCOLLUM. That is right. That you want to find out where that person stands. Maybe you do not know. Then you can tell your neighbors, and it can be part of the next election debate, if that Member is not aboard in this, because this resolution, even though we may differ exactly on what the length of terms ought to be, is the one that everybody virtually who is involved in term limits of either party has decided to make as the vehicle for this debate.

So nobody should be allowed to duck away from it.

Now, we have one other freshman here tonight with us representing the middle part of the country. I realize that we have got the Southern and the Eastern part, and we have got the Western part, and we also are represented from that class, that great freshman class, by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG], and I am happy to yield to him.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

I am delighted to be here to indicate my strong support for your resolution for term limits for all the Members of Congress, not just a few.

I want to commend you for the effort that you have made, for your leadership and the strong tone of your eloquence this evening as to exactly where you stand on this matter. I think you have highlighted in very great detail, as have my colleagues on either side here, just what it is we want with this business of term limits.

One reason that I ran for office is the firm conviction that Congress required some fundamental reform. I think an important step to improving our system would be to let the entrenched interests here in Washington know that the days of the career politicians are numbered and should be numbered. The Representatives in the People's House should be more concerned about the well-being of this country than they are with building their own political empires.

Right now, most Americans believe just the reverse, and that is corroding the trust for this body. I think we are here as representatives of the people, and we should be listening to what the American people are saying.

There is no question that public sentiment in this country is for term limits. As has been mentioned, in 15 States since last fall, including my own State of Michigan, term limits passed by overwhelming majorities. This spring I did a study through my newsletter that I sent out, and tens of thousands of responses came back indicating they supported term limits, limiting congressional terms. The answer of the report was some 81 percent were in favor of term limits, which exceeds most of the studies and most of the surveys that have been done, but that is for my own particular district in Michigan.

Our Founding Fathers envisioned a government of citizen-legislators who would have firsthand knowledge of how the actions they were taking would affect their families and their neighbors back home. Now, until January, I was one of those people. I ran a small business. I could not understand why politicians kept saying they were concerned about jobs and seemed to be determined to bury the small businesses and bury jobs and bury businessmen like me with this impossible regulation and all the tax burdens that come along with it.

Now I am sitting in Congress as a Member of Congress. I am serving on the Small Business Committee, which is one committee, and I am still dismayed by the assault that is made on small business, on America's entrepreneurs, on America's job creators. But I do have a better understanding of why this is happening.

The reason I believe is too many people here in Washington are totally out of touch. They may be well-intentioned. I truly think they are. But they fail to realize that the laws that they are passing are not academic experiments. They do not feel the burdens from these laws, because they exempt themselves, and it is impossible when you exempt yourselves to feel the impact of the law. They cannot understand then what these burdens do to everyday Americans who are trying to earn a living, trying to raise a family, and because they have breathed this rarefied air, and I am talking about the politicians now, they have breathed this rarefied air here in Washington for far too long and, Mr. Speaker, if we thwart the will of the American people and let the term-limit amendment languish in committee, the American people will be justified in writing this body off, because it frankly will have ceased to serve them.

I urge my colleagues to sign the discharge petition, bring the amendment up on the floor, and sent it to the American people for ratification. I believe reform starts here.

I know that the hour is late. I do not intend to go any further, but I do want to come back and salute the gentleman from Florida [Mr. McCOLLUM] for the leadership he has displayed. He has been at this for a long time. I have just come into this arena, but I strongly feel, as he does, this is important to America. It is the reform that the American people want. I salute you for all the efforts you have made and my colleagues for being here.

Mr. McCOLLUM. I thank you for coming out tonight and letting us know how you feel about this, as I know you represent a lot of other folks who are not here tonight who are particularly from your class who feel so strongly about this issue.

You make one particularly good point about signing the discharge petition.

□ 0040

Because a Member of Congress does not have to be in favor of this particular proposal to sign the discharge petition. That Member of Congress does not even have to favor term limits to understand that it is fundamentally unfair not to let this issue come out for debate. In order to provide fairness for the voice of the American people to be heard, Members of Congress of all persuasions on this issue should sign the petition for House Joint Resolution 38. I would hope, too, that the American public, who are ultimately going to hold our colleagues responsible in the election process and in their town meeting which they hold and in the letter writings and so on, would recognize that distinction, and even where their Member may have legitimate concern and opposition to this position, could at least argue with them, and I believe argue very correctly, that they should sign the discharge petition to let the debate occur whatever the result might be.

