□ 1615

Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be titled the ''know when to say when'' amendment. It puts a halt on corporate subsidies to the alcohol industry to boost its booze abroad. It simply carves away a very targeted portion of the Market Protection Programs, the multi-million-dollar handout to the alcohol industry to lure drinkers in foreign countries. Over the course of the last 3 years, the taxpayers has reached deep into their pockets and handed over $24 million to the alcohol industry.

Let's just tell it like it is. The American taxpayers give subsidies to some companies that are making money hand over fist so that they can entice more people to drink. What we are doing here is financing a worldwide scam. We know what this kind of advertising is like. It is the most glamorous advertising in the world and hooks young people on the number one drug on this planet.

The wrongheadedness with which we subsidize alcohol exports and advertising by major alcohol corporations is compounded by the error of spending millions and millions of dollars to entice people to drink. It is a tragedy, and we should put an end to it.

Jim Beam last year got over $2.5 million to push its whisky abroad. Other whisky giants like Hiram Walker and Brown-Forman profited under this program. Even companies like Miller, Coors, and Stroh Beer get money under this program.

If that were not enough of a corporate scandal, we add insult to injury by asking the American taxpayer to foot the bill for some of the world's largest foreign alcohol giants. We actually pay these foreign alcohol companies to advertise our wine, our bourbon and our whiskey overseas. Seagrams, a Canadian company, received over $1 million from the United States taxpayers for wine promotion and nearly $150,000 to advertise Four Roses Whiskey in Europe and the Far East. Three English companies, including Guinness, have received almost $3 million to advertise United States-made bourbon and whiskey in Japan and Yugoslavia.

The Wine Institute itself spent $40,000 of United States taxpayers' money to fly a group of Japanese wine stewards to California for a weeklong adventure that included trips to several wineries.

The fact is that we are going to hear a lot of yakking from people that come from wine country that tell us that this is just a program to help out the small vintners of America. That is a bunch of hogwash. If you look at where the numbers go, notwithstanding the fact we heard the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] talking about the fact that 89 of the vintners are small, that is, 89 of 100 vintners are the small vintners. They also get the small dollars.

If we look at it, Ernest and Julio, the two brothers that stood up to Caesar Chavez, they get 57 percent of all the money that goes into this program. Fifty-seven percent to one company that only made $1.5 billion more. Fetzer Vineyards, owned by Brown-Forman, makers of Jack Daniels, Southern Comfort, and Canadian Mist, millions more. Vintner International, another one of the largest companies in this country in the wine business, millions more.

Meanwhile, the small vintners, oh, yeah, there are a bunch of them, Geyser Park received $999, Pine Ridge received $162. Santa Cruz Winery, $223, Santino Wines, $4,167; and Saints Berry, $3,892.

Ladies and gentlemen, let's break the back of those corporations that come in and try to jump on the back of the taxpayer in this hall and say to them that we are going to stand up to not only welfare mothers but we are going to stand up to this kind of corporate subsidy as well.

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

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that this amendment, while broadly worded, is frankly a loaded gun pointed at the American wine industry.

Second, it would not save any money under the gentleman's amendment. We all are aware frankly that our domestic wineries are at a competitive disadvantage as they attempt to compete with European and South American wines due to the export subsidies and frankly the trade tariffs that are imposed on our wine exports abroad.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Fresno, CA [Mr. RADANOVICH], the first professional winemaker to serve in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in protest to this amendment that is being offered currently. I am a winemaker. I do not take MPP's. I never will take MPP's. But when my industry is singled out among 20 to 25 commodities that are participants in the MPP program, I must rise in protest.

Mr. Chairman, I am a member also of the Committee on the Budget and I do not believe that programs like this are going to survive 7 years of budget cuts that are necessary in order to get to zero. But I do agree that those decisions regarding the fate of MPP must be budget-driven and they must be decided within the Committee on Agriculture under the direction of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS], our chairman, not from someone who comes from a State where there is very little agriculture and no participation in the program. I rise in strong protest to this amendment and urge ''no'' vote on the Kennedy amendment.

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

Let me make two quick points. Even the gentleman from Massachusetts, the maker of the amendment, points out that 100 some odd wineries have been participating in the MPP. Of that group, 89 are small wineries. These are mostly small, family owned operations. Second, the five largest wine recipients of the MPP purchase 90 percent of their grapes from independent grape growers. The gentleman's amendment would hurt those small grape growers which again are for the most part small, family owned businesses.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT].

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Chairman, I will be brief. What the Kennedy amendment does is single our independent grape growers across California. This penalizes farmers, farmers who grow grapes and sell them to the wineries in California and throughout this country. He is penalizing small, independent grape growers. If he has a beef with grape growers, do it a different way. This is not the way to do it.

There is $607 million paid in excise tax. That is what the wine industry does. It is a $9 billion industry in California. It is an important industry in California. It is about jobs, it is about American wine, and we should not single out this industry and discriminate against them. If we have got a beef with the grape growers, do it another way.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say, although I respect the gentleman from Massachusetts, I do not support his amendment because this amendment directly and unfairly targets my constituents in Sonoma and Martin counties. These are the people who produce the best wines in the world. If this amendment passes, their world-famous wine would no longer be able to compete in the world market.

The amendment would devastate the small wine producers in my district, who rely upon Federal export assistance to enter the global marketplace.

Unlike Europe and South America, United States wine producers receive no production subsidies what-so-ever! Furthermore, our competitors out-spend the U.S. in export subsidies by more than 6 to 1!

Mr. Chairman, small California wineries cannot compete in such a lop-sided marketplace without some assistance.

The Kennedy amendment takes this critical assistance away from small wine producers. And, in doing so, it takes away jobs; it takes away trade; and, it takes away fairness.

We should help export California wine, not California's jobs!

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Louisville, KY, our mutual birthplace [Mr. WARD].

Mr. WARD. Mr. Chairman, I stand in opposition to this amendment. This amendment singles out one industry for punishment. We all know we need to increase exports. We need to make our balance of trade come out better. I stand in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 30 seconds.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, in 1981 we had an interesting experience around here. We formed what was called the Presidential Commission on Drunk Driving under Ronald Reagan. We spent 1½ years working on that. We took a lot of time to do it. I was privileged to sit on that committee and we did an exhaustive study of what was going on in America.

After we did all this and found out how many were dying as a result of drunk driving, paraplegics, quadriplegics and people with very serious back injuries, we found that the No. 1 reason was the enticement they had to get people to drink. This is a harmless little amendment. It makes a lot of sense. All we are asking to do is take away the advertisement in this area. We are not in any way changing some of these other areas.

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

Mr. Chairman, I point out that recent studies have indicated that moderate alcohol beverage consumption could actually be beneficial to personal health.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time evenly between my colleagues, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] and the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] will be recognized for 10 seconds, and the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] will be recognized for 10 seconds.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH].

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, this is the kind of amendment that drives us all to drink. It is discrimination aimed at Wisconsin where we produce the finest beers in the world and we want all people around the world to share in it.

Beer is a very noble product, and an honored part of American history. Many American fortunes have been made in the liquor industry. The liquor industry played an early role in the wealth of some of the most prominent American families, as the sponsor may recall.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, we are almost out of time.

When we work the doors here, JOSEPH, because you are a fourth-generation Irishman and I am a redheaded second-generation Irishman, and remembering that redheaded patriarch of your clan, and some friends in Scotland assure me they will not be toasting you in the champagne regions of France and the distilleries of beautiful Bonnie Scotland.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Just say no, big BOB. Just say no.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] which would prohibit the use of funds in the bill to promote the sale or export of alcohol or alcoholic beverages.

This amendment is targeted at the Market Promotion Program [MPP].

MPP is a good program which is conducting important value-added marketing overseas. It works effectively, and MPP has been a crucial element of improving the export situation of our domestic wine industry, centered in California.

The California wine industry produces an award-winning, high-value product that can compete with the best of the world's wine industries—but we need MPP to help get that message out.

U.S. wine production represents approximately 6.5 percent of world production. However, despite aggressive export growth during the past 6 years, the industry has only a 3.0 percent market share of wine exports.

We need MPP to help us do better.

We need to remember that the European Union spends more on export promotion for wine than the United States spends in promoting all of our agricultural products.

The European Community wine industries are heavily subsidized—to the tune of $1.5 billion, which includes $90 million for export promotion.

Other countries then do even more. For example, the Italian Trade Commission is funded for an additional $25 million.

When it comes to the wine industry, MPP is a program that helps small business.

In 1994, for example, 101 wineries participated in MPP and 89 were small wineries.

MPP promotes independent business.

The five largest wine recipients of MPP funds purchase over 90 percent of their grapes from independent grape growers.

In short, we will continue to battle for our fair share of foreign markets. But we need an export promotion program to allow us to achieve our competitive potential.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the Kennedy amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 19, 1995, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. DEUTSCH

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. DEUTSCH:

Amendment No. 5: Page 71, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. 726. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to provide assistance to, or to pay the salaries of personnel who carry out a market promotion program pursuant to section 203 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5623) that provides assistance to, the U.S. Mink Export Development Council or any mink industry trade association.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 20, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida for 10 minutes, and, in opposition, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman if he would yield back 5 minutes.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield back 5 minutes before we begin.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back 5 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is corporate welfare at its absolute worst; at its absolute worst. This is a program that spends about $2 million a year on the U.S. Mink Export Development Council, a council that is managed by four people, an attorney and assistant and representatives of two companies. Those two companies get 98 percent of the funds of that $2 million.

