

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, September 23, 1994

The House met at 10 a.m.

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

We remember with gratitude, O God, those who answer the Nation's call and who are willing to serve with honor and distinction. We remember this day the women and men of our Armed Forces who respond with a good spirit, with courage, and with a devotion to their tasks. May the duty and honor of serving their country ever enable them to take pride in their calling and make them faithful in Your service. 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 gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WISE 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.

### THE GOP CONTRACT—NOT A CONTRACT FOR AMERICA BUT A CONTRACT ON AMERICA

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

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, we are going to hear a lot about a contract for America that our friends on the other side are going to be offering. It is a contract that David Stockman would be proud of. Remember supply-side economics? Remember 3.5 trillion dollars' worth of debt because of the promise of tax cuts and spending increases?

Let us read the fine print in the contract, because as I say, "I don't call this a contract for America, I call this a contract on America," because it is a hit job.

Talk to the Social Security recipient. They are going to cut Social Security. The only way they can make their deficit reduction figures, they are going to cut Medicare. The only way

they can make their deficit figures, they are going to cut veterans. The only way they are going to do it is to add \$1 trillion to the deficit.

I say, Mr. Speaker, read history. This is a contract on America.

Remember those who want to suddenly do something for you in the future would not vote for you in the past because they would not vote for the tax cuts for working Americans; they would not vote for the deficit reduction that passed here. They would not vote for the burgeoning economy that we now have, and that was just a year and a half ago.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a contract for America; it is a contract on America.

### REPUBLICANS WOULD SEEK VOTES ON 10 CONTRACT POINTS UNDER OPEN RULES

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is amusing to listen to the whiners on the Democratic Party side of the aisle about the contract. I can understand why they do not want to make promises that they agree that they are actually going to keep and they are asking the American people to hold us to it.

They talk about this costing \$1 trillion. Most of what is in that cost figure is giving back to the people who earned the money, the money they earn to use any way they want. Only liberals could construe that as a cost. I would challenge the Members to read the contract.

The other thing is not to pass it but to consider these items and to consider them under an open rule. The contract is not that all these things are going to pass but for a change we are going to discuss the items that the people say in every single poll they want to happen, that we are going to consider these things on the floor of the House with their Representatives, consider them under an open rule that can be amended and decide the 10 items that the American people want. Their Representatives should at least debate these things which we have been denied in the past and have a chance to vote on these things. That is something denied under the present leadership of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Members to go back and explain to the taxpayers not why they do not want to pass these things but why they do not even want

to consider these things on the House floor.

### THE REPUBLICAN PARTY CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

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

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, Americans expect their local Congressmen to represent their local interests. They want them to stay attuned to their local needs and concerns and represent them as best they can to Congress.

Americans do not want their local representatives pledged to the ambitions of congressional leaders. Next week Republican candidates will stand on the House steps and sign their independence away to NEWT GINGRICH and the ideology of the Republican leadership.

Instead of telling Congress what the people want, they will go home and tell the people what their Republican bosses want. For their allegiance they will collect a check provided by the big-money interests that back the Republican leadership's hungry drive for power.

The only pact Republicans will make next week is a contract with GINGRICH. Never mind a contract with the people back home—they do not have the big-money clout of the Republican Party bosses.

### HEARINGS SOUGHT ON DEPLOYMENT OF UNITED STATES FORCES TO HAITI

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

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Government Operations Subcommittee on Legislation and National Security, I asked our chairman this week to hold hearings as soon as possible to ascertain what national security interests, if any, justify the deployment of American military personnel to Haiti.

President Clinton failed to secure congressional authorization prior to ordering that deployment. As a coequal branch of Government, we have a constitutional obligation to hold hearings on this matter now.

Because the administration vigorously asserts that its actions in Haiti are justified, I assume it will welcome a formal inquiry.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

It obviously is too late to avoid military involvement in Haiti. But for the sake of our military men and women there, it is vital that they and their families clearly understand why they are there, how the decision was made to send them, and when they will be returning home.

#### THE GOP CONTRACT— REAGANOMICS II

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

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, the silly season is here. Most Representatives, and especially aspiring Representatives, spend time at home listening to what their people want them to do. Next week the GOP's candidates will come here to Washington to get their marching orders, to sign up for Reaganomics II, the contract.

It is a preposterous set of proposals that again tries to dupe the American public with a have-your-cake-and-eat-it-too lunch of fiscal nonsense.

The proposal? Cut taxes, mainly for upper income people, and increase defense spending, for a total increase in the deficit over the next 7 years of close to a half trillion dollars. Then, claim you are going to balance the budget. Well, either that means major, huge cuts in Social Security and Medicare, or not balancing the budget. It is the sort of ripe demagoguery that gives deceit a bad name.

As a recent Wall Street Journal piece said, "The Republicans are offering more of the same—tax cuts for the affluent, budget promises that don't add up, and political reforms they don't mean. Voters ought to demand a money-or-Representative-back guarantee."

□ 1010

#### COMMENTS ON THE CITADEL

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

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, this week's Army Times quotes administration officials who think that the ROTC units at the Citadel, the military college of South Carolina are so hostile to women that graduates will be unable to adapt to today's military.

This is outrageous and preposterous. The Citadel and Virginia Military Institute offer a unique, military liberal arts education in a single gender environment. The concept of duty, honor, country is stressed in the classroom, on the people field, in the barracks, and on the athletic fields.

The mission of the Citadel is to prepare citizen-soldiers, a concept that dates back to Cincinnatus. By requir-

ing all Citadel cadets to enroll in ROTC, regardless of whether they pursue a commission or not, guarantees that all Citadel graduates are prepared to serve their country if called upon to do so.

Since 1842, the Citadel has produced citizen-soldiers who have served this Nation gallantly in peace and war. There have been 112 general and flag officers who were Citadel graduates. These include 2 four star generals and 15 lieutenant generals. There are two Citadel graduates in this House, and one in the Senate. Alvah Chapman, Citadel Class of 1942, chairman of the board for Knight-Ridder News Service, was asked by former President George Bush to lead the cleanup effort following Hurricane Andrew. Service is a way of life for Citadel graduates.

This past summer, Army ROTC cadets from the Citadel excelled at ROTC advanced camp. Citadel cadets surpassed the national average for basic rifle marksmanship, land navigation, the Army physical fitness test, and peer evaluations. Five Air Force cadets from the Citadel were named distinguished graduates, the most from any school. All 31 Navy midshipmen from the Citadel were rated in the top 5 percent of Naval ROTC midshipmen.

The Citadel commissions approximately 30 percent of its graduating class each year. The Citadel is the third largest source of ROTC commissions in the United States.

Performance, not political correctness, should be the measure of military officers. Those who value true diversity understand that some young men flourish under the unique, all-male military environment that the Citadel provides. To destroy the option of single-gender military education would be a loss to U.S. military and the Nation.

#### THE REPUBLICAN CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, like a twisted version of Robin Hood, the Republican leadership is bringing their merry men to Washington to sign on to a plan that steals from the elderly and the middle class and gives to the rich.

In a most undemocratic fashion, Republican candidates are being called to Washington to sign a contract written by the Republican leadership and their special interest contributors. Instead of taking a made in America message to Washington, these candidates are receiving the lobbyist stamp of approval.

The plan is the same tired, trickle-down economics that tripled our national debt in just 12 years. The rich get big tax breaks and the middle class get stuck with the bill. Albert Hunt, of the Wall Street Journal, said, "the po-

litical and policy centerpieces of the Republican plan are frauds." It is estimated that the plan would blow a \$1 billion hole in the budget.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican strategy is all too clear: Ignore the people, do the special interests' bidding, and let your grandchildren pick up the tab.

#### THE CITADEL: AN ICON OF EXCELLENCE IN A SEA OF INCREASING MEDIOCRITY

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

Mr. RAVENEL. Mr. Speaker, recently the New Yorker magazine, through its hired feminist, Susan Faludi, launched a vicious attack on The Citadel, the prestigious military college of South Carolina. In an article, Ms. Faludi not only resurrects old fictitious tales of excessive hazing and racism, but she also makes perverse assertions about the character of the all-male corps of cadets. Her story attempts to discredit The Citadel by portraying its students as insecure misogynists facing identity crises of epic proportions.

The truth is that the "Citadel Men," as its graduates are known, epitomizes honor, duty, self-discipline, and achievement. The Citadel succeeds because of its single-gender educational program and its philosophy, building fine and productive citizens from young men who accept the challenge of a demanding fourth-class system. Today, I salute The Citadel, that rare institution, as an icon of excellence in a sea of increasing mediocrity.

#### GOP COUNTERATTACK

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

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, the 103d Congress is near adjournment, the campaign season is about to begin, and next Tuesday we are to be stampeded by a herd of elephants lobbying criticisms at our accomplishments.

I say let the elephants come in, but the stampede will not be enough to crush one of the most productive legislative records in recent memory.

I thought elephants were supposed to have good memories, but these seem to need some reminding.

Mr. Speaker, we have passed the largest deficit reduction package in U.S. history.

Our economy has been infused by over 4 million new jobs.

We have put family and medical leave into law and the National Service Program we passed is making it possible for deserving youth to gain work experience and afford college educations.

And over 15 million American families received a tax break through the earned income tax credit.

And let us not forget the crime bill, which bans 19 assault weapons, puts more cops on the streets, and protects battered women.

Need I say more? There is much more, but Mr. Speaker, 1 minute allows for only so much reminding.

#### PAYING FOR OUR AGENDA

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, although we have just unveiled our plan, our Democrat rivals have launched a desperate attack. They simply cannot believe that we can ease the tax burden on families and senior citizens and reduce deficit spending at the same time. That is because they cannot imagine a government that would be smaller and less intrusive in American's lives. Yet we Republicans have shown, in specific, credible budget proposals, that we can pay for every initiative we intend to propose and still shrink the budget deficit.

The Democrat's effort to question our numbers reflect a weak attempt to deflect attention from the fundamental policy issues raised in our contract. We will propose the largest change in size, scope, and direction of the Federal Government since the 1930's. We will demonstrate how Republicans would bring sense to our national security policy, limit congressional terms, reform the legal system, substantially reduce Federal regulation, and, at the same time, allow working American families to keep more of their own money.

#### LESSON TO BE LEARNED FROM SINGAPORE DRUG PENALTIES

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, a Dutch businessman was executed in Singapore. His crime: Possession, possession, of nine pounds of heroine.

Now, many in America are stunned. Quite frankly, I am not. Singapore does not tolerate narcotics. The bottom line is Singapore does not have a major drug problem, and America is a stone-cold shooting gallery. There is a very simple reason, folks. In Singapore, they not only walk the walk, they hang the pushers. In America, we simply talk the talk.

Think about it. There are very few drug smugglers that want to visit Singapore. There is one hell of a message there.

#### THE SITUATION IN HAITI

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I was opposed to a United States invasion of Haiti and I am opposed to an occupation. There are no vital United States interests in Haiti and the cause of democracy is not served by putting United States troops on the line, with an unclear mission, and changing rules of engagement.

While I commend former President Carter for his humanitarian concern, I cannot condone the idea of bargaining with criminals.

We got a bad deal. The evil dispensers of hate, rape, torture, and other violence quoted by President Clinton are not removed; they are not departing—and I remind my colleagues that President Clinton told the American people the Carter delegation was going to Haiti for one thing: To discuss the terms of the junta's departure.

And what did we get for risking American lives? Mr. Aristide's belated and begrudging thanks.

Many of us thought the days of Americans installing regimes is over. If Mr. Aristide can only come to power because of American cajoling and promising, then he only retains power as long as America backs him with force.

He loses credibility with his people. And when the troops leave, his future is again in doubt.

Now that we have landed, I have written to the President asking that he clarify our mission. I look forward to a response.

God bless our troops and keep them safe.

#### CALL FOR INVESTIGATION OF TOOELE, UT, CHEMICAL WEAPONS DISPOSAL PLANT

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

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Speaker, I am today calling on the House of Representatives to begin an immediate investigation of allegations of safety violations at the Army's chemical weapons disposal plant at Tooele, UT. These allegations were made by a former safety manager who was recently fired by the plant contractor.

As the elected representative of the area where the next chemical weapons destruction facility is scheduled, I believe it is imperative that the Congress quickly determine the facts. Yesterday, I wrote to House Armed Services Committee chairman, RON DELLUMS, asking for such an investigation.

Safety has been the preeminent issue surrounding the destruction of our chemical weapons stockpile, which is

mandated by Federal law and international agreements. The House must act now to ensure the safety of stockpile workers and citizens living in surrounding communities.

#### DESPERATE DEMOCRATS

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, the liberals are desperate. Floundering in the polls, the public is poised to throw them out of Congress in November. So what do they do? They try to distort the Republican record. Instead of a program for more spending, more government, more taxes, and broken promises, Republicans have not just a plan, not just a promise, but a contract with America, that will cut the government, cut redtape, cut the taxes, with a \$500 per child tax credit, a promise of a vote on a balanced budget amendment, and a term limitation proposal, and next Tuesday we will unveil our contract with America to America.

But before we can unveil it, the liberals assail it.

And because a big lie seems easier for them to tell than a little one, they claim that it will do the opposite of what it promises it will.

If we had a plan that would increase spending as much as they said ours does, they would be for it.

In the war of ideas, our contract with America will prove that Republicans are armed to the teeth. The Democrats' carping criticism shows that they are unarmed and proud of it.

□ 1020

#### TRIBUTE TO DONA FELISA RINCON DE GAUTIER, "WOMAN OF THE AMERICAS"

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I join the Puerto Rican community of New Jersey and throughout the United States and Puerto Rico in mourning the death last Friday of Dona Felisa Rincon de Gautier. Dona Fela, as she was affectionately known to her fellow Puerto Ricans, was one of Puerto Rico's most distinguished citizens of the 20th century.

On Monday, thousands of residents of the beautiful city of San Juan, where she was the only woman mayor for 22 years, lined the streets to pay final respects to their beloved Dona Fela. They tossed flowers at her funeral procession as it wound its way down the streets of old San Juan to her burial at Rio Piedras cemetery.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Puerto Rico loved Dona Fela. They loved her

because she loved them. Her love for all of them, but especially for the poor, was manifest in a lifetime of deeds: getting electricity for those who had no light, water for those who were thirsty or could not bathe, paying bills for those who could not make ends meet, or buying shoes for those who could not afford them.

Dona Fela was loved because she was a true public servant. In 1932, Puerto Rican women won the right to vote because Dona Fela led that fight. She entered politics that year and never ceased to fight the good fight: for child care, legal aid for the poor, senior citizens' centers, and Head Start. So great was her popularity and so vast her power that many have compared her to Franklin Roosevelt.

Mr. Speaker, Puerto Rico may have lost a political giant, but her legacy lives on. It is only fitting that we remember this "Woman of the Americas" in the U.S. Congress.

#### A CALL FOR REMOVAL OF TROOPS FROM HAITI

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

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to look at page A16 of the Washington Post this morning. In an article entitled "Money Shortage Forces Navy to Curtail Training of Reserve Forces," the subhead says, "This is the first time the Navy has so acted."

The opening paragraph says, "The Navy has canceled training and drills for thousands of reservists for the rest of the month because the Naval Reserve ran out of money."

I will introduce next week a resolution, and I will ask the Democratic leadership to make it in order, to order the immediate withdrawal from Haiti. When we cannot pay to keep our Reserve forces trained, when we cannot pay to keep our troops equipped, when we cannot do the things that matter to protect Americans, it is madness to be spending a billion or more dollars on a country of no national security interest to the United States. I think we should withdraw, and I think the President should rethink his budget to defend America.

#### INTRODUCTION OF THE MILITARY SERVICE ACADEMY HONOR CODE ACT

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the honor codes in use at the military service academies. The Naval Academy at Annapolis, the Air Force Academy, and

the Military Academy at West Point all strive to set a high standard of honor for our Nation's future officers.

We have been hearing story after story about the future military officers corps, which can only cause a great deal of concern.

Recent negative publicity concerning honor code violations calls into question how the honor codes are administered. While the Nation expects one honor standard, each academy's code is stated differently from the other two.

To address the current honor code problems, I have introduced legislation, H.R. 5047, the Military Service Academy Honor Code Act.

This act would authorize the Secretary of Defense to appoint a commission to review whether there should be a standardized honor code for all three service academies, and if this standard code should also apply to officer candidates in the ROTC and OCS commissioning programs.

There should be one honor standard for all.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to cosponsor the Military Service Academy Honor Code Act, H.R. 5047.

#### CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, this contract with America seems to have struck a raw nerve on the other side. I do not know why. Maybe Tuesday's election exacerbated that problem.

The contract with America is a set of ideas that will change the way Congress does business.

The plan will be unveiled next Tuesday, yet somehow the Democrat leadership has scored all 10 bills and they claim the contract will be costly. I must say it is incredible that the Democrat leadership could not get a cost analysis of their health care bills after 18 months, but they are able to appraise 10 bills they have not even seen.

The Democrat leadership is launching these desperate attacks because, the fact is, they are on the wrong side of each of the issues enumerated in the contract.

These ideas were not handed down from on high. We have asked Americans across the country what they would do to fix Congress. The contract with America is their recommendation.

The Democrats' inflated price tag is a lame attempt to take the wind out of the sails of congressional change. It will not work. The American people know the Democrats have been at the helm too long and have charted a course of big Government and bigger taxes.

#### FAT CAT CONTRACT

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, it is all starting to come together now, if Members watched the other body stay up all night with Republicans filibustering spending limits that were in the campaign reform bill. Why?

Well, this morning we heard a lot about the contract with America. Well, let me tell my colleagues, that is a fat cat contract with America, because, if they paid enough, they got to help write the contract. And then if they signed the contract, they get the money the fat cats paid in to help write the contract.

What we want is a contract for all America, not a contract by fat cat America.

#### UNSTACKING THE STACKED DECK

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, most people know that 9 against 4 is a heavily stacked deck. Around here, 9 against 4 is the ratio of majority to minority members in the House Rules Committee, the ultimate stacked deck, designed to ensure that the Democrat majority retains ironfisted control over the legislative agenda of this House. If you want to know why proposals that a majority of Americans want us to debate—like term limits, a true balanced budget amendment, repeal of the Social Security earnings test or rollback of capital gains taxes—seldom come to the floor for a vote, look no further than the Rules Committee, where good ideas like these often go to die. For 40 years we have tried it the Democrats' way. It is time to make a change—and that is what the Republican contract with America is all about. Change the balance of power in this House, unstack the stacked deck, and bring the people's agenda forward.

#### STATE AS LABORATORIES FOR HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago the President challenged us to provide lifetime health care security to every American.

Congress has been engaged in a non-stop health care debate over which model will work best, which will meet the goals of universal access, consumer choice, cost containment, and improve the quality of care.

The Congress is deeply divided over which approach will work best: Single payer, health care alliances, managed care, insurance market reform. No single approach is supported by anything

near a majority. I fear the next Congress will do no better. Yet while we dither, a number of States have worked to expand access and improve health care services, with no help from the Federal Government.

Is it now time we got out of the way and let the States become the laboratories of health care reform, each testing their own approach until we can approve which reforms work best? Or better still, the Federal Government should help the States and encourage their innovation, with insurance reform, waivers and modest levels of Federal funding to support State efforts, to expand access, control costs, and improve care.

□ 1030

I am introducing a companion bill to one introduced yesterday in the Senate which will do just that. I urge my colleagues to drop the divisive debate and join us in passing this reform.

#### HAITI'S PRICE TAG? WHO KNOWS?

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, for the past few days, my staff and I have been trying to find out just how much Operation Uphold Democracy will cost the American taxpayers.