That is a very important point the gentleman is making at this juncture, and I thank him for doing that.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

Mr. GOSS. I think the gentleman has used a term, "discharge petition," which we understand here, but I am not sure everybody in the world does.

Mr. McCOLLUM. That is a good point.

Mr. GOSS. It seems odd, I am sure, to many Americans that so many Congresspersons seem to support the idea of term limits. Why is it that there are only 89 or so, however many, out of 435, or 440, counting the delegates, who have gotten involved with the discharge petition? Of course, there is the down side. Perhaps the gentleman would like to explain why there is sometimes some reluctance to sign discharge petitions.

Mr. McCOLLUM. I would be glad to take a bite at that. There is some reluctance because you go on the record here with the leadership of this body, who does not want to see this out here. If you are particularly involved in the majority party, it becomes very difficult to sign a discharge petition and put your name on the line. And then if it becomes a factor, we get the 218 to sign it, and it comes out to the floor,

there is going to be a recorded vote and everybody is going to get to see who stands for what rather than your being able to go home and say, "Well, I will skate around this, maybe I do favor this, I do favor this, I do favor that." You are not on the record then. But you would be on the record if we got that discharge petition out here.

What that means is that it goes around the Rules Committee, as the gentleman was going to point out, I think. The gentleman serves on that committee, and he knows that even if we got a bill out of the committee, the regular Judiciary Committee, for example, it would still not get to the floor unless the Rules Committee of the leadership which controls it allowed it to do that. But this circumvents all of that, the committee, the Rules Committee, everybody, brings it straight to the floor for a vote, for debate, of course, and then a vote.

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HORN. Is it not true that the public will never know who signed that discharge petition because under the rules of the House, who signs is a confidential matter.

Mr. McCOLLUM. That is right.

Mr. HORN. There is a proposal to charge that rule. In fact, there is a discharge petition there to get that rule out of committee so that we can vote on it so the public will know.

Mr. McCOLLUM. That is the discharge petition No. 2. I signed it, as the gentleman probably did, in the last day or two to change that rule.

Mr. HORN. That is right. But we need to get open rules where we know who is willing to put their name on the dotted line because, as both gentlemen indicate, there have been notorious examples in this chamber in the last decade where key powerful Chairs go up and practically lead a member of the majority party by the nape of the neck to cross their name off the discharge petition.

And it seems to me one of the things we are going to do to try to remedy this, when we have sort of discharge Thursday around here, with the gentleman's proposal, to see if people who sign that will sign sort of an exit poll survey that they have signed the discharge petition. So at least the voters can have an indication from the Members as to who signed that petition and the voters, suitably informed, can take whatever appropriate action they would like to take.

Mr. McCOLLUM. I think the gentleman has stated it very well. I think in conclusion tonight we need to make a point of the fact that while the ones of us here tonight are Republicans who are discussing this and there was mention in the discussion about the frustrations that we particularly share, the fact of the matter is there are Democrat cosponsors of this legislation, there are members of the Democrat Party, this House of Representatives, who plan to sign the discharge petition. And while they may be in a minority here, they represent the vast majority of their political party.

This is not a partisan issue. In the American public opinion polls that have been taken, the most recent of which was the Fabrizio-McLaughlin national poll that I mentioned earlier, not by name but by statistic, shows the 76.6 percent support nationwide of all demographic and makeup of the entire country. Interestingly enough, when asked to break that down by political party, 74.9 percent of all Democrats polled in this national poll were in favor of term limits. So that says that maybe there is half a percentage point or so difference between Republicans and Democrats on this issue in the country and no more.

It just does not matter what region of the country you are from, it does not matter what political party you are registered with, it does not matter what your ethnic or any other background might be the American people, by 75 percent-plus margin favor limiting the terms of Members of Congress. and yet we have not been able to get even a hearing on this subject, despite the fact that we have 89 Members who signed onto one particular proposal, which is the leading proposal.