One of those companies happens to be a Canadian company. Actually, it is a subsidiary of a Canadian company whose gross revenues are 3.9 billion American dollars. What do they spend this money on every year? They spend it on fashion shows overseas and many times even work that is done to bring it back to the United States.

This is a copy of one of the fashion shows that does not even describe the minks or the mink stoles as America product.

Mr. Chairman, this is not an amendment against mink farmers; it is an amendment against the U.S. Mink Export Development Council program.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this amendment, and I again say through the efforts of this committee we have forced the Department to redo the way that it manages the market Promotion Program and it now targets the small, nonbranded groups.

We cannot pick apart this program and make it work. This program is good for America. Do not destroy this program. This program means jobs to the United States. To pass this amendment means jobs in other countries. Vote no and save American jobs.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. PETRI].

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

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Deutsch amendment, because what it boils down to is a short-sighted attempt to exclude one particular industry from participation in this promotion program simply because animal rights activists do not like that industry.

The funding to promote U.S. mink exports to foreign markets is by law used only to promote the sale of U.S. produced mink and only U.S. mink ranchers can benefit from this program. The funding benefits only U.S. entities, just as every other MPP-funded program does. Ninty-five percent of U.S. produced mink are sold through two auction houses; one of them a rancher cooperative, that is rancher-owned, the other is substantially owned by hundreds of U.S. mink ranchers.

It is ridiculous to say that the mink ranchers who produce all those pelts do not benefit by the marketing work done by these two companies. I cannot honestly understand how less than $2 million in marketing assistance to U.S. mink exporters can be truthfully characterized as ''wasteful spending.''

It is not a give away. It is a matching funds program which helps counter the massive subsidies that European countries give directly to their mink producers.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the questions we will answer when we vote on this amendment are these: Shall Congress discriminate against the MPP mink program just because it helps market U.S.-produced mink and not American seafood, paper products, grapes, walnuts, chocolate, cotton, raisins, feed grains, meats, wheat, rice, apples, wine or citrus from Florida and other States, even though the mink industry receives less marketing subsidy than any of these industries; and, shall Congress deny marketing assistance to the mink industry for the sole purpose of satisfying the extremists animal rights lobby?

Mr. Chairman, I must say that I think the rational answer to those questions, and the only real answer to those questions, is a resounding ''no.'' I urge my colleagues to join me in voting a resounding ''no'' on the amendment.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, this is another one of those squirrely little issues where you have friends on both sides of the issues. But of all the subjects in all of the trade issues on the planet, why either party should be helping mink manufacturers, I do not know.

This would be a hard sell at any town hall meeting in America, and I would say if there was ever an industry that was on its own, it ought to be the mink industry.

Before we end up discussing vicuna coats and plain-cloth Republican coats or Democratic coats, I know my party has had an image problem for about 50 years as the party of the big guy, and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle get away with bloody murder, being the party of the little guy. I say let those little minks fight for themselves without Federal tax dollars.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO].

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

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Chairman, I stand in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, agriculture is a major Idaho industry. With 21,000 farmers and ranchers, its annual production totals nearly $3 billion. This translates into billions of dollars in additional economic activity as well as an expanded tax base and tens of thousands of jobs.

This amendment arbitrarily excludes a small, yet very important part of this economy from participation in the MPP Program. Groups who do not believe that animals should be used for food, clothing or medical research are trying to prevent any MPP money from being used to retain and develop overseas markets for U.S.-produced mink.

MPP Program helps U.S. mink ranchers counter the efforts of massive production subsidies which go to foreign mink ranchers. In Idaho alone, the economic impact of the mink industry is $7.3 million a year. MPP funding to promote mink exports is an investment with a 5,000 percent return. For about $2 million, the MPP helps the U.S. mink industry achieve over $100 million in export sales each years.

Additionally, the United States mink industry has successfully promoted the superior quality of United States mink to quality-conscious furriers and importers in Italy, Japan, Hong Kong, and elsewhere. Over 95 percent of the U.S. mink industry's total sales will be exported this year.

Contrary to the comments made that MPP funds go to big corporations, all of the branded mink participants in the MPP Program are classified as ''small entities'' by the SBA. The industry is made up of small, family owned mink ranches in 28 States. MPP marketing assistance has helped the mink producers survive 5 years of global over production caused by direct and indirect subsidization in China, Russia, and mostly in Scandinavian countries.

I urge my colleagues to reject this anti-jobs amendment.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to strongly oppose the Deutsch amendment. My colleagues need to understand what is going on here. Ninety-five percent of our market of mink, the mink ranchers in my district, is overseas. They have no Government program. They have no other money that comes to them, except for this MPP program. It is only $1.9 million.

If we destroy this industry, what we are going to do is what we did with the wool and mohair industry; we are just going to give that industry to the foreign countries, to the Danish, to the Norwegians, to the Finlanders.

Mr. Chairman, I can personally tell my colleagues that these mink ranchers are having a tough time. They are on the verge of going out of business anyway. They do not need us to single them out with this amendment and make the situation harder.

Mr. Chairman, this is not about MPP. What this is about are the animal rights folks, who do not like these people, trying to drive one more nail in their coffin.

I ask my colleagues to strongly oppose this amendment and maintain the mink industry in this country. These are good people, family farmers. We do not need to put them out of business.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS].

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. During the last few days, we have heard clearly what the plot to balance the budget is all about. The plot to balance the budget is merely to squeeze out money from Medicare and Medicaid and money for the cities.

The plot to balance the budget is not sincere at all, because we are refusing to take away taxpayer subsidies for tobacco. We will not take away taxpayer subsidies for alcohol. We will not take away taxpayers subsidies for mink coats. How are we going to balance the budget?

It would be only fair if you were to offer export promotion funds for everybody. I have a used clothing processing plant in Brooklyn, the largest in the world, and they export used clothing to all parts of the world. The underdeveloped world buys a lot of used clothes. They should have the export advertising subsidy also. They should get in on it also.

All products, such as automobiles, have a hard time in Japan. They should have the export promotion program also. We should be fair and have socialized marketing across the board; never balance the budget, cut Medicare and Medicaid.

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

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], the cosponsor of the amendment.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I tried to avoid participating in the debate today, because we are all tired and we all feel strongly about these issues. But I have a hard time recognizing we have annual deficits at over $200 billion a year, our national debt is close to $4.8 trillion, and I am going back to my district and telling them we are slowing the growth of Medicare, we are slowing the growth of Medicaid. We are cutting housing programs, we are cutting education programs, but we are going to subsidize tobacco, alcohol, and mink export?

This, to me, is an obscenity. I join my colleague and thank the gentleman for offering this amendment.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such times as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as I stated, this is truly corporate welfare at its worst. I ask my colleagues to take a look at the specifics of this particular program, what it really does. It is almost beyond belief what this program does. It is almost a parody of government gone crazy in terms of corporate welfare.

We have about $2 million a year, we give it to the U.S. Mink Export Development Council managed by 4 people, 2 of whom are representatives of companies. One is an attorney for the council and one an assistant.

Those people then all of a sudden, lo and behold, give 98 percent of the money that they get to the 2 companies represented on the board, at which point they then spend the money for fashion shows all over the world; Mainland China, Japan, Korea, Italy, and it is unclear what is going on.

One of the companies is a $3.9 billion gross sales a year Canadian company. It is foreign corporate welfare. We are doing so well today in America that we can afford foreign corporate welfare.

It is not about mink farmers; it is about this particular program. If we cannot get rid of this, we are not going to get rid of anything.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Deutsch-Shays amendment.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER].

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from New Mexico, Mr. SKEEN, for yielding, and thank my colleagues in the House for their endurance during this entire consideration of the agriculture appropriation bill.

The amendment that we have before us has been explained very clearly by my colleagues that have proceeded me. There are two exchanges that handle U.S. furs for mink producers in America. It is the Seattle Fur Exchange, a co-op of ranchers out West. Here in the East, it is the New York market and 36 percent of it is owned by small mink farmers around the country.

But this program is about helping small farmers around our country. It is not about helping corporations. It is about helping our farmers compete in a world market where they have to compete with subsidized furs from all around the world. This program has helped open markets for U.S. producers. They have been through 5 years of almost all of them going out of business. They are actually starting to make some money, and pulling the plug on this program at this time, frankly, is not fair to them.

In the budget, agriculture is taking its hit. We are going to be putting up somewhere between $17 and $20 billion over the next 7 years to balance the budget. We are going to do our share. But this is not the way to do it.

But let me say to my colleagues that this amendment is more than about cutting money. Some who are interested in this amendment are interested in it only for one reason, because they want us to kneel down at the altar of political correctness of those radical animal rights people who do not want you to wear mink, they do not want to wear mink. They are bringing this to the floor of the House and it is unfair. Vote against this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH}.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and, pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 19, 1995, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 19, 1995, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order: The amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH].

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 64 OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY OF MASSACHUSETTS

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by a voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DEUTSCH

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by a voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been requested. Those in support of the request for recorded vote will rise and be counted.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. A quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XXIII, the Chair will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for an electronic vote ordered on the pending question following this quorum call.

□ 1645

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago I had an amendment and enough people rose to ask for a recorded vote. You assured me that we had, and were going to have a recorded vote on my amendment. Are we having a recorded vote on my amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair announced at that point, the Chair began to count for a recorded vote. The Chair then remembered the planned order to postpone any request for a recorded vote until later on. It was a mistake on the part of the Chair not to immediately postpone the request for a recorded vote, without counting for a sufficient number to support a recorded vote. When proceedings later resumed, the request was not supported by a sufficient number.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Wait a second, could I have unanimous consent to have another attempt to have that vote, please?