We have heard the President throw out numbers ranging from as low as \$250 million. At our briefing the other day, Secretary of State Christopher said the figure was closer to \$350 million. Now, officials at both the State and Defense Departments tell me that this figure could be upward of \$2 to \$3 billion.

I find it alarming that this figure keeps increasing day by day. And then yesterday, Secretary Perry told us that he will have to come to us for additional moneys—who knows what dollar figure that will be.

Regardless, I believe it would be financially irresponsible for us to not only closely examine where this money is being spent, but also where it is coming from.

I do not believe that any additional moneys for an operation such as this should come at the expense for our already deeply cut Defense Department.

We have all heard the stories of soldiers on food stamps and maintenance depots having to resort to cannibalism. As a veteran, I find this truly disgusting.

We must pay our bills and do everything in our power to support our troops. But I will not sit idly by and let us pass the buck for Operation Uphold Democracy at the expense of those brave men and women serving in our military.

#### CHILD CARE CENTERS

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

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend 3 Oregon companies for being among the 100 best companies for working mothers, as selected by Working Mother magazine.

Mentor Graphics, Nike, and Hanna Andersson have all been named to this prestigious list because of their commitment to our Nation's most precious resource—our children.

All three of these companies recognize that worker productivity, job satisfaction, and employee morale can all be helped simply by doing the right thing—whether it is providing on-site child care centers, subsidizing child care costs for lower paid workers, reimbursement for child care expenses for business travel, or providing paternity leave.

What these Oregon companies realize is that not only is it right, it is profitable for them to be a child-friendly company. Mentor Graphics, which has made the list for the second year in a row, has an excellent on-site child care center, and that plays a big factor in retention rates of 92 percent of the parents who use it. Theirs is not a fair weather commitment. Even when, some years ago, Mentor Graphics had a dip in earnings, it expanded its family-friendly benefits.

Nike is also on the list for the second year in a row. They also provide on-site day care, scholarships for employees' children, and this year offered to subsidize child care for those employees with a family income of less than \$60,000.

Hanna Andersson realized that fathers should also be given leave when a child is born or adopted, and so they have instituted up to 4 weeks of paid paternity leave. Their innovative child-friendly policies have earned them a spot on the Working Mothers' list 4 years running.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of all three of these companies. They are a shining example for all businesses.

#### A HIP-POCKET CONGRESS—A DIS-SERVICE TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, on September 27 several members of the Republican Party, candidates and incumbents alike, are going to assemble on the steps of the Capitol. There they will sign a blood oath of loyalty, not to their constituents back home, but to the Republican leadership's inner circle.

When fair-minded Republicans wanted to act on health care reform, the Republican inner circle said "no."

When right-thinking Republicans wanted to stand with the American people on the assault weapon ban, the inner circle again said "no."

We have seen it once, we have seen it twice. A hip-pocket Congress is a disservice to the American people. Reject this charade of more Republican dirty tricks and let's continue our Democratic agenda of protecting seniors, fighting crime, and creating jobs.

#### TIME FOR A RATIONAL, RESPONSIBLE POLICY IN TRAINING AMERICA'S RESERVISTS

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

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday the Navy was forced to cancel all the reserve drills for the remainder of this fiscal year, affecting the drill for over 20,000 Navy reservists. We called the Navy this morning to ask them why, and they gave us two reasons:

One, this House appropriated, this year, \$160 million less than we appropriated last year, and two, they said:

We have been asked to go to Rwanda and we went. We have been asked to go to Bosnia and we went. We have been asked to go to Somalia and we went. Now we have been asked to go to Haiti, and we are there, too.

Mr. Speaker, the question is not, perhaps, whether those places are places for our reserves to be. The question is are we going to let our forces go there undertrained. We did that once before. It was in the late 1970's, when we had a hollow force. Today's Washington Post points out once again that we are not even able to train our forces to do the jobs that we ask them to do at this level of training.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for this House to look at a rational, responsible policy toward training of our reservists.

#### IMPROBABLE REPUBLICAN PROMISES JEOPARDIZE THE NATION'S ECONOMY

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

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, in 1981 Ronald Reagan called it supply side economics. In 1994, NEWT GINGRICH calls it his contract with America. For this country, the mathematics is the same: Increase defense spending, lower taxes on the wealthy, and promise a lower deficit. That improbable combination almost bankrupted this Nation a decade ago. In the 1990's, we promised things were going to be different.

Mr. Speaker, through the Democratic deficit reduction plan we have reduced

the Federal deficit by 40 percent, put this Nation on sound economic footing by creating 4 million jobs in 18 months. Now they promise to take us back to the future. We learned then. We cannot make the same mistake again.

The Republican Party should learn to be responsible with its mathematics, be part of being honest with the American people about our future, and get this country again into deficit reduction, job creation, without jeopardizing the welfare of our own people.

**SUPPORT OUR TROOPS IN HAITI:  
BRING THEM HOME**

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

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Speaker, while all Americans are thankful that our troops have not suffered any casualties, our presence in Haiti has done little to end the violence aimed at pro-Aristide Haitians and to bring democracy to that country. That leaves me with one question: Why are we there?

The problem we face in Haiti is symptomatic of this administration. It has an amorphous undefined foreign policy. Mr. Speaker, there is a lack of coordination between military and foreign policy. President Clinton has targeted the military for deep cuts, while at the same time expended their role throughout the world. Mr. Speaker, he cannot have it both ways.

Once again, our troops have been placed in harm's way in the role of peacekeepers, policemen, and social workers; their mission remains undefined; and they have no idea when they will be coming home.

Mr. Speaker, our Haitian policy is misguided and out of control. We should begin bringing our troops home as soon as possible, and if the President will not do it, Congress should do it for him before we lose any American lives.

Support our troops in Haiti. Bring them home.

□ 1040

**CONTRACT WITH AMERICA: LET'S  
GET SERIOUS**

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

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, next Tuesday, House Republican incumbents and Republican candidates for Congress will climb the Capitol steps to sign a contract with the Republican leadership. Led by our colleagues on the other side, Republicans will promise to wage a holy war by fighting for a balanced budget amendment.

I look forward to this spectacle. The last time the Republicans made a promise to the American people, they

said "Read my lips." At least this time we will get it in writing.

If they are going to balance the budget, why do they not offer the American people something new and different.

Why do they not give out cash rebates. That is right, rebates. Why do they not give back to the American people all the tax dollars they took away during the Reagan-Bush years. It was their spend-and-borrow economics that gave us the enormous deficits all Americans are paying off today.

Let us give cash rebates. That is better than making massive cuts in aid to children, to the elderly, to the infirmed. That is better than making massive cuts in aid to depressed neighborhoods in our cities and farming communities ravaged by natural disaster.

A balanced budget amendment is an empty promise. At least rebates would mean something. Or, we could pass real legislation like the Democratic deficit-cutting package we approved last year which cut the deficit in half.

I appeal to NEWT GINGRICH and DICK ARMEY.

Let us get serious. Let us make a bipartisan contract with the American people.

Let us get to work.

**A SHADOW ON THE CONGRESS**

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a shadow was cast upon the Congress and I think each Member should be aware of it.

America has a heart as big as all outdoors and Americans are generous to a fault, both to the less fortunate around the world and to those whom misfortune has befallen here at home. But there is only so much in the cupboard. So we must try to be good stewards of the American pursestrings.

But some grow greedy and some become powerful, perhaps too powerful, and perhaps too greedy. That is the shame, the shame and the shadow that was cast on this Congress yesterday.

The transportation appropriations conferees deliberated all day to appropriate \$352 million to meet America's highway needs and they did a lot of good. But when they finished, one State, West Virginia, with less than 1 percent of America's population walked away with nearly 30 percent of the cash. Three House Members represent this area receiving \$100 million while the remaining 432 Members came up short.

How come? How did this happen? Power, greed, and perhaps a little fear, fear of retribution, fear of rocking the boat, fellow Members. This is a shame. A shadow has been cast on this Congress and it is a shadow that we must remove.

**THE REPUBLICAN CONTRACT WITH  
AMERICA**

(Mrs. MEEK of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, next week 156 Republican candidates for Congress and all Republican incumbents will gather in Washington to sign a contract with America. It is a one-sided contract which only the Republican leadership had a hand in drafting.

The so-called contract spells out a series of steps that Republicans promise voters to take if they gain control of the House. They promise to pass a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

At the same time they pledge to bring to the floor and work for enactment of enormous tax cuts. The last time we heard Republicans saying they could balance the budget while cutting taxes was in 1981. The contradiction in policy more than tripled the national debt in just 12 years; the interest payments are now a seventh of the budget whose size the tax-cutters so regularly deplore.

As usual, the Republicans are talking out of both sides of their mouths—offering us false promises of tax cuts, reduced deficits, and balanced budgets.

Well, I do not know who is advising all these Republican candidates—who all claim to be agents of change—to come to Washington and sign a contract written by the Republican leadership, but I sure hope it has a sanity clause.

By the way, it is no secret that there is a huge Republican fundraiser in Washington later that night. Which is probably the real reason these Republican candidates are coming.

**HEALTH CARE REFORM FOR THE  
SELF-EMPLOYED**

(Mrs. MEYERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of this week I introduced H.R. 5062, a bill to make permanent the 25-percent deduction for health costs of the self-employed. The deduction expired in December, but small business owners have been promised for over a year that health care reform would preserve this health insurance deduction and even perhaps increase it. Now that a larger health care reform package does not appear viable, we must continue to offer this minimal health care deduction to our small businesses.

Over 100 cosponsors, from both sides of the aisle, have already gone on record supporting small business and the self-employed through this permanent extension of the 25-percent deduction. The National Association of the Self-Employed and the National Federation for Independent Business both

support this extension. I expect to have well over 200 cosponsors by the end of next week. Please be sure to support the small entrepreneurs in your district by cosponsoring H.R. 5062.

#### CONTRACT WITH AMERICA CALLED A CONTRACT FOR FAILURE

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I joined my Democratic colleagues in shedding some light on the latest publicity stunt from the Republican leadership in the House. This time, the minority whip and company are inviting candidates to come to Washington and sign their allegiance to the GOP agenda—a blood oath to support an array of feel-good proposals. Election-year gimmickry aside, the problem with the Republicans' so-called contract with America is that it is a contract for failure.

An article in yesterday's Wall Street Journal points out the problems. It is the same old thing from Republicans: tax breaks for the wealthy and budget smoke and mirrors.

The GOP promises a balanced-budget and \$200 billion in tax cuts. How can they do that? They cannot. Even the most regressive budget legislation comes up \$700 billion short. The only way to pay for this budget boondoggle is by cutting Social Security, Medicare or raising taxes. That is not what the American people want and that is not a contract any hardworking American would sign.

The American people want us to fight crime, expand student loans, create jobs, and retrain our workers. That is what Democrats have delivered. The choice is clear in this election: A record of achievement or a contract for failure.

#### GLIDE PATH TO A HOLLOW FORCE?

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

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post reports today that the Navy has announced it is canceling paid drill for Navy reservists for at least the remainder of the month. Why did they cancel the training? There is no money left in the training budget. This situation is especially ironic because of our current occupation of Haiti, an action that the American people do not feel is in our national interest. That occupation will cost this country at least a quarter of a billion dollars by the end of this year with more costs into the future.

The President has done nothing to allay the suspicion that his adminis-

tration is starving the military of funds while at the same time sending them on risky, costly missions that are not relevant to the national security needs of our Nation. This is a prescription for a hollow military force. If the present trends continue, training will deteriorate, combat readiness will decline, and the willingness to reenlist will dwindle.

In Desert Storm, our forces defeated the fourth largest army in the world in 100 hours. Why? Because they had the equipment, because they were trained to peak combat readiness, and they were given a clear mission.

A little more than 3 years later, we are seeing the fabric of readiness begin to shred as a result of the administration's misguided defense cuts and a confused foreign policy. They better straighten it out.

#### AMERICA'S TRADE DEFICIT

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, let me point out to my friends that the free traders who brought us \$100 billion trade deficits over the past decade, that have decimated good-paying jobs in America, 3.2 million manufacturing jobs lost since 1979; the folks who brought us NAFTA which has led to a 32-percent decrease in our trade advantage with Mexico coupled with a 32-percent increase in United States investment, over 8,000 more jobs lost; and the very same free traders who idly talk for partial agreements with Japan even as the United States racked up one of its worst monthly trade deficits with Japan—\$5.7 billion in July, or using the administration's own calculation of 20,000 jobs for every billion dollars of trade, in stark terms, over 100,000 United States jobs lost because of our trade deficit with one country in July—well, this same group now wants to sell you GATT.

They want to give GATT to you like a fast ball, with no amendment, with no real hearings, and they want to take their stealth bill of 1994 and pass it in the wee hours before this session ends.

Just remember, I told you so. As reported by the Washington Post, the United States could wind up with its worst trade year in history. This after oh so many years of trade agreements like GATT. When are we going to wake up and sign trade agreements that benefit America for a change?

□ 1050

#### DEMOCRATS SCARED OF LOSING ELECTION

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, what is wrong with making a contract with the American people to bring a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution to the floor of the House? What is wrong with bringing a line-item veto bill to the floor of the House? What is wrong about bringing welfare reform legislation to the House floor? What is wrong with bringing tax fairness for senior citizens legislation to the floor of the House?

That is what the contract we are going to make with the American people next week will promise. We are going to promise in the first 100 days of a Republican Congress we will vote on this kind of legislation.

So why are the Democrats screaming to high heaven—because they are scared to death? They lost election after election after election. The Speaker of this House this week only got 35 percent of the vote in the State of Washington. They are terrified that for the first time in 40 years the Republicans are going to take control of this House.

My friends, wake up. You are out of touch with America. The people want change. They want a contract, not a promise.

#### PASS GATT NOW

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

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I heard the gentleman's remarks and I am not scared this morning. I just wanted you to know that. But I am a little nervous about one thing, and the one thing I am just a little nervous about is that we will not have an opportunity to pass the Guaranteed Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. GATT is very, very important not only to this body, not only to this country, but internationally as well. How the world looks at us is going to be very dependent on passing GATT before we adjourn.

GATT also has incredible economic ramifications. There is no doubt in my mind that the next 10 to 20 years will be impacted greatly by this agreement. The future of this country is tied to our trade situation and passage will help us prosper and expand jobs in this country. We should pass GATT before we adjourn. Hopefully we will pass it by a good margin and hopefully we will be able to go into the next century as a strong trading country.

#### VOTE REPUBLICAN FOR CHANGE

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I have heard my friends on this side of the

aisle, the Democrats, complain about the contract that the Republicans are offering. In a nutshell, it comes down to one thing. If you think this Government is too big, spends too much money, and there is no accountability, then you should vote Republican. If you think we need government spending then you should vote Democrat. And if you believe we need accountability after 42 years of one party running this place and would like to see an outside accounting firm tell you how the dollars have been spent then you should vote Republican, because the contract the Republicans have is going to do many many things, including real reform.

The Democrats provided in the first 100 days of this Congress the largest tax increase in American history, increased Government spending, taxing Social Security recipients, and drastically cutting the defense budget.

I ask my colleagues, think about this: Are you happy with the status quo? Then vote Democrat. If you are not, vote for real change: Republican.

#### FEHBP COVERAGE OF BONE MARROW TRANSPLANTS AS TREATMENT FOR BREAST CANCER

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

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, Rebecca Perez-Ford is a 39-year-old mother of three small children who is suffering from stage III inflammatory breast cancer. Ms. Ford has literally been fighting for her life, fighting for the opportunity to raise the young children who need her. Her struggle against cancer, however, has by no means been her biggest challenge. Rather, her greatest obstacle has been a Federal insurance plan which has denied her the means to survive her disease.

I recently testified before the Subcommittee on Compensation and Employee Benefits after learning that the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program [FEHBP] has excluded countless women like Ms. Ford from scientifically advanced, effective treatment for breast cancer. While many FEHBP policies have covered bone marrow transplants for testicular cancer and other diseases, OPM and the insurance companies have claimed that for breast cancer, this procedure is too experimental to be covered. Many noted oncologists, however, maintain that the evidence supporting the use of bone marrow transplants to treat breast cancer is far superior to the evidence supporting the same treatment for testicular cancer.

I was so pleased to read in Wednesday's Washington Post that starting immediately, all FEHBP plans will be required to cover high-dose chemotherapy with autologous bone marrow

transplantation in the treatment of breast cancer. This disease is itself a horrendous proposition, and without insurance reimbursement, women are left to bargain for lifesaving treatment.

FEHBP's reluctance to cover bone marrow transplants for breast cancer patients was clearly inconsistent and discriminatory—the revamping of OPM's policy on this issue is a welcome change which is long overdue.

#### HIDDEN RIPOFFS IN GATT

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, this administration is about to push through Congress one of the worst special interest ripoffs of the American people ever to come through this body and that is saying a lot.

Hidden in the GATT implementation legislation are provisions like the one that will dramatically reduce the patent protection now enjoyed by the American people.

Let me repeat that, the GATT implementation legislation secretly contains a major reduction in the patent protection enjoyed by Americans; 90 percent of the rest of our Members do not even know this. Billions in royalties that would be going to Americans will end up in the bank accounts of Japanese and multinational corporations.

I supported NAFTA strongly. I say let us not pass GATT until the hidden ripoffs are taken out. What are we in such a hurry about? Members are going to hear, oh, we have to do it immediately. They are afraid that this body and the American people are going to find out what is in GATT, hidden in there.

We need to look at this legislation. It should be shelved until next year so the American people and this body will be able to find all of the secret provisions.

Get those ripoffs out of GATT or I am not going to support it.

#### DEMOCRATS SCARED OF REPUBLICAN CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, next week on September 27, Republicans from around the country and the incumbents here will stand on the steps of the Capitol and propose a contract with the American people. Last week the President came out and attacked this contract. This week our colleagues on the Democrat side here in the House have attacked it. I am really wondering why. This has not even been unveiled yet.

What Republicans want to do is bring real congressional reform to the House

of Representatives. We want to guarantee to the American people that within the first 100 days of a Republican House that 10 bills will be brought to the floor for a full vote, commonsense reforms like a balanced budget amendment, a line-item veto, real welfare reform, a bill to stimulate economic growth, another bill to try to ease the regulatory burdens on the American people.

Yet, our colleagues on the Democrat side who have run this House for 40 years are complaining. Yes, I think they are scared. I think they are scared of losing their election. I think they are really more scared about losing their control over this institution.

Remember, this is not a campaign promise, this is a contract, and if we do not live up to our end of this deal, throw us out.

#### REPUBLICAN CONTRACT WITH THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, the foreign policy of this country is in shambles and yet Democrats come to the floor of the House of Representatives today largely in fear that the Republicans are going to go out and talk to the American people with a contract, a signed contract to do some real things in the next Congress.

The trade deficit of this country is ballooning but Democrats come to the floor today most worried about the fact that the Republicans might actually make a contract with the American people that will fix our economic competitiveness problems.

We are beginning to see signs of the collapse of the economy and yet Democrats are worried that the Republicans might actually sign a contract with the American people to balance the budget, reform welfare, and provide for some tax fairness.

It seems to me that the reasons why they are most worried about this contract is that they realize that the kinds of things that we are going to talk to the American people about are exactly what the American people have decided are in the best interests of this country. The American middle class is fearful that the economic collapse, trade deficit, the collapse of our defense, the foreign policy shambles are in fact a downward turn for America. They want people with a sense of hope for our future. The Republican contract is that sense of hope.

