

\$2.00 per bushel. Prices normally decline at harvest time, but they are unusually low this year because of the record 1994 crop, projected at 9.6 billion bushels. The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) has been criticized in some corners for setting the 1994 Acreage Reduction Program (ARP) at zero percent.

Soybean prices have also declined, from an average of \$6.72 per bushel in June to \$5.31 per bushel in September—and less than \$5.00 per bushel at some local elevators. This decrease was fueled by the highest-ever national soybean yields, producing a record crop of between 2.3 billion and 2.5 billion bushels. Demand is expected to increase next year from greater exports and more livestock feeding, but not enough to compensate for the record crop. Low soybean prices are particularly damaging for Hoosier farmers because Indiana is the only major soybean state where the crop is projected to be lower than 1993.

#### OPTIONS FOR RAISING PRICES

I have urged the Department of Agriculture to consider a number of options to boost corn and soybean prices. Possibilities include:

**Increase corn ARP:** USDA recently announced a preliminary 1995 corn Acreage Reduction Program of 7.5% below the established base. This would take land out of production and improve corn prices for the coming year.

**Raise corn support loan rate:** Some farm groups have called for an increase in the 1994 Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) loan rate from the current, \$1.89/bushel to as high as \$2.40/bushel. They claim this would have a direct impact on prices in the near future. USDA is considering an increase in the loan rate for 1995.

**Allow 1994 corn crop entry into Farmer-Owned Reserve:** The President has allowed farmers to place 1994 corn in the Reserve when their CCC loans mature after 9 months. It is unclear what impact this would have on short-term prices.

**Soybeans on "flex" acres:** If USDA determines that the price of soybeans next year will be below 105% of the loan level, it can prohibit program participants from planting soybeans on their optional flex acres. This would reduce production and increase prices.

**Export Enhancement Program (EEP):** EEP has been used in the past to help export soybean oil. If world prices continue to fall, USDA could increase EEP support of soybean oil to maintain America's competitive position.

**Ethanol and other alternative products:** As of January 1, about 30% of the U.S. gasoline market will be required to use ethanol in reformulated gasoline. Over time, corn prices may rise as much as 20 cents per bushel because of this rule. Congress is also examining ways to encourage the use of soy ink and other non-food uses for American agricultural products.

#### THE 1995 FARM BILL

The effectiveness of these measures to support prices will also be addressed in the 1995 farm bill. Government commodity support programs must be reauthorized next year. The 1990 farm act made farm programs more market-oriented, giving farmers more flexibility in choosing which crops to plant. A provision known as the Madigan amendment gave the Secretary of Agriculture more flexibility in setting loan rates and set-asides to maintain competitiveness in world markets. I expect this trend towards market flexibility to continue in the 1995 farm bill. Program flexibility puts more decisions in the hands of farmers rather than government bureaucrats, but it can also lead to greater price fluctuations for farmers.

The farm bill should also address the hidden costs of farming. First, participating in crop support programs should be less complicated. The paperwork for program participation should not be a burden to farmers. Second, government regulations should be flexible at the local level. It is not possible to set detailed and comprehensive guidelines from the top, and major regulations should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, using risk assessment and cost-benefit analysis.

Some of the biggest issues in the 1995 farm bill will be environmental issues, including wetlands policy, and renewing the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP). Current wetlands policy that restricts farming on wetlands makes no distinction between wetlands that are environmentally important and those that are not. I am supportive of efforts to narrow the definition of wetlands.

CRP has been successful at boosting prices and preserving valuable resources. Because of our terrain, the average Southern Indiana farmer receives even more in CRP payments than in deficiency payments, and I support the full reauthorization of CRP. In addition, the 1995 farm bill should make CRP flexible enough to distinguish between more and less environmentally important lands. The program should remain completely voluntary.

#### CONCLUSION

I recognize the great risks in the farming business. The risks involved in farming are greater than in most industries, and Congress should continue to provide some stability to agriculture and assure that farmers can maintain a decent living and have a reasonable return on their investments. The 1995 farm bill is an opportunity to improve farm support programs and reduce the regulatory burden on farmers.

#### ENGLISH LANGUAGE TAX CREDIT

#### HON. BILL EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 4, 1995*

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce an important piece of legislation that I believe to be an integral part of the official English movement. As you may know, I am the author of H.R. 123, the Language of Government Act which seeks to make English the official language of the United States Government. This legislation is the perfect complement to the Language of Government Act. It recognizes the need for a highly skilled labor force and provides a tax credit to employers for the cost of providing English language instruction to their limited-English-proficient employees.

Many Americans lack the language skills and literacy necessary to take full advantage of roles as responsible citizens and productive workers. While many employers acknowledge the need to educate their workers and have demonstrated an interest in establishing on-site training programs for their employees, the high cost of doing so often prevents them from taking any concrete action. This legislation will provide them with an incentive to offer this crucial instruction to their employees and make the workplace a friendlier, and less daunting environment for non-English-proficient employees.

#### NATIONAL SECURITY REVITALIZATION ACT

#### HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 4, 1995*

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of this historic Congress, I take great pleasure in introducing the National Security Revitalization Act which implements the foreign affairs and the national defense provisions in the Contract With America.

It is a great honor and privilege for me to serve as the chairman of the newly named International Relations Committee and I intend to ensure that our highest priority will be the consideration of this important and long overdue legislation which will ensure that we maintain a strong defense capability around the world and imposes serious limitations on the subordination of American troops to foreign command in United Nations peacekeeping operations.

In addition, the bill will strengthen critically important regional institutions, such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and will ensure that our participation in any future U.N. mission directly serves our national interests.

Together with my good friend and colleague, FLOYD SPENCE, the chairman of the National Security Committee, we will bring the National Security Revitalization Act back to the House floor to restore American credibility around the world and to ensure that Congress plays an enhanced role in the foreign policy making process.

In the second session of the 103d Congress, Republican members of the Foreign Affairs Committee laid a solid foundation for the attainment of these objectives by championing key provisions in the Foreign Relations Act for fiscal year 1994 and fiscal year 1995 and the NATO Participation Act which I introduced in March of last year.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this vitally important legislation.

#### INTRODUCTION OF RAPID DEPLOYMENT FORCE LEGISLATION

#### HON. BARBARA B. KENNELLY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 4, 1995*

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation to establish a Rapid Deployment Force as an added resource of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This force would be temporarily deployed by the FBI, to assist local authorities in investigating an increasing of crime in a particular municipality, due to an increase of drug or gang related activity. The Rapid Deployment Force would represent a partnership between the Federal, State, and local crime fighting entities.

This past weekend in my hometown of Hartford, CT, a rash of crime broke out leaving four dead, another critically wounded, and three others injured from gunshot wounds. This final criminal outbreak of 1994 brought the number of homicides in the city to 58, an increase of over 400 percent in the past 2 years. As the spread of drugs, and the city's