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

There was no objection.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote on the Kennedy amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Chair will vacate all proceedings since the resumption of unfinished business, to include those on the point of no quorum raised by the gentleman from Florida,

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RIGGS. Just to establish the sequence of the votes now, will we be voting first on the Kennedy amendment followed by the Deutsch amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will begin again, and it will be clear in just a minute.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 19, proceedings will now resume on

those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order:

The amendment by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH].

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in the series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY OF MASSACHUSETTS

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair tells Members this will be a firm 17-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 130, noes 268, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 552]

AYES—130

Archer
Armey
Bachus
Barcia
Bartlett
Bass
Beilenson
Bereuter
Blute
Borski
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Christensen
Collins (IL)
Conyers
Coyne
Crapo
Davis
DeLay
Doyle
Duncan
Ensign
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Flake
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Goodlatte
Goss
Graham
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hayworth
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Hunter
Inglis
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
King
LaFalce
Largent
Lewis (GA)
Linder
LoBiondo
Luther
Markey
Martini
McHale
McInnis
McKeon
McNulty
Mfume
Minge
Molinari
Moran
Morella
Myrick
Nadler
Neumann
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Payne (NJ)
Porter
Poshard
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Rivers
Rohrabacher
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Scarborough
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skaggs
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Stockman
Tate
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Towns
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waldholtz
Wamp
Waters
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Wolf
Yates
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—268

Ackerman
Allard
Andrews
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (FL)
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Chrysler
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Costello
Cramer
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Frank (MA)
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hancock
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hoyer
Hutchinson
Hyde
Istook
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennelly
Kim
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Lipinski
Livingston
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McIntosh
McKinney
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Mink
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Murtha
Myers
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Pryce
Radanovich
Rahall
Richardson
Riggs
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Scott
Shadegg
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Studds
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Traficant
Tucker
Upton
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Ward
Watt (NC)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—36

Abercrombie
Baker (LA)
Bateman
Brown (CA)
Burton
Clay
Collins (MI)
Cox
Crane
Dreier
Ehlers
Foglietta
Gallegly
Geren
Goodling
Hastings (WA)
Hefley
Hilliard
Houghton
Lantos
McDermott
Meehan
Metcalf
Miller (CA)
Moakley
Ortiz
Quillen
Quinn
Reynolds
Seastrand
Stokes
Stupak
Torricelli
Watts (OK)
Weldon (PA)
Young (FL)

□ 1707

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Moakley for, with Mr. Dreier against.

Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. BARR changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. CANADY of Florida, SMITH of Michigan, BARTLETT of Maryland, and GRAHAM changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DEUTSCH

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] for a recorded vote on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] has demanded a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 232, noes 160, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 553]

AYES—232

Ackerman
Andrews
Archer
Bachus
Bass
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blute
Boehlert
Borski
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Burr
Buyer
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Christensen
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dixon
Doggett
Dornan
Doyle
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Engel
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foley
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Furse
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gibbons
Gilman
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hayworth
Heineman
Hilleary
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Jones
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
King
Klink
LaFalce
Largent
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martini
Mascara
McCarthy
McCollum
McDade
McHale
McInnis
McKinney
McNulty
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Molinari
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Neumann
Ney
Norwood

Olver
Pallone
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Scarborough
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skaggs
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stockman
Studds
Tate
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Torkildsen
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Waldholtz
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—160

Allard
Armey
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baldacci
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bereuter
Bevill
Bishop
Bliley
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Chrysler
Clinger
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Cramer
Crapo
de la Garza
Deal
DeLay
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dooley
Doolittle
Edwards
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Forbes
Frost
Gekas
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefner
Herger
Hoekstra
Holden
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kaptur
Kennelly
Kim
Kingston
Kleczka
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
Laughlin
Lazio
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Livingston
Longley
Lucas
Martinez
Matsui
McCrery
McHugh
McIntosh
McKeon
Meek
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Myers
Nethercutt
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Radanovich
Rahall
Roberts
Rogers
Rose
Saxton
Schaefer
Scott
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Stenholm
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tucker
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Watt (NC)
White
Whitfield
Wise
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—42

Abercrombie
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barton
Bateman
Bentsen
Brown (CA)
Burton
Clay
Collins (MI)
Cox
Crane
Dreier
Ehlers
Foglietta
Gallegly
Geren
Goodling
Hastings (WA)
Hefley
Hilliard
Houghton
Johnston
Lantos
McDermott
Meehan
Metcalf
Miller (CA)
Moakley
Ortiz
Owens
Quillen
Quinn
Reynolds
Seastrand
Shadegg
Stokes
Stupak
Torricelli
Watts (OK)
Weldon (PA)
Young (FL)

□ 1716

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Moakley for, with Mr. Barton against.
Mr. Stokes for, with Mr. Ehlers against.
Mr. Dreier for, with Mr. Hastings against.
Mr. Quinn for, with Mr. Dermott against.
Mr. Shadegg for, with Mr. Watts against.

Messrs. JOHNSON of South Dakota, GORDON, HOKE, VOLKMER, GREENWOOD, SMITH of Texas, and MANZULLO changed their votes from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, at this point in the RECORD I insert a table that shows a comparison of accounts in the bill.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD & DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1976)

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
TITLE I - AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS					
Production, Processing, and Marketing					
Office of the Secretary	2,801,000	2,886,000	10,227,000	+7,426,000	+7,341,000
Executive Operations:					
Chief Economist		4,240,000	3,748,000	+3,748,000	-492,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Economics	540,000			-540,000	
World Agricultural Outlook Board	2,496,000			-2,496,000	
National Appeals Division		12,166,000	11,846,000	+11,846,000	-320,000
Office of Budget and Program Analysis	5,795,000	5,899,000	5,899,000	+104,000	
Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization		724,000			-724,000
Total, Executive Operations	8,833,000	23,029,000	21,493,000	+12,660,000	-1,536,000
Chief Financial Officer	580,000	4,952,000	4,133,000	+3,553,000	-819,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration	596,000	616,000	596,000		-20,000
Agriculture buildings and facilities (USDA)	135,193,000	135,774,000	135,774,000	+581,000	
Payments to GSA	(87,957,000)	(89,971,000)	(89,971,000)	(+2,014,000)	
Building operations and maintenance	(18,614,000)	(20,216,000)	(20,216,000)	(+1,602,000)	
Repairs, renovations, and construction	(28,622,000)	(25,587,000)	(25,587,000)	(-3,035,000)	
Advisory committees (USDA)	698,000	695,000	600,000	-128,000	-95,000
Hazardous waste management	15,700,000	15,700,000	15,700,000		
Departmental administration	26,187,000	27,347,000	27,886,000	+1,799,000	+539,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations	1,764,000	1,836,000	3,797,000	+2,033,000	+1,959,000
Office of Communications	5,198,000	5,890,000	5,198,000		-692,000
Office of the Inspector General	63,418,000	64,739,000	63,639,000	+221,000	-1,100,000
Office of the General Counsel	25,992,000	27,860,000	27,860,000	+1,868,000	
Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education and Economics	520,000	535,000	520,000		-15,000
Economic Research Service	53,936,000	54,665,000	53,131,000	-805,000	-1,534,000
National Agricultural Statistics Service	81,424,000	89,837,000	81,107,000	-317,000	-8,730,000
Agricultural Research Service	714,889,000	709,810,000	705,810,000	-9,079,000	-4,200,000
Human Nutrition Information Service	(10,618,000)				
Buildings and facilities	43,718,000	30,200,000	30,200,000	-13,518,000	
Total, Agricultural Research Service	758,407,000	740,010,000	735,810,000	-22,597,000	-4,200,000
Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Activities:					
Research and education activities	433,436,000	432,212,000	389,372,000	-44,068,000	-42,840,000
Native Americans Institutions Endowment Fund		(4,600,000)	(4,600,000)	(+4,600,000)	
Buildings and facilities	62,744,000			-62,744,000	
Extension Activities	438,744,000	437,552,000	413,257,000	-25,487,000	-24,295,000
Total, Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Activities	934,926,000	869,764,000	802,629,000	-132,297,000	-67,135,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs	605,000	625,000	605,000		-20,000
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service:					
Salaries and expenses	443,651,000	430,279,000	433,664,000	-9,987,000	+3,385,000
Special fund, user fees 1/	(96,660,000)	(100,254,000)	(100,254,000)	(+3,594,000)	
Buildings and facilities	6,973,000	12,541,000	12,541,000	+5,568,000	
Total, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	450,624,000	442,820,000	446,205,000	-4,419,000	+3,385,000
Agricultural Marketing Service:					
Marketing Services	56,591,000	50,807,000	46,862,000	-9,929,000	-3,945,000
New user fees	(4,452,000)	(3,887,000)	(3,887,000)	(-565,000)	
(Limitation on administrative expenses, from fees collected)	(57,054,000)	(56,461,000)	(56,461,000)	(+1,407,000)	
Funds for strengthening markets, income, and supply (transfer from section 32)	10,309,000	10,451,000	10,451,000	+142,000	
Payments to States and possessions	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,000,000	-200,000	-200,000
Total, Agricultural Marketing Service	66,100,000	62,258,000	58,113,000	-8,987,000	-4,145,000
Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration	23,314,000	23,679,000	23,058,000	-256,000	-621,000
Inspection and Weighing Services (limitation on administrative expenses, from fees collected)	(42,784,000)	(42,784,000)	(42,784,000)		
Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety		580,000	450,000	+450,000	-130,000
Food Safety and Inspection Service	516,738,000	594,889,000	540,365,000	+23,627,000	-54,524,000
Lab accreditation fees 2/	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)		
Total, Production, Processing, and Marketing	3,178,784,000	3,254,178,000	3,062,196,000	-116,588,000	-191,982,000
Farm Assistance Program					
Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services	549,000	570,000	549,000		-21,000