□ 1100

#### 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

conference report on the bill (H.R. 4554) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes, as well as the Senate amendments reported in disagreement, and that I may include extraneous material and tables.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4554,  
AGRICULTURAL, RURAL DEVELOPMENT,  
FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION,  
AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS  
ACT, 1995

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 4554) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

(For conference report and statement see proceedings of the House of September 20, 1994, at page 24968.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let me say at the outset the consideration of this conference committee report marks the end of an era on this important subcommittee of the House of Representatives. We are all painfully aware of the fact that our cherished colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], has announced his retirement.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] is literally a legend in the history of the U.S. House of Representatives, and for this particular Agriculture Subcommittee, it has been Mr. WHITTEN's world for so many years that the mind of man runneth not to the contrary on Capitol Hill. In fact, for 46 years, JAMIE WHITTEN of Mississippi has had a steady hand on the rudder for this important agency, the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

His legacy has been noted in speeches on this floor many times, but I will tell you that we can give him credit, a large measure of credit, for the fact that America, through this almost half century, has remained a country well fed with the most efficient agricultural production in the world.

He has fought long and hard for these programs and for many other programs for which he has not received credit. There is an orphan-drug program in the Food and Drug Administration which provides drugs for families which have a member suffering from rare diseases. These are not drugs that are really profitable on a market basis, but we invest in these drugs so these families have hope that the family member suffering from the disease may find some comfort, relief, or cure. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] initiated this program on his own and did it with little or no fanfare.

I can tell you that literally thousands of American families owe a great deal of gratitude to him. In fact, all of us across this country do. We are going to miss him. He is a great institution.

For those who give long speeches about term limits, let me tell you, if we had lost the service of JAMIE WHITTEN after he had been here for 6 years, this Nation would have lost a great treasure and a great resource. He careered and his contribution are unparalleled in the U.S. House of Representatives.

At the staff level, we also have a changing of the guard here which is a painful one for many of us. Bob Foster has been one of the very best members of the Committee on Appropriations staff over the years. He was appointed to the Committee on Appropriations by Chairman George Mahon in May 1969. He was assigned to the Defense Subcommittee, but came to his senses and moved over to the Agriculture Committee in 1972. He became clerk of the subcommittee in 1975.

Most folks do not understand the huge job which our staff members have in dealing with these budgets. This year this total budget is in the neighborhood of \$68 billion. We literally have the hard work and good services of our three direct staff members, Bob Foster, Tim Sanders, and Carol Murphy, who are attempting to deal with this budget and to make some sense of it, find savings, and make certain that what we do is consistent.

Bob Foster has led this effort now since 1975. He has been my strong right hand for the last 2 years. He has announced his retirement. We are certainly going to miss his service. Like the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], he has made an incredible contribution to this country, one which most people will never know.

Those of us who have the responsibility of standing before the microphones and cameras realize how critically important their contribution has been. I want to personally thank Bob and, of course, thank all of the staff for the work that they have done.

I am blessed on the subcommittee to have the very best minority spokesman in the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN]. They just do not get any

better. JOE and I have worked closely over the years. We have worked closely on this conference committee report.

There were some delicate moments, some tough moments, but we worked through them together on a bipartisan basis.

I could read the names of all the members of the subcommittee, and I could say that without exception these men and women have worked hard, have earned their pay, and have done a good job for the American people.

But let me speak to this bill, because I know it is a Friday, and people are anxious to go home and get back to their districts. This is known as the agriculture bill, and many people dismiss it as just an agriculture bill. If it were only that, it would be a very, very important bill.

In fact, it does provide for agricultural production programs to guarantee a reliable food supply for our country, and that is no mean feat. We have done that consistently throughout our Nation's history because of the foresight of planners in Washington and also because of the initiative and hard work of farmers and producers across America.

But this bill does so much more. It provides school lunches for 25 million American kids. It provides prenatal care nutrition for 40 percent of America's infants; some 6.5 million American mothers and infants and children work through the WIC Program to make sure they get adequate nutrition. This bill provides commodities to food banks, and food stamps for low-income and unemployed Americans; it provides for safe and nutritious food inspection so the families know they can be confident the food products reaching our tables are safe for their families; it protects our Nation's water resources; it preserves our soil; it builds homes, waterworks, and sewage treatment plants in small-town America; it provides disaster funds when floods, droughts, hurricanes, and other natural calamities occur. It also funds the Food and Drug Administration, which is the little giant of the Federal Government.

With less than \$1 billion to approve our new drugs and medical devices, inspect our foods, monitor our Nation's blood banks, mammography clinics, and medical laboratories, this critically important agency is funded by this bill, and it serves each and every American family.

This bill passed the House on June 17, the Senate on July 20, it returned to the Senate August 12, and our conferees met September 19 and 20 and filed this report on September 20 after many hours of hard work by our staff people.

The conference agreement totals \$68 billion. It is \$2.8 billion less than last year. It is below the President's request by some \$461 million. It is \$1.2

billion below last year's spending in discretionary areas.

There is a lot of talk on this floor about cutting spending on Capitol Hill. We have just heard a long series of speeches on both sides of the aisle about the wisdom of a balanced budget. I will tell my colleagues that this is the first step, if you want to know what the balanced-budget process is all about. We literally had to sit down and take good and valuable programs, in some cases eliminate them, in many other cases reduce spending. I wish that we did not have to do that. Some of these programs really are necessary.

But in order to bring our deficit under control and keep our economy moving, it must be done.

Now, when we left the House, we had hoped the House Committee on Agriculture would establish a user fee for meat and poultry inspection in the United States. We assumed that they would and that we would derive some \$100 million plus from that user fee that the industry would pay for overtime inspection, and that these funds could be used for other purposes. No legislation has been enacted, so we had to reduce the bill in conference in order to fund it, and with that suffering a shortfall of over \$100 million. As a result, several programs were reduced below the mark which left the House.

We have funded the Food Safety Inspection Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture at last year's level. We have given the Food and Drug Administration only \$6 million more than last year, and with this level of funding they will be forced, I am afraid, to reduce the number of employees doing this important work.

In the major items of this bill, we have increased WIC by \$260 million, which moves us toward full funding, a goal which I believe Democrats and Republicans share.

We have funded the TEFAP Program at \$25 million for commodities. That is above the President's budget request.

We have provided funds for the Commodity Supplemental Food Program at \$84 million, and we have also addressed a very contentious issue on the cashout of the Food Stamp Program. At this moment, 18 cashout projects have been approved by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and are in operation.

In this bill we provide that a total of 25 projects, including the 18 presently operating, can be approved by the Secretary, so long as the total of such projects does not exceed 3 percent of the total number of caseloads in the program.

I think this is an important step forward toward welfare reform. It gives the local units of government some flexibility in trying ideas to break the welfare cycle. I do not know of a single Member of Congress, Democrat or Republican, who endorses today's welfare system. We know it needs to be

changed. We want to make sure the important mission of food stamps, to make certain America's people are well fed, is not compromised in the process. I think what we propose in this conference report meets that goal.

For the Soil Conservation Service, conservation operations account, we provide funding of \$556 million, but allow unobligated, unneeded 1994 CRP and WRP balances to be transferred to the account.

We also provide watershed and flood-prevention operations at \$70 million to continue the program.

We have our export programs funded, EEP at \$800 million, MPP at \$84.5 million, SOAP and COAP at \$25.6 million.

□ 1110

There is money, \$905 million, for water and sewer loans, and \$500 million for water and sewer grants in the Farmers Home Administration. One item we debated long and hard was section 515 rural rental housing. We maintained the same level as it left the House at \$220 million. This is a dramatic cut from last year's spending.

I hope everyone involved takes very seriously the debate that took place in the committee and on the floor about the future of this program. We need Federal help to continue to build housing in rural areas for the elderly and low-income families. But we certainly need a better and more cost-efficient program. I hope this appropriation bill is a signal to the industry and to everyone involved to take this very seriously. If this program does not change when we come back next year, this Member, if he is reelected, will make certain that the message is delivered in even more forceful terms.

This conference committee report also includes disaster funding, funding necessary for 1994 crop losses, particularly in areas like Georgia and Florida, which have been hard hit, to provide this disaster assistance.

At this point I reserve the balance of my time.

I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico, my friend and colleague, JOE SKEEN, and again I want to thank JOE for the fine work he has put into this bill and that of his staff, as well.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by saying to my chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [DICK DURBIN], that it has been to me one of the most pleasant associations and fruitful associations that I have ever experienced because, when you talk about respect and dignity, that is the way in which this chairman has led this group from the very beginning. I think it is in the best traditions of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] whom we honor today.

I also want to speak about the staff. Bob Foster, Tim Sanders, Carol Murphy, all those folks who work so hard.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know why Bob Foster wants to retire. He has been only giving us about 95 percent of his time for a long time, and I do not know why he wants to expand the 5 percent so as to have some enjoyable time on the golf course. But I am sure he is going to find some other pursuits. I have never seen a group so dedicated in my entire life to the furtherance of the work of this subcommittee to make sure that it is right, that it is accurate, that we are well informed.

Thank God nobody brought up the idea of term limitations for professional staff in the Congress of the United States because otherwise this place would never function as well as it does because there is an institutional memory and these folks should be given the kind of credit they deserve because day in and day out around the clock every season they are here, and we appreciate it very, very much.

It is also, I think, to the credit of our chairman that he is wise enough to keep that counsel going and to extend that tradition.

Now let me talk about the bill. I think the chairman has done a good job of covering it. This bill provides about \$68 billion in new budget authority, approximately, for mandatory and discretionary USDA, FDA, and other related agency programs for fiscal year 1995.

This represents a reduction, a reduction of \$2.8 billion, less than the amount enacted in 1994 and \$461 million dollars below the President's 1995 budget request. Only \$13.4 billion of the total is allocated for discretionary spending. That is a cut of almost \$1.2 billion below 1994 and \$457 million dollars under the budget request.

The discretionary spending makes up less than 20 percent of the total spending, meaning that mandated programs represent 80 percent of our spending, meaning that these, year in and year out, the mandatory spending programs require 80 percent of our funding there by law, and you must obey the law.

The mandatory entitlement programs continue to increase at an out-of-control rate. This bill's mandatory spending continues to gobble up more of the discretionary programs, including WIC, Agricultural Research, export and conservation programs, which is why Congress and the administration need to fight for expeditious consideration of entitlement reform.

The major differences: This conference report deleted the controversial user fees totaling more than \$250 million from the Food and Safety Inspection Service and the Food and Drug Administration. This conference deleted this controversial user fee section. While deleting these user fees was a popular decision, we had to make a number of difficult choices about

which program would be cut in order to make up the shortfall. The committee made sure that the Food and Safety Inspection Service, Agriculture Research Service, Food and Nutrition Service, and the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service were among the agencies that were virtually fully funded. These are for the protection of the consumers of this country and for the entire world, for that matter, because we are a provider of foodstuffs to almost the entire world.

WIC, Agriculture Research, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, and disaster assistance payments were also given high priority. On the other hand we were forced to cut some very popular programs. Farmers Home Administration section 502 and 515 loan programs on housing were necessary for us to cut. The Food and Drug Administration, temporary emergency food assistance program [TEFAP] is a very popular program among the some 26 nutritional programs that we deal in year in and year out, and the export programs, including the market promotion program, were cut in order to get below our budgetary caps. While the spending for those programs is lean, it is also responsible under these tough budget times and the parameters under which we have to work on the money situation.

This conference report makes sure that Federal spending will continue to insure that our food is the safest, healthiest, and cheapest food in the world. Spending for research helps our farmers compete and remain the most productive anywhere in the world. We are going to continue to feed the hungry here at home and abroad as we have done consistently throughout our history. This is what this conference report is all about. This is responsible Federal spending, but it is getting tougher and tougher as the discretionary money continues to decline. I urge you to vote for this conference report. It is a product worthy of final passage.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, if I may, I would like to engage the chairman in a colloquy.

There has been considerable interest in the disposition of amendment No. 81. This was a provision that has been in the appropriation bill annually since fiscal year 1986. Would the chairman please explain the impact of dropping this provision?

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

Mr. SKEEN. I yield to the chairman. Mr. DURBIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, yes. I would be glad to discuss it. Since the early 1980's different administrations have continually proposed user fees for the Food and Drug Administration. At one point several years ago, the FDA claimed it had authority to collect generic user

fees. It cited "31 U.S.C. 9701" as its authority to establish and collect such user fees. This particular law is very general in nature and provides that as one of the criteria of consideration is public policy. Congress has steadfastly explained to the FDA that due to the significant change in public policy for FDA to charge user fees it must come to the Congress, testify to any specifics, and have Congress address the issues. While the Appropriations Committee has not taken a position on the appropriateness of user fees, it firmly believes that such a significant change in FDA policy for user fees must be explicitly approved by the authorizing committees and the Congress. The FDA currently charges user fees for many activities but I know of no case where they charge without specific statutory authority. The conference decision to delete the language contained in amendment No. 81 in no way gives authority to FDA to charge generic user fees. Interested parties should know that if the FDA were to try to use 31 U.S.C. 9701 as user fee, authority that Congress would step in and take action.

Mr. SKEEN. I thank the chairman for the explanation and assurances. I, too, want to voice my support for what the chairman has said. I want to reiterate that the conference position did not in anyway give the FDA any generic user fee authority.

□ 1120

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. PASTOR], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, today we are considering an important piece of legislation. It is one which will impact many American households by providing some of the most valuable and basic assistance contained in the U.S. budget. Funds provided here will help supplement the inadequate diets of too many of our children and senior citizens and help expand housing choices for many low-income citizens. I am pleased to be associated with the efforts that have produced this legislative proposal. It was a difficult process but one in which fairness and genuine interest in balancing competing interests prevailed.

Still, I would be remiss if I did not emphasize that some truly painful choices had to be made in the fashioning of this appropriations bill. Funds have fallen far short of the levels needed to adequately fund not only nutrition and housing programs, but also many important conservation initiatives.

I feel it is most appropriate to stress at this point that the budget cuts implemented in last year's budget agreement are real and will be felt through

the country; the 1995 Agriculture budget clearly reflects a genuine effort to reduce the budget deficit. While I agree many cuts to the Federal budget are necessary in this context, I think some valuable programs have been reduced to the point where important initiatives will be virtually canceled. To illustrate, funding for The Emergency Food Assistance Program, or TEFAP, will not come close to filling the gaps many families face as they work to put food on their tables.

I worry about the choices which lie ahead for us, and hope that we will continue to work assiduously to preserve any progress we have made toward the goal of helping the neediest and most disadvantaged in our society.

Mr. Speaker, I also would like to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, the ranking minority member, and the staff for the fine work they have done.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH], a member of the committee.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], the ranking member of the subcommittee, for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4554, the Agriculture Appropriations Conference Report, and I would like to thank and praise our subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], and the staff for all their leadership and hard work in crafting this bill. I would also like to thank my colleagues on the subcommittee for the courtesies they have extended me. I have enjoyed working with them very much through this bill.

I would also like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I have been very proud to serve with Chairman WHITTEN over the past 2 years on this committee, and when I grow old, I can tell my grandchildren that I served with Chairman WHITTEN, as did my father, William Walsh, who has asked me to extend his regards also to Chairman WHITTEN.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report makes the best of a bad situation, as budget pressures caused us to cut many important programs, including Soil Conservation. We had tough decisions to make. But we were able to maintain \$25 million in the Commodity Purchase Program for TEFAP and \$40 million for administrative costs. This program has more volunteer activists involved than any other program I can think of within our jurisdiction. It does a good job. It helps people who do not receive public assistance, are too proud to receive public assistance, but are willing to go into a food pantry for some assistance.

Mr. Speaker, we were able to pass a bill that did not impose FSAS user fees for meat and poultry producers and did not impose user fees for the FDA.

I would like to thank the ranking member and the subcommittee chairman for their clarification of amendment No. 81 regarding user fees and state that I remain strongly opposed to additional user fees. We do not want to send a signal to the FDA, the OMB, or the Clinton administration that in any way could be seen as an encouragement for them to establish user fees. In fact, we need to be sending the opposite message to the administration, that is, that they need to stop submitting to Congress budget requests that contain unauthorized user fees.

I support the increase in the WIC program. It has broad, strong bipartisan support.

I would also like to praise Chairman DURBIN's compromise on the food stamps cash-out demonstration projects, limiting the total number of the projects to 25. While I question the good sense of this program, others do not. Others have faith in it. My feeling is that we should strongly support the EBT, the Electronic Benefit Transfer program, the use of debit cards for food stamps. I think we should be getting away from anything that is negotiable, as are food stamps and certainly cash. But there is some support for these demonstration projects. I think we should run the course with them and then eliminate them and get straight to the Electronic Benefit Transfer Program.

The conference agreement is \$68 billion. It is almost \$3 billion less than last year, and only 20 percent of this is for discretionary. It shows clearly that we on the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee are doing our fair share to meet deficit needs.

Last, Mr. Speaker, I would urge that the Members support the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, under permission to include extraneous matter, I submit into the RECORD clarifying language concerning an Agricultural Research Service project related to alternatives to chemicals on apples, as follows:

#### AGRICULTURE RESEARCH SERVICE

The conference agreement contains \$300,000 for research on identifying practical alternatives to pesticides on apples. Apple growers are anxious to lessen their use of pesticides in the growing, handling, storing, and processing of apples to reduce production costs and environmental exposure. Alternative control approaches are important to identify as 35 or more diseases, insects, and other pests attack apples. It is expected that these funds will be allocated to ARS research projects and facilities in New York State (Geneva, Cornell) and California and that research and funding priorities should be done in consultation with the apple industry through the International Apple Institute.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to another member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say, before the gentleman is recognized, that

Mr. SMITH makes an extraordinary contribution to this subcommittee. His practical knowledge and firsthand experience in agricultural issues has been invaluable to us as we have debated this matter. He makes a positive contribution to this subcommittee and to the Committee on Appropriations, and I am just glad that we have him here.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I first of all want to thank the gentleman from Illinois for those remarks, and I want to say that this subcommittee has done a very good job this year with a very tight budget. I want to give my accolades to the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking minority member of the subcommittee and all the members and the staff.

As was indicated a while ago, we have a professional staff. I hear this talk on the floor all the time about congressional reform. They talk about what percentage should go to the majority and what percentage to the minority. We should not even be talking about that. We have a professional staff, and that is the way it ought to operate, and it operates well in this case.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference agreement.

I wish to commend Chairman DURBIN, Ranking Member SKEEN, the members of the subcommittee and the staff for the hard work needed to bring this bill within the tight budget limits.

The conference report provides \$68 billion in budget authority for fiscal year 1995, \$1.2 billion less than what was available in fiscal year 1994 for discretionary programs, but all that is available under the allocations to the various subcommittees within which we stay to meet deficit reduction goals.

I believe that nearly all of the members of the subcommittee agree that we did the best we could with the allocated funds available. We could have fully justified additional funds for export programs, conservation, nutrition, food safety, rural development, and several other programs in this bill.

We could not do all we wanted to do, but we accomplished as much as possible through a judicious use of the funds that were available.

One thing that we accomplished which did not cost any money was to impose some limits on food stamp cashouts. There has been a recent rash of proposals by States wanting to pay for what they call welfare reform by securing cash from the Department instead of food stamps for low-income families. It is sure to result in many children's food allowance being used for other purposes. I vigorously oppose these cashouts and believe they must be stopped.

Under the conference agreement, the Department may not approve more than 25 cash-out projects at any one time. The limit is on the number of projects, not States. Some States have

more than one project. At present, the Department has approved 18 projects. Some of these projects focus on AFDC recipients, others have the elderly and others cash-out food stamps for the first month or two to certain new applicants.

The conference agreement would also limit cash-out projects to a total of not more than 3 percent of the national household participation level for the Food Stamp Program.

I do not favor any cash-out programs that would take food out of the mouths of needy children and families. The conference agreement allows the current cash-out projects to continue until I believe they will be proven a bad experiment and provides an adequate opportunity to approve some spending applications for additional projects.