It is for that reason tonight, wrapping up, that we are here to announce the fact that we are using the device of this discharge petition to try to draw attention to this, to try to get the debate going on it and to give the public a chance to hold their Members accountable for whether or not they sponsor the bill or piece of legislation to, at the very least, declare themselves in favor of bringing this out through signature on the discharge petition for debate and for a vote on the floor of the House so that it can be resolved, so that we can determine, as my colleagues so ably pointed out tonight, who is really for this and who is not for this and let the elections and the American public hold all of the Members of this body accountable on the terms of this issue.

I want to thank the gentleman for joining me tonight. There will be other opportunities for some discussion. This is just the beginning of this debate. We will make sure that many other occasions occur in this Congress for that to happen.

Again I thank them for this and hope that anyone who wishes to will remember the resolution No. 38 and make sure their Congressman or Congresswoman hears about it.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BLUTE (at the request of Mr. MICHEL) for today, on account of the arrival of the newest member of the family, James Geremia Blute.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida (at the request of Mr. MICHEL) until 2 p.m. today, on account of medical reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. McCOLLUM) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 30 minutes, on June 30.

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

Mr. GLICKMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BONIOR, for 60 minutes each day, on August 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. WYNN) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BONIOR, for 60 minutes each day, on September 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28, 29, and 30; October 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29; November 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 29, and 30; and December 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28, 29, 30, and 31.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McCOLLUM) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HERGER.

Mr. GALLEGLY in two instances.

Mr. SANTORUM.

Mr. SHUSTER.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. BILIRAKIS.

Mr. CRANE in three instances.

Mr. KOLBE.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas in three instances.

Mr. RAMSTAD.

Mr. PORTMAN.

Mr. SUNDQUIST.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut.

Mr. SOLOMON.

Mr. MANZULLO.

Mr. ISTOOK.

Mr. DORNAN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ROEMER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BECERRA.

Mr. SYNAR.

Mr. LAFALCE.

Mr. GLICKMAN.

Mr. CARDIN.

Mr. LIPINSKI in two instances.
Mr. CLAY.
Mr. TOWNS in two instances.
Mr. HAMBURG.
Mrs. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
Mr. POSHARD.
Mr. KLEIN.
Mr. SHEPHERD.
Mr. MINETA.
Mr. MAZZOLI.
Mr. KANJORSKI.
Mr. BISHOP.
Mr. FAZIO.
Mr. MURPHY.
Ms. ESHOO.
Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
Mr. MENENDEZ.
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCCOLLUM) and to include extraneous matter:)
Mr. KLUG.
Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 48 minutes a.m.), the House adjourned until today, Wednesday, June 30, 1993, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to as follows:

1489. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's private reinsurance study, pursuant to Public Law 102-242, section 322(b)(1) (105 Stat. 2371); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1490. A letter from the Chairman, National Commission on Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome, transmitting the Commission's final report entitled, "AIDS: An Expanding Tragedy," pursuant to Public Law 100-607, section 245(b)(1) (102 Stat. 3106); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1491. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice concerning the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Korea for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 93-22), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1492. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification of the Department of the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to the Coordination Council for North American Affairs for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 93-23), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1493. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of defense equipment sold commercially to Japan (Transmittal No. DTC-14-93), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1494. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, Department of State, transmitting notification of the removal of items from the U.S. munitions list, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2778(f); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1495. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of the report of political contributions by Andrew J. Winter, of New York, to be Ambassador to the Republic of the Gambia and members of his family, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1496. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to authorize the transfer of $20,000,000 in addition to United States war reserve stockpiles for allies in Thailand to support the implementation of a bilateral agreement with Thailand; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1497. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting his certification that the amounts appropriated for the Board for International Broadcasting for grants to Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, Inc., are less than the amount necessary to maintain the budgeted level of operation because of exchange rate losses in the first quarter of fiscal year 1993, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2877; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1498. A letter from the Acting Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, transmitting the fiscal year 1994 arms control impact statement, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2576(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1499. A letter from the Director, Office of Science and Technology Policy, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(e); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1500. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting the semiannual reports of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation and the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 1992, through March 31, 1993, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2501. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1502. A letter from the Secretary, Smithsonian Institution, transmitting the semiannual report of the inspector general for the period October 1, 1992, through March 31, 1993, and the management report for the same period, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1503. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the annual report on "Collision Avoidance Systems" for the fiscal year 1992, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. app. 1348 note; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

