HMO's, managed care, or high deductible insurance policies, they will have that choice.

The important thing to note is this: They will choose, not a bureaucrat, not a politician in power; they will choose.

## REPUBLICANS AND DEMOCRATS CAN WORK IT OUT

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, news reports say that John Wayne Bobbitt, bearing roses and chocolates, went acourting the same woman who tried to steal his family jewels once before. That is right. The same news sources say that ex-wife Lorena says, I quote, ''As far as I am concerned, this matter is cut and dried.''

Mr. Speaker, the reports say John Bobbitt is not discouraged. He said he will try again. Now, think about this. If the Bobbitts, John Bobbitt specifically, can set his pride aside on the side of the road and try and resolve differences, Democrats and Republicans can work out what differences exist with Medicare. Think about it. In fact, if this couple can resolve their differences, all of America can work out our problems. With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of any outstanding matter in this 1-minute.

## APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREE ON H.R. 4, PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Without objection, Mr. TANNER is appointed as a conferee on the bill (H.R. 4) to restore the American family, reduce illegitimacy, control welfare spending, and reduce welfare dependence.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the change in conferees.

## PERMISSION FOR SUNDRY COMMITTEES AND THEIR SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT TODAY DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit today while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule: the Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, the Committee on Commerce, the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, the Committee on International Relations, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Resources, the Committee on Science, the Committee on Small Business, and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

It is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

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

There was no objection.

## LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message of the President on the bill (H.R. 1854) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the message, together with the accompanying bill, H.R. 1854, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the veto message of the President on the bill, H.R. 1854, is referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

There was no objection.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the veto message of the President to the bill H.R. 1854, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

## CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1976, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 235 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 235

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany 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. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 235 is a simple resolution providing for consideration of the conference report making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, rural development, the Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies for fiscal year 1996. House Resolution 235 waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration. I am pleased that the rule was unanimously approved by the Rules Committee.

This was a productive conference and it is important to note that the conference report provides a total of $63.2 billion, which is $4.8 billion less than was appropriated last year. The conference report is also $3.3 billion lower than the amount requested by the Clinton administration, and $630 million lower than the Senate-passed bill.

It is clear that the appropriators have to balance an assortment of concerns and make difficult choices with limited funding at their disposal this year. I want to recognize Chairman BOB LIVINGSTON and Subcommittee Chairman JOE SKEEN for their efforts to keep the appropriations language as close as possible to the provisions included in the original House bill during the conference with the Senate.

The product of their work under extraordinarily tight fiscal constraints will help guarantee that the available funding is spent where it is needed most.

Among the notable appropriations and provisions in the conference report is funding for rural water and waste disposal grants and loan, funding for conservation programs to sustain agricultural productivity, the retention of a provision prohibiting the use of Market Promotion Program funds by the mink industry, and the establishment of priorities for the women, infants and children nutrition program. While the conference report makes its contribution to balance the budget and continue the consolidation of the Department of Agriculture, this bill also effectively maintains functions that are crucial to the health and safety of the American consumer and to the future success of this Nation's farming communities.

I am encouraged to note that the Clinton administration has indicated that it is supportive of this bill. In light of this support, I hope that the President will sign it. I urge my colleagues to support the rule so that we may proceed with debate and consideration of the underlying legislation.

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

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

(Mr. HALL of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleague from Georgia, Mr. LINDER, as well as my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for bringing this rule to the floor.

House Resolution 235 makes it in order to consider the conference report on H.R. 1976, the Department of Agriculture and related agencies appropriation bill for fiscal year 1996, and waives all points of order against the conference report. The Rules Committee reported the rule without opposition by voice vote.

The conference report on H.R. 1976 appropriates a total of $63.1 billion. I believe the conferees did a good job of setting priorities under difficult budget constraints and I commend the leadership of Mr. DURBIN and Chairman SKEEN.

I am especially pleased that the bill includes $3.7 billion for WIC. This is one of the most effective Federal antihunger programs that provides food and nutrition to low-income women, infants, and children.

I am also pleased with the funding levels for international food aid, which is one of the best U.S. international programs. In my travels to the developing nations such as Bangladesh, Ethiopia, and Peru, I have personally seen United States grain save the lives of hungry people during times of famine. It is fitting that this bill gives high priority to the title II portion of Public Law 480 which provides food for people threatened by a humanitarian crisis or natural disaster.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule.

□ 1045

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the rule just adopted, I call up the conference report on 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.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and that I be permitted to include tables, charts, and other extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

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

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of September 28, 1995, at page H9628.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that since the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] is in support of the conference report as it now stands, as is the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], the ranking Democratic member on the subcommittee, that the rule provides that the time be allocated with at least one-third being given to a Member who is at this point opposed to the proposal. Given that rule, I would ask that one-third of the time be assigned to me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Since the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] does not appear to be present, the Chair is going to assume that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] is in favor of the conference report because he signed it. Therefore, pursuant to the rule, the time will be allocated 20 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], 20 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], and 20 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN].

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring before the House today the conference report on H.R. 1976 which appropriates funds for fiscal year 1996 for Agriculture, Rural Development, the Food and Drug Administration and related agencies.

The House approved the bill on July 21 by a vote of 313 to 78. The Senate passed its version of the bill on September 20 by a vote of 97 to 3. House and Senate conferees met on September 27 and approved the report which was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 28 and which is before the House today.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report has an appropriation of $63.1 billion which is $4.8 billion below last year's appropriations bill and $3.8 billion below the fiscal year 1996 request. It is right at the committee's allocation for budget authority for discretionary spending.

There were two limitation provisions against mandatory programs in the House bill. These were agreed to by the authorizing committee. The Senate repeated these two limitations in their bill and added five more. In conference, we persuaded the Senate to drop three of these five new limitations. It was our understanding that the two we kept were not being used for savings by the authorizing committee in fiscal year 1996. Since then the situation for one of these limitations has changed, but it was adjusted so the authorizing committee can still capture $570 million in out year savings.

Before recommending this bill to my colleagues, I want to once again point out that although we always refer to this as the Agriculture appropriations bill, the scope of programs which this bill supports touches and improves the lives of every American, every day. This is a bill for rural America, for urban America, for every constituency represented in this body.

To begin with, this bill supports a system of agriculture which allows less than 2 million farmers and ranchers to deliver an abundant supply of food to 260 million Americans. It also is the basis for an export system that this year is delivering a record $50 billion in sales overseas, supporting jobs in the agriculture, food processing, and transportation industries in every one of our great States, territories and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. That same system also continues nearly 50 years of American leadership in delivering food aid to fight hunger and disease in other countries.

Included in this bill are the appropriations for the food safety programs which protect our food supply as well as the Food and Drug Administration's programs to ensure the safety of medicines and medical devices.

The bill continues strong support for the Women, Infants, and Children feeding program and food stamps as well as feeding and nutrition programs for preschool and school-age children, the elderly, and the homeless.