I urge your support of the conference agreement.

□ 1130

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS], another fine member of the subcommittee, a longtime member, one of the longest in tenure.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise first to say this committee is going to be quite different next year. We knew that the gentleman from Mississippi, Chairman WHITTEN, was going to leave our committee, and it is going to be a tremendous loss to this committee, because I do not think there is anyone in this Congress that knows more about agriculture, knows more about the experience of the various programs, how they came about, how they have been funded, than our colleague JAMIE WHITTEN. So we are going to miss the gentleman from Mississippi very much.

I was surprised this morning to learn one of our staff members now is also joining those ranks. Is there a message coming across here we do not know about? Bob Foster, who has helped both Democrat and Republican, ignoring politics, as has already been mentioned by Mr. SMITH of Iowa. This committee has always been nonpartisan, not bipartisan. In the interests of helping agriculture and helping farmers, we cannot afford to be partisan. We have to put our best foot forward at all times.

Yes, I guess next to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH], I will be the longest serving member then of the Committee on Agriculture next year.

Certainly the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH], being a practicing farmer like myself, knows something about the problems of a producer today.

This is where I have concern today with this agriculture appropriation bill. Realizing that it is not the fault of any member of this committee, and I commend every member of this committee, and the staff, for the hard

work. The 602(b) allocations that were given to us earlier in the year dealt us a severe blow. And I certainly support reducing spending. But we reduced it here on the backs of the wrong people, the people that can least afford to be cut.

I believe in a balanced budget, but we cut agriculture research in this bill. If there is any place where a farmer can be helped today, it is finding better production methods, more use for agricultural products, so we can get a better price for the product we produce. And this is being cut in this bill. This is not the fault of the committee, but the fault of the allocation system.

In the committee, the mandates are 80 percent of the bill today, and the discretionary, where we have an opportunity to play with some money, to put it where it best can be served, down to 20 percent, and both of those figures are moving in opposite directions. Next session we must do something about this. We simply have to cut down the mandated section, so we will have more opportunity to help the farm producer out there who is suffering today. When those figures are 80-20, it is way out of proportion. When we look at the allocations in title I, the farm programs, the programs that go directly to a farmer to help him, where the research money is, we find a reduction of 11 percent this year from last year. A reduction of 11 percent in research and farm programs that help the farmer produce.

Using one comparison of where we also had to meet cuts to meet the budget that our chairman spoke about, the National Endowment for the Arts. I do not think many people here find a whole lot of favor, and our constituents certainly do not, we cut the national Endowment for the Arts only 2 percent, leaving all that money in for pornography and all of these social programs that most taxpayers could care less about. We cut that only 2 percent, while we cut farm production, helping farmers to be competitive, in not only our own market but the world market, we cut it 11 percent. So again, it is not the criticism about this committee, but the procedure we are using today. The only thing we can do about it is next year start to do something about these mandates versus discretionary funding. I hope the next session of Congress, we all get our heads together and start doing something about this.

So again, it is the best bill I think that could be produced, but it comes far short of what we should be doing to help farm producers, meeting agribusiness, meeting world competition, where most of the export surplus can be exported. I hope next year we can do better.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALDOMAEGA].

Mr. FALDOMAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I lend full support to the conference

committee report on H.R. 4554, and I commend the chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], and members of the conference for the outstanding job they have done in this important legislation now under consideration in the House.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for giving me the opportunity to submit a statement on this very important bill. I stand in strong support of H.R. 4554, Agriculture appropriations for fiscal year 1995. With my colleagues I would like to express my appreciation for all the hard work and time that members and their staff, of both House and Senate subcommittees, have put in to crafting a comprehensive and well thought-out bill.

As the bill progressed through both the House and Senate my attention lay with the treatment of funding for the American Samoa Food Stamp Program—slightly modified to provide nutritional assistance only to the elderly, blind, and disabled persons. I was pleased to see that this program gathered a lot of support especially when there was the possibility of underfunding.

I support the conference report in that future appropriations for this program should be funded under the proper food stamp account and not the discretionary account of food donations. Because of the unique nature of this program we can not afford to play with nutritional assistance appropriations, especially to the needy.

I ask my colleagues to work with me on this and ensure that American Samoa's Food Stamp Program is properly authorized in the 1995 farm bill. Let us apply equal treatment to this program as we have done to other nutrition assistance programs.

Once again the combined efforts of key members and staffers ensured that American Samoa's program would not be left in the cold. I especially would like to thank the following people for their assistance in this matter: Representatives RICHARD DURBIN, JOE SKEEN, and staffer Carol Murphy; Senators J. BENNETT JOHNSTON, DANIEL INOUE, PATRICK LEAHY, and their staffers, Laura Hudson, Margaret Cummsky, Mark Fox, and Edward Barron; from American Samoa, Governor Lutali and director of ASNAP John Suisala, and last but not least USDA Secretary Mike Espy and his staff at Food Nutrition Services. Thank you so much for your help.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
Washington, DC, September 1, 1994.

Hon. ENI F.H. FALDOMAEGA,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR ENI: This is in response to your letter of July 27, 1994, requesting support for the future funding of the American Samoa Nutrition Assistance Program (ASNAP) for the low-income elderly, blind, and disabled in American Samoa. I want to assure you of the Department of Agriculture's (USDA) support for this program.

USDA has requested \$5.3 million in funding for ASNAP for fiscal year (FY) 1995 which should be more than adequate considering the initial participation. I assure you that USDA is committed to securing appropriate funding for the program. As you know, the House of Representatives deleted funding for

ASNAP in H.R. 4554, the FY 1995 USDA Appropriations Bill, but the Senate included ASNAP funding as the Administration had requested. We will urge the House and Senate conferees to provide appropriate funding for ASNAP so that future operation of ASNAP is not in jeopardy. We also support your efforts to help resolve this problem.

I was pleased to be able to support ASNAP by sending Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) staff from the national office, the Western Regional Office, and the Honolulu field office to American Samoa in June and July to provide technical assistance for the opening of the program on July 1, 1994. I also plan to send FNS staff to American Samoa in September to provide further assistance.

Once again, I assure you of USDA's commitment for securing funding for ASNAP and we will work with you toward that goal.

Sincerely,

MIKE ESPY,

Secretary.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR], a very valuable member of the subcommittee, one of my colleagues who came to Congress with me.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in full support of this agriculture appropriations conference report, and want to especially compliment our chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], for his stellar leadership, along with our ranking member, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN]. I also want to thank Bob Foster for his dedicated years of service, not just to this committee, but to the American farmer and American agriculture. It is that type of professionalism which has kept America the most productive nation in the world.

I could not stand here today and not acknowledge the presence of our chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi, JAMIE WHITTEN, for his years of service and lessons to all of us, especially teaching us that there is a difference between money and wealth. Our job on the Committee on Agriculture is to help create the wealth of America through the investments that we make through this department.

Mr. Speaker, the bill appropriates \$68 billion in fiscal year 1995 spending. This is \$2.8 billion less than the fiscal year 1994 bill, \$461 million less than the President's request, and \$1.2 billion less than fiscal year 1994 discretionary spending.

To call this an agriculture bill is a bit misleading. Nearly 60 percent of the programs funded by our subcommittee are nutrition programs, primarily food stamps. The bill also funds rural development, food assistance, and export programs as well as the Food and Drug Administration.

Mandatory spending not under the jurisdiction of this subcommittee accounts for a majority of the appropriations in this bill. Discretionary spending in this bill amounts to \$13.4 billion in budget authority.

I would like to commend the chairman and the members of the subcommittee for putting together a fiscally responsible bill. We were faced

with tight budget constraints that forced us to cut over 70 programs including: rural rental housing, emergency food assistance, agricultural research, and conservation programs.

Tough choices had to be made. Yet while faced with tight budget constraints we were still able to shift resources to priority programs. I am especially pleased we were able to extend \$1 billion in emergency disaster assistance to those communities who suffered through the severe weather conditions of this past year. In my own district, the nursery industry suffered losses as a result of ice storms and the extreme cold this past winter. This bill will assist these vital small businesses in their recovery.

Our subcommittee worked hard to see that TEFAP, the Emergency Food Assistance Program, receives funding for commodity purchases in spite of the administration's recommendation to zero out this program. This program will receive \$65 million for fiscal year 1995; \$25 million for commodity purchases and \$40 million for administrative expenses.

The Women Infants and Children Feeding Program receives an 8-percent increase over last year's funding and is intended to move the program to the administration's goal of full funding for WIC by the end of 1996. WIC decreases infant mortality rates and investments in WIC are offset by decreases in long term Federal Medicaid expenditures.

Traditional farm programs however continue to receive a decreasing portion of our spending. With the upcoming debate on the 1995 farm bill, it is my hope that we can reverse this trend.

In the decade of the 1980's we have slowly eroded the basis of American agriculture—the family farmer—and are moving in the direction of large corporate farms. I will be looking to next year's farm bill to ensure that prices are maintained at a level high enough to compensate for costs of production and to maintain standards of living in order to attract and retain individuals in farm production. We must also negotiate trade agreements which encourage and enhance the ability of family farmers to compete in world markets.

In agriculture trade, we must also work to recapture lost markets and increase exports. As American agricultural exports grow, foreign agriculture exports are being shipped to the United States in greater magnitude. Since 1981, our agricultural exports have declined from \$43.8 billion to a low of \$26.2 billion in 1986 and back to \$37.6 billion for 1991. Under the USDA programs, the profit has gone to the exporter but the cost is charged to the farmer. Since 1981 agricultural imports have increased from \$10.8 billion to \$22.6 billion in 1991, a 100-percent increase, in many cases these are products our own farmers could be selling.

In closing, I want to again commend the chairman and the ranking member for putting together a good bill. I urge the Members to support this fiscally responsible measure.

□ 1140

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON], a member of the subcommittee and hard-working contributor to this important conference report.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bill, a very tough bill. I think we did the best job we could with the constraints that we had. I also want to commend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], for all of his service to this committee.

It has been absolutely magnificent. He will be sorely missed.

I, too, was surprised to hear that Bob was going to move out on us next year. I just wanted him to know that he taught me a lot in the last 2 years. His process that he gave to me will be used in ongoing years as we go ahead.

This is a very austere bill. I am very concerned with the fact that we did not do what I felt we should do, be able to do in conservation programs, emergency feeding programs, and certainly in the rural housing programs. Those are issues that are very dear to America and certainly to rural America.

We have got to look at this as we get into the next year. I strongly support, in closing, the electronic transfer card as we get into the food stamp program. We have got to expand this process. We have to look at this as America demands greater accountability as we look at the expenditures as food stamps grow in ensuing years.

I appreciate the good works of the gentleman and the ranking member as we worked on this very difficult bill.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this conference report and urge my colleagues to support its passage. I commend the gentleman from Illinois for his dedication, leadership, and diligent work in drafting this legislation. I applaud the conference committee's efforts in supporting American agriculture and the U.S. Department of Agriculture's food and nutrition programs which are so important to millions of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, we should not overlook the difficulty which the Appropriations Committee faced in putting together this crucial legislation. Despite this difficulty, this bill manages to put a premium on the needs of families and children while maintaining the U.S. Department of Agriculture's commitment to our Nation's farmers and rural communities.

I applaud the conference committee's resolve in maintaining the funding

level which the House passed originally increasing the Women, Infants, and Children [WIC] Program by \$260 million for fiscal year 1995. This increase guarantees that the administration's goal of full funding for WIC by the end of 1996 is right on schedule. Thousands of families with young children across this Nation will benefit from this effective program.

Furthermore, I applaud the chairman for his continued support for the section 515 Rural Housing Program. The funding level in this legislation will enable scores of poor rural families in this Nation to have decent and affordable housing.

This conference report is both fiscally responsible and good for rural America. I urge my colleagues to support passage of this conference report.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. THORNTON], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to rise to express my deep appreciation to the gentleman for his leadership in this subcommittee and to express my appreciation and that of the entire State of Arkansas, and, indeed, our Nation for the leadership of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

In 1972, when I was elected to my first term in Congress, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] was already a legend. He has conducted himself in a manner that is exemplary of what all of us should aspire to be.

Additionally, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] has shown the kind of bipartisan support that has made this difficult bill possible.

Mr. Speaker, in Arkansas we have a saying that when the going gets tough, the tough get going. This was a year in agriculture where the going got tough. Thanks to the leadership of the chairman, the tough got going.

We worked on programs to continue the support for education. As a former president of a land grant institution, I know the importance of that program in support of rural housing in section 515.

I just want to congratulate the gentleman for his leadership and rise in strong support of this conference report.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas. If the going gets any tougher, I am going to give this back.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to engage the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies in a colloquy about a matter of great importance to the State of North Dakota that I represent.

As the chairman and I have discussed, North Dakota has been excluded from participation in the Wetlands Reserve Program because our State law limits Federal wetlands easements to 30 years. The Department of Agriculture issued regulations for the Wetlands Reserve Program so that only States with permanent easements could participate. As a result, North Dakota, a State comprised of a major portion of the Prairie Pothole Region with highly valuable wetlands has never been permitted to participate in this valuable program.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman and I have worked together to include report language in this year's agriculture appropriations bill to clarify the intent of the Wetlands Reserve Program. When Congress passed the law in 1985, it created a method to prioritize with the highest value and the longest term easements being most attractive for participation in the program.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman, is it the intent of the committee to include North Dakota in the Wetlands Reserve Program and to compensate producers for the high value wetlands?

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

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, before addressing the question directly, let me thank the gentleman for his contribution. Agriculture is so critically important to the economy and future of the State of North Dakota as well as our Nation. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY] has made a valuable contribution to this Congress. I have enjoyed working with him.

I am happy to rise to participate in this colloquy to clarify a very important point. It is, indeed, the intent of the committee to include States covered by the Water Bank Program in the Wetlands Reserve Program. North Dakota is one such State. The Wetlands Reserve Program is an important program to preserve, protect, and restore wetlands, improve wildlife habitat, and protect migratory bird habitat. Established criteria for the program ensures that the highest priority wetlands are accepted in the program.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, is it further the intent of the committee that the U.S. Department of Agriculture, in its administration of this program, create a fair compensation scheme for high-value wetlands with less than permanent easements?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, while the committee believes that permanent easements are the most cost-effective and environmentally beneficial, it is the intent of the committee that the Department recognize that States such as North Dakota have State laws regarding easement limitations and adjust the regulations accordingly.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and I congratulate the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies for their very good work.

□ 1150

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say one more time what a distinct honor, privilege, and pleasure it is to serve with the people who have served on this committee under the leadership of our chairman, who has done an outstanding job and very innovative.

I want to say, also, members of this subcommittee are outstanding men and women, each and every one of them. It is a real pleasure and privilege. About all we get out of life is the friends that we make and the acquaintances that we make. I really treasure those of you who have served on this committee with us, because you have made it a real pleasure to do it. I think it has been a very effective job.

A lot of times, Mr. Speaker, we think we have to apologize to the public for what we do. In this case, we do not even have to apologize, because we have given it our all and done our very best.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member is pleased that this conference report includes \$1 million to fund a 50-project demonstration program to provide Federal loan guarantees for the development of multifamily rental rural housing. This Member thanks the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], chairman of the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], the ranking member of the subcommittee, and all of the conferees for their cooperation in funding this program.

Mr. Speaker, this demonstration program is included in H.R. 3838 which passed the Banking Committee on June 15, 1994. The conference report specifies that the \$1 million transfer would become available only upon the enactment of the authorizing legislation. This would leverage up to more than \$30 million in loan value, and probably far more than that figure.

The demonstration being funded will finance 25 projects in each of fiscal years 1995 and 1996 and will provide a 90-percent guarantee on loans made by private lenders to the developers of rental housing for five or more families in rural areas.

Current law provides direct loans for the development of rental housing for low to moderate income families. The demonstration program will provide for additional housing for low and moderate income families at a limited cost to the Federal Government. Unlike direct loans, which require appropriations of the whole amount of a loan, loan guarantees only cost the Federal Government the amount of defaults on private loans. For example, the current FmHA 502 Middle Income Loan Guarantee Program for single-family housing development in rural areas began similarly as a

demonstration program, which this Member also advocated. It is currently operating with great success, in fact the 502 Program's default rate is only 2.33 percent.

Funding this new demonstration program will allow us to move forward to provide a cost effective innovative method for financing rural rental housing.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, this Member is pleased that the committee has agreed to provide \$423,000 in agricultural research funding for the Midwest Food Manufacturing Alliance. The alliance is an association of 12 leading research universities whose purpose is to develop and facilitate the transfer of new food manufacturing and processing technologies.

Mr. Speaker, the future viability and competitiveness of the U.S. agricultural industry depends on its ability to adapt to increasing worldwide demands for U.S. exports of intermediate and consumer good exports. In order to meet these changing worldwide demands, agricultural research must also adapt to provide more emphasis on adding value to our basic farm commodities. The Midwest Advanced Food Manufacturing Alliance provides the necessary cooperative link between universities and industries for the development of competitive food manufacturing and processing technologies. This will, in turn, ensure that the U.S. agricultural industry remains competitive in a increasingly competitive global economy.

Mr. Speaker, this Member is also pleased that the conference committee has agreed to adopt Senate recommended funding levels for all but one of the following ongoing Cooperative State Research Service [CSRS] and Extension projects at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln:

CSRS:	
Food processing center .....	\$42,000
Nonfood agricultural products .....	93,000
Sustainable agricultural systems .....	59,000
Rural housing policy .....	68,000
Rural Policy Research Institute (Consortium) .....	644,000
Drought mitigation .....	200,000
Extension:	
Rural development .....	392,000
Chinch bug, Russian wheat aphid .....	67,000
Agricultural communications ..	1,221,000

However, Mr. Speaker, this Member is extremely concerned that the huge growth of entitlement spending in the agriculture appropriations conference report, which now accounts for more than two-thirds of all agricultural spending, is crowding out the normal and necessary appropriations for crucial agricultural research, soil and water conservation, and agricultural lending and export promotion programs.

Unfortunately, this entitlement spending does not represent an investment in the future of the agricultural industry. Instead, Mr. Speaker, cuts in discretionary spending programs like basic agricultural research at universities across the country, watershed and flood prevention operations, and agricultural export promotion represent a serious lack of investment in the future of the agricultural industry. For example, this year's appropriations bill cuts agricultural export programs below levels the United States agreed to in the Uruguay round trade agreement negotiations. This

unilateral reduction in export subsidies is naive and will only enable foreign competitors to continue to gobble the United States' rapidly declining share of world agricultural trade, while seriously jeopardizing our annual \$18 billion trade surplus in this important industry.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, this appropriations bill cuts Farmers Home Administration agricultural lending programs at a time when it is increasingly difficult for young farmers to get started and when cattle and hog prices have reached dangerous lows, and it drastically reduces funding for the Soil Conservation Service and many other important soil and water conservation programs including: Flood Prevention, cut from fiscal year 1994 \$221 million to \$70 million; Agriculture Conservation Program, cut from fiscal year 1994 \$195 million to \$100 million; and Water Quality Incentive Program, cut from fiscal year 1994 \$18.5 million to \$15 million.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, despite severe spending cuts in nearly all discretionary agricultural spending programs, this Member reluctantly supports this legislation because defeat of the bill could, in fact, expose the agricultural industry to even greater cuts.

Again, Mr. Speaker, this Member would like to thank the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], chairman of the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], the ranking member of the subcommittee for their work in bringing this conference report before the House.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I would first like to say that I greatly appreciate the work of Chairman DURBIN and our colleagues on this bill, the last rural development and agriculture appropriations bill I will have a chance to vote for.