1504. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the Department's annual report, entitled "Transportation Security" for calendar year 1992, pursuant to Public Law 101-604, section 102(a) (104 Stat. 3068); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

1505. A letter from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "Extension of VA Contract and Grant Authority in the Philippines Act of 1993"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1506. A letter from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "Persian Gulf Veterans Treatment Act of 1993"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1507. A letter from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "Veterans' Program Improvement Act of 1993"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1508. A letter from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to pay the actual cost of a contract burial, not to exceed $600, to bury a nonservice-connected veteran who dies in a Department of Veterans Affairs [VA] facility and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1509. A letter from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "Philippine Veterans Currency Act of 1993"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1510. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a copy of a report entitled, "Use of Recycled Paving Material," pursuant to Public Law 102-240, section 1038(b)(5) (105 Stat. 1988); jointly, to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation and Energy and Commerce.

1511. A letter from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide to employees appointed under that title protection from prohibited personnel practices; jointly, to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and Post Office and Civil Service.

1512. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State; transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995," pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; jointly, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Post Office and Civil Service, Ways and Means, Natural Resources, the Judiciary, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and Public Works and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. GORDON: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 214. Resolution waiving certain points of order against the bill (H.R. 2520) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-163). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FROST: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 215. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2010) to amend the National and Community Service Act of 1990 to establish a Corporation for National Service, enhance opportunities for national service, and provide national service educational awards to persons participating in such service, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-164). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTED BILLS SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

Mr. GLICKMAN: Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. H.R. 2330. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1994 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the U.S. Government and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, with an amendment; referred to the Committee on Armed Services for a period ending not later than July 16, 1993, for consideration of such provisions of the bill and amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee pursuant to clause 1(c), rule X (Rept. 103-162, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. STUDDS (for himself, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. MANTON, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. REED, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Ms. FURSE, Ms. SCHENK, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BARLOW, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. KING, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mrs. BENTLEY, and Mr. HAMBURG):

H.R. 2547. A bill to improve the economy of the United States and promote the national security interests of the United States by establishing a national shipbuilding initiative to provide support for the U.S. shipbuilding industry in order to assist that industry in regaining a significant share of the world commercial shipbuilding market, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Armed Services.

By Mr. DEUTSCH:

H.R. 2548. A bill to improve the ability of the Federal Government to prepare for and respond to major disasters, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation, Armed Services, and Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA (for himself and Mr. ABERCROMBIE):

H.R. 2549. A bill to establish administrative procedures to extend Federal recognition to certain Indian groups; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GLICKMAN (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

H.R. 2550. A bill to establish a Markets and Trading Commission in order to combine the functions of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission in a single independent regulatory commission, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture, Energy and Commerce, and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas:

H.R. 2551. A bill to authorize the award of the Southwest Asia service medal to any member of the Armed Forces who was assigned to duty outside the United States during the Persian Gulf war with a unit that actively engaged in combat operations during that war; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 2552. A bill to require that all Government records that contain information bearing on the last flight and disappearance of Amelia Earhart be transmitted to the Library of Congress and made available to the public; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and House Administration.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY (for himself, Mr. STUMP, Mr. ROWLAND, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 2553. A bill to provide for a grant by the Secretary of Defense to be made for the support of establishment of research facility to study low-level chemical sensitivity, particularly in Persian Gulf war veterans; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. GORDON, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. BRYANT, Ms. DANNER, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. GOSS, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. HOAGLAND, Ms. THURMAN, Mr. POSHARD, Mrs. MEEK, Mr. GALLO, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. HYDE, Mr. SHAW, Mr. COPPERSMITH, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. PORTER, Mr. ROTH, Mr. PASTOR, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. WELDON, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. STUMP, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. SHEPHERD, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ZIMMER, Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. REED, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. CRANE, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. HANSEN):

H.R. 2554. A bill to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Amendments of 1986 to prevent the repeal of the exemption for certain bona fide hiring and retirement plans applicable to State and local firefighters and law enforcement officers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PORTMAN:

H.R. 2555. A bill to designate the Federal building located at 100 East Fifth Street in Cincinnati, OH, as the "Potter Stewart United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. KING, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. FISH):

H.R. 2556. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for partial removal of limitations on contributions to candidates whose opponents exceed personal contribution limitations in an election; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SOLOMON (for himself, Mr. KING, and Mr. LEVY):