I would say to all of my colleagues that during the August recess, many of your offices contacted the subcommittee to express concern about rural housing and development programs, asking us to add money back into these programs if possible. I am pleased to tell my colleagues that we were, in fact, able to do this. The conference report provides for a loan level for section 502 direct housing of $1 billion and $1.7 billion for guaranteed housing loans. This was possible, in part, because the subsidy rate for the section 502 direct loan program has dropped by nearly one third since we first marked up the bill. In addition, we were able to increase the House level of funding for rural water and sewer programs to $488 million.

Finally, the bill continues strong levels of support for research, conservation, and environmental protection throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, on a personal note, I want to once again thank all my Democratic and Republican colleagues on the subcommittee, each and every one of whom made valuable contributions to this bill. My special thanks go first to the former chairman of the subcommittee and now the ranking member, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois and my good friend, DICK DURBIN. I also extend sincere thanks to our Democratic colleagues MARCY KAPTUR, RAY THORNTON, and NITA LOWEY. And to my Republican colleagues I also want to say thanks for all their help and hard work in getting us here today: JOHN MYERS, JIM WALSH, JAY DICKEY,

JACK KINGSTON, FRANK RIGGS, and GEORGE NETHERCUTT.

I would also like to point out that both the distinguished chairman and ranking member of the full committee were active in the work on this bill from subcommittee markup through the conference, and I want to also thank the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] for their efforts.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good, bill. It was created in a bipartisan process and deserves bipartisan support. The White House has indicated that the President will sign this bill. If you support the conference report you can go home and tell your constituents that you did a lot for them for fiscal year 1996 and a lot for them in the future because it does its fair share to reduce the deficit and downsize the Government.

The statement of managers accompanying the conference report inadvertently fails to explain the conference committee's agreement regarding Agricultural Research Service [ARS] laboratories proposed for closure in the President's fiscal year 1996 budget. The conference agreement provides funding to maintain the El Reno, OK; Sidney, MT; Clemson, SC; and Miami, FL, ARS laboratories. The other locations not transferred to nonFederal ownership, as proposed by both the House and Senate, are to be maintained as ARS worksites. The Houma facility is to be used as a worksite of the ARS center in New Orleans, LA.

The conference report concurs with Senate report language that the Food and Drug Administration not proceed further with a cosmetic hotline. It should, instead, evaluate existing programs to promote the voluntary reporting of serious adverse reactions to cosmetics.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to vote ''aye'' on the conference report for H.R. 1976.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my chairman, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], in saying at the outset that this subcommittee, despite the tremendous challenges which we have had to provide funding for the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the Food and Drug Administration, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, and other important agencies, despite these challenges and despite the fact that the resources available are so limited, it has been a genuine pleasure to work on this subcommittee.

We have our differences, we have our battles, but I think that the people of this country would be proud of the way that they are handled. Virtually every issue is handled on a bipartisan basis. We strive to find a commonsense solution. Quite honestly, I think that is what people expect of Congress and expect of their elected representatives in both the House and the Senate. It is one of the reasons why I have enjoyed this subcommittee so much over the years, both as chairman and as the ranking minority member.

I want to salute the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] for his leadership. It has been a tough, tough year. Not only did you have budgetary restraints, the new mantle of leadership puts you in a tougher position than you have seen in the past, and you have handled it so well. It is a great source of satisfaction to you, I am sure, and to all of us to have been part of this process.

I want to salute my colleagues, my Democratic colleagues who have played such an important role on our side of the aisle: the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. THORNTON], the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], and, of course, sitting right next to me during the course of the deliberations, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR]. All of them made a significant contribution.

Let me tell you about the pluses and minuses, and I think the chairman has pointed to them.

I am very happy to report that the level of funding for the women, Infants and Children supplemental feeding program has been maintained at what I consider a very responsible level at a very tough time. The gentleman from New Mexico and all Members know of my commitment to this program. I honestly believe that if we do not invest our dollars in the women of America who are in fact lower income and disadvantaged and pregnant, that we will pay a very dear price.

We have to make certain that these women are given the very best in medical care and in nutritional care, as well, so that they have a good pregnancy and give birth to a healthy baby. That is the best investment in the future of this country we can make.

This committee is the ag subcommittee but it is also by and large a nutrition subcommittee. When we assign priorities to nutrition in America, there is no higher priority than pregnant women and their small children. The WIC Program takes care of them.

I thank the chairman for taking care of them this year. He has maintained a commitment which we all have the highest respect for in the future of this program. We cannot let up in the future years. We have got to keep this commitment very much alive.

I am concerned that even though we have improved some figures on rural development, we still are far short of what we need. The chairman lives in small town America, as do I, he in the southwestern part of the United States, myself in the Midwest. Small towns in this country are really facing great pressures, economic pressures. They need to make sure that resources are available to modernize their infrastructure and to provide for housing. We help them. Unfortunately, we are not going to help them enough.

I hope we can find creative ways, perhaps with less Government money but with better results in the future, and that is what we are striving to do. I am glad that we were able to restore some of the money for research in this bill, because ag research is so critically important. When you consider that some 17 percent of our gross domestic product comes from the production and sale of food and fiber in America, it is a major industry in the economic fabric of our country. Yet when you look at the research dollars from the Federal level that are dedicated to this industry, they are very small, $1.1 billion roughly given by this Government out of a $1.5 trillion budget for research purposes. Quite honestly, when you look at money invested in the Pentagon or other areas of research, the amount given here is minuscule. What we ask of the people involved in research here is substantial, to come up with new ways to grow crops, to do it in a safe way.

One of the issues that we got involved in in this committee, a debate which was resolved on the floor of the House, was over the new standards for meat and poultry inspection in America. It has been my experience to meet one woman in Chicago who lost her 6-year-old son to contaminated meat. E. coli bacteria, literally in the course of 4 or 5 days, took the life of her son. It is still devastating, this long afterwards, for her to speak of it. But she understands, as all of us must, that modernizing meat and poultry inspection is in the best interests of America.

We have got to get beyond the old days, the 1908 days of Upton Sinclair's jungle where the Federal inspectors stood by and if they did not smell something funny or it did not look odd, they approved the meat. We are in a new era and our meat and poultry inspection has to come of age with it. I am glad we are dedicated to that happening.

Also the market promotion program, that was a big hassle and one that went late into the night. We finally, I think, came to a good conclusion. This is a good program. We are going to dedicate resources where they are needed the most. We have to maintain our competitive edge around the world.

□ 1100

Now there is one provision in the bill which I disagree with, and it relates to chickens, and I do not know if we will get into this debate today over frozen and fresh chickens. If we do, I will have my opportunity to speak to it, but I think quite honestly that we have taken the wrong course when it comes to this important issue.

When a consumer goes in a store in America and sees a chicken labeled as fresh, that consumer should, of course, be confident that they are buying a fresh chicken, but unfortunately the poultry industry has decided that they can freeze a chicken down to zero degrees and still call it fresh.

My colleagues, all of us know by common sense that is not the case. A fresh chicken tastes differently than one that has been frozen, and a fresh chicken may cost a little more than one that has been frozen, but the poultry industry, in order to protect their profit margins, want to continue to basically hoodwink consumers in this country and not tell them the true story about whether or not that poultry product has ever been frozen. Most people, men and women, who work in the kitchen at home know that once a chicken is frozen it is not desirable to refreeze it, it is not a good idea, and yet consumers may not know any better based on how it is labeled.