I am sorry to hear, also, that the subcommittee is losing the services of my friend and colleague, Bob Foster. Bob and I have worked closely throughout the years and I have found him to be invaluable. I know the subcommittee will greatly miss his expertise and advice. I wish he and his wife Jean every success in whatever the future holds for them.

As you know, this marks my final vote for a rural development appropriations bill, and I do so with a great sense of pride in what we have been able to accomplish over the years for rural communities. While this year there were several disappointments about the level of cuts we faced under the current deficit reduction program, this year's bill does continue to provide for worthwhile Federal programs such as rural housing, water and sewer programs, rural electricity and all the rest that mean so much to agriculture and rural America.

Along with the many national programs provided for in this bill, the conference committee also provided for many programs of vital interest to my State of Mississippi. The bill included funds for the National Center for Physical Acoustics and for the School Food Service Management Institute at the University of Mississippi. It provided for continued research on Kenaf, a new fiber plant being grown in the delta and processed in Charleston.

Funds were also included for the Natural Products Center at Ole Miss, for the Polymer Institute at the University of Southern Mis-

issippi, for program grants at Mississippi Valley State University, and for numerous agriculture research programs at Mississippi State University.

The conference approved funding over and above the budget request for the Soil Conservation Service's watershed and flood prevention operations.

Research funds were also provided to continue aquaculture programs, both in the delta and on the gulf coast. Continued funding was included for the National Sedimentation Lab at Oxford and the Pesticide Research Unit at Stoneville.

Mr. Speaker, these are all programs that benefit my State, but also the Nation as a whole. As I have pointed out many times, agriculture is the basis for all the rest of our economy.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4554, the conference report on the 1995 Department of Agriculture and related agencies appropriations bill.

I would like to start out by applauding the members of the Agriculture Appropriations Committee for their excellent work in producing a fine piece of legislation. I commend the chairman, Mr. DURBIN, and my colleagues for their worthy efforts and cost consciousness in keeping the USDA fiscal year 1995 budget down to \$68 billion by distributing these limited funds among important projects for our Nation's farmers. This funding level is well below budgetary limits set by the administration as well as last year's appropriations legislation.

Our country is one of the leading agricultural industries of the world. H.R. 4554 provides funding for a wide variety of agricultural programs which help us to maintain our renowned status. I am particularly encouraged by efforts to fund research and development, soil conservation, domestic food assistance, and disaster relief programs which benefit the entire country, including the State of New Jersey.

The research and development activities undertaken at the Agricultural Experiment Station at Rutgers University are vital to agricultural development. These activities include the interregional research project No. 4 [IR-4], the Agricultural Biotechnology Center, and the ARS Station. H.R. 4554 allocates \$5.711 million to continue IR-4, a national research program to clear pest control agents for use on minor crops. IR-4 produces research data on pest control products in minor, food crops and ornamental commodities. IR-4 services every State and is headquartered at the New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station. In addition, Rutgers University's Cook/Douglas Campus houses a plant bioscience and biotechnology center whose purpose is to propel plant sciences and agricultural biotechnology to premier national status. This center is earmarked to receive \$3.785 million to help complete construction of the second phase of this chief test sight.

Furthermore, a leading agriculture research station, located in Chatsworth, NJ, ranks top in blueberry and cranberry production as it works to develop technology to reduce pesticide use and its impact on the environment. I am pleased by the decision of the conferees to allocate \$220,000 for additional research at this

site, as well as restoring \$510,000 in funding for continued operation of the Chatsworth ARS Station.

I am sure that my colleagues agree that we could not maintain strong R&D activities and a viable farming industry without the commitment to preserving the land. H.R. 4554 seeks to conserve our soil, water, and other precious resources through a balanced cooperative program. While I am concerned that the \$556 million appropriated for soil conservation operations conducted through the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service and the Soil Conservation Service will not allow our farmers to benefit from the technical assistance provided in years passed, I do understand that we are experiencing difficult fiscal times which include having to make tough decisions about sensitive funding issues.

H.R. 4554 also provides \$40.25 billion for domestic food programs. Among the many important programs include the Emergency Food Assistance Program [TEFAP] and the Women's Infant and Children [WIC], Farmer's Market Nutrition Program, which will enable States like New Jersey to provide access to a more nutritious diet for persons with low incomes.

New Jersey's TEFAP Program currently services nearly 523,000 needy recipients including families, individuals with disabilities, and senior citizens. Currently as many as 15 different foods and supplemental commodities, are being distributed through more than 1,100 local public distribution sites. I applaud my colleagues on the conference committee for continuing to provide funds to administer and purchase foods for the TEFAP Program. Furthermore, I am delighted to report that in fiscal year 1995 New Jersey will be among several States participating in the WIC Program. H.R. 4554 allows for New Jersey to receive \$153,149 in Federal funds to administer WIC for the first time since its inception. Approximately 40 percent of the children born this year will go through the WIC Program and the committee's decision to continue its funding is a worthwhile investment for our future.

Finally, I realize that the Members of this Chamber are all sensitive to the devastating effects that mother nature has inflicted this past year. From the winter freeze, to ravaging floods and the engulfing flames of wildfires, our Nation's farmers have been faced with the ultimate challenge. H.R. 4554 provides much needed funds to qualifying growers, such as those in New Jersey who have experienced severe weather conditions such as icing, heavy snow, frost, hail, high winds, and rain, and even a tornado. Farmers in my State and around the country will soon be able to apply for disaster payments to help them recover and replant lost crops.

The fiscal year 1995 Agriculture appropriations bill is a promising funding measure for the agricultural industry. In these tough economic times, it is difficult to establish a funding bill to satisfy all. However, I feel that H.R. 4554 provides sufficient means for many important programs. Therefore, I strongly encourage my colleagues to join with me in supporting this bill.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report. The fiscal year 1995 appropriations conference report continues our

support for the important and diverse agricultural production and food assistance programs. Our agriculture sector contributes a major and important portion to the vitality of our Nation's economic health. More than \$40 billion in export trade and millions of jobs depend upon the hard work and productivity of our farmers and ranchers. Our core Agriculture programs, especially cooperative research, soil conservation, export trade assistance, and other price and income assistance work in tandem with American agriculture to maintain our abundance of wholesome and healthy food. It is easy to forget and often take for granted the truism that America enjoys the very best food, and at the most affordable prices in the world.

For most of our history this appropriation bill has effectively maintained a good balance and ratio of Federal support for farm production programs and food assistance for the poor. But today, unfortunately, due to our budget deficit problems, we find ourselves with dwindling and scarce budgetary resources, especially for the discretionary agriculture production and support programs.

This imbalance is evidenced, rather dramatically by this conference report. Over 80 percent of the proposed spending, or a little more than \$54.6 billion is allocated for spending on social welfare and mandatory programs, while only about \$13.6 billion of the total is available for the traditional farm programs. This imbalance was also further compounded by the Clinton budget cuts of over \$2 billion for this year's agriculture spending below 1994 levels. And the fact that only the WIC Program with an increase of \$260 million and Food and Drug Administration salaries and expenses are funded at significantly higher levels than last year.

Mandatory spending on food stamps is increased by \$600 million for a total of \$28.9 billion over 1994.

Despite the bad hand dealt us by the President's budget and our lowered 602b allocations, our distinguished and creative subcommittee chairman, DICK DURBIN and our dedicated ranking Republican, JOE SKEEN, performed true miracles to bring us an improved product. They and all of the other good members of this subcommittee were forced to make enormously difficult choices, and I have nothing but the greatest respect for the work they have performed.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that \$1.0 billion in rural housing loan guarantees are made available for the section 502 FMHA program, up \$250 million over last year. This cost effective homeownership program will assure that more than 25,000 rural families will achieve homeownership. I am proud that this program which I introduced in 1987 is achieving its goals. I also commend Chairman DURBIN and my good friend from New Mexico, JOE SKEEN, for their continued fight to preserve vital agriculture research funding. Where for such a small dollar investment of under a billion dollars in Federal spending the returns for higher quality and disease and insect reductions for crops is more than three times the pay back benefit.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank my colleagues on their effort and I strongly recommend approval of the conference report.

Ms. LAMBERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4554, the fiscal year 1995 Agriculture appropriations bill. Chairman DURBIN and the members of the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, as well as Chairman BUMPERS and his colleagues in the Senate have done a remarkable job with limited resources, and they are to be commended for their tireless efforts on behalf of America's farmers.

This bill comes to us today costing \$461 million less than the administration's request, and \$2.8 billion less than was appropriated for fiscal year 1994. Shrinking appropriations bills are a sign of the times and a trend that must continue. The Federal Government must spend less and deliver better service if the American people are to retain faith in our Government. I have been a strong supporter of increased fiscal responsibility and tough spending controls. Although I support this bill and the important programs that it funds, I come to the floor today more than a little frustrated with yet another decrease in funding for American agriculture.

I would like to remind this body of a few facts that I and my colleagues on the House Agriculture Committee have been pointing out during the entirety of the 103d Congress: agriculture programs account for less than 1 percent of the Federal budget and yet agriculture is the only sector of our economy that has a trade surplus. With that relatively small investment, we not only feed this country, but much of the entire world. That statistic alone is remarkable. But consider the fact that all of this has been accomplished while agriculture programs have been cut over \$52 billion during the last 12 years, and the cuts keep coming. The Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee had one of the smallest 602b allocations of any subcommittee and the administration cut USDA's budget more than any other agency. In addition, in the spirit of "Reinventing Government"—of which we have all heard so much and seen so little—USDA was the only department to submit a reorganization proposal. One would think that American agriculture would be held as the model for reform, but instead we are continually used as a political target for budget cuts—as if the budget could be balanced on less than 1 percent of its entirety.

I don't attribute these cuts to any malevolent intention but rather to a lack of understanding from a country—and a Congress—that has grown increasingly urban and disassociated with agriculture. As each generation gets further and further from the farm, our farmers have been increasingly taken for granted.

We as Americans have the luxury of the most affordable, safest, and most abundant food supply in the world. That fact must not be lost on the American public. It seems that people have come to believe that the food they enjoy magically produced itself on the shelf of the local grocery store, forgetting that it was once part of a crop that was nurtured by a farm family who faced incredible adversity from the weather, increased cost of production, and burdensome regulations. We must reverse this trend of public opinion and hold the American farmer as a model of the principles that this country was founded on rather than as a scapegoat for budgetary and environmental problems.

Mr. Speaker, we are about to enter a farm bill year in 1995 and I want to take this opportunity to serve notice that I intend to vigorously support and defend our farmers from self-appointed economists who would cut farm programs while our competitor countries subsidize at much higher levels—leaving our farmers at a global disadvantage; I intend to defend them from attacks from radical environmentalists who seek to place the environmental problems of the country on the back of the farmer, and who want to regulate them out of existence. I intend to remind them that our farmers are the original best stewards of the land and have a direct stake in its health.

Again I want to commend Chairman DURBIN for his hard work and support of American agriculture, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, it takes a lot for a farm State Representative to rise in opposition to agricultural appropriations legislation; however, given the contents of the conference report presented to us here today, we simply have no choice.

For centuries, farmers have had to face great adversaries—climate, weather, predators, and pests. Today, those adversaries pale in comparison to the unholy duo of the Uruguay round of GATT and unfunded mandates. Legislation that we are about to consider in this body will forever change the world our agricultural producers will face.

From the beginning of my congressional career I have said that change is inevitable. However, what you do in response to change makes all the difference. If you let change happen to you, that is deterioration. If you mold change to your advantage, that is progress.

That's why I have encouraged this body to equip our Nation's farmers with the tools they need to face the environmental challenges of the future while carving out a permanent place in the world agricultural market. Regrettably, the appropriations legislation before us today does not do that. In fact, in many respects it cuts our farmers off at the knees.

In the area of environmental funding, financing for the Agricultural Conservation Program is cut from \$90 to \$46 million, conservation operations funding is reduced from \$544 to \$510 million, watershed and flood prevention operations—so vital in our recovery from the devastating midwestern floods and east coast hurricanes of the past few years—is slashed from \$128 to \$39 million, and funding for our resource conservation and development councils is reduced from \$20 to \$16 million. Soon, agricultural conservation will simply become another item on the long list of unfunded Federal mandates.

In response to the Uruguay round, we should be fully funding our export enhancement programs like EEP, SOAP, and COAP as well as our so-called Green Box programs like the Market Promotion Program. Instead, this bill makes total cuts in these programs of almost \$60 million.

Further, this legislation does not resolve the problem that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY] and I brought to the floor of the House during the debate on crop insurance reform and that is the underfunding of the crop insurance program in the upcoming fiscal

year. Indeed, with the funds provided in this bill, we are still \$200 million short of the funding we require to have a crop insurance program in 1995.

Finally, the issue of meat inspection user fees remains unresolved. While there appears to be no user fees outlays assumed in the upcoming year, there is a line item for user fees under budget authority. It is time to simply remove any reference to user fees in this area.

I know that the conferees worked hard, Mr. Speaker, and I certainly do not impugn their efforts. However, on behalf of the multitude of my constituents who rely on the farm economy for their incomes and financial livelihoods, I simply say "we can and must do better." I, therefore, urge my colleagues in voting no on this bill.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to comment on those sections of the agriculture appropriations conference report (H.R. 4554), which deal with our Nation's child nutrition programs. The Federal child nutrition programs are authorized by the Education and Labor Committee, of which I am the ranking Republican member.

As a former educator, I am well aware of the link between proper nutrition and a child's ability to achieve in school. For this reason, I am very pleased that the conference agreement provides \$4.1 billion for the School Lunch Program and over \$1 billion for the School Breakfast Program. These two programs provide many of our Nation's poor children with the only nutritious meals they receive each day. They do, therefore, play a major role in education reform and in our ability to raise the educational achievement of our Nation's children.

Likewise, the Summer Food Program provides meals to children in low-income areas during the summer months when the School Lunch and Breakfast Programs are not available to meet their nutritional needs. In this way, we prevent any nutritional-related health problems which could impact on their ability to do well in the next school year.

Of course, one of the most important nutrition programs is WIC, the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants and Children. I am pleased to note that the conference agreement contains an increase which allows for growth in this successful program. WIC also plays a major role in the ability of children to do well in school. When mothers receive appropriate prenatal health care and nutrition, there is a reduced likelihood that they will give birth to children with low birth weight and related disabilities. WIC then provides supplements to mothers after their children are born to insure that their nutritional needs are met during their first few years of life, thus assuring they come to school ready to learn.

Finally, I would like to thank the conferees for agreeing to spend \$6.7 million for the Farmer's Market Coupon Program. This program not only increases the use of fresh fruits and vegetables among WIC participants, it provides another outlet through which our Nation's farmers can sell their fresh produce. As we attempt to improve the eating habits of our Nation's families to assist them in meeting the dietary guidelines, it is important that we increase consumption of fresh fruits and vegeta-

bles among WIC participants. The Farmer's Market Coupon Program has been successful in accomplishing this goal since many of the WIC participants come back to purchase additional produce once they have used their WIC coupons.

Mr. Speaker, we are in the midst of reauthorizing these important nutrition programs. I want to commend the conferees for providing these programs with the necessary funding to meet the needs of the participants.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 287, noes 107, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 438]

AYES—287

Abercrombie	Costello	Hamburg
Ackerman	Coyne	Hamilton
Andrews (ME)	Cramer	Harman
Andrews (NJ)	Danner	Hastert
Andrews (TX)	Darden	Hastings
Bacchus (FL)	de la Garza	Hefner
Baesler	Deal	Hilliard
Barca	DeFazio	Hogland
Barcia	DeLauro	Hochbrueckner
Barlow	Derrick	Holden
Barrett (NE)	Deutsch	Horn
Barrett (WI)	Diaz-Balart	Houghton
Barton	Dicks	Hoyer
Bateman	Dingell	Hughes
Becerra	Dixon	Hunter
Bellenson	Durbin	Hutto
Bentley	Edwards (CA)	Hyde
Bereuter	Edwards (TX)	Insole
Bevill	Emerson	Jefferson
Billbray	Engel	Johnson (GA)
Bilirakis	English	Johnson (SD)
Bishop	Eshoo	Johnson, E.B.
Billey	Evans	Johnston
Blute	Everett	Kanjorski
Boehlert	Ewing	Kaptur
Bonilla	Farr	Kennedy
Borski	Fazio	Kennelly
Boucher	Fields (LA)	Kildee
Brewster	Filner	Klecza
Brooks	Fish	Klein
Browder	Flake	Klink
Brown (CA)	Foglietta	Kopetski
Brown (FL)	Ford (MI)	Kreidler
Brown (OH)	Ford (TN)	LaFalce
Bryant	Franks (CT)	Lambert
Callahan	Frost	Lancaster
Camp	Furse	LaRocco
Cantwell	Gejdenson	Laughlin
Cardin	Gekas	Leach
Chapman	Gephardt	Lehman
Clayton	Geren	Levin
Clement	Gibbons	Lewis (CA)
Clyburn	Gillmor	Lewis (FL)
Coleman	Gilman	Lightfoot
Collins (GA)	Gonzalez	Linder
Collins (IL)	Gordon	Lipinski
Collins (MI)	Green	Livingston
Combest	Greenwood	Long
Condit	Gutierrez	Lowey
Conyers	Hall (OH)	Lucas
Coppersmith	Hall (TX)	Maloney

Mann	Peterson (FL)	Spratt
Margolies-	Peterson (MN)	Stenholm
Mezvinsky	Pickett	Stokes
Markey	Pickle	Strickland
Martinez	Pomeroy	Studds
Mazzoli	Poshard	Stupak
McCloskey	Price (NC)	Sweet
McCrery	Rahall	Swift
McDade	Ravenel	Synar
McDermott	Reed	Tauzin
McHale	Regula	Taylor (MS)
McKinney	Reynolds	Tejeda
McMillan	Richardson	Thomas (CA)
McNulty	Ridge	Thomas (WY)
Meehan	Roemer	Thompson
Meek	Rogers	Thornton
Menendez	Ros-Lehtinen	Thurman
Mfume	Rose	Torres
Michel	Rostenkowski	Torricelli
Miller (CA)	Rowland	Towns
Mineta	Roybal-Allard	Traficant
Minge	Rush	Tucker
Mink	Sabo	Unsoeld
Moakley	Sanders	Upton
Mollohan	Sangmeister	Valentine
Montgomery	Santorum	Velazquez
Morella	Sarpaluis	Vento
Murtha	Sawyer	Visclosky
Nadler	Schenck	Volkmer
Neal (MA)	Schiff	Vucanovich
Neal (NC)	Schroeder	Walsh
Nussle	Schumer	Waters
Oberstar	Scott	Watt
Obey	Serrano	Waxman
Olver	Sharp	Whitten
Ortiz	Shepherd	Williams
Orton	Sisisky	Wilson
Owens	Skaggs	Wise
Pallone	Skeen	Wolf
Parker	Skelton	Woolsey
Pastor	Slaughter	Wyden
Payne (NJ)	Smith (IA)	Wynn
Payne (VA)	Smith (NJ)	Yates
Pelosi	Smith (TX)	Young (AK)
Penny	Snowe	Young (FL)

NOES—107

Allard	Goss	Myers
Archer	Grams	Oxley
Armey	Grandy	Packard
Bachus (AL)	Gunderson	Paxon
Baker (CA)	Hancock	Petri
Ballenger	Hansen	Pombo
Bartlett	Hefley	Porter
Boehner	Hobson	Portman
Bunning	Hoekstra	Pryce (OH)
Burton	Hoke	Quinn
Buyer	Huffington	Ramstad
Canady	Hutchinson	Roberts
Castle	Inglis	Rohrabacher
Clinger	Istook	Roth
Coble	Jacobs	Roukema
Cox	Johnson, Sam	Royce
Crane	Kasich	Saxton
Crapo	Kim	Schaefer
Cunningham	King	Sensenbrenner
DeLay	Kingston	Shaw
Dickey	Klug	Shays
Doolittle	Knollenberg	Shuster
Dornan	Kyl	Smith (MI)
Dreier	Lazio	Smith (OR)
Duncan	Levy	Solomon
Dunn	Lewis (KY)	Spence
Ehlers	Manzullo	Stearns
Fawell	McCandless	Stump
Fields (TX)	McCollum	Talent
Fingerhut	McHugh	Taylor (NC)
Fowler	McInnis	Torkildsen
Franks (NJ)	Meyers	Walker
Gilchrest	Mica	Weldon
Gingrich	Miller (FL)	Zeliff
Goodlatte	Molinar	Zimmer
Goodling	Moorhead	

NOT VOTING—40

Applegate	Dellums	Johnson (CT)
Baker (LA)	Dooley	Kolbe
Berman	Frank (MA)	Lantos
Blackwell	Galleghy	Lewis (GA)
Bonior	Gallo	Lloyd
Byrne	Glickman	Machtley
Calvert	Hayes	Manton
Carr	Herger	Matsui
Clay	Hinche	McCurdy
Cooper	Inhofe	McKeon

Moran	Slattery	Washington
Murphy	Stark	Wheat
Quillen	Sundquist	
Rangel	Tanner	

□ 1213

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mrs. Byrne for, with Mr. Herger against.  
Mr. Dellums for, McKeon against.