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD & DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1976)—Continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
Consolidated Farm Service Agency:					
Salaries and expenses		811,771,000	805,888,000	+805,888,000	-5,883,000
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, salaries and expenses	785,217,000			-785,217,000	
(Transfer from export loans)	(589,000)	(609,000)	(589,000)		(-19,000)
(Transfer from P.L. 480)	(1,036,000)	(746,000)	(745,000)	(-291,000)	
(Transfer from ACIF)	(200,227,000)	(214,163,000)	(208,446,000)	(+8,219,000)	(-5,717,000)
Total, salaries and expenses	(987,069,000)	(1,027,287,000)	(1,015,668,000)	(+28,599,000)	(-11,619,000)
State mediation grants	3,000,000	3,000,000	2,000,000	-1,000,000	-1,000,000
Dairy indemnity program		100,000	100,000	+100,000	
Outreach for socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers	2,995,000	3,000,000		-2,995,000	-3,000,000
Total, Consolidated Farm Service Agency	791,212,000	817,871,000	807,888,000	+16,776,000	-9,983,000
Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Farm ownership loans:					
Direct	(78,061,000)	(70,000,000)	(35,000,000)	(-43,061,000)	(-35,000,000)
Guaranteed	(540,674,000)	(540,687,000)	(550,000,000)	(+9,326,000)	(+9,313,000)
Subtotal	(618,735,000)	(610,687,000)	(585,000,000)	(-33,735,000)	(-25,687,000)
Operating loans:					
Direct	(500,000,000)	(542,860,000)	(400,000,000)	(-100,000,000)	(-142,860,000)
Guaranteed unsubsidized	(1,735,000,000)	(1,700,000,000)	(1,700,000,000)	(-35,000,000)	
Guaranteed subsidized	(230,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	
Subtotal	(2,465,000,000)	(2,442,860,000)	(2,300,000,000)	(-165,000,000)	(-142,860,000)
Soil and water loans:					
Direct		(2,898,000)			(-2,898,000)
Guaranteed		(1,422,000)			(-1,422,000)
Subtotal		(4,320,000)			(-4,320,000)
Indian tribe land acquisition loans	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(750,000)	(-250,000)	(-250,000)
Emergency disaster loans	(100,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(100,000,000)		
Credit sales of acquired property		(45,000,000)	(22,500,000)	(+22,500,000)	(-22,500,000)
Total, Loan authorizations	(3,184,735,000)	(3,203,867,000)	(3,008,250,000)	(-176,505,000)	(-195,617,000)
Loan subsidies:					
Farm ownership:					
Direct	10,983,000	16,373,000	8,187,000	-2,796,000	-8,186,000
Guaranteed	20,870,000	19,681,000	20,019,000	-851,000	+338,000
Subtotal	31,853,000	36,054,000	28,206,000	-3,647,000	-7,848,000
Farm operating:					
Direct	56,565,000	74,209,000	54,690,000	-1,875,000	-19,529,000
Guaranteed unsubsidized	9,360,000	18,360,000	18,360,000	+9,000,000	
Guaranteed subsidized	29,425,000	17,960,000	17,960,000	-11,465,000	
Subtotal	95,340,000	110,529,000	91,000,000	-4,340,000	-19,529,000
Soil and water loans:					
Direct		606,000			-606,000
Guaranteed		30,000			-30,000
Subtotal		636,000			-636,000
Indian tribe land acquisition	123,000	274,000	208,000	+83,000	-66,000
Emergency disaster	26,290,000	32,080,000	32,080,000	+5,790,000	
Credit sales of acquired property		8,226,000	4,113,000	+4,113,000	-4,113,000
Negative subsidies	-782,000	-296,000		+782,000	+296,000
Total, Loan subsidies	152,824,000	187,505,000	155,605,000	+2,781,000	-31,900,000
ACIF expenses:					
Salaries and expenses	229,735,000	214,852,000	208,935,000	-20,800,000	-5,717,000
Administrative expenses	14,031,000	12,606,000	12,606,000	-1,425,000	
Total, ACIF expenses	243,766,000	227,258,000	221,541,000	-22,225,000	-5,717,000
Total, Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund	396,590,000	414,763,000	377,146,000	-19,444,000	-37,617,000
(Loan authorization)	(3,184,735,000)	(3,203,867,000)	(3,008,250,000)	(-176,505,000)	(-195,617,000)
Total, Farm Assistance Programs	1,188,351,000	1,233,204,000	1,185,683,000	-2,668,000	-47,521,000

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD & DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1976)—Continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
CORPORATIONS					
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation:					
Federal crop insurance corporation fund	219,107,000	1,263,708,000	1,263,708,000	+1,044,601,000	
Commodity Credit Corporation:					
Reimbursement for net realized losses	15,500,000,000	10,400,000,000	10,400,000,000	-5,100,000,000	
Hazardous waste (limitation on administrative expenses)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)		
Borrowing authority (emergency)	1,000,000,000			-1,000,000,000	
Total, Corporations	16,719,107,000	11,663,708,000	11,663,708,000	-5,055,399,000	
Total, title I, Agricultural Programs	21,086,242,000	16,151,080,000	15,811,587,000	-5,174,655,000	-339,503,000
(By transfer)	(201,882,000)	(215,518,000)	(209,780,000)	(+7,898,000)	(-5,738,000)
(Loan authorization)	(3,184,755,000)	(3,203,887,000)	(3,008,290,000)	(-176,505,000)	(-195,617,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(104,838,000)	(108,245,000)	(108,245,000)	(+1,407,000)	
TITLE II - CONSERVATION PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment	677,000	696,000	677,000		-19,000
Natural Resource Conservation Service:					
Conservation operations	555,082,000	645,735,000	629,986,000	+73,924,000	-15,749,000
River basin surveys, investigations, and watershed planning			14,000,000	+14,000,000	+14,000,000
River basin surveys and investigations	12,970,000	11,210,000		-12,970,000	-11,210,000
Watershed planning	10,548,000	7,542,000		-10,548,000	-7,542,000
Watershed and flood prevention operations	70,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	+30,000,000	
Resource conservation and development, Great Plains conservation program, forestry incentives program, and Colorado River Basin salinity control program			47,000,000	+47,000,000	+47,000,000
Resource conservation and development	32,845,000	28,900,000		-32,845,000	-28,900,000
Great Plains conservation program	15,172,000	11,000,000		-15,172,000	-11,000,000
Forestry incentives program	6,825,000	6,825,000		-6,825,000	-6,825,000
Colorado River Basin salinity control program	4,500,000	2,881,000		-4,500,000	-2,881,000
Wetlands reserve program	93,200,000	210,000,000	77,000,000	-16,200,000	-133,000,000
Total, Natural Resource Conservation Service	801,920,000	1,023,693,000	867,986,000	+66,066,000	-155,707,000
Consolidated Farm Service Agency:					
Agricultural conservation program	100,000,000	50,000,000	75,000,000	-25,000,000	+25,000,000
Water quality incentives program	(15,000,000)	(15,000,000)	(11,000,000)	(-4,000,000)	(-4,000,000)
Emergency conservation program		3,000,000			-3,000,000
Conservation reserve program	1,743,274,000	1,926,370,000	1,781,785,000	+38,511,000	-144,585,000
Total, Consolidated Farm Service Agency	1,843,274,000	1,979,370,000	1,856,785,000	+13,511,000	-122,585,000
Total, title II, Conservation Programs	2,645,871,000	3,003,759,000	2,725,448,000	+79,577,000	-278,311,000
TITLE III - RURAL ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Economic and Community Development	568,000	586,000	568,000		-18,000
Rural Housing and Community Development Service:					
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Low-income housing (sec. 502)	(1,200,000,000)	(1,200,000,000)	(900,000,000)	(-300,000,000)	(-300,000,000)
Unsubsidized guaranteed	(1,000,000,000)	(1,300,000,000)	(1,500,000,000)	(+500,000,000)	(+200,000,000)
Housing repair (sec. 504)	(36,000,000)	(36,000,000)	(36,000,000)		
Farm labor (sec. 514)	(15,915,000)	(16,482,000)	(15,000,000)	(-915,000)	(-1,482,000)
Rental housing (sec. 515)	(220,000,000)	(220,000,000)	(150,000,000)	(-70,000,000)	(-70,000,000)
Site loans (sec. 524)	(832,000)	(832,000)	(800,000)	(-32,000)	(-32,000)
Credit sales of acquired property		(75,000,000)	(35,000,000)	(+35,000,000)	(-40,000,000)
Total, Loan authorizations	(2,471,547,000)	(2,847,114,000)	(2,635,800,000)	(+164,053,000)	(-211,314,000)
Loan subsidies:					
Single family (sec. 502):					
Direct	227,520,000	251,880,000	188,910,000	-38,610,000	-62,970,000
Unsubsidized guaranteed	17,200,000	2,210,000	2,550,000	-14,650,000	+340,000
Housing repair (sec. 504)	11,690,000	14,193,000	14,193,000	+2,503,000	
Farm labor (sec. 514)	7,911,000	9,482,000	8,629,000	+718,000	-853,000
Rental housing (sec. 515):					
Direct	115,500,000	92,973,000	82,035,000	-33,465,000	-10,938,000
Unsubsidized guaranteed	(1,000,000)			(-1,000,000)	
Credit sales of acquired property		13,073,000	6,100,000	+6,100,000	-6,973,000
Total, Loan subsidies	379,821,000	383,811,000	302,417,000	-77,404,000	-81,394,000
RHIF administrative expenses	389,818,000	395,211,000	390,211,000	+393,000	-5,000,000