So, the administration tried to move to a new category, one that I think is fairly bizarre, called hard-chilled, whatever the heck that means, hard enough to be a bowling ball, but they called it hard-chilled. I think it is frozen, and I think we ought to just level with consumers.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, in this bill we basically say we are not going to, we are going to continue to play the game. The poultry people are going to put the label ''fresh'' on something that has been frozen as hard as a bowling ball, and the consumers will not know any better, and, quite honestly, I think that is a mistake, and I voted against it in committee.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if that issue will come up today in deliberation, but, if it does, I hope that we have a chance to rectify that.

But, having said that, I will not make of that wart the whole face. I will say that in fact this is a great bill. It is one that was worked on long and hard by staff and Members, and I congratulate my chairman.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, first let me say that, when I left, or when the bill left the House originally, I opposed it because I thought that the reductions that were provided for rural sewer and water and rural housing were very much too deep to reflect a fair share of the required spending reductions in the budget which were assigned to rural America.

Mr. Speaker, I think people often forget there is as much poverty in rural America, in fact more, than there is in urban America, and we, as a society, have a tendency to ignore that.

I want to congratulate the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] because I think that they have done probably the best job that was possible to do in restoring some of those unfair reductions and achieving a better balance within the bill in terms of the reductions that are required. And I guess, while I am uncomfortable with some of the reductions, I guess I would have to say that I think people in rural America want spending reductions as much as anybody else, and, if they do, then they have to expect them to be applied to programs that affect rural America just like everybody else.

So, while I still have great misgivings about some of the squeeze that this will put on our rural communities, I cannot really quarrel with the judgments that the committee has made. And I think it is a substantially improved bill, and I really do not want to urge anyone to vote against it because of what I am going to say here this morning. But I am taking the well because I am concerned with the item that was mentioned by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], and I will have a motion to recommit at the proper time because I think that, while this bill is a reasonable bill in terms of its spending reductions, I think that is unreasonable with respect to the fraudulent labeling of poultry products which it allows to continue.

Mr. Speaker, let me simply summarize what that situation is:

The insane situation that the conference agreement would continue allows poultry to be labeled as fresh if its internal temperature is 1 degree above zero and below 40 degrees Fahrenheit. Only poultry chilled to zero degrees or below would have to be labeled as frozen under the existing situation.

Now it is that existing situation which has led to considerable consumer confusion and to court cases. In fact, in one legal action striking down what was a fairly sensible California State law, Mr. Speaker, a U.S. appeals court wrote the following:

> We affirm this absurdity. Congress has given Federal bureaucrats the power to order that frozen chickens be labeled fresh.

Now to remedy that situation, Mr. Speaker, the Food Safety and Inspection Service has tried to stop that fraudulent labeling. They reviewed some 26,000 comments from the public and from interested parties, and they decided that in the interests of consumer protection and honesty in advertising they decided to require that in order to be labeled fresh, poultry must have an internal temperature not lower than 26 degrees, because 80 percent of the water in a chicken is frozen at that temperature. And they decided as a concession, as a concession to the poultry processing industry, that chicken with temperature greater than zero, but less than 26, would be labeled as hard-chilled rather than frozen.

But even that was not good enough for some of the special interests, Mr. Speaker, and so unfortunately the other body, the Senate, agreed to a proposition, and the conferees in turn agreed to that Senate action, which would continue the present absurdity of letting obviously frozen poultry be labeled as fresh. It will mean that the large special interests in the poultry industry will have won another battle in their ongoing effort to keep the American consumers as uninformed as possible as far as labeling is concerned. Under this turkey of an agreement they will continue to label as fresh, poultry that is chilled down to 1 degree Fahrenheit.

Now why is that important to the special interests? Because they can charge more and get away with it in the marketplace for poultry which is labeled as fresh rather than frozen, and that mislabeling has led consumers to overpay for what they are buying to the tune of up to $1 billion, and so it just seems to me that to allow this rip-off to continue is something which the Congress simply should not do.

Mr. Speaker, I come from a rural area myself, and I want to see as many agriculture products sold as possible around the country, but I do not want to see them sold under false pretenses, and to suggest that a piece of poultry which is chilled to 1 degree above zero is not frozen or at least hard-chilled is to me to revamp the Webster's dictionary definition of what indeed is fresh.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will be offering a motion to recommit which asks the House to reject that specific provision in the conference report so that this conference committee can go back and do what is honest, tell the American public what it is they are buying when they are buying something that is labeled fresh, and, if it is not fresh, for God's sake tell them. I think the Congress would be better off if we take that approach. I think the industry itself would have more credibility and certainly the consumer would be better informed than they would be under this turkey of an arrangement which the committee is bringing us here today.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's motion, and I appreciate all the great things he said because we had a good working relationship. There is a lot of controversy in dealing with this poultry situation. We had a very interesting exchange of ideas in the conference committee as well, learned more about chickens than I ever really wanted to know. We in the West, if we do not freeze it, we do not eat it, because it is transported such long distances. So I am always amazed at the arguments that we get into. However, if we say it is fresh, and under false pretenses it has been frozen, I really object to that as well. But I will oppose the gentleman's motion for recommittal because the Senate bill, passed bill, included a provision that delays the implementation of a poultry-labeling regulation until legislation is enacted directing the Secretary of Agriculture to promulgate such a regulation or the House and Senate authorizing committees receive and approve a revised proposal. The conference agreement includes this provision, and let me tell my colleagues why.

When we were getting ready to conference with the Senate, we asked both

the Department and the poultry industry if there were some alternative or compromise language that could be substituted for the Senate language which everyone could live with. The response from the Department was that they did not have an alternative proposal, and, even though they did not like the Senate language, they could live with it. The poultry industry stated that they did not want to delay the regulations. They just wanted two changes made to the Department's proposed regulations, but deferred to the conferees to negotiate. Since the administration did not seem to think the Senate language was worth a compromise proposal and the industry was unwilling to officially propose an alternative on its own, the original Senate language was retained. I am confident from the statements made before conference from the poultry industry and the Department that a compromise can be reached, a compromise that will be acceptable to the authorizing committee. Therefore, I ask my colleagues to defeat any motion to recommit so that we can move on to the passing of the conference report and would appreciate a ''no'' vote.

Now I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Wisconsin for their kind remarks. It has been great working with both of them. The association has been good. We have got a great committee. We also have a great staff, and I want to give them credit for the hard work they do on both sides and tell them how much we appreciate the time they give and also the guidance they give.

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

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to beat a dead chicken, but I do want to try to make clear what this issue is all about. It may strike some people as odd or even amusing that Members of Congress and this great legislative body are talking about frozen chickens today, but what is at stake here is a lot of money.

Mr. Speaker, if a chicken can be sold as fresh, it means a much greater profit for the company that is selling that chicken. I have no objection to people selling fresh chickens as fresh chickens and making the money that might be attendant to that sale. What I object to, what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] objects to, what people in the administration object to, is deceptive labeling, deceptive advertising.

Mr. Speaker, if a consumer walks into the supermarket, that consumer ought to be confident that what is labeled on that product is a fact. Today a consumer can walk into the poultry section and see in a plastic bag a chicken which is labeled fresh and not know that that chicken has been frozen as hard as a bowling ball.