Messrs. MCCANDLESS, LAZIO, HUTCHINSON, DICKEY, and GILCHREST changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

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

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably not present for the vote today on H.R. 4554, the conference report on Agriculture appropriations for fiscal year 1995. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

#### DIRECTING SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO MAKE TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS IN ENROLLMENT OF S. 2182, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 285) directing the Secretary of the Senate to make technical corrections in the enrollment of S. 2182, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Senate amendment: Page 1, after line 11, insert:

(3) In section 132(a)(1)(C), strike out "(described in subsection (i))" and insert in lieu thereof "(described in subsection (h))".

(4) In section 924, strike out "Court of Military Criminal Appeals" each place it appears and insert in lieu thereof "Court of Criminal Appeals".

(5) In section 1661(b)(4)—

(A) strike out "by adding at the end" in subparagraph (A) and insert in lieu thereof "by inserting after section 3020"; and

(B) strike out "by adding at the end" in subparagraph (B) and insert in lieu thereof "by inserting after section 8020".

(6) In section 2832, strike out "Authority" each place it appears (other than in the caption of subsection (b)) and insert in lieu thereof "Agency".

Mr. MONTGOMERY (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS). Is there objection to the re-

quest of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Is there objection to the original request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4008, NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 1994 AND 1995

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103-742) on the resolution (H. Res. 542) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4008) to authorize appropriations for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration for fiscal years 1994 and 1995, 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. 3171, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE REORGANIZATION ACT

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103-744) on the resolution (H. Res. 544) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3171) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to reorganize the Department of Agriculture, 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. 4926, NATIONAL TREATMENT IN BANKING ACT

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103-743) on the resolution (H. Res. 543) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4926) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to identify foreign countries which may be denying national treatment to U.S. banking organizations and to assess whether any such denial may be having a significant adverse effect on such organizations, and to require Federal banking agencies to take such assessments into account in considering applications by foreign banks under the International Banking Act of 1978 and the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4554, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1995

##### AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the amendments in disagreement are considered as having been read.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that each of the motions printed in the joint explanatory statement of the managers be considered as read when offered.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendments numbered 5, 18, 24, 29, 58, 83, 95, 96, and 101 be considered en bloc and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendments in disagreement.

The texts of the various Senate amendments referred to in the unanimous-consent request are as follows:

Senate amendment No. 5: Page 12, line 2, after "California" insert ", Beckley, West Virginia".

Senate amendment No. 18: Page 17, line 3, after "\$10,147,000" insert ", of which up to \$125,000 may be transferred to the Cooperative State Research Service".

Senate amendment No. 24: Page 19, line 3, after "improvements" insert ": Provided further, That \$462,000 shall be available for a grant pursuant to section 1472 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3818), in addition to other funds available in this appropriation for grants under this section".

Senate amendment No. 29: Page 25, after line 21 insert:

In fiscal year 1996, section 32 funds shall be used to promote sunflower and cottonseed oil exports to the full extent authorized by section 1541 of Public Law 101-624 (7 U.S.C. 1464 note), and such funds shall be used to facilitate additional sales of such oils in world markets.

Senate amendment No. 58: Page 51, line 5, after "\$47,500,000," insert "of which \$1,000,000 shall be available to carry out the Northern Great Plains Rural Development Act (if enacted); and".

Senate amendment No. 83: Page 70, after line 6 insert:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no employee of the United States Department of Agriculture shall be peremptorily removed without a hearing from his or her position because of remarks made during personal time regarding Departmental policies or proposed policies.

Senate amendment No. 95: Page 80, strike out lines 1 to 16 and insert:

SEC. 723. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR HONEY PAYMENTS OR LOAN FORFEITURES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall be used

by the Secretary of Agriculture to provide for a total amount of payments and/or total amount of loan forfeitures to a person to support the price of honey under section 207 of the Agriculture Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1446h) and section 405A of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1425a) is excess of zero dollars in the 1994 and 1995 crop years.

Senate amendment No. 96: Page 80, strike out all after line 16 over to and including line 2 on page 81 and insert:

SEC. 724. No funds shall be available in fiscal year 1995 and thereafter for payments under the Act of August 30, 1890 and the tenth and eleventh paragraphs under the heading "Emergency Appropriations" of the Act of March 4, 1907 (7 U.S.C. 321 et seq.).

Senate amendment No. 101: Page 83, after line 18 insert:

SEC. 744. (a) In addition to funds made available elsewhere in this Act, there are hereby appropriated as of the date of enactment of this Act the following, to remain available through September 30, 1995:

Emergency Community Water Assistance Grants, \$10,000,000

Very Low-Income Housing Repair Grants, \$15,000,000

Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program account: For the cost of direct loans, including the cost of modifying loans, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as follows: emergency loans, \$7,670,000.

(b) Of the amount appropriated in the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1994, Public Law 103-211, for Watershed and Flood Prevention Operations, \$23,000,000 is transferred to the Emergency Conservation Program.

(c) These amounts are designated by Congress as emergency requirements pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, and that such amounts shall be available only to the extent the President designates such use as emergency requirements pursuant to such Act.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DURBIN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. DURBIN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 18, 24, 29, 58, 83, 95, 96, and 101 and concur therein.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 11: Page 14, line 15, strike out all after "expended;" down to and including "amended;" in line 18.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DURBIN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. DURBIN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "\$475,000 for rangeland research grants as authorized by subtitle M of the National Agriculture Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977, as amended; \$8,990,000 for contracts and grants for agricultural research under the Act of August 4, 1965, as amended (7 U.S.C. 4501(c));".

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 15: Page 16, line 2, strike out "\$413,960,000" and insert "\$423,083,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DURBIN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. DURBIN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$433,438,000".

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 25: Page 19, line 24, strike out "\$438,901,000" and insert "\$438,901,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DURBIN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. DURBIN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$443,651,000".

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 26: Page 21, strike out all after line 18 over to and including line 2 on page 22.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DURBIN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. DURBIN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

In fiscal year 1995, the agency is authorized to collect fees to cover the total costs of providing technical assistance, goods, or services requested by States, other political subdivisions, domestic and international organizations, foreign governments, or individuals, provided that such fees are structured such that any entity's liability for such fees is reasonably based on the technical assistance, goods, or services provided to the entity by the agency, and such fees shall be credited to this account, to remain available until expended, without further appropriation, for providing such assistance, goods, or services.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS). The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 32: Page 29, line 22, strike out all after "\$62,796,000" down to and including "Service" in line 24.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DURBIN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. DURBIN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken by said amendment insert: *Provided*, That until October 1, 1995, the Secretary of Agriculture may collect and use such sums as may be necessary for the delivery of catastrophic risk protection under subsections (b) and (c) of section 508 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as that Act would be amended by section 6(a)(3) of H.R. 4217 as passed by the House on August 5, 1994, if such provision or similar provision is enacted into law; *Provided further*, That in addition to amounts otherwise appropriated in this Act, there are hereby appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the crop insurance fund established under section 516 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as that Act would be amended by sections 8 (b) and (c) of H.R. 4217, if such provision or similar provision is enacted into law.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 33: Page 32, after line 3 insert:

DISASTER ASSISTANCE

Such sums as may be necessary from the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be

available, through July 15, 1995, to producers under the same terms and conditions authorized in chapter 3, subtitle B, title XXII of Public Law 101-624 for 1994 crops, including aquaculture and excluding ornamental fish, affected by natural disasters: Provided, That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, and that such funds shall be available only to the extent an official budget request for a specific dollar amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: Provided further, That these funds shall be made available upon enactment of this Act: Provided further, That such funds shall also be available for payments to producers for 1995 through 1998 orchard crop losses, if the losses are due to freezing conditions incurred between January 1, 1994, and March 31, 1994, and Federal Crop Insurance is not available for affected orchard crop producers; Provided further, That the use of funds for this purpose is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, and that such use shall be available only to the extent the President designates such use an emergency requirement pursuant to such Act: Provided further, That such funds made available from the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be available to fund the costs of replanting, reseeded, or repairing damage to commercial trees (regardless of the age of the damaged trees), including orchard and nursery inventory, as a result of 1994 weather-related damages: Provided further, That the use of funds for these purposes is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, and that such use shall be available only to the extent the President designates such use an emergency requirement pursuant to such Act: Provided further, That the terms and conditions of section 521, paragraphs (a) (3) and (4), paragraph (b)(3), subparagraph (c)(2)(C), and subsections (d) and (e), as amended in section 201 S. 2095 (as reported by the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry on June 22, 1994) shall apply to all claims for assistance made under this paragraph.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DURBIN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. DURBIN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

DISASTER ASSISTANCE

Such sums as may be necessary from the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be available, through July 15, 1995, to producers under the same terms and conditions authorized in chapter 3, subtitle B, title XXII of Public Law 101-624 for 1994 crops, including aquaculture and excluding ornamental fish, affected by natural disasters: Provided, That these funds shall be made available upon enactment of this Act: Provided further, That

such funds shall also be available for payments to producers for 1995 through 1996 orchard crop losses, if the losses are due to freezing conditions incurred between January 1, 1994 and March 31, 1994, and Federal crop insurance is not available for affected orchard crop producers: Provided further, That such funds shall also be available to fund the costs of replanting, reseeded, or repairing damage to commercial trees, including orchard and nursery inventory, as a result of 1994 weather-related damages: Provided further, That the terms and conditions of section 521, paragraphs (a)(3) and (4), paragraph (b)(3), subparagraph (c)(2)(C), and subsections (d) and (e), as amended in section 201 of S. 2095 (as reported by the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry on June 22, 1994) shall apply to all claims for assistance made under this paragraph: Provided further, That such amounts and uses of funds made available under this paragraph are designated by Congress as emergency requirements pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, and that such funds and uses shall be available only to the extent an official budget request for a specific dollar amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 34: Page 33, line 2, strike out "\$576,562,000" and insert "\$591,049,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DURBIN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. DURBIN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: "\$556,062,000, and the unobligated and uncommitted portion of the fiscal year 1994 appropriation for the Conservation Reserve Program shall be transferred to this account".

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 37: Page 35, line 14, strike out all after "2209b)" down to and including "State" in line 19.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DURBIN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. DURBIN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"(of which \$10,000,000 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, for fiscal year 1995 only, not to exceed 10 per centum of the foregoing amounts shall be available for allocation to any one State".

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 41: Page 42, line 25, strike out "\$2,323,339,000" and insert "\$2,400,000,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DURBIN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. DURBIN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,200,000,000".

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 42: Page 43, line 11, strike "\$268,105,000" and insert "\$282,640,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DURBIN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. DURBIN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$244,720,000".

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 57: Page 50, strike out lines 8 to 11.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DURBIN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. DURBIN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken by said amendment insert:

**RURAL WATER AND WASTE DISPOSAL GRANTS**

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may use 1980 or 1990 census information for grant eligibility of projects submitted to the agency prior to the availability of 1990 census information in amounts not to exceed total project cost overruns.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 70: Page 59, line 25, after "Institute" insert: *Provided further*, That \$859,000 shall be available to provide grants to States for non-recurring costs in providing for the special dietary needs of children with disabilities".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DURBIN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. DURBIN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$500,000".

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 75: Page 61, line 19, strike out "\$28,817,457,000" and insert "\$28,830,710,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DURBIN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. DURBIN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment insert "and section 601 of Public Law 96-597 (48 U.S.C. 1469d), \$28,830,710,000".

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 76: Page 62, line 9, strike out all after "Project" down to and including "1994" in line 13.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DURBIN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. DURBIN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "Provided further, That none of the funds in this Act shall be used to cash out food stamp benefits beyond a total of 25 projects and the total participation in such projects shall not exceed 3 per centum of the estimated national household level participating in the Food Stamp Program".

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 84: Page 70, after line 6 insert:

None of the funds in this Act may be used to enforce the permitted levels and conditions of use for the nutrient selenium, as revised in the Federal Register for September 13, 1993. The permitted levels and conditions of use for the nutrient selenium are deemed to be the levels and conditions set forth in section 573.920 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations, prior to September 13, 1993, unless and until the Commissioner determines that the use of selenium at those levels results in a direct and significant adverse effect on the quality of the environment.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DURBIN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. DURBIN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

The stay (published at 58 Fed. Reg. 47962) of the 1987 food additive regulation relating to selenium (21 Code of Federal Regulations 573.920) is suspended until December 31, 1995.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 89: Page 72, line 3, strike out all after "expenses" down to and including "appropriation" in line 8.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DURBIN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. DURBIN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 89 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "Provided, That the Commission is authorized to charge reasonable fees to attendees of Commission sponsored educational events and symposia to cover the Commission's costs of providing those events and symposia, and notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, said fees shall be credited to this account, to be available without further appropriation".

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 91: Page 77, line 14, after "3837" insert " , unless additional acres in excess of the 100,000 acre limitation can be enrolled without exceeding \$93,200,000: *Provided*, That the unused portion of the fiscal year 1994 appropriation shall be used in addition to the \$93,200,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DURBIN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. DURBIN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: " , unless additional acres in excess of the 100,000 acre limitation can be enrolled without exceeding \$93,200,000: *Provided*, That the unobligated portion of the fiscal year 1994 appropriation shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for the Soil Conservation Service, Conservation Operations".

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 94: Page 79, strike out lines 19 to 25.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DURBIN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Speaker pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. DURBIN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 94 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$25,650,000".

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 98: Page 83, after line 18 insert:

SEC. 741. Notwithstanding section 715 of this Act, 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 \$90,000,000: *Provided*, That the appropriated levels provided in this Act for the following accounts shall be reduced by 1.5 percent:

- Office of the Secretary.
- Office of Budget and Program Analysis.
- Chief Financial Officer.
- Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration.
- Advisory Committees (USDA).
- Departmental Administration.
- Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.
- Office of Communications.
- Office of the Inspector General.
- Office of the Assistant Secretary for Economics.
- Economic Research Service.
- National Agricultural Statistics Service.
- World Agricultural Outlook Board.
- Office of the Assistant Secretary for Science and Education.
- Office of the Assistant Secretary for Marketing and Inspection Services.
- Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Salaries and Expenses.
- Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Salaries and Expenses.
- Soil Conservation Service, Conservation Operations.
- Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account, Administrative Expenses.
- Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account, Administrative Expenses.
- Rural Development Insurance Fund Program Account, Administrative Expenses.
- Rural Development Loan Fund Program Account, Administrative Expenses.
- Farmers Home Administration, Salaries and Expenses.
- Rural Electrification and Telephone Loans Program Account, Administrative Expenses.
- Rural Telephone Bank Program Account, Administrative Expenses.
- Office of the Assistant Secretary for Food and Consumer Services.
- Food and Drug Administration, Salaries and Expenses.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DURBIN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. DURBIN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 98 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

Delete the matter inserted by said amendment, and on page 61, line 12, of the House engrossed bill strike "\$94,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$84,500,000", and on page 79, line 18, of the House engrossed bill strike "\$850,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$800,000,000".

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 100: Page 83, after line 18, insert:

SEC. 743. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to provide any Federal benefit or assistance to any individual or entity in the United States unless the Federal entity or official to which the funds are made available takes reasonable actions to determine whether the individual is in a lawful immigration status in the United States.

(b) In no case may a Federal entity, official or their agent discriminate against any individual with respect to filing, inquiry, or adjudication of an application for funding made available in this Act on the basis of race, color, creed, handicap, religion, sex, sexual orientation, national origin, citizenship status or form of lawful immigration status.

(c) For purposes of this section, the term "Federal benefit or assistance" does not include search and rescue; emergency medical care; emergency mass care; emergency shelter; clearance of roads and construction of temporary bridges necessary to the performance of emergency tasks and essential community services; warning of further risks or hazards; dissemination of public information and assistance regarding health and safety measures; the provision on an emergency basis of food, water, medicine, and other essential needs, including movement of supplies or persons; reduction of immediate threats to life, property and public health and safety; and programs funded under title IV of this Act.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DURBIN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. DURBIN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 100 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

SEC. 725. The Secretary shall take reasonable steps to ensure that no funds made available under this Act be used to provide any direct individual Federal benefit or assistance to any individual applying for such benefit or assistance unless said individual meets all eligibility criteria for the benefit or assistance.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 102: Page 83, after line 18 insert:

SEC. 745. REPAYMENT OF DEFICIENCY PAYMENTS.—In any case in which the Secretary of Agriculture finds that the farming, ranching, or aquaculture operations of producers on a farm have been substantially affected by a natural disaster in the United States or by a major disaster or emergency designated by the President under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) during the 1994 crop year, the Secretary of Agriculture shall not require any repayment under subparagraph (G) or (H) of section 114(a)(2) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1445j(a)(2)) for the 1994 crop of a commodity prior to January 1, 1995.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DURBIN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. DURBIN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 102 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

SEC. 727. REPAYMENT OF DEFICIENCY PAYMENTS.—In any case in which the Secretary of Agriculture finds that the farming, ranching, or aquaculture operations of producers on a farm have been substantially affected by a natural disaster in the United States or by a major disaster or emergency designated by the President under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), the Secretary of Agriculture shall not require any repayment under subparagraph (G) or (H) of section 114(a)(2) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1445j(a)(2)) for the 1993 crop of a commodity prior to March 1, 1995.

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

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the conference report and on the several motions was laid on the table.

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3222

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed from the list of cosponsors of H.R. 3222.

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

There was no objection.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time in order that I might inquire of the distinguished majority leader the program for next week.

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

Mr. MICHEL. I am happy to yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Missouri.

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

There are no more votes today.

On Monday, September 26, the House will meet at 10:30 a.m. for morning business. The House will meet at noon for suspensions. There will be two bills on suspension which are listed on the schedule, tentative 4: H.R. 4448, the Lowell National Historical Park; H.R. 4008, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Authorization Act; and H.R. 4539, Treasury, Postal and Certain Independent Agencies conference report. I will say to the gentleman there will not be votes until 5 p.m.

On Tuesday, September 27, and the balance of the week, we will meet at 10:30 a.m. for morning hour Tuesday; at noon on Tuesday, the House will meet. The House will meet at 10 a.m. Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday.