H.R. 2557. A bill to discourage States and local governments from providing general welfare assistance to able-bodied individuals unless such individuals are participating in workfare programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VOLKMER:

H.R. 2558. A bill to establish a congressional commemorative medal for veterans of the Battle of Midway; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WHEAT:

H.R. 2559. A bill to designate the Federal building located at 601 East 12th Street in Kansas City, MO, as the "Richard Bolling Federal Building"; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. FAZIO (for himself and Ms. HARMAN):

H.R. 2560. A bill to establish a program in the Department of Defense to promote and demonstrate electric vehicle and infrastructure development for military and civilian use; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.J. Res. 220. Joint resolution to designate the month of August as "National Scleroderma Awareness Month," and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut:

H. Res. 212. Resolution relating to State actions to protect children from injury in motor vehicle accidents; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SANTORUM:

H. Res. 213. Resolution providing for savings in the operations of the House of Representatives to be achieved by transferring functions to private sector entities and eliminating staff positions; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

214. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Medicaid prescription drug restrictive formularies that were contained in the Omnibus Budget Reauthorization Act of 1990; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

215. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to the construction of a four-lane limited access highway connecting the New Iberia, Morgan City, Thibodaux, and Houma metropolitan areas to Interstate 49; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 81: Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Ms. BYRNE, Mr. REED, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, and Mrs. LLOYD.

H.R. 94: Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 300: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 345: Mr. MURTHA.

H.R. 349: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 428: Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 559: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. KLINK, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. DIXON, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. SHAW.

H.R. 563: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. CRANE.

H.R. 584: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 585: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 667: Mr. MOORHEAD.
H.R. 688: Mr. WALSH.
H.R. 741: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. CALLAHAN, and Mr. BAKER of Louisiana.
H.R. 911: Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 935: Ms. THURMAN and Mr. WASHINGTON.
H.R. 937: Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. THOMPSON.
H.R. 1012: Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. SCOTT.
H.R. 1036: Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. BORSKI.
H.R. 1088: Mr. HUTCHINSON.
H.R. 1206: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 1251: Mr. ROEMER.
H.R. 1285: Mr. MARTINEZ.
H.R. 1296: Mr. OWENS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. EDWARDS of Texas.
H.R. 1304: Mrs. UNSOELD.
H.R. 1310: Mr. COMBEST, Mr. ROGERS, and Mr. PARKER.
H.R. 1322: Mr. NATCHER and Mr. SWIFT.
H.R. 1360: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 1457: Mrs. MEEK and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 1480: Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. HYDE, Mr. MINGE, and Mr. RAVENEL.
H.R. 1490: Mr. BISHOP and Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 1521: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, and Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 1529: Mr. HOKE and Mr. HUTCHINSON.
H.R. 1532: Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. COX, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Mr. COBLE.
H.R. 1533: Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. KLINK.
H.R. 1539: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Mr. MCCURDY.
H.R. 1636: Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 1645: Mr. OWENS, Mr. SWETT, Mr. TEJEDA, and Mr. HAMBURG.
H.R. 1670: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. TORKILDSEN.
H.R. 1683: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BROWN of California, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 1696: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1697: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 1707: Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin, Mr. SCHIFF, and Ms. MALONEY.
H.R. 1788: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 1801: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 1827: Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. DICKEY, and Mr. SARPALIUS.
H.R. 1877: Mr. HUGHES, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. OBERSTAR, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. FISH.
H.R. 1911: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. INSLEE, Miss COLLINS, of Michigan, and Mr. FISH.
H.R. 1912: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. INSLEE, Miss COLLINS, of Michigan, and Mr. FISH.
H.R. 1933: Mr. PARKER, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. PETE GEREN, of Texas, and Mr. KREIDLER.
H.R. 2050: Mr. BARCIA of Michigan.
H.R. 2076: Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. HAMBURG, and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 2101: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. DARDEN.
H.R. 2110: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. DELLUMS, Mrs. MINK, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. MANTON, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SCOTT, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. PELOSI, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. OWENS, and Mrs. MEEK.
H.R. 2130: Mr. PASTOR, Mr. GUNDERSON, and Mr. FROST.
H.R. 2219: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 2253: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.
H.R. 2254: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.
H.R. 2261: Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 2315: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 2340: Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO and Ms. FURSE.
H.R. 2346: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 2367: Mr. CRANE.
H.R. 2451: Mr. EDWARDS of California.
H.R. 2456: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO.
H.R. 2494: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Ms. PELOSI.
H.J. Res. 111: Ms. PELOSI, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. WYNN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CARR, Mr. GALLO, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BISHOP, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Miss COLLINS of Michigan.
H.J. Res. 112: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. MARTINEZ.
H.J. Res. 131: Mr. KLUG, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mrs. FOWLER, and Mr. PORTER.
H.J. Res. 191: Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. BONIOR, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. FROST.
H.J. Res. 195: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BECERRA, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.J. Res. 196: Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mrs. THURMAN.
H.J. Res. 213: Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. REGULA.
H. Con. Res. 66: Mr. NADLER.
H. Con. Res. 69: Mr. HAMBURG.
H. Con. Res. 80: Mr. SLATTERY.
H. Con. Res. 91: Mr. LEACH, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. WELDON, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. LEWIS of California, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. KING, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. KINGSTON, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. GOODLING, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WALSH, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. GALLO, Mr. MCCRERY, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. HERGER, Mr. DREIER, Mr. QUINN, Mr. KYL, Mr. HORN, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. EWING, Mr. ZIMMER, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. FINGERHUT, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CAMP, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. BUYER, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. COX, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Ms. FOWLER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HOKE, Mr. LINDER, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. LEVY, Mr. PAXON, Mr. KASICH, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. HYDE, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. PETRI, Mr. KLUG, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. DELAY, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. CRANE, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. BOEHLERT, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. MCKEON, Ms. DUNN, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. REGULA, Mr. CANADY, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. OXLEY, and Mr. SHAYS.
H. Con. Res. 99: Mr. FISH.
H. Res. 122: Mr. FISH and Mr. BUYER.
H. Res. 175: Mr. DELAY, Mr. HOBSON, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. KYL, Mr. WALKER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HYDE, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. KASICH, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCCRERY, Ms. MOLINARI, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ROTH, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SUNDQUIST, and Mr. WELDON.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2010