Now of course the people who sell the chickens would like us to believe that they are all fresh regardless of how much they have been frozen or to what temperature they have been brought to, but that is not right.

A few years ago Dr. Kessler of the FDA angered some of the food giants who were running around the grocery store and labeling everything ''fresh.'' Bottled spaghetti sauce and canned products were being called ''fresh.'' Mr. Speaker, consumers had a right to be suspicious, and Kessler said:

> Your suspicions are well founded. Make that labeling accurate. When a consumer makes a purchase, let them know that their hard-earned dollars are being spent on something they actually want to purchase.

So he took on some of the giants in the industry on behalf of this administration, and I am glad he did because it meant better labeling, and it made for authentic and more honest labeling, and now when it comes to poultry products, once again we are fighting some of the giants of this country. They want to sell these chickens, mislabel them, call them fresh. They want the consumers to fall for it, pay more, so that they can get more profit out of the sale.

Mr. Speaker, frankly we spend a lot of time in Congress changing laws. We cannot change the laws of physics. The laws of physics tell us water freezes at 32 degrees Fahrenheit and that chickens freeze, because of their water content, at 26 degrees Fahrenheit.

□ 1115

So this administration tried to come up with a reasonable compromise, came up with a bizarre term called hard chilled, something between zero degrees and 26 degrees; I have never quite understood it.

The Chicago Sun Times came up with an editorial a few weeks ago. They thought this was a pretty simple idea. What they said was this: ''We can help the bureaucrats and the Congressmen out. If chickens are frozen, let us call them frozen. If they are thawed but used to be frozen, call them previously frozen. If they have never been frozen, call them fresh.

There used to be an old commercial on television about chickens, saying parts is parts. Well, this debate is about whether fresh is fresh, and I will tell the Members, it goes far beyond the chuckling we have had on the floor this morning. There is a lot of money at stake, and what is even more important, what is at stake here is consumer confidence across this country. Our government is entrusted with the power and authority to regulate advertising so when we walk into the supermarket and see something on the counter and it is labeled, it is labeled honestly and accurately. This is not a buyer beware situation. It is a situation where the consumers have the right to know so their hard-earned dollars are spent on products they actually want to buy and the deception is taken away. I am going to join my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], in supporting his motion to recommit on an otherwise very good bill.

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DICKEY].

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak against this motion, and want to stress one thing, that this is not a consumer issue. This issue has come up because of the situation that exists in California, so what I call it is a California market protection motion. What happens is that California cannot raise chickens, process them, and sell them as cheaply as we can in the southern States, in Arkansas, my State, and other States, and ship them out there. So what they want to do, rather than this being a consumer issue on that side, what they want to do is allow them to sell chickens by the pound for a higher amount in California than in other States. We think the consumer wants the price lower. We think the consumer is not harmed by this in any way.

If we had our way, when we first started all this we would not have the government intrusion. We would say, ''Okay, we are not going to label this at all.'' That is like saying the government comes in and says, ''We are going to label this pretty or not pretty.'' It is that irrelevant to the issue. Six hundred million pounds of chickens in 1 year's period of time were sent out with an 800 number, an 800 number that says, ''If you are dissatisfied with this labeling or with this food or this product in any way, call us.'' Less than 50 came in in 1 year.

The consumers are not being harmed by this. We need to keep it like it is and not start meddling with it, particularly just to take care of one State's situation, where they want to charge more.

As far as the charges are concerned, I understand chicken is something like $1 a pound, somewhere around there. We are not talking about a great differential if we are sitting there with chicken at that price. We are not talking about a great differential. What we are trying to do is deliver chicken safer, so the retailer cannot have so many shipments in a period of time that it would burden them. They want to be able to hold the chickens so they can put it into the retail market in a safe way. That is what is behind this. It is a matter of government intrusion, and we should not have done it in the first place, but now that we have it, we need to keep it for the sake of the price of chicken.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, one of the previous gentlemen on this side of the aisle said this issue is, and I have forgotten what reason he gave, but he indicated this issue was here because people were concerned about bureaucrats. This issue is here for one very simple reason: because Tyson's chicken company and a number of others like them want to sell what is in essence frozen products

and label them fresh, and earn extra money because they can charge the fresh rather than the frozen price. That is why this issue is here. They got their friends in the Senate to swallow it and push it down our throats.

Shoppers, I think, know the difference between fresh and frozen. It seems to me it is time that Congress learned that, too. Chickens hard enough to hammer nails are not fresh. They should not be labeled as being fresh. One of the other gentlemen said, ''Oh, this is just a California issue.'' I am not from California, I am from Wisconsin. I believe in legitimate labeling of agricultural products, whether they are chickens or whether they are BGH-laced milk. I want that label to show what the consumer is buying. My farmers do, too. I certainly know my consumers do.

The issue here is very simple. If you think that the consumer ought to know that they are not buying fresh chicken when they purchase chicken that is frozen down to 1 degree, then vote for my motion to recommit. If Members think the industry ought to be able to continue to scam them and continue to deceive consumers into thinking that they are buying fresh chicken when they are not, then stick with the committee. It is just that simple.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I think we have let the chicken issue be well thought out, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], chairman of the committee, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, despite all the hard work by so many on this bill, including the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations, I reluctantly rise to register my disappointment with the Agriculture appropriations conference report, and on a related note, the real lack of progress Congress is making on bringing real reform to agricultural price support and subsidy programs. Despite statements from the leadership that this session would bring genuine reform of Federal agricultural policies, it seems that at the end of the day very little may change with regard to sugar, tobacco, cotton, and other programs. The sugar program is of particular concern to those of us from the State of Florida and, in fact, what compels me to be here today. It is a Federal program that continues the direct involvement of the Federal Government in the marketplace—where it does not belong. In addition, the sugar program has a unique impact on Florida because it artificially supports and encourages farming a crop that is known to damage the Everglades ecosystem and Florida Bay—true national treasures. If this Congress falls short of achieving the repeal of sugar's benefits, I hope the committee will work with the Florida delegation to deal with the consequences of this Federal program for our State—possibly by using dollars from Florida sugar producers to bolster efforts to save the Everglades and Florida Bay. This is the absolute minimum I will accept.

Mr. DURBIN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this agriculture appropriations bill. In fact, I do not know why we are voting on an agriculture appropriations bill when we have not dealt with major issues of reform of the agriculture program.

The bottom line is a simple one, that many of us, particularly colleagues on the other side of the aisle, were promised that we would have an open debate on an authorization bill. Then we were told it would not be an authorization bill, but we would be allowed to have some input before reconciliation. What we read in the newspapers is all sorts of deals are being cut, so that, for instance, the sugar program, which I think is one that is way out of line, it is socialism if there ever was in America, where we tell people, ''This is the price we are going to pay you, this is what you can grow, this is what you cannot grow,'' we are not even going to have an opportunity to deal with that issue.

In my judgment, it makes no sense to vote for an agriculture appropriations bill unless there is reform. I would say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, they come here saying, ''Government is the source of all evil,'' they come here saying, ''We have to have less Government,'' they come here saying that ''Government control is the worst thing in America,'' but when it comes to agriculture, they take a bow, they take a duck. This is the most intrusive area of Government in our entire economy.