There will be a variety of suspensions on Tuesday which are listed on the gentleman's schedule, and then we have a set of bills that will be taken up during the week: Lobbying Disclosure Act conference report, Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act, National Treatment in Banking Act.

Members can expect votes on Friday as that is the last day of the fiscal year, and obviously we have to finish the appropriation bills if at all possible.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I do not see on the program congressional reform.

Is there any intelligence on that issue before we get out of here?

Mr. GEPHARDT. If the gentleman will yield further, it is my understanding that the Committee on Rules is still considering that legislation, and I am not altogether sure at this point exactly when it might come forward, but they are still working on it.

Mr. MICHEL. Let me also make the observation that last evening the Speaker and I had a private conversation in which he assured me that before we do adjourn the Members will have an opportunity to vote on Haitian policy, and I guess after it winds its way through the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and I have to take the Speaker, certainly, at his word, and it is probably good that it be reaffirmed by the distinguished majority leader for those who might have an interest, a burning interest, in the issue, and if the assur-

ance is there, I think it helps us in programming.

Mr. GEPHARDT. If the gentleman will yield further, that is correct. The Speaker did communicate the fact, as I understand it, that a bill is being prepared in the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and that will be coming to the floor either next week or the week after that, but certainly before we leave.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

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

Mr. MICHEL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I just had a question for the majority leader with regard to the lobbying disclosure bill. I have had a chance to look over a summary of what is going to be contained in that bill. It appears to be something where Members are going to want to be fairly well educated about the nature of some of the very big changes that are suggested there.

I am wondering if we are going to have sufficient time to get Members properly briefed before that bill gets to the floor. I had heard some talk that it might come up as early as next Tuesday. It is going to make it very difficult for us to get Members fully informed about the details of that bill if, in fact, it is run out here on Tuesday.

Mr. GEPHARDT. If the gentleman will yield further, first, it will be filed today, so it will be in the RECORD, and Members can look through it over the weekend. We will be trying to do it probably on Tuesday. We will be back here Monday afternoon, and we will get to it Tuesday afternoon, so Members I think, will have adequate time.

□ 1230

Finally, the bill, as I understand it, is a lot like the House-passed bill. There are a few differences, but frankly not that many. So there is not a lot of new material to look through.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman will yield further, the question that comes up, as you read through the briefing materials that I have seen so far, is not so much the details but what some of the interpretations of this are going to be. And I think Members are going to want to be very, very aware of how some of this fairly general language may be spelled out in terms of Ethics Committee rulings. And that is not clear from any of the briefing material I have seen so far. And there were questions raised at the time the House bill passed about those questions that had never been resolved. I would at least be hopeful that we would have answers to some of those specifics before the bill comes to the floor for consideration.

Mr. GEPHARDT. If the gentleman will yield further, we would be happy to try to have Representative BRYANT and others who worked on this and

their staff available on Monday to answer questions, or someone else from the committee who is conversant with it. But we will try to make them available to any Member who wants to ask questions.

Mr. MICHEL. I simply want to underscore the concern of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] because from what I have been able to gather just preliminarily, some real drastic changes relative to how this place will operate next year, concerned Members, particularly what they can or cannot do, being subject to penalties and all the rest. It is one of those things affecting Members' lives as closely as it does and as far-reaching as it does, we really ought to have a good briefing what they are signing onto if they end up voting for it. My inclination right now, from what I have heard, I just do not think it is the proper approach to take. But then that is always a debatable item in this particular body.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I am glad the gentleman made the statement.

The other concern I think I would have is that I think Members are going to be held accountable for beginning to do these things right now as soon as it is passed.

In the public's eyes, waiting until next January, when we have already passed the bill, is not going to be good enough. My guess is that various groups are going to begin holding Members accountable for this in the campaign season that we are now engaged in. I would think that Members are going to want to know exactly what is going to be asked of them as they are out in the countryside with regard to this law.

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to my friend from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank the Republican leader for yielding.

I would like to inquire of the distinguished majority leader on the issue of reform, I wanted to get back to congressional reform. I did not hear the colloquy on the floor here, but I understand there was discussion about what is being taken up in the Rules Committee.

Having served on the joint committee, thanks to the great appointment I got from our Republican leader, Mr. MICHEL, I have been very frustrated in the nature of H.R. 3801, the bill that was reported out, passed by the joint committee last November before Thanksgiving. That is not the legislation that we are marking up in the Rules Committee. I am hoping very much that we will be able to get back to that initial piece of legislation as it was reported out, having gone through a year of hearings and very elaborate markup of the legislation. It seems to me that as we look at this, that is the

way we should proceed. I hope very much we will be able to do that.

I wonder if the majority leader might have any comments on that issue of where we are headed on the issue of congressional reform, which was a key issue back in the 1992 election. I had many people asking me when are you going to do it.

Mr. GEPHARDT. If the gentleman will yield, it is my understanding, and I am not entirely conversant with all of the details, but it is my understanding that the Rules Committee is working very industriously to pull the bill together and to bring it to the floor. That is their jurisdiction and their job, and they are going to do it as quickly as they can. We intend to bring it up.

Mr. DREIER. We have been doing it upstairs, as I said, but the thing that concerns me is that we are not actually marking up the legislation that was reported out of our joint committee. There have been some major changes made by the chairman of the committee. It seems to me it is very unfortunate we have proceeded with a bill which is much different than that which we worked on for such a long period of time.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I understand the gentleman's concern. The committee has to act on this. It is their jurisdiction. It is a job they have to perform. Obviously, when it gets to the floor, Members can vote for changes or vote against the bill.

Mr. DREIER. I am hoping very much we will be able to get an open amendment, an open rule, so that we will be able to make the kinds of changes that I think the majority of this House and the American people want us to put into place.

Mr. GEPHARDT. We are certainly concerned, with the minority, about how this will be brought up, and as the gentleman knows, the minority has certain rights about bringing up alternatives and motions to recommit and other ways. I am sure that will occur.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of any time I may have.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 1994

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

#### DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business

in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

#### NOTIFICATION OF INTENTION TO OFFER A PRIVILEGED RESOLUTION

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under rule IX of the House, I announce my intention to offer a privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS). The gentleman will state the form of the resolution.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, before I state the form of the resolution, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, my understanding is, under rule IX there is a 2-legislative-day period during which the Speaker may schedule calling up the resolution. It would be my intention to call it up no later than Tuesday of next week. Is that the Speaker's understanding?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. COX. I thank the Chair.

Mr. Speaker, the form of the resolution is as follows:

#### HOUSE RESOLUTION CALLING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE AND AUTHORIZATION FOR U.S. OCCUPATION OF HAITI

Whereas for months prior to the September 19, 1994 occupation of Haiti by U.S. military forces, President Clinton and members of his Administration publicly and repeatedly threatened a military occupation of Haiti; and

Whereas the Speaker's refusal to schedule floor debate on the impending occupation of Haiti led to the occupation of Haiti without Congressional consideration or authorization; and

Whereas the need for immediate Congressional consideration of Haiti policy is clear, inasmuch as the thousands of U.S. troops in Haiti without Congressional authorization could be required to defend themselves at any moment, without notice, thus initiating hostilities; and

Whereas immediate Congressional consideration of Haiti policy is further required by the impending October 15 deadlines for the departure of the Haitian military leaders, inasmuch as noncompliance would in all likelihood prompt the thousands of U.S. troops now in Haiti to immediately commence offensive military operations; and

Whereas the continued refusal of the Speaker to schedule floor debate to consider the scope of, and authorization for, U.S. military operations in Haiti deprives the House collectively of its prerogatives under Article I of the Constitution; and

Whereas the continued refusal of the Speaker to schedule floor debate to consider the scope of, and authorization for, U.S. military operations in Haiti deprives the House collectively of its authority to speak on such important questions of policy; and

Whereas the refusal of the Speaker to consider the scope of, and authorization for, U.S. military operations in Haiti effectively requires each Member of this body to abdicate his or her responsibility to debate and vote upon such important questions of policy, and therefore has brought scorn and ridicule on the House collectively; and

Whereas there are no exigencies of secrecy or surprise that would prevent the House from considering these issues; and

Whereas the House is scheduled to adjourn in a matter of weeks, and failure of the Speaker to schedule floor debate to consider the scope of, and authorization for, the U.S. military occupation of Haiti will effectively commit our Nation to occupy Haiti for nine months or more without Congressional authorization; and

Whereas the extraordinary and heroic commitment of U.S. servicemen and women in the current military operation requires from the U.S. Congress a high level of responsibility and attentiveness in policymaking towards Haiti; and

Whereas Rule IX of the House of Representatives provides that a privileged motion shall be in order to protect the rights and dignity of the House collectively and of members individually.

Resolved, That the Speaker should immediately schedule a debate and vote upon the scope of, and authorization for, the U.S. military occupation of Haiti.

#### TRIBUTE TO HEATHER WHITESTONE, MISS AMERICA

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

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, some say miracles don't happen and some even claim that dreams can no longer come true. But, I am proud to say that an extraordinary young lady from my congressional district has gracefully proven them wrong.

Last Saturday evening before a national television audience, Dothan, AL, native, Heather Whitestone defied personal challenges and traditional odds by becoming the first deaf woman to be crowned Miss America.

Heather's story is more than just a first for the national pageant. It is a shining example of what one can accomplish if only they put their mind to it. In Heather's words, "The most handicapped person in the world is a negative thinker."

She is the embodiment of personal achievement, observing that as a child her mother told her the last four letters of "American" spell "i can."

If the beauty and talent of this young lady were sufficient enough to wow the American public, her grace and bravery against a seemingly insurmountable obstacle surely won their hearts.

Heather is proof positive that belief in oneself coupled with a strong faith in our creator are still sufficient to achieve the greatest of triumphs. Heather's father Bill, and her grandparents, Herb and Colley Whitestone, reside in Dothan while grandparents, Jim and June Gray, and her mother,

Daphne Gray, live in Birmingham and Pelham, respectively.

Heather, we are so very proud of you. Alabama is much richer because of your presence and the Nation will be wiser for your gifted inspiration.

Congratulations to the new Miss America.

[From the Dothan Eagle, Sept. 19, 1994]

DOTHAN NATIVE HEATHER WHITESTONE THE  
NEW MISS AMERICA

When Heather Whitestone finished her walk down the runway as the new Miss America Saturday night, the other contestants were eager to crowd around her.

They didn't seem disappointed that another woman had won the title they all wanted. In fact, some of them were celebrating as much as she was.

Some people say Miss Whitestone was destined to win. She won the Miss Alabama Pageant on her third try, and one of the state organizers said that in the 74 years of the Miss America pageants, "there has never been a contestant like this."

The judges felt the same way. But the road to the Miss America title was not a cakewalk for the 21-year-old Dothan native.

Miss Whitestone was born with normal hearing, but suffered nerve damage in both ears as the result of a reaction to a diphtheria-pertussis-rubella vaccine when she was 18 months old.

Doctors classify her as "profoundly deaf." She can hear virtually nothing without a hearing aid.

She says had her parents not enrolled her in dance classes so she would have a form of expression, she probably would not have been in the pageant. Her ballet teacher in Birmingham says Miss Whitestone "dances for God, that it's her way of expressing her gratefulness for giving her something special."

Her ballet, performed to the song "Via Dolorosa," enchanted the judges Saturday. In preliminary competition, the crowd in the Atlantic City Convention Center gave her three thunderous ovations before she was finished and another at the end.

She also won the swimsuit competition, becoming the 28th woman in pageant history to win two preliminary events. She was the 14th to go on to win the crown.

Miss Whitestone is the first Miss America with a physical disability. At least one past contestant had a hearing impairment and others have had cancer, Bell's palsy and other ailments.

Beauty pageants were criticized in the 1960s and 1970s for being sexist, racist and demeaning. The Miss America Pageant responded by erasing the word "beauty" from the title, crowning a black winner, dropping the scoring significance of the swimsuit competition and encouraging contestants to speak out on issues.

The junior accounting major at Jacksonville State University wants to become a CPA and a dance teacher, but is considering switching to a career in counseling.

Her goal is to inspire people to overcome their obstacles and achieve their dreams. We can think of no better ambassador.

We know a winner when we see one, and her name is Heather Whitestone.

□ 1240

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS). Under the Speaker's an-

nounced policy of February 11, 1994, and June 10, 1994, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

#### HAITI IS A HEMISPHERIC RESPONSIBILITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARR of California. I rise under special orders, Mr. Speaker, to express my concern for our committee in Haiti. As of last night, Mr. Speaker, we had 10,000 troops in Haiti. Fourteen thousand troops will be assembled shortly. These troops will remain in Haiti at least through December.

Reports put the cost of maintaining the troops at least an additional \$250 million, which will require a supplemental appropriation. The Secretary of Defense, Mr. Perry, said yesterday it is unlikely that we would lessen that force before the December elections. At some unspecified point 2,000 troops from 23 other nations will also become involved. After this, once the President determines that Haiti is safe and secure, the responsibility will be firmly transferred to the United Nations peacekeeping forces. The operation will then become a U.N. mission in Haiti. The force will then be 6,000 strong. The United States is expected to contribute half of this number.

My concern with our commitment in Haiti is this: We do not need to put in more than our fair share of manpower or payment. I believe that Haiti is a hemispheric responsibility.

No single nation in this hemisphere should be forced to bear the brunt of the responsibility. I believe that all nations should help pay for the operations—the peacekeeping operations—in Haiti. It just makes sense that our payment levels should coincide with the manpower levels that we contribute.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will be introducing next week a resolution which will support this sense of equity. It will resolve that the United States should, while acting in a multinational U.N. mission in Haiti, commit a troop level not to exceed the level of funding we are contributing to the peacekeeping effort.

#### DAY FIVE OF THE OCCUPATION OF HAITI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I note that it is day five of the occupation of Haiti and, as our colleague who has spoken just before me pointed out, the costs are mounting. Fortunately, so far we

have been pretty much able to avoid any fatalities among our American troops, and that, of course, is the main aim, and the easiest way to solve that problem and that worry is in bringing our troops home as soon as possible, and today would not be too soon in my view.

The second problem that seems to be creeping in as we, fortunately, have avoided fatalities, is that we are now getting a chance to take a look at what this ill-advised foreign policy has finally led us to.

I heard on National Public Radio this morning as I got up that suddenly our reserve training fund for the Navy had run out, and part of that is because we have spent moneys on misadventures like Haiti that are draining our resources apparently.

Here we are confronted with the fact that we cannot go with a normal business as usual for our military because we do not have the funds. You ask why, and apparently part of the answer is because of these unforeseen expenditures on places like Haiti.

It is a little tough to accept that, but then, when you go on to the next part of your day and read the newspaper in the morning after listening to the radio for a minute, you find in the Washington Post a statement that says the toughest task in Haiti is going to be reviving the economy. Now I do not know where it says that the U.S. taxpayers are supposed to revive the economy of a country that for 200 years has been the poorest in this hemisphere on an increasing scale.

But one thing is very clear: The Haitians expect that we are going to rebuild their country for them. They understand that the sanctions, the embargo that has been put on their country, has been a U.S. embargo even though it is paraded under a U.N. flag, and they are expecting the United States to come in there once the situation settles down a little bit, and presumably President Aristide is returned, and rebuild the country and pay for all the damages that have taken place.

Now let me tell you that may be an expectation that the Haitians have, but I do not think it is an expectation that the United States taxpayers have because we are talking in excess of billions—and that is "b," billions—of dollars, to get that country to a point where it even can be slightly self-sustaining at this point given the total shambles of the economy, the infrastructure, and any form or semblance of government that exists in that country today.

So if, indeed, those colleagues who felt that the Clinton administration's policy was good to keep this embargo going, then those colleagues are going to be the ones that are going to have to explain to the Haitians or the United States taxpayers why either anticipation is going to fall short.

The curious part of all this is that part of the accord that President Carter signed on behalf of President Clinton with provisional President Jonassaint last Sunday which did accomplish the objective of avoiding an armed hostile conflict, for which we are all grateful; nevertheless one of those provisions was that the sanctions, the embargo, would be lifted immediately.

Here it is, the fifth day of the occupation, and we are still squabbling, apparently in the United Nations, about whether or not that embargo should be lifted, and maybe it should not be lifted until President Aristide returns.

Now a problem here is very clear. We have got two separate agreements now that bind the United States, one signed by President Carter on behalf of President Clinton and the other the Governors Island accord a few years ago, and unfortunately they are not consistent. They promise different things, that do not work, to different people.

For example, the Governors Island accord says that General Cedras will leave Haiti. The accord signed by President Carter on behalf of President Clinton says that General Cedras may stay in Haiti as long as he is no longer in the military. This has created different expectations and severe problems, and this is the kind of thing that comes about when you have an ill-advised, poorly thought out, little-understood, lack of experience team of people giving you foreign policy.

We have got now a situation where the amnesty question is very much up in the air. Who is going to grant the amnesty? Is it the Parliament that is there today that the Aristide followers say is illegal and cannot grant amnesty, whereas the Cedras people are saying, "But the other Parliament is no longer in the country, and they won't come back to grant amnesty, and we aren't leaving until amnesty is granted?" So we have got another catch-22 on the amnesty problem.

□ 1250

Everywhere you look in this Haitian policy, there is a problem. There are anticipations that cannot be met. Of course, the most important responsibility we have in Congress is the concern of the well-being of our troops. The second concern right after that is the question of how we are using or abusing the taxpayers' dollars in this situation.

It is clearly time, as the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] has said, for this debate to come to the Halls of the U.S. Congress. We have been forestalled in having this debate by the Democratic leadership. They are stonewalling to protect the President on this.

The American people want some accountability; they want to know what is going on, and we have got to have

this debate before we adjourn sine die, which is coming very soon. I cannot conceive of going home to my district, leaving those troops in harm's way, all of those costs mounting, and looking my voters in the eye and saying, yeah, we are in control of the situation. We know what is going on. That would not be being truthful.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in this quest to get this on the floor.

#### GOP CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, next Tuesday, over 300 Republican Members of Congress and candidates for the House will come together on the Capitol steps to lay out a contract, a contract with the American people. Its premise is simple: Should the American people give the Republican Party a majority in the House of Representatives, we will guarantee by contract that within the first 100 days, January through March, 1995, certain bills will come to the House floor for an up or down vote.

With other Republicans, I will sign my name on that contract, for all to see. Its terms are nonnegotiable. The commitments made will happen, if we are a majority. The bills that we commit to bring to the floor for a vote will demonstrate what this party stands for.

We represent a commitment for reform, a commitment to change, a commitment to action. On opening day we will start with changing the rules, and, among other things, we will abolish proxies in committees. If one is to register one's vote in committee, one will have to show up in person, listen to the discussion line by line on the bill, and cast his or her vote as the matter comes up.

Right now a chair and his Republican counterpart can hold batches of proxies of absent Members and direct them in any direction they want, unless they have been instructed. We want people to be active participants in committees.

We will also work to adopt the rule we adopted in the Republican Conference at the beginning of the 103d Congress, and that is to rotate the principal party member, the chairman or ranking member for the minority, every 6 years. That will be the beginning of bringing some democracy to this House.

Besides that commitment of action on opening day, what we will do in the first 100 days is bring up some long-buried items, or some long-weakened and softened items when they come before us. That is term limits, the balanced budget, the line-item veto, welfare reform, and a number of other

matters that have been buried in committee by the Democratic Party for a number of years.

For example, our colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM], introduced a term limits constitutional amendment in 1981 when he was first sworn into this body. It has been buried in the Committee on the Judiciary since 1981. For a dozen years, it was not even given the benefit of a hearing on the merits or demerits. When it finally was given a hearing, in the fall of 1993, guess what? Only those opposed were allowed to testify.