By Mr. BALLENGER:

—In section 129(d)(2) of the National and Community Service Act of 1990, as added by section 101(b) of the bill, strike "(including labor organizations)".

—In section 130(b) of the National and Community Service Act of 1990, as added by section 101(b) of the bill, strike paragraph (12) and insert the following:

"(12) A description of the manner and extent to which participants, representatives of the community served, and community-based agencies with a demonstrated record of experience in providing services contributed to the development of the national service programs referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2).

—In section 130 of the National and Community Service Act of 1990, as added by section 101(b) of the bill—

(1) strike subsection (e), and

(2) redesignate subsection (f) as subsection (e).

—In section 131(c) of the National and Community Service Act of 1990, as added by section 101(b) of the bill, strike paragraphs (1) through (3), and insert the following:

"(1) provide in the design, recruitment, and operation of the program for broad-based input from—

"(A) the community served and potential participants in the program; and

"(B) community-based agencies with a demonstrated record of experience in providing services, if these entities exist in the area to be served by the program; and

"(2) in the case of a program that is not funded through a State, consult with and coordinate activities with the State Commission for the State in which the program operates.

—In section 114(d)(5) of the National and Community Service Act of 1990, as added by section 103(a) of the bill—

(1) strike subparagraphs (A), and

(2) redesignate subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively.

—In section 119(d)(2) of the National and Community Service Act of 1990, as added by section 103(a), strike subparagraph (B) and insert the following:

"(B) assurances that the applicant will comply with the nonduplication and nondisplacement provisions of section 177 and grievance procedure requirements of section 176(f); and

H.R. 2518

By Mr. GORDON:

—Page 46, beginning on line 2, strike "direct loans as authorized by title IV, part D, of the

Higher Education Act, as amended," and insert the following:

the direct loan demonstration program authorized by section 451 of Public Law 102-325 (106 Stat. 569),

—Page 46, line 3, strike "as amended" and insert "as in effect on June 30, 1993".

By Mr. MANZULLO:

—Page 62, after line 10, insert the following new section:

SEC. 507. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to provide assistance to any individual who was a soldier for Iraq during the Persian Gulf conflict, or to any spouse or dependent of such individual.