If Members are going to be consistent, if they are going to say ''Government is no good to build public housing, Government is no good to build our roads, and Government is no good in health care,'' why the heck, in a program that is more outdated and more antediluvian than any other, do we say, ''Oh, no, in agriculture, we leave it alone.''

I think it would be a disgrace to pass this bill. I know that all the various agriculture interests are fighting over a more limited pie, but before we appropriate the money, we ought to see what the program is going to be. Is there going to be reform? Are all the promises that, ''Oh, yes,'' as the chairman of the Committee on the Budget promised me, ''there is going to be the same reform there as everywhere else,'' we have not seen one jot of reform. We have not seen any changes. All we have seen is a lot of just the same thing we have seen in Medicare, ''Do not do this in public; behind closed doors, maybe we can work something out.''

I say to my colleagues, whether they are liberal or conservative, Republican or Democrat, to vote the money on an appropriations bill before we see what measure of reform comes about is stupid from a policy point of view, it is stupid from a political point of view, it makes no sense, and I would urge with all due respect to my good friend who is the ranking member of the subcommittee and ranking member of the committee, as well as the chairpeople of both, that we should not be voting on this kind of bill right now. I would urge my colleagues to defeat it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to say that I significantly disagree with the gentleman who just spoke. I do not think people should be confused by the debate that is going on with respect to basic farm programs and this appropriation bill. This appropriation bill has very little to do with that debate.

I would point out the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] says if we are going to be cutting housing, that we should not exempt agriculture. I would point out that this is the appropriation for rural America, and it does cut housing in rural America as well. Rural America is not being exempted from these reductions. They are not being exempted from the budget squeeze. In fact, one of my concerns about this bill is that I think that in areas such as rural sewer and water and housing, this bill is not adequate enough. That is not the fault of the subcommittee. They tried to do everything they could within the limitations provided to them.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply hope, as I said earlier, I do not want anyone to vote against this bill because of my comments on the frozen chicken issue, which is a very separate issue. I think this committee has done a fairly balanced job under very difficult circumstances in trying to allocate the budget actions. I do not agree with every action taken in the conference, but I think it is certainly a far better bill than the bill that left the House. I think people need to understand that in fact, rural America is taking a significant hit in the overall budget and in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman that the basic agricultural programs are screwed up, and I would not vote to continue them because, for one example, the milk marketing order system in this country substantially discriminates against small family farmers in my region of the country, and unfairly benefits the same region of the county which is, I think, speaking out the most loudly in favor of this

frozen chicken fraud, which the committee is about to perpetrate. I urge with the gentleman that those basic farm programs are screwed up, but that has very little to do with what the committee is doing on the programs in this bill.

□ 1130

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE].

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report on the Agriculture appropriations bill.

The conference report is almost $5 billion less than the 1995 level, so it is making a significant contribution to reducing spending to get to a balanced budget. These are real cuts.

In making these cuts, I realize Chairman SKEEN and the members of the committee had some very difficult decisions to make. During House consideration of the Agriculture appropriations bill, I and many other members who represent rural areas expressed concern over the size of the proposed reduction in the section 502 Rural Housing Program. At that time, Chairman SKEEN and Representative DURBIN promised that they would try to provide adequate funding for this program during the conference with the Senate. They have made good on that promise.

In the original House bill, the committee was forced to make almost a 50-percent cut in the 502 Rural Housing Program. Because of the changes made in conference, the bill will now provide $1.2 billion in loans to help low-income Americans in rural areas purchase their own homes. The 502 Direct Loan Program is the only affordable homeownership program that serves low and very-low income families in rural areas.

The typical direct loan borrower is working and is making $15,165 per year. These are hardworking people trying to achieve the American dream of owning their own home. The 502 Direct Program is the most effective program to help them make that dream a reality.

This program works. It helps people who would otherwise be unable to afford a home, make the step to homeownership. While these families have very low income, they pay their mortgages.

There is currently a 2- to 3-year waiting list for these loans.

Construction of these homes provides new jobs, an expanded tax base for schools and other investments and increased sales and other tax revenues. A single family 502 direct home generates 1.75 jobs, $50,201 in wages, and $20,560 in annual tax revenues to rural America. In short, the program not only provides homes to low-income rural families, it provides jobs and tax revenues to rural communities.

The conference committee has done a good job in balancing priorities among all our agriculture and rural programs. I strongly support the conference report and urge my colleagues to approve its passage.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS].

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in admiration and respect for the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] and his able staff, but in reluctant opposition to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant opposition to this bill for several reasons.

Earlier this year the Committee on Agriculture and the Appropriations Committee conducted a series of discussions and meetings with leadership over the issue of mandatory and discretionary spending and which committee should receive credit for any reductions in these accounts.

From these talks an agreement was forged with the Speaker, the Appropriations chairman, the Budget chairman and myself as chairman of the Agriculture authorizing committee, in which the Appropriations Committee pledged, for the purpose of deficit reduction, to stay within the bounds of discretionary accounts and the Agriculture authorizing committee would in turn stay on the mandatory side of the ledger. This was a fair compromise. I am including a copy of that agreement for publication in the RECORD.

This bill before us today is a disappointing violation of the spirit and letter of that agreement. It's not only disappointing for what it will do to the policy reform efforts the Committee on Agriculture is attempting, but also for the precedent it sets for the next 7 years of budget deficit reduction efforts in the Congress.

This bill avoids the tough choices required in budget balancing and it is crafted using accounting gimmickry—the bill merely shifts funds from the mandatory side of the ledger over to the discretionary side—simply put: robbing Peter to pay Paul.

I have no doubts that this bill's supporters can make good justifications for every project and program in this document. Each probably has considerable merit. There is only one very troubling problem: each account that is maintained and increased is done so at the expense of farm commodity and conservation programs. At a time when the Agriculture Committee is laboring to reform outdated New Deal Era farm programs and help farmers and ranchers adapt to a market driven economy, cuts made to mandatory programs will cripple this effort by making it impossible for the Agriculture Committee to make necessary changes.

I am further opposed to this bill because it represents business as usual. First, and foremost, when the other body marked up the 1996 Agriculture Appropriations bill, they added $1.2 billion in spending over the House passed level. Conferees agreed to keep over $600 million of this amount in the bill before us today.

It should be instructive for my colleagues to look at what this bill before us does in terms of additional spending. The bottom line: we are spending $3.0 million more on special research grants at a time when there is a growing consensus that we should be putting more money into competitive research grants.

To this end we in the Agriculture Committee have been conducting an extensive review of the $1.7 billion we spend on agricultural research and extension each year. We have sent out an extensive set of questions to our Nation's agricultural research community and asked for their input on how to better direct limited research dollars. I believe this $1.7 billion can be spent in a more efficient manner and I will work with the Appropriations Committee next year to coordinate the overhaul of our Nation's research effort.

Equally disappointing is the House's capitulation to the Senate's spending on CSREES buildings and facilities account. Having no compunction about dipping into mandatory accounts to pay for these new university research buildings, the Senate decided it was critical to fund $57 million worth of new buildings.