Mr. Speaker, this House has to hear from parties on both sides of the issue. This House has to bring before the House what the American people expect them to bring before the House, which are those issues of burning concern to our citizens, be they Democrats, Republicans, libertarians, peace or freedom, independent. The people want action out of this body, and we represent that commitment to action.

Unfortunately, the majority party, including the White House media machine, has started a sniping campaign of this idea, that one political party will sign on the dotted line to make a contract with America to get before this body, without a lot of shenanigans of the Committee on Rules, the measures that count and that the people want decided one way or the other.

The question is, why are they sniping at this? What can possibly be wrong with writing a contract with the American people? Some might not like every item on the contract agenda. Fine. Let us vote. Let us vote "yea" or "nay". As always, we will debate.

We will not be closed down hopefully by the Committee on Rules in a majority Republican Conference, as we have been in recent years in this body, limited in the amendments we can bring before it, 100 percent closed rules between January and May 1993, which meant you could not freely amend the bills on this floor. The average was, I believe, 79 percent last year. Closed rules, that denies democracy.

But the days of gridlock and the days of buried proposals and the days and months and years of false promises by the current majority will be over. We will see votes on the House floor. Remember, it is a contract with America.

#### PTO SPECIAL DEALS PUT PATENT SYSTEM IN JEOPARDY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, American inventors are upset over being zapped in the pending GATT agreement. Patent and Trademark Office officials are contacting congressional offices in an effort to assure members

and staff alike that changing the patent term in the GATT enabling legislation to a firm 20 years from filing date is in the public interest. If you believe that, you also believe in the "good tooth fairy." So it is for good reason that American inventors are upset over the change in the patent term.

The objections range from inventors working in a garage to big companies with millions of dollars invested in research in developing a patent.

They wonder how the public interest is served if inventors are unable to capitalize their inventions because of a shorter patent life? Patents mean jobs and a robust commerce, so how can shortening the patent life possibly benefit American workers—or for that matter—the American Government which depends upon taxes from business transactions?

In an article entitled "GATT Provisions Could Hurt Biotech Patents" the Genetic Engineering News of September 1 reports the harm of changing the patent term for the \$7 billion biotech industry.

The story quoted James A. Forstner, corporate counsel for Dupont—Wilmington, DE—and international committee chair of the American Bar Association, Intellectual Property Law Section that changing the term to 20 years from filing would result in a shortened patent life for biotech.

Mr. Forstner explained that the average patent takes 2 years to issue, but in biotechnology it can run to 7 years. He stated, "Thus, the average biotech patent could lose 3 to 4 years of protection."

That certainly can be a substantial loss to a company as well as to the competitive stand of U.S. industry.

This potential loss was explained in a letter from the Biotechnology Industry Organization by Charles Ludlam, Vice President for Government Relations. He pointed out that "Without patent protection the potential to recoup our investment and generate a reasonable rate of return is negligible. If our patent terms are reduced, even by a few years, funding for research will be reduced."

In the same letter Ludlam pointed out that "GATT does not require patent terms to be limited to 20 years from application. It requires only that they be at least 20 years from application." So, why is the administration attempting to change the term from what was negotiated in GATT?

The answer is that Patent Commissioner, Bruce Lehman, signed an agreement with the Japanese to change our patent term to match the Japanese system in exchange for a 2-month period to allow for American firms to file patents in Japan in English instead of Japanese. This was done without congressional hearings. I am not belittling the value of filing in English, but I do question Mr. Lehman's methods. I do

believe that inadequate consideration was given to the results of such changes. And if I do say so, Mr. Speaker, once again the U.S. side of the negotiating table has been bam-boozled.

Perhaps he is unaware that Japan has targeted the American patent system first in the late 1800's, again in the early 1900's and again as late as 10 years ago.

Years ago, Japan sent a committee to the United States to determine what made this country an industrial power. The report concluded that the patent system was the secret of U.S. industrial might, if Japan could understand the secret then, it is surprising that our present own Government officials and trade negotiators do not understand the same fact.

We need congressional hearings involving a wide range of small inventors before we fundamentally alter the U.S. system. These changes will give up the technological lead of the United States for the next 100 years. Perhaps you want to explain this in your States in terms of jobs and opportunities. Let us stop this nonsense and keep the Lehman/Japan changes to our patent system out of GATT.

□ 1300

#### MILITARY SPENDING

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

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, this morning's Washington Post contained some headlines that truly are troubling about the future and, for that matter, current state of affairs in regard to the funding difficulties that our U.S. military is beginning to experience.

On the headlines in the Washington Post today, "Money Shortage Forces Navy to Curtail Training of Reserve Forces."

I would like to read the first paragraph.

The Navy has canceled training and drills for thousands of reservists for the rest of this month because the naval reserve ran out of money, the Navy announced yesterday.

Well, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the funding levels of the Pentagon and when it comes to the execution of foreign policy, that is clearly the time to put aside partisan differences and to operate in this Congress with an America first policy. But I must say that over the course of the last several years, there has been a debate about whether we do, in fact, have adequate resources planned for the effective operation of our U.S. forces.

Two years ago, during the debate on the budget, members of the Budget Committee, Republican members of the Budget Committee argued vociferously that the level of funding over the 5

years, as illustrated in the 5-year defense plan of the President's, simply was not going to be enough, that in fact we would find ourselves in a situation where systems would be jeopardized, systems that would be necessary for enabling our soldiers to effectively carry out their mission, that difficulties with pay would begin to arise. And, in fact, the goal of a ready military could be brought into question.

We have begun to see events unfold over the period of the last couple months that begin to underscore our problems.

Just several months ago, Mr. Deutch, from the Pentagon, put out a memo where he began to think out loud about the difficulties we are going to have being able to acquire some of the advanced weapons systems that the Congress, on a bipartisan basis, felt we needed to acquire in order to have an effective and strong military.

Now, we cannot say that those systems are going to be canceled, but that memo is particularly troubling because it begins to indicate that systems like the F-22, the new advanced fighter program that clearly is necessary if we are going to maintain air superiority, programs like that are being brought into question.

One of the things that the Congress likes to do, whenever it finds itself in a shortage of money, is to essentially stretch out programs. And when you stretch out programs, you create great turbulence in those programs. You drive up the cost of those programs, and we begin to go back to the debate that started all the way back in the 1960's and 1970's about programs that do not work, that cost too much in the Department of Defense.

The Congress always figures out a way to stretch these programs out when there are money shortages, but clearly that is not the solution to our financial problems as they relate to the Department of Defense. But equally troubling is the idea that we will begin to raid the readiness accounts of this country.

One of the reasons why weapons systems tend to be spread out rather than canceled, if necessary, is because there is always a constituency for the funding of weapons systems. There are always money to be made in the area of weapons systems. But when it comes to the area of readiness, it is kind of a nebulous area.

Is the soldier getting enough flying hours? Is the soldier getting enough steaming hours? Is there enough ammunition? This readiness is the building block of an effective military. But all too many times it is easy to cut the readiness accounts, to save money quickly, to do it on the cheap. And without a constituency howling out there about the negative impact of reducing readiness, readiness tends to be cut; systems tend to survive, although

they are stretched out. And we find ourselves in a situation of developing a hollow military force.

When Ronald Reagan was elected in 1980 and came to town in 1981, he declared the military to be on the edge of being hollow. And on a bipartisan basis the Congress moved to try to restore the cuts that had been made to the military, with dramatic increases in spending. And whether it is the military or whether it is any other part of a problem that the Federal Government wants to address, if you throw massive amounts of money at any program, we all know that there is inevitably waste.

So what we have been arguing about here during this Clinton administration, these boom and bust cycles of pumping up defense and then cutting it to the bone is not the way to do it. It lends itself to waste. It also means that we begin to enter a phase where our military is simply not as effective and as efficient as it ought to be.

#### MORE ON MILITARY SPENDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, the difficulty that we have found ourselves in, is entering this stage of deep cuts in the Department of Defense budget. And while this debate has gone on up here in the Congress, there has been a constant fight about whether the level of funding will be adequate or whether we find ourselves in this position of having shortages in money for either effective weapons systems or the readiness of our forces.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, this morning, when we read an article that says that money shortages forces the Navy to curtail the training of reserve forces and that the Navy has canceled training and drills for thousands of reservists for the rest of this month, it begins to raise this issue one more time.

What I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, is that as we enter the next budget cycle, that we be very careful to make sure that we make good assessments of the kind of moneys we want to spend on our military; that we, in fact, Mr. Speaker, not slash and burn and cut the Department of Defense budget to feed the other programs of the Federal Government, leaving our Pentagon in a position of where our soldiers will not get the kind of training that they want or that we will not be able to afford the kind of systems that we need for our soldiers to be able to be victorious.

□ 1310

We should guarantee them a commitment through committing enough resources to the Department of Defense

so that our soldiers are adequately prepared, and at the same time, they have got the most modern equipment to carry out the mission.

Mr. Speaker, I would direct all of the Members of this House to pay attention to this article this morning, and to think about what the implications of this would be. We do not want to continue to slash and burn defense, while at the same time we take that money and use it to run many inefficient programs in the Federal Government. We owe more to the men and women in our Armed Forces, and I would suggest that, Mr. Speaker, on a bipartisan basis we go back, we begin to restore some of the spending reductions that the White House has insisted upon, and we do what we need to do to avoid the boom and bust cycles of defense, and that we stop the consistent movement in this body towards hollowing out the U.S. Armed Forces and making sure we are as ready and as prepared as this Nation deserves to be.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FARR of California). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1549

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BRYANT) at 3 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HERGER (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), from 3:45 p.m. on Thursday, September 22, 1994, through today, on account of official business.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mr. HORN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. BENTLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KASICH, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. FARR of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. BENTLEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MICHEL.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH.

Mr. GUNDERSON.

Mrs. BENTLEY.

Mr. DOOLITTLE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FARR of California) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. MILLER of California.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

Mr. SAWYER.

Mr. KLEIN in three instances.

Ms. DELAURO.

Mr. MANTON.

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey in three instances.

Mr. REED.

Mr. DEUTSCH.

Mr. FOGLIETTA.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GEKAS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut.

Mr. SCHAEFER.

Mr. KANJORSKI.

Mr. FILNER.

Ms. CANTWELL.

Mr. PASTOR.

Mr. HORN.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon.

Mr. COPPERSMITH.

Mr. VENTO.

Mr. MANTON.

Mr. CRANE.

Mr. ROHRBACHER.

Mr. WILLIAMS.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1406. An act to amend the Plant Variety Protection Act to make such act consistent with the International Convention for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants of March 19, 1991, to which the United States is a signatory, and for other purposes; and

S. 1703. An act to expand the boundaries of Piscataway Park, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.) under its previous order the House adjourned until Monday, September 26, 1994, at 10:30 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3864. A letter from the Department of Defense, transmitting notification that the Secretary has invoked the authority granted by 41 U.S.C. 3732 to authorize the military departments to incur obligations in excess of available appropriations for clothing, subsistence, forage, fuel, quarters, transportation, or medical and hospital supplies, pursuant to 41 U.S.C. 11; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3865. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a CDC plan for preventing birth defects, pursuant to Public Law 102-531, section 306(a) (106 Stat. 3495); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. MOAKLEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 542. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4008) to authorize appropriations for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration for fiscal years 1994 and 1995, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-742). Referred to the House Calendar.

Ms. SLAUGHTER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 543. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4926) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to identify foreign countries which may be denying national treatment to United States banking organizations and to assess whether any such denial may be having a significant adverse effect on such organizations, and to require Federal banking agencies to take such assessments into account in considering applications by foreign banks under the International Banking Act of 1978 and the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (Rept. 103-743). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DERRICK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 544. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3171) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to reorganize the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-744). 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. DINGELL: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 3392. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to assure the safety of public water systems, with an amendment; referred to the following committees

for a period ending not later than September 26, 1994: to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology for consideration of such provisions contained in the bill and amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(r), rule X; and to the Committee on the Judiciary for consideration of such portions of sections 15 and 17 of the amendment recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(1), rule X. (Rept 103-745, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

#### SUBSEQUENT ACTION ON A RE- PORTED BILL SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

The Committee on Government Operations discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2680; H.R. 2680 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### 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. SAWYER (for himself, Mr. PETRI, Miss. COLLINS of Michigan, and Mr. MCCLOSKEY):

H.R. 5084. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to improve the accuracy of census address lists, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BRYANT:

H.R. 5085. A bill to provide for the disclosure of lobbying activities to influence the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAESLER:

H.R. 5086. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a pilot program to evaluate the feasibility of county-based rural development boards, develop a strategy for adoption of national rural development goals and objectives, establish a training program for local county board leaders, providing roles and responsibilities for State rural development councils, substate regional organizations, and 1862 and 1890 land grant institutions, and establish a grant program for financing various rural and small community development initiatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut:

H.R. 5087. A bill to maintain funding and staffing for the Office of National Drug Control Policy for fiscal year 1995; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself and Mr. BRYANT):

H.R. 5088. A bill to recognize and grant a Federal charter to the National Alliance for the Mentally Ill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLINK:

H.R. 5089. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for contributions to an individual training account; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCLOSKEY (for himself and Mrs. MORELLA):

H.R. 5090. A bill to authorize noncompetitive, career, or career-conditional appoint-

ments for temporary and term employees of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, including those assigned to the Resolution Trust Corporation, who are separated due to downsizing and office closures or due to the termination of the Resolution Trust Corporation; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OBEY (for himself, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. VENTO, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. WILSON, and Ms. PELOSI):

H.R. 5091. A bill to provide for tax relief in the case of low economic growth; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PASTOR (for himself, Mr. KYL, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. CANADY, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. MCCLOSKEY):

H.R. 5092. A bill to establish rules governing product liability actions against raw materials and bulk component suppliers to medical device manufacturers, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SANDERS:

H.R. 5093. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide a 1-year extension of the applicability of certain provisions in the programs for block grants regarding mental health and substance abuse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SANDERS:

H.R. 5094. A bill to provide a 1-year extension of the applicability of the authority to transfer funds under the programs for block grants regarding mental health and substance abuse; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 5095. A bill to apply arbitration to major league baseball and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VENTO:

H.R. 5096. A bill to amend the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation Act of 1972 to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1995 for operating and administrative expenses and to require a plan for the orderly dissolution of the Corporation; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mrs. VUCANOVICH:

H.R. 5097. A bill to require the identification of certain high-fire-risk Federal forest lands in the State of Nevada, the clearing of forest fuels in such areas, and the submission of a fire prevention plan and budget; jointly, to the Committee on Natural Resources and Agriculture.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 5098. A bill to ratify a compact between the Assiniboine and Sioux Indian Tribes of the Fort Peck Reservation and the State of Montana; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MCMILLAN:

H.J. Res. 414. Joint resolution to authorize and encourage States to adopt interstate compacts for the regulation of interstate insurance; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GEPHARDT (for himself, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio):

H. Con. Res. 296. Concurrent resolution commemorating the 125th anniversary of the birth of Mahatma Gandhi; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CRANE (for himself, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr.

HEFLEY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ROTH, Mr. STUMP, Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. ARCHER, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. BUNNING, and Mr. STEARNS):

H. Res. 545. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Dr. Joycelyn Elders be called upon to resign her position as Surgeon General of the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE (for himself, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. COBLE, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. MOORHEAD, Ms. DUNN, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. KIM, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. PAXON, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. WALKER, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. POMBO, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. KASICH, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRANE, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. DELAY, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. SAXTON):

H. Res. 546. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives relating to United States Armed Forces in Haiti; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

493. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of Guam, relative to the golden anniversary salute of Guam's liberation; jointly, to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service and Natural Resources.

494. Also, Memorial of the Legislature of Guam, relative to urging the United States of America to adopt appropriate measures to improve the living conditions of Federal retirees living in the Philippines; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor, Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and Post Office and Civil Service.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

- H.R. 133: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 559: Mr. EVANS and Mr. ROSE.
H.R. 692: Mr. EVANS, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 702: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 1276: Mr. QUILLEN.
H.R. 1381: Mr. SABO.

H.R. 2648: Mr. EDWARDS of California and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 2863: Mr. WYNN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 2873: Mr. ORTON.
H.R. 2959: Mr. ENGEL and Ms. SCHENK.
H.R. 3182: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 3251: Mr. HAYES, Mr. PETRI, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. GALLEGLEY, and Mr. POSHARD.

H.R. 3546: Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. KLUG, and Mrs. CLAYTON.

H.R. 3712: Mr. GORDON, Mr. KLECZKA, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. LANCASTER, and Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 3713: Mr. JACOBS.
H.R. 3722: Mr. BACHUS of Alabama.

H.R. 4303: Mr. HYDE, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. INSLER.

H.R. 4370: Mr. PALLONE and Mr. MENENDEZ.
H.R. 4393: Mr. MCMILLAN.

H.R. 4474: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 4610: Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. OLVER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ORTIZ, and Mr. WILSON.

H.R. 4618: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 4669: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 4708: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 4830: Mr. SHUSTER.
H.R. 4861: Mr. TALENT and Mr. GINGRICH.

H.R. 4912: Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. WILSON, Mr. LANCASTER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. PARKER.

H.R. 4936: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 4946: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. HASTERT, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 4953: Mr. ROHRBACHER.
H.R. 4957: Ms. CANTWELL and Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 4971: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 4977: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 4978: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 4979: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 4982: Mr. EMERSON, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 5028: Mr. DEFazio and Mr. BILBRAY.
H.R. 5062: Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. KYL, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. EMERSON, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. BILLRAKIS, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. WALSH, Mr. GILCREST, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. PACKARD, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. MICA, Ms. SHEPHERD, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. APPELEGATE, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PORTER, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. CANADY, Mr. KIM, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. ROTH.

H.R. 5064: Mr. DELLUMS and Mr. HALL of Ohio.

H.J. Res. 44: Mr. PAYNE of Virginia.

H.J. Res. 311: Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin, Mr. DEAL, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HAMBURG, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, and Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

H.J. Res. 385: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. TANNER, Mr. MCNUTLY, and Mr. KLEIN.

H.J. Res. 391: Mr. EMERSON, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. WATT, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.J. Res. 398: Mr. ROGERS, Mr. KIM, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. COPPERSMITH, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ROSE, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. WYNN, Mr. SWETT, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. MCCREERY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. MFUME, Mr. SHARP, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BATEMAN, and Mr. VALENTINE.

H.J. Res. 400: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. FROST, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. MANTON.

H.J. Res. 403: Mr. MORAN and Mr. WYNN.

H. Con. Res. 35: Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. MANTON, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. WISE, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. EHLERS, Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. TANNER, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. SYNAR, and Ms. MOLINARI.

H. Con. Res. 192: Mr. MOAKLEY.

H. Con. Res. 217: Mr. DELLUMS.

H. Con. Res. 35: Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. MANTON, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. WISE, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. EHLERS, Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. TANNER, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. SYNAR, and Ms. MOLINARI.

H. Con. Res. 192: Mr. MOAKLEY.

H. Con. Res. 217: Mr. DELLUMS.

H. Con. Res. 192: Mr. MOAKLEY.

H. Con. Res. 217: Mr. DELLUMS.

H. Con. Res. 192: Mr. MOAKLEY.

H. Con. Res. 217: Mr. DELLUMS.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 3222: Mr. WALSH.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

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

Petition 12 by Mr. TRAFICANT on H.R. 3261: Carlos J. Moorhead and John Linder.

Petition 15 by Mr. BILIRAKIS on House Resolution 382: Deborah Pryce.

Petition 18 by Mr. HASTERT on House Resolution 402: Curt Weldon, Joe Barton, and Deborah Pryce.

Petition 25 by Mr. CONDIT on House Resolution 489: Jim Cooper and John Edward Porter.