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD & DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1976)—Continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
Rental assistance:					
(Sec. 521)	517,108,000	566,583,000	530,000,000	+12,892,000	-36,583,000
(Sec. 502(c)(5)(D))	5,900,000	5,900,000	5,900,000		
Total, Rental assistance	523,008,000	571,483,000	535,900,000	+12,892,000	-36,583,000
Total, Rural Housing Insurance Fund	1,292,647,000	1,350,505,000	1,228,528,000	-64,119,000	-121,977,000
(Loan authorization)	(2,471,547,000)	(2,847,114,000)	(2,635,600,000)	(+164,053,000)	(-211,514,000)
Self-Help Housing Land Development Fund:					
Loan authorization	(803,000)	(803,000)	(803,000)		
Loan subsidy	11,000	31,000	31,000	+20,000	
Administrative expenses	14,000			-14,000	
Rural Community Facility Loans Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Direct 3/	(225,000,000)	(250,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(-25,000,000)	(-50,000,000)
Guaranteed 3/	(75,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(75,000,000)		(-25,000,000)
Total, Loan authorizations	(300,000,000)	(350,000,000)	(275,000,000)	(-25,000,000)	(-75,000,000)
Loan subsidies:					
Direct 3/	21,375,000	(43,800,000)	34,880,000	+13,505,000	+34,880,000
Guaranteed 3/	3,728,000	(4,740,000)	3,555,000	-173,000	+3,555,000
Total, Loan subsidies	25,103,000		38,435,000	+13,332,000	+38,435,000
Administrative expenses 3/		(11,247,000)	8,836,000	+8,836,000	+8,836,000
Very low-income housing repair grants	24,900,000	24,900,000	24,900,000		
Rural housing for domestic farm labor	10,900,000	10,900,000	10,000,000	-900,000	-900,000
Mutual and self-help housing	12,850,000	12,850,000	12,850,000		
Supervisory and technical assistance grants		2,500,000			-2,500,000
Rural community fire protection grants 3/	3,400,000	(3,400,000)	1,000,000	-2,400,000	+1,000,000
Compensation for construction defects	495,000	495,000	495,000		
Rural housing preservation grants	22,000,000	22,000,000	11,000,000	-11,000,000	-11,000,000
Rural housing performance partnerships program		90,602,000			-90,602,000
Subtotal, grants and payments	74,345,000	164,047,000	60,045,000	-14,300,000	-104,002,000
RHCDS expenses:					
Administrative expenses		53,650,000	53,315,000	+53,315,000	-335,000
(Transfer from RHIF)	(369,818,000)	(362,074,000)	(377,074,000)	(-12,744,000)	(-5,000,000)
(Transfer from ACIF)		(171,000)	(171,000)	(+171,000)	
(Transfer from RCFLP)		(11,114,000)	(8,731,000)	(+8,731,000)	(-2,383,000)
Total, RHCDS expenses	(369,818,000)	(447,009,000)	(439,291,000)	(+49,473,000)	(-7,718,000)
Total, Rural Housing and Community Development Service	1,392,120,000	1,568,233,000	1,389,190,000	-2,930,000	-179,043,000
(Loan authorization)	(2,772,150,000)	(3,197,717,000)	(2,911,203,000)	(+139,053,000)	(-286,514,000)
Rural Business and Cooperative Development Service:					
Rural Business and Industry Loans Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Direct 3/		(50,000,000)			(-50,000,000)
Guaranteed 3/	(500,000,000)	(750,000,000)	(500,000,000)		(-250,000,000)
Total, loan authorizations	(500,000,000)	(800,000,000)	(500,000,000)		(-300,000,000)
Loan subsidies:					
Direct 3/		(3,505,000)			
Guaranteed 3/	4,750,000	(8,825,000)	6,437,000	+1,687,000	+6,437,000
Total, Loan subsidies	4,750,000		6,437,000	+1,687,000	+6,437,000
Administrative expenses 3/		(19,742,000)	14,868,000	+14,868,000	+14,868,000
Rural Development Loan Fund Program Account:					
(Loan authorization) 3/	(55,036,000)	(60,000,000)	(60,000,000)	(-26,036,000)	(-30,000,000)
Loan subsidy 3/	46,000,000	(53,885,000)	35,790,000	-10,210,000	+35,790,000
Administrative expenses 3/	1,476,000	(2,961,000)	1,792,000	+316,000	+1,792,000
Total, Rural Development Loan Fund	47,476,000		37,582,000	-9,894,000	+37,582,000
(Loan authorization)	(55,036,000)	(60,000,000)	(60,000,000)	(-26,036,000)	(-30,000,000)
Rural Economic Development Loans Program Account:					
Direct loans (limitation on obligations)	(12,865,000)	(14,091,000)	(12,865,000)		(-1,226,000)
Direct subsidy	3,077,000	4,085,000	3,729,000	+652,000	-356,000
Administrative expenses		864,000	584,000	+584,000	-280,000
Alternative Agricultural Research and Commercialization Revolving Fund	6,500,000	8,000,000	5,000,000	-1,500,000	-3,000,000
Loan authorization		(25,000,000)			(-25,000,000)
Loan subsidy		7,138,000			-7,138,000
Administrative expenses		500,000			-500,000

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD & DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1976)—Continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
Rural business enterprise grants 3/	47,500,000	(48,000,000)	46,000,000	-2,500,000	+46,000,000
Rural technology and cooperative development grants 3/	1,750,000	(3,500,000)	1,500,000	-250,000	+1,500,000
Local technical assistance and planning grants 3/	1,750,000	(2,500,000)		-1,750,000	
Rural business performance partnerships program		112,315,000			-112,315,000
RBCDS expenses:					
Salaries and expenses 3/	57,294,000	(8,546,000)	9,520,000	-47,774,000	+9,520,000
Salaries and expenses, FmHA	37,811,000			-37,811,000	
Rural business performance partnerships program		61,874,000			-61,874,000
(Transfer from RBILP)		(19,582,000)	(14,747,000)	(+14,747,000)	(-4,835,000)
(Transfer from RDLFP)	(1,476,000)	(2,946,000)	(1,764,000)	(+308,000)	(-1,184,000)
(Transfer from RETLP)		(864,000)	(584,000)	(+584,000)	(-280,000)
Self-Help HLDF (by transfer)	(14,000)			(-14,000)	
RBCDS (by transfer)		(32,119,000)			(-32,119,000)
Total, RBCDS expenses	(96,595,000)	(117,367,000)	(26,635,000)	(-69,960,000)	(-90,732,000)
Total, Rural Business and Cooperative Development Service	207,908,000	194,776,000	124,220,000	-83,688,000	-70,556,000
(By transfer)	(1,490,000)	(66,513,000)	(17,115,000)	(+15,625,000)	(-36,398,000)
(Loan authorization)	(568,036,000)	(915,000,000)	(550,000,000)	(-28,036,000)	(-365,000,000)
Rural Utilities Service:					
Loan authorizations:					
Water and waste disposal facility loans: Direct	(905,523,000)			(-905,523,000)	
Loan subsidies:					
Water and sewer: Direct	126,502,000			-126,502,000	
Rural Electrification and Telephone Loans Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Direct loans:					
Electric 5%	(100,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(90,000,000)	(-10,000,000)	(-10,000,000)
Telephone 5%	(75,000,000)	(75,000,000)	(70,000,000)	(-5,000,000)	(-5,000,000)
Subtotal	(175,000,000)	(175,000,000)	(160,000,000)	(-15,000,000)	(-15,000,000)
Treasury rate: Telephone	(297,000,000)	(300,000,000)	(300,000,000)	(+3,000,000)	
Muni-rate: Electric	(575,250,000)	(575,250,000)	(500,000,000)	(-75,250,000)	(-75,250,000)
FFB loans:					
Electric, regular	(300,000,000)	(400,000,000)	(300,000,000)		(-100,000,000)
Telephone	(120,000,000)	(120,000,000)	(120,000,000)		
Subtotal	(420,000,000)	(520,000,000)	(420,000,000)		(-100,000,000)
Total, Loan authorizations	(1,467,250,000)	(1,570,250,000)	(1,380,000,000)	(-87,250,000)	(-190,250,000)
Loan subsidies:					
Direct loans:					
Electric 5%	9,703,000	23,520,000	21,168,000	+11,465,000	-2,352,000
Telephone 5%	5,497,000	14,955,000	13,958,000	+8,461,000	-997,000
Subtotal	15,200,000	38,475,000	35,126,000	+19,926,000	-3,349,000
Treasury rate: Telephone	60,000	60,000	60,000		
Muni-rate, electric	46,020,000	62,300,000	54,150,000	+8,130,000	-8,150,000
FFB loans: Electric, regular	450,000	3,360,000	2,520,000	+2,070,000	-840,000
Negative subsidy		-1,715,000			+1,715,000
Total, Loan subsidies	61,730,000	102,480,000	91,856,000	+30,126,000	-10,624,000
RETLP administrative expenses	29,982,000	34,385,000	29,982,000		-4,403,000
Total, Rural Electrification and Telephone Loans Program Account	91,712,000	136,865,000	121,838,000	+30,126,000	-15,027,000
(Loan authorization)	(1,467,250,000)	(1,570,250,000)	(1,380,000,000)	(-87,250,000)	(-190,250,000)
~~Rural Telecommunication Partnership Loan Program Account:~~					
Loan authorization		(15,000,000)			(-15,000,000)
Loan subsidy		594,000			-594,000
Administrative expenses		1,110,000			-1,110,000
Total		1,704,000			-1,704,000
Rural Telephone Bank Program Account:					
Direct loans (limitation on obligations)	(175,000,000)		(175,000,000)		(+175,000,000)
Direct loan subsidy	770,000		770,000		+770,000
RTB salaries and expenses	8,794,000		3,541,000	-5,253,000	+3,541,000
Distance Learning and Medical Link Grants	7,500,000	15,000,000	7,500,000		-7,500,000
Rural water and waste disposal grants	500,000,000			-500,000,000	
Solid waste management grants	2,995,000			-2,995,000	
Rural utilities performance partnerships program		785,183,000	562,000,000	+562,000,000	-223,183,000
Solid waste management grants, rural water and waste disposal grants, and water and waste disposal facility loans (administrative expenses)			12,740,000	+12,740,000	+12,740,000