No less alarming is the level spent in this bill for salaries and expense at the Consolidated Farm Services Agency and the Natural Resources Conservation Service agency; $1.5 billion, $1.5 billion to administer $7 billion worth of mandatory farm and conservation programs. That's 20 cents for every dollar spent on commodity and conservation programs. We can and should spend less in this area—taxpayers demand nothing less. The Appropriations Committee should look to this and other accounts like it next year before it comes over to the Agriculture Committee's mandatory accounts for its required savings.

The bottom line on this bill is truly found on its bottom line: it spends over $600 million more than the bill we in this body passed over 2 months ago. I urge my colleagues to reject this conference report.

I include for the RECORD a letter from Chairman LIVINGSTON to me, as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
*Washington, DC, July 13, 1995.*

Hon. PAT ROBERTS,
*Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROBERTS: This is to confirm the agreement relating to budget responsibilities in future agriculture appropriations and authorization legislation. We all recognize the need to reform our budget process. A part of that reform should be a review of both mandatory and discretionary spending accounts. We further recognize that there are gray areas—areas where appropriations reductions to mandatory spending can advance our mutual policy and deficit reduction goals.

However, as a general policy it is our intention that beginning in FY 1997 all discretionary spending reductions will be attributed to the Appropriations Committee, and all mandatory spending reductions will be attributed to the Agriculture Committee. Any future situation that deviates from the general policy will require consultation and agreement between the two committees. But as part of an effort to move the FY 1996 Agriculture Appropriations Bill through the House, this agreement will provide a clear basis for managing the federal funds devoted to supporting farmers and the rural sector as we move toward a balanced budget.

Sincerely,

NEWT GINGRICH,
*Speaker.*

JOHN KASICH,
*Chairman, Budget Committee.*

BOB LIVINGSTON,
*Chairman, Appropriations Committee.*

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

Mr. Speaker, several minutes ago I yielded to the gentleman from New York. That was a triumph of courtesy over common sense, because I disagree with him so much and yet respect, of course, his right to express his point of view.

It troubles me for him to take the floor and to criticize this bill because it has not reformed agriculture in America. The bottom line is we have done many things in this subcommittee to bring significant reform in the area of agricultural policy.

Two years ago we made, I think, a significant advance in terms of reforming crop insurance in this country, a program that was costing taxpayers over $200 million a year, and because of provisions in our bill we have pushed forward a reform that will literally save billions of dollars for taxpayers over the life of the program.

Again, in the area of housing which the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] just addressed, because of investigations by this subcommittee, by actions in this subcommittee we have pushed for reforms in the authorizing legislation on housing programs that will mean that the taxpayers' dollars will be more carefully guarded. It also means that, frankly, we will be building more and better housing at a lower cost. You cannot beat that.

The bottom line is, if you want to reform agriculture, you have to go to the Committee on Agriculture. I sincerely hope the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] who just rose and said he opposed this bill will have second thoughts when it comes to final passage.

We have done our job. We have accepted our responsibility. We were told to pass an appropriations bill. We worked long and hard to do it.

Now I hope his Committee on Agriculture will accept its responsibility. I hope for the first time since Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal, we will not see the Committee on Agriculture drop the ball and fail to write a farm bill. I served on that Committee on Agriculture many years ago. I served on the Committee on the Budget, too.

When I hear people on the Committee on Agriculture saying they are going to let the Committee on the Budget write the farm bill now, I am worried. There are bean growers on the Committee on Agriculture; there are bean counters on the Committee on the Budget. Let us put the farm bill in the hands of the bean growers, the people who understand agriculture, who live in small town America.

I sincerely hope the gentleman from Kansas who takes exception to our bill will roll up his sleeves in his own committee and address real agricultural reform. I think that is only fair. We have tried our best to stay out of any area in this bill that might offend him. I am sure there have been areas where we have crossed the line. It was not intentional.

But I hope that he accepts his responsibility and the responsibility of his Committee on Agriculture. I will join him in that effort. I think all members of the subcommittee will join him in that effort.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am in a position under which, as I said earlier, because of the customs of the House, if I am in a position to offer the motion to recommit to try to correct this outrageous consumer fraud that is going on with respect to frozen chickens, then I really am virtually required to vote against the conference report.

As I have indicated, I do so with great reluctance, because I think that the committee has done a pretty good job in restoring some of the reductions that were originally in this bill for rural sewer and water and housing. I think that responsible folks in rural America recognize that they have to accept their fair share of reductions. So while I do not agree with all of the reductions, I think the committee has done a reasonable job, given the limitations it has been operating under.

I do want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the opposition of the House Committee on Agriculture to this bill reminds me of the old story about Leo Durocher when he managed the New York Giants. Durocher was hitting ground balls to Eddie Stanky and Stanky dropped a couple. So Durocher said, ''Stanky, give me a glove. Let me show you how to play second base.'' He took the glove and went out to play second base, and the very first ball hit to Durocher, he dropped. He turned to Stanky and said, ''Stanky, you have second base so screwed up, nobody can play it.''

I would suggest right now that agriculture policy has been so screwed up by the House authorizing committee through the years, both in the past and in this session, that nobody can unscrew it. So what we are faced with is a ridiculous situation in which it appears like the Committee on the Budget is going to be writing farm policy, and what a lot of people on the Committee on the Budget know about cows, you can put in your left ear.

It just seems to me that while I think there are good reasons to vote for this recommittal motion, and while I am required, because I am offering the recommittal motion, to vote against the bill, I think that this bill needs to be evaluated fairly in contrast to what is coming out of the House Committee on Agriculture.

All I can say is that I see the chances of anything good for my dairy farmers coming out of the House Committee on Agriculture are slim and none, because we are being given a choice between either swallowing what is essentially on that bill the status quo, which really puts Midwest dairy farmers at a huge economic disadvantage, or else swallowing the idea that we ought to in essence end all farm programs. It seems to me that we ought to be able to do better than that, but obviously we are not going to be given that opportunity.

I just wanted to say that to keep everything in balance before we vote on this turkey of a chicken proposal that is in this committee bill.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report on the agriculture appropriations. I would like to congratulate our chairman, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], and our ranking member, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], for the excellent job that they did in conference in holding to most of the House positions. I think they have really worked hard to bring a bill to the floor that even the critics can support, or may have a small problem with, but overall, this is a good, solid bill.

Let me give you some of the reasons why we should vote for this. First of all, it is almost $5 billion below last year's level. It supports the reorganization of the USDA. It consolidates and reduces by 25 percent the funding available for USDA congressional affairs activities. It reforms the market promotion plan, the market promotion program.

It dramatically increases funding from the original bill for rural housing, which is of critical importance to our rural communities, and in New York, where we do have, believe it or not, rural communities, this is a big help. It provides $488 million for rural water and waste disposal grants and loans, which is critical, given the difficulty that small communities have in meeting EPA standards. It provides additional funding for WIC, which is a very important and popular program.

There are so many reasons to vote for this and so few not to. I would really urge a ''no'' vote on the motion to recommit. This bill is far too important to recommit it back to the conference because of basically a dispute between Arkansas and California chicken farmers. That is really what it comes down to. Please give us the opportunity to pass this on to the President. Vote ''no'' on the motion to recommit, vote ''yes'' on final passage.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to remind all of my colleagues that this bill represents a lot of hard choices and a lot of hard work, as every appropriations bill should. We have to look to the taxpayers who pay for these programs and who use them

every day, whether they are urban farmers, such as the gentleman from New York, who shops in the Cheerio basket division, and I have great admiration for him because he is a great cause-promoter, but this is a tough job.

It is one that has to be done, and I think we have done an excellent job. I appreciate the hard work that has gone into the bill, all the effort that was made by everybody on that particular committee, particularly the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

The bottom line is that this bill is a responsible bill and it cuts spending and meets our budget targets. We would not and we could not be here today if it did not do so. At the same time, the bill provides our farmers and ranchers the resources to produce an abundant, safe supply of food, and that is what these folks demand day by day and count on, a safe, adequate supply of food.

There is no place on Earth any better than right here in the United States because of the kind of work that we do on this committee and other committees dealing with agriculture products. We may have our debate, but in the end, that is the essence of what we are doing.

This is an essential bill for women, children, senior citizens, and the poor. It provides shelter and economic opportunity in rural areas and makes sound investments in research, education and the environment for the future prosperity of this great country.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask my colleagues to vote ''aye'' on this conference report and to vote ''no'' on the motion to recommit. At this point in the RECORD I would like to insert a table.

## FY 1996 AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1976)

| | FY 1995 Enacted | FY 1996 Estimate | House | Senate | Conference | Conference compared with enacted |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| TITLE I - AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS | | | | | | |
| Production, Processing, and Marketing | | | | | | |
| Office of the Secretary | 2,770,000 | 2,886,000 | 10,227,000 | 12,801,000 | 10,227,000 | +7,457,000 |
| Executive Operations: | | | | | | |
| Chief Economist | ..... | 4,240,000 | 3,948,000 | 3,814,000 | 3,948,000 | +3,948,000 |
| Office of the Assistant Secretary for Economics | 540,000 | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | -540,000 |
| World Agricultural Outlook Board | 2,498,000 | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | -2,498,000 |
| National Appeals Division | ..... | 12,166,000 | 11,846,000 | 11,846,000 | 11,846,000 | +11,846,000 |
| Office of Budget and Program Analysis | 5,795,000 | 5,899,000 | 5,899,000 | 5,899,000 | 5,899,000 | +104,000 |
| Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization | ..... | 724,000 | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| Total, Executive Operations | 8,833,000 | 23,029,000 | 21,693,000 | 21,559,000 | 21,693,000 | +12,860,000 |
| Chief Financial Officer | 580,000 | 4,952,000 | 4,133,000 | 4,133,000 | 4,133,000 | +3,553,000 |
| Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration | 596,000 | 616,000 | 596,000 | 596,000 | 596,000 | ..... |
| Agriculture buildings and facilities (USDA) | 135,193,000 | 135,774,000 | 135,774,000 | 135,774,000 | 135,774,000 | +581,000 |
| Payments to GSA | (87,957,000) | (89,971,000) | (89,971,000) | (89,971,000) | (89,971,000) | (+2,014,000) |
| Building operations and maintenance | (18,614,000) | (20,216,000) | (20,216,000) | (20,216,000) | (20,216,000) | (+1,602,000) |
| Repairs, renovations, and construction | (28,622,000) | (25,587,000) | (25,587,000) | (25,587,000) | (25,587,000) | (-3,035,000) |
| Advisory committees (USDA) | 928,000 | 885,000 | 800,000 | 650,000 | 650,000 | -278,000 |
| Hazardous waste management | 15,700,000 | 15,700,000 | 15,700,000 | 15,700,000 | 15,700,000 | ..... |
| Departmental administration | 26,187,000 | 87,347,000 | 27,986,000 | 27,986,000 | 27,986,000 | +1,799,000 |
| Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations | 1,764,000 | 1,838,000 | 3,797,000 | 1,764,000 | 3,797,000 | +2,033,000 |
| Office of Communications | 8,196,000 | 8,690,000 | 8,196,000 | 8,196,000 | 8,196,000 | ..... |
| Office of the Inspector General | 63,418,000 | 64,739,000 | 63,639,000 | 63,639,000 | 63,639,000 | +221,000 |
| Office of the General Counsel | 25,992,000 | 27,860,000 | 27,860,000 | 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 | 520,000 | 520,000 | ..... |
| Economic Research Service | 53,936,000 | 54,665,000 | 53,131,000 | 53,526,000 | 53,131,000 | -805,000 |
| National Agricultural Statistics Service | 81,424,000 | 89,837,000 | 81,107,000 | 81,107,000 | 81,107,000 | -317,000 |
| Agricultural Research Service | 714,689,000 | 709,810,000 | 705,610,000 | 707,000,000 | 710,000,000 | -4,689,000 |
| Human Nutrition Information Service | (10,618,000) | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| Buildings and facilities | 42,318,000 | 30,200,000 | 30,200,000 | 30,200,000 | 30,200,000 | -12,118,000 |
| Total, Agricultural Research Service | 757,007,000 | 740,010,000 | 735,810,000 | 737,200,000 | 740,200,000 | -16,807,000 |
| Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Activities: | | | | | | |
| Research and education activities | 432,387,000 | 432,212,000 | 389,172,000 | 421,622,000 | 421,929,000 | -10,458,000 |
| Native Americans Institutions Endowment Fund | ..... | (4,600,000) | (4,600,000) | (4,600,000) | (4,600,000) | (+4,600,000) |
| Buildings and facilities | 60,560,000 | ..... | ..... | 57,838,000 | 57,838,000 | -2,722,000 |
| Extension Activities | 438,744,000 | 437,552,000 | 413,257,000 | 439,681,000 | 427,750,000 | -10,994,000 |
| Total, Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Activities | 931,691,000 | 869,764,000 | 802,429,000 | 919,141,000 | 907,517,000 | -24,174,000 |
| Office of the Assistant Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs | 605,000 | 625,000 | 605,000 | 605,000 | 605,000 | ..... |
| Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service: | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 443,651,000 | 430,279,000 | 433,864,000 | 429,379,000 | 431,921,000 | -11,730,000 |
| Special fund, user fees 1/ | (96,660,000) | (100,254,000) | (100,254,000) | (100,254,000) | (100,254,000) | (+3,594,000) |
| Buildings and facilities | 4,973,000 | 12,541,000 | 12,541,000 | 4,973,000 | 8,757,000 | +3,784,000 |
| Total, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service | 448,624,000 | 442,820,000 | 446,205,000 | 434,352,000 | 440,678,000 | -7,946,000 |
| Agricultural Marketing Service: | | | | | | |
| Marketing Services | 56,591,000 | 50,607,000 | 46,662,000 | 46,517,000 | 46,517,000 | -10,074,000 |
| New user fees | (4,452,000) | (3,887,000) | (3,887,000) | (3,887,000) | (3,887,000) | (-565,000) |
| (Limitation on administrative expenses, from fees collected) | (57,054,000) | (58,461,000) | (58,461,000) | (58,461,000) | (58,461,000) | (+1,407,000) |
| Funds for strengthening markets, income, and supply (transfer from section 32) | 10,309,000 | 10,451,000 | 10,451,000 | 10,451,000 | 10,451,000 | +142,000 |
| Payments to States and possessions | 1,200,000 | 1,200,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,200,000 | 1,200,000 | ..... |
| Total, Agricultural Marketing Service | 68,100,000 | 62,258,000 | 58,113,000 | 58,168,000 | 58,168,000 | -9,932,000 |
| Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration | 23,314,000 | 23,679,000 | 23,058,000 | 23,289,000 | 23,058,000 | -256,000 |
| Inspection and Weighing Services (limitation on administrative expenses, from fees collected) | (42,784,000) | (42,784,000) | (42,784,000) | (42,784,000) | (42,784,000) | ..... |
| Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety | ..... | 560,000 | 450,000 | 440,000 | 440,000 | +440,000 |
| Food Safety and Inspection Service | 525,820,000 | 594,869,000 | 540,365,000 | 563,004,000 | 544,906,000 | +19,086,000 |
| Lab accreditation fees 2/ | (1,000,000) | (1,000,000) | (1,000,000) | (1,000,000) | (1,000,000) | ..... |
| Total, Production, Processing, and Marketing | 3,181,200,000 | 3,254,178,000 | 3,062,196,000 | 3,192,012,000 | 3,170,583,000 | -10,617,000 |
| Farm Assistance Programs | | | | | | |
| Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services | 549,000 | 570,000 | 549,000 | 549,000 | 549,000 | ..... |