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD & DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1976)—Continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
RUS salaries and expenses		19,627,000	19,211,000	+19,211,000	-416,000
Electric and telephone loans (by transfer)	(29,962,000)	(34,366,000)	(29,962,000)		(-4,403,000)
Rural telephone bank (by transfer)	(6,794,000)		(3,541,000)	(-3,253,000)	(+3,541,000)
Water and waste disposal loans (by transfer)		(17,760,000)			(-17,760,000)
Rural Telecommunication Partnership Loan (by transfer)		(1,110,000)			(-1,110,000)
Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund (by transfer)		(318,000)	(318,000)	(+318,000)	
Rural partnership (by transfer)			(12,623,000)	(+12,623,000)	(+12,623,000)
Subtotal	(36,776,000)	(73,230,000)	(66,675,000)	(+29,899,000)	(-7,555,000)
Total, Rural Utilities Service	738,273,000	956,379,000	727,600,000	-10,673,000	-228,779,000
(By transfer)	(36,776,000)	(53,803,000)	(46,464,000)	(+7,688,000)	(-7,139,000)
(Loan authorization)	(2,372,773,000)	(1,585,250,000)	(1,380,000,000)	(-992,773,000)	(-205,250,000)
(Limitation on obligations)	(175,000,000)		(175,000,000)		(+175,000,000)
Total, title III, Rural Economic and Community Development Programs	2,336,869,000	2,721,974,000	2,241,578,000	-97,291,000	-480,396,000
(By transfer)	(430,064,000)	(502,475,000)	(449,555,000)	(+19,471,000)	(-52,920,000)
(Loan authorization)	(5,732,961,000)	(5,897,957,000)	(4,851,203,000)	(-881,758,000)	(-846,754,000)
(Limitation on obligations)	(187,865,000)	(14,091,000)	(187,865,000)		(+173,774,000)
TITLE IV - DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services	540,000	553,000	440,000	-100,000	-113,000
Food and Consumer Service:					
Child nutrition programs	2,202,274,000	2,369,942,000	2,354,566,000	+152,292,000	-45,376,000
Transfer from section 32	5,249,077,000	5,520,492,000	5,597,858,000	+348,781,000	+77,366,000
Total, Child nutrition programs	7,451,351,000	7,920,434,000	7,952,424,000	+501,073,000	+31,990,000
Special milk program	18,069,000			-18,069,000	
Special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children (WIC)	3,470,000,000	3,820,000,000	3,729,807,000	+259,807,000	-90,193,000
(By transfer)			(4,000,000)	(+4,000,000)	(+4,000,000)
Commodity supplemental food program	84,500,000	86,000,000		-84,500,000	-86,000,000
Food stamp program:					
Expenses	26,167,710,000	26,119,887,000	25,954,828,000	+787,118,000	-165,059,000
Reserve	2,500,000,000	2,500,000,000		-2,500,000,000	-2,500,000,000
Nutrition assistance for Puerto Rico	1,130,528,000	1,143,000,000	1,143,000,000	+12,472,000	
Cattle tick eradication	12,472,000			-12,472,000	
Total, Food stamp program	29,830,710,000	29,762,887,000	27,097,828,000	-1,732,882,000	-2,665,059,000
Food donations programs for selected groups:					
Needy family program	33,154,000	78,639,000	65,000,000	+31,846,000	-13,639,000
Elderly feeding program	150,000,000	151,250,000	150,000,000		-1,250,000
Subtotal	183,154,000	229,889,000	215,000,000	+31,846,000	-14,889,000
Soup kitchens	40,000,000	40,000,000		-40,000,000	-40,000,000
Total, Food donations programs	223,154,000	269,889,000	215,000,000	-8,154,000	-54,889,000
The emergency food assistance program	40,000,000	40,000,000		-40,000,000	-40,000,000
Commodity purchases - TEFAP	25,000,000			-25,000,000	
Commodity assistance program			168,000,000	+168,000,000	+168,000,000
Total, The emergency food assistance program	65,000,000	40,000,000	168,000,000	+103,000,000	+128,000,000
Nutrition Initiatives:					
Nutrition support		45,528,000			-45,528,000
Nutrition promotion		4,218,000			-4,218,000
Food program administration	106,465,000	141,360,000	108,323,000	+1,858,000	-33,037,000
Total, Food and Consumer Service	40,249,269,000	42,090,314,000	39,271,382,000	-977,887,000	-2,818,932,000
Total, title IV, Domestic Food Programs	40,249,809,000	42,090,867,000	39,271,822,000	-977,987,000	-2,819,045,000
TITLE V - FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS					
Foreign Agricultural Service, direct appropriation	108,880,000	120,201,000	114,547,000	+5,667,000	-5,654,000
(Transfer from Commodity Credit Corporation)	(4,914,000)	(5,176,000)	(5,176,000)	(+262,000)	
(Transfer from export loans)	(2,792,000)	(3,137,000)	(2,792,000)		(-345,000)
(Transfer from P.L. 480)	(1,425,000)	(1,005,000)	(1,005,000)	(-420,000)	
Total, Program level	(118,011,000)	(129,519,000)	(123,520,000)	(+5,509,000)	(-5,999,000)
Scientific activities overseas (foreign currency program) (limitation on administrative expenses)	(1,062,000)			(-1,062,000)	

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD & DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1976)—Continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
Public Law 480 Program Account:					
Title I - Credit sales:					
Program level	(320,342,000)	(177,857,000)	(316,342,000)	(-4,000,000)	(+138,485,000)
Direct loans	(291,342,000)	(161,440,000)	(291,342,000)	.....	(+129,902,000)
Ocean freight differential	29,000,000	16,417,000	25,000,000	-4,000,000	+8,583,000
Title II - Commodities for disposition abroad:					
Program level	(821,100,000)	(795,703,000)	(821,100,000)	.....	(+25,397,000)
Appropriation	821,100,000	795,703,000	821,100,000	.....	+25,397,000
Title III - Commodity grants:					
Program level	(157,442,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(-107,442,000)	.....
Appropriation	157,442,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	-107,442,000	.....
Loan subsidies	236,162,000	131,833,000	236,162,000	.....	+104,329,000
Debt restructuring	.....	1,800,000	.....	.....	-1,800,000
Salaries and expenses:					
General Sales Manager	1,425,000	1,005,000	1,005,000	-420,000	.....
CFSA	1,036,000	745,000	745,000	-291,000	.....
Subtotal	2,461,000	1,750,000	1,750,000	-711,000	.....
Total, Public Law 480:					
Program level	(1,298,884,000)	(1,023,890,000)	(1,187,442,000)	(-111,442,000)	(+163,752,000)
Appropriation	1,246,165,000	997,203,000	1,134,012,000	-112,153,000	+136,809,000
CCC Export Loans Program Account:					
Loan guarantees:					
Short-term export credit	(5,000,000,000)	(5,200,000,000)	(5,200,000,000)	(+200,000,000)	.....
Intermediate export credit	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	.....	.....
Emerging democracies export credit	(200,000,000)	.....	.....	(-200,000,000)	.....
Loan subsidy	394,393,000	374,347,000	374,347,000	-20,046,000	.....
Salaries and expenses (Export Loans):					
General Sales Manager	2,792,000	3,137,000	2,792,000	.....	-345,000
ASCS	589,000	608,000	589,000	.....	-19,000
Total, CCC Export Loans Program Account	397,774,000	378,092,000	377,728,000	-20,046,000	-364,000
Total, title V, Foreign assistance and related programs	1,752,819,000	1,466,466,000	1,626,287,000	-126,532,000	+130,791,000
(By transfer)	(9,131,000)	(9,318,000)	(8,973,000)	(-158,000)	(-345,000)
TITLE VI - RELATED AGENCIES AND FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION					
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES					
Food and Drug Administration					
Salaries and expenses, direct appropriation	819,971,000	828,999,000	819,971,000	.....	-9,028,000
Prescription drug user fee act	(79,423,000)	(84,723,000)	(84,723,000)	(+5,300,000)	.....
Mammography clinics user fee	(6,500,000)	(13,000,000)	(13,000,000)	(+6,500,000)	.....
New user fees	.....	(38,740,000)	.....	.....	(-38,740,000)
Total, Program level	(905,894,000)	(965,462,000)	(917,694,000)	(+11,800,000)	(-47,768,000)
Buildings and facilities	18,150,000	8,350,000	15,350,000	-2,800,000	+7,000,000
Rental payments	46,294,000	46,294,000	46,294,000	.....	.....
Total, Food and Drug Administration	884,415,000	883,643,000	881,615,000	-2,800,000	-2,028,000
DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY					
Financial Management Service: Payments to the farm credit system financial assistance corporation	57,026,000	15,453,000	15,453,000	-41,573,000	.....
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Commodity Futures Trading Commission	49,144,000	59,711,000	49,144,000	.....	-10,567,000
Farm Credit Administration (limitation on administrative expenses)	(40,420,000)	(39,900,000)	.....	(-40,420,000)	(-39,900,000)
Total, title VI, Related Agencies and Food and Drug Administration	990,585,000	958,807,000	946,212,000	-44,373,000	-12,595,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(40,420,000)	(39,900,000)	.....	(-40,420,000)	(-39,900,000)
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority	69,084,195,000	66,421,993,000	62,722,934,000	-6,341,261,000	-3,699,059,000
(By transfer)	(841,067,000)	(727,309,000)	(872,308,000)	(+31,241,000)	(-55,001,000)
(Loan authorization)	(14,817,716,000)	(14,601,834,000)	(13,559,453,000)	(-1,058,263,000)	(-1,042,381,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(148,320,000)	(148,145,000)	(108,245,000)	(-40,075,000)	(-39,900,000)
(Limitation on obligations)	(187,885,000)	(14,091,000)	(187,885,000)	.....	(+173,774,000)

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD & DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1976)—Continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
RECAPITULATION					
Title I - Agricultural programs	21,066,242,000	16,151,090,000	15,911,587,000	-5,174,655,000	-239,503,000
Title II - Conservation programs	2,645,871,000	3,003,788,000	2,725,448,000	+79,577,000	-278,311,000
Title III - Farmers Home and Rural development programs	2,336,888,000	2,721,874,000	2,241,578,000	-97,291,000	-480,296,000
Title IV - Domestic food programs	40,249,809,000	42,080,867,000	39,271,822,000	-977,987,000	-2,819,045,000
Title V - Foreign assistance and related programs	1,752,819,000	1,496,486,000	1,626,287,000	-126,532,000	+130,791,000
Title VI - Related agencies and Food and Drug Administration	990,585,000	956,807,000	946,212,000	-44,373,000	-12,595,000
Total, new budget (obligational) authority	69,064,195,000	66,421,893,000	62,722,934,000	-6,341,261,000	-3,698,959,000

1/ Such sums as available from AQI user fee account for FY 1996.
2/ In addition to appropriation.
3/ On 9/2/95 the Administration amended its FY 1996 request (H.Doc. 104-63). This table reflects the program levels as submitted in the original budget.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. speaker, on Thursday, July 20, I missed four rollcall votes and on Friday, July 21, I missed three rollcall votes during consideration of H.R. 1976, Agriculture appropriations for fiscal year 1996.

On rollcall vote Nos. 542, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, I would have voted ''nay.''

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1976, the Agriculture appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996, represents a serious effort to cut Federal spending on agriculture programs. I am pleased that this bill cuts funding from current levels by nine percent. But we can go even farther. This bill preserves a number of agricultural subsidies that I believe should be reviewed in light of our desire to move toward reducing our deficit. Although this bill preserves Federal subsidies for several agricultural programs which I believe should be cut or eliminated, I am encouraged by the assurances from Chairman Roberts of the Agriculture Committee that he will ensure votes on these subsidy programs during consideration of the farm bill later this year.

This bill recognizes the importance of child nutrition programs funded through the Department of Agriculture. I am pleased that the Republican leadership recognized the shortsightedness of their initial proposal to reduce funding for school lunch and breakfast programs. H.R. 1976 provides $8 billion in funding for school lunch and breakfast programs, an increase of $501 million over fiscal year 1995, and $32 million more than the President's request.

This bill was also improved when an amendment offered by Representative HALL was accepted to remove the cap on the number of participants in the nutrition program for Women, Infants, and Children [WIC]. WIC is a cost-effective program which has significantly reduced rates of infant mortality, low birthweight, and anemia. If food cost inflation is lower than previous years, or if a State manages the program efficiently, the cap would have prohibited the state from enrolling additional eligible women, infants and children.

I do, however, remain concerned about the removal of the competitive bidding requirement included in this bill. If history serves as a guide, this will translate into higher costs for infant formula and fewer infants being served under the program.

Prior to enactment of the competitive bidding requirement in 1989, only half of State WIC programs used competitive bidding. The other half used industry-favored cost containment systems that saved 35 percent less than competitive bidding. For this reason, Congress passed the competitive bidding requirement in 1989 with bipartisan support and with support from the Bush White House.

Competitive bidding works. Competitive bidding saved the WIC program $1.1 billion last year. Nearly 25 percent of women, infants and children served by WIC last year were served with savings from competitive bidding. In my home State of Rhode Island, the competitive bidding requirement has enabled the program to serve an additional 5,000 infants.

If we are searching for deep cuts across programs, surely it makes sense to support an incentive for states to utilize competitive bidding, given the documented costs savings that result. The Bush administration supported the competitive bidding requirement in 1989 because it utilizes the free market to secure the lowest prices for infant formula, thereby making the most efficient use of the taxpayers' dollars and stretching WIC funds to serve more participants.

In States that do not use competitive bidding the losers will be vulnerable infants, pregnant women, and children. We should not sell out to large infant formula companies at the expense of infants, and I will urge my colleagues in the Senate to retain competitive bidding.

Finally, this legislation does not contain funding for the Coastal Institute at the University of Rhode Island. I am hopeful that through my continued effort and through the effort of the Senate, funding for this worthwhile project will be included in the conference report. The State of Rhode Island is enthusiastic about this project and voters have already approved a bond referendum for $7 million. Bonding authority and other approved matching sources are at the $12.56 level in support of this project. The Institute will focus on the major sources of estuarine pollution, including urban development, agriculture, and deep water activities. The Institute's mission has important implications for both these activities and for the world's fisheries. In addition, the Coastal Institute will contribute to the economic well-being of the region through the training and research that will be conducted.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 1976, the Agriculture appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996. I commend Mr. SKEEN, my colleague from New Mexico, for putting together a good bill which makes a firm contribution toward achieving our goal of a balanced budget by 2002. This bill funds important programs necessary to provide agricultural research, nutrition, conservation, health and safety, and farm sector stability.

I appreciate the hard work that Mr. SKEEN, and the other Committee members have put into allocating scarce resources among the many worthwhile projects covered by this bill. I look forward to working with the chairman in the future on programs important to the agricultural sector of our economy.

I offered an amendment to this bill that would have cut $12 million from the Department's administrative accounts. This would have been less than 4 percent of the administrative funds. I was encouraged by the fact that 196 members of the House share my view that the Department's headquarter's bureaucracy should be further downsized at a time when farm programs are being cut dramatically. However, I accept the majority view that the Department's administrative downsizing is progressing at a sufficient pace.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Bunning amendment to eliminate funding for the Food and Drug Administration [FDA].

FDA plays an important role in the lives of every American. It is the last stage in translating life saving medical innovation to consumers. It examines the medications and feeds for farm livestock and household pets. It insures the safety of the foods we eat, and it regulates one-fourth of every dollar Americans spend. Yet, the FDA budget is only one-tenth of 1 percent of the industries it regulates. Its employees work in facilities that are out of date and in decrepit condition.

Currently the agency is located in over 48 leased and owned buildings at 20 different sites across Maryland and the District of Columbia. Many FDA facilities are in appalling condition. It has become increasingly difficult to attract the caliber of employees the FDA needs to perform its mission, especially with respect to drug and medical device product review.

Who will ensure that the food in American grocery stores is safe? Will the manufacturers and the distributors do a better job? Will the pharmaceutical companies protect the public against dangerous drugs and medical devices? Must we have another Thalidimide scare before we appreciate the good work of this agency?

Vote against the Bunning amendment and protect the health and safety of the American public.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my serious concern about the Committee Report accompanying H.R. 1976, the fiscal year 1996 Agriculture appropriations bill, which contains a provision that will seriously affect the availability of food on Indian reservations nationwide, and will dramatically increase hunger and hardship for some of America's most underserved population, our low-income Native Americans.

In the report, the Appropriations Committee directs the Secretary of Agriculture to begin the termination of the Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations, commonly known as the commodities program. Indians who benefit from the commodities program will be transferred to the Food Stamp Program.

This small non-controversial program has not been a target for cuts under any previous administration. The administration requested $78.6 million for reservation commodities in fiscal year 1996. The Committee's bill provides for $65 million for commodities, a difference of $13.6 million (17 percent). Should this severe underfunding and eventual phaseout proceed, more than 110,000 Native Americans on reservations in 24 States will be virtually cut off from monthly food supplements. This misguided shuffling of programs would result in increased costs to the Federal Government and add to our ever-increasing deficit.

When Congress and the Nixon administration instituted the Food Stamp Program nationwide in 1974, one exception was made. Then, as now, the supply of commodity food items directly to Indian tribes for distribution among low-income tribal members made better economic sense than the State-administered Food Stamp Program. Indian reservations are some of the most remote and sparsely developed areas in this country. Currently, Indians can participate in either the commodities or food stamps programs but not both. The Food Stamp Program requires individuals to trade food coupons for food at grocery stores. In many reservation areas, there are not many stores. Travel to stores may take hours by car. In addition, the prices for foods at on-reservation stores are generally higher than in urban or suburban areas. Thus, food stamps buy less food at reservation stores than off-reservation stores.

In addition, while tribes operate the distribution of commodities, States operate the Food Stamp Program. Conversion to the Food Stamp Program will require Native Americans

to travel vast distances to the nearest State food stamp office. Other problems with the Food Stamp Program include a differing set of eligibility rules, and the likelihood that nonperishable foods, which make up the bulk of the commodities programs, will be less available under the Food Stamp Program because stores are less likely to stock them. Without a continued commodities program, food shortages will result and people will go hungry.

Finally, it appears that conversion to the Food Stamp Program will result in increased costs to the Federal Government. In fiscal year 1994, the average per month cost of food stamp benefits was $69.01, compared to $33.51 for commodities.

There are nine federally recognized tribes in South Dakota, whose members collectively make up one of the largest Native American populations in any State. At the same time, South Dakota has 3 of the 10 poorest counties in the Nation, all of which are within reservation boundaries. In fiscal year 1994, 11,600 low-income individuals living on or near reservations in my State were served through this program. This poorly thought out reshuffling of existing successful programs will severely impact the health and well-being of Native Americans in my State and across the country.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman. I want to inform the body that I am a farm owner and am involved in the Federal Farm Program, as I had been for many years before coming to Congress. I believe my involvement in and resulting knowledge of farm programs make me a more informed member of the Agriculture Committee. While I will vote present on this amendment to avoid any hint of conflict of interest, I am in opposition to the amendment to the Agriculture appropriations bill submitted by Representative LOWEY barring those with off-farm incomes of $100,000 or greater from participating in Federal farm programs.

First of all, farm programs are a part of this country's food security policy, not our welfare programs. Means testing ag payments make as much sense as means testing those who invest in Government bonds. The Clinton administration has repeatedly stated the need for outside investment in rural America. Landowners who own but do not operate farms represent outside capital that agriculture needs to finance farming, conserve soil and water resources, and support the economy of rural America. Forty-three percent of all U.S. farmland is owned by someone who does not actually farm the land. In my Illinois district some 70 percent is owned by absentee landowners. This provides most family farmers with the opportunity to operate on a scale that is economically viable. Land prices prohibit farmers from purchasing all the land necessary to provide for a viable operation.

If landowners with off-farm incomes of $100,000 or more are prohibited from participation in farm programs, land leases will move from share-rent leases to cash-rent. A share-rent lease simply means that both the tenant and landowner split costs and production, both assuming risks inherent to farming. Cash-rent leases represent a total shift of risk to the farmer. The tenant pays the landowner for the privilege of farming the land, then pays for all expenses and keeps all production.

I commend Representative LOWEY for trying to reduce Federal spending. The problem is, this amendment will not save money. Shifts in rental agreements will prevent this from happening. Ms. LOWEY'S amendment will not reduce spending, but it will hurt family farmers.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman. I strongly support the Agriculture Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1996. Not only does this bill provide much needed funding for farm programs, it provides vital funding for research in the field of nutritional health.

The Children's Nutritional Research Center [CNRC] at Baylor College of Medicine is located in the heart of the Texas Medical Center in Houston. This center is currently our Nation's only Federal facility dedicated to investigating the food needs of pregnant and nursing women and of children through their adolescence.

Since its inception in November 1978, the Children's Nutritional Research Center has focused on critical questions relating to women and nutrition. These include determining how the diet of a pregnant woman affects her health and the health of her child and how a mother's nutrition affects by lactation and the nutrient contents of her milk. The center also has researched the relationship between nutrition and the physical and mental development of children.

In addition, CNRC has conducted amazing research which has identified the genes contributing to nutrient intake and determined the factors that regulate these genes. This research will lead to valuable discoveries in the field of genetics.

This year, CNRC will fully activate the two remaining units of its research program, the Metabolic Research Unit and the Greenhouse. The Metabolic Research Unit will serve as the central laboratory for detailed nutrition studies in the center. The 12 apartments, 2 nurseries, metabolic kitchen, and four recreational areas in the unit will allow family participation in CNRC's research activities. Studies will examine the nutrients associated with growth and development and the role of diet in birth weight.

The Greenhouse will prepare plant foods to study the digestion of carbon, nitrogen, iron, and calcium in foods eaten by pregnant and nursing women and their children. Recently, CNRC scientists uncovered a major research breakthrough by using labeled foods to accurately determine essential and nonessential nutrients. The Greenhouse will further study this phenomenon and is unique among the Department of Agriculture's nutrition research centers.

I am pleased that the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee has agreed to maintain funding for the Children's Nutrition Research Center. Under the Guidance of Baylor College of Medicine, one of the premier academic health science centers in the Nation, I am certain CNRC will continue to lead the way in the field of nutritional research.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution No. 188 and the order of the House of July 20, 1995, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CRAPO) having assumed the chair, Mr. KLUG, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1976) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 188 he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 313, nays 78, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 554]

YEAS—313

Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bass
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (FL)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Costello
Cramer
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Flake
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson-Lee
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski

Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Manton
Manzullo
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meek
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Sabo
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Scott
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stenholm
Stockman
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Upton
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Watt (NC)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Young (AK)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—78

Ackerman
Baldacci
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Blute
Brown (OH)
Cardin
Collins (IL)
Conyers
Coyne
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Duncan
Ensign
Eshoo
Fattah
Fields (LA)
Filner
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gutierrez
Hancock
Harman
Jacobs
Johnson (SD)
Kennedy (MA)
Kennelly
Kleczka
LaFalce
Lofgren
Maloney
Markey
Martinez
Menendez
Mfume
Mineta
Moran
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Payne (NJ)
Petri
Pickett
Rangel
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Salmon
Sanders
Scarborough
Schroeder
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Slaughter
Stark
Stearns
Studds
Stump
Taylor (MS)
Torkildsen
Velazquez
Vento
Volkmer
Waters
Waxman
Williams
Yates

NOT VOTING—43

Abercrombie
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barton
Bateman
Bentsen
Brown (CA)
Burton
Clay
Collins (MI)
Cox
Crane
Dreier
Ehlers
Foglietta
Fox
Gallegly
Geren
Goodling
Hastings (WA)
Hefley
Hilliard
Houghton
Johnston
Lantos
McDermott
Meehan
Metcalf
Miller (CA)
Moakley
Moorhead
Ortiz
Quillen
Quinn
Reynolds
Seastrand
Stokes
Stupak
Taylor (NC)
Torricelli
Watts (OK)
Weldon (PA)
Young (FL)

□ 1734

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Watts of Oklahoma for, with Mr. McDermott against.

Mr. Dreir for, with Mr. Moakley against.

Mr. Ballenger for, with Mr. Stokes against.

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1944. An act making emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance, for anti-terrorism initiatives, for assistance in the recovery from the tragedy that occurred at Oklahoma City, and making rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 1976, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE A PRIVILEGED REPORT ON VETERANS AFFAIRS, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1996

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on a bill making appropriations for VA, HUD and independent agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All points of order are reserved on the bill.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], the distinguished majority leader, to explain the schedule for next week.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, by now it is obvious to most of the Members that we did not make our 3 o'clock departure today. Mr. Speaker, before I give the details of next week's legislative schedule, let me first outline what we need to accomplish next week in order to protect the August recess for Members. I recognize that we have all worked very hard for many long hours during this appropriations process, and I think by and large that we have made good progress.

We have worked these long hours for many reasons, not the least of which is our strong commitment to preserve the right of every Member to offer amendments to these important pieces of legislation. I want to thank each and every Member for their patience and diligent efforts to keep the House on schedule.

That being said, to protect the August departed tour date, next week we need to complete the Transportation appropriations bill, as well as the Commerce, Justice, State, and the VA–HUD appropriations bills.

I realize that working all night every night is unhealthy and is not overly productive. With that in mind, I will outline a schedule I feel is more reasonable and fair to Members.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday the House will meet at 10:30 a.m. for the morning hour and 12 o'clock for legislative business. Members should be advised that there will be no recorded votes before 5 o'clock on Monday, During the time when no recorded votes are expected, we plan to consider the rule and amendments to H.R. 70, the Alaskan oil export bill. If any recorded votes are ordered on H.R. 70, they will be postponed. We then plan to return to the Transportation appropriations bill. We will rise no later than 10 o'clock p.m. on Monday night, hopefully, after completing consideration of the Transportation bill.

On Tuesday, and the balance of the week, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business. On Tuesday, we plan to consider H.R. 1943, the San Diego Coastal Corrections Act. We will then return to the appropriations bill, hopefully taking up the Commerce, State, Justice bill. We plan to rise on Tuesday by no later than 8 o'clock. Members will take note that the House will meet in joint session with the Senate at 11 a.m. on Wednesday to receive the President of Korea. We hope to rise no later than 10 p.m. on Wednesday night.

On Thursday, we hope to finish no later than midnight, unless a few extra hours of work would allow us to complete our scheduled business and get Members home to their districts and their families at an earlier time.

Members should realize that when we finish the schedule I have outlined, we will go home. But if we have not, the House will work on Friday and through the weekend to finish the business I mentioned earlier.

Again, I would like to thank the Members for their help and patience thus far during this difficult process, and I would simply close by saying that no one is looking more forward to the August break and to a good fishing hole than I am. And I thank the gentleman for yielding.