## FY 1996 AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1976) — continued

| | FY 1995 Enacted | FY 1996 Estimate | House | Senate | Conference | Conference compared with enacted |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Consolidated Farm Service Agency: | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | ..... | 811,771,000 | 786,368,000 | 805,888,000 | 795,000,000 | +795,000,000 |
| Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, salaries and expenses | 790,217,000 | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | -790,217,000 |
| (Transfer from export loans) | (569,000) | (608,000) | (569,000) | (569,000) | (569,000) | ..... |
| (Transfer from P.L. 480) | (1,036,000) | (745,000) | (745,000) | (745,000) | (745,000) | (-291,000) |
| (Transfer from ACIF) | (200,227,000) | (214,163,000) | (206,446,000) | (214,163,000) | (206,446,000) | (+6,219,000) |
| Total, salaries and expenses | (992,049,000) | (1,027,287,000) | (986,168,000) | (1,021,385,000) | (1,004,760,000) | (+12,711,000) |
| State mediation grants | 3,000,000 | 3,000,000 | 2,000,000 | 3,000,000 | 2,000,000 | -1,000,000 |
| Dairy indemnity program | ..... | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | +100,000 |
| Outreach for socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers | 2,995,000 | 3,000,000 | ..... | 2,000,000 | 1,000,000 | -1,995,000 |
| Total, Consolidated Farm Service Agency | 796,212,000 | 817,871,000 | 790,468,000 | 810,988,000 | 798,100,000 | +1,888,000 |
| Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account: | | | | | | |
| Loan authorizations: | | | | | | |
| Farm ownership loans: | | | | | | |
| Direct | (78,081,000) | (70,000,000) | (35,000,000) | (60,000,000) | (60,000,000) | (-18,081,000) |
| Guaranteed | (540,674,000) | (540,687,000) | (550,000,000) | (550,000,000) | (550,000,000) | (+9,326,000) |
| Subtotal | (618,755,000) | (610,687,000) | (585,000,000) | (610,000,000) | (610,000,000) | (-8,755,000) |
| Operating loans: | | | | | | |
| Direct | (500,000,000) | (542,860,000) | (400,000,000) | (550,000,000) | (550,000,000) | (+50,000,000) |
| Guaranteed unsubsidized | (1,735,000,000) | (1,700,000,000) | (1,700,000,000) | (1,700,000,000) | (1,700,000,000) | (-35,000,000) |
| Guaranteed subsidized | (230,000,000) | (200,000,000) | (200,000,000) | (200,000,000) | (200,000,000) | (-30,000,000) |
| Subtotal | (2,465,000,000) | (2,442,860,000) | (2,300,000,000) | (2,450,000,000) | (2,450,000,000) | (-15,000,000) |
| Soil and water loans: | | | | | | |
| Direct | ..... | (2,898,000) | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| Guaranteed | ..... | (1,422,000) | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| Subtotal | ..... | (4,320,000) | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| Indian tribe land acquisition loans | (1,000,000) | (1,000,000) | (750,000) | (750,000) | (750,000) | (-250,000) |
| Emergency disaster loans | (100,000,000) | (100,000,000) | (100,000,000) | (100,000,000) | (100,000,000) | ..... |
| Credit sales of acquired property | ..... | (45,000,000) | (22,500,000) | (21,696,000) | ..... | ..... |
| Total, Loan authorizations | (3,184,755,000) | (3,203,867,000) | (3,008,250,000) | (3,182,446,000) | (3,160,750,000) | (-24,005,000) |
| Loan subsidies: | | | | | | |
| Farm ownership: | | | | | | |
| Direct | 10,983,000 | 16,373,000 | 8,187,000 | 14,034,000 | 14,034,000 | +3,051,000 |
| Guaranteed | 20,870,000 | 19,681,000 | 20,019,000 | 20,019,000 | 20,019,000 | -851,000 |
| Subtotal | 31,853,000 | 36,054,000 | 28,206,000 | 34,053,000 | 34,053,000 | +2,200,000 |
| Farm operating: | | | | | | |
| Direct | 56,555,000 | 74,209,000 | 54,680,000 | 75,185,000 | 75,185,000 | +18,630,000 |
| Guaranteed unsubsidized | 9,360,000 | 18,360,000 | 18,360,000 | 18,360,000 | 18,360,000 | +9,000,000 |
| Guaranteed subsidized | 23,425,000 | 17,960,000 | 17,960,000 | 17,960,000 | 17,960,000 | -11,465,000 |
| Subtotal | 95,340,000 | 110,529,000 | 91,000,000 | 111,505,000 | 111,505,000 | +16,165,000 |
| Soil and water loans: | | | | | | |
| Direct | ..... | 608,000 | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| Guaranteed | ..... | 30,000 | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| Subtotal | ..... | 638,000 | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| Indian tribe land acquisition | 123,000 | 274,000 | 206,000 | 206,000 | 206,000 | +83,000 |
| Emergency disaster | 26,290,000 | 32,080,000 | 32,080,000 | 32,080,000 | 32,080,000 | +5,790,000 |
| Credit sales of acquired property | ..... | 8,226,000 | 4,113,000 | 3,966,000 | ..... | ..... |
| Negative subsidies | -782,000 | -296,000 | ..... | ..... | ..... | +782,000 |
| Total, Loan subsidies | 152,824,000 | 187,505,000 | 155,605,000 | 181,810,000 | 177,844,000 | +25,020,000 |
| ACIF expenses: | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses | 229,735,000 | 214,652,000 | 208,935,000 | 214,652,000 | 208,935,000 | -20,800,000 |
| Administrative expenses | 14,031,000 | 12,606,000 | 12,606,000 | 12,606,000 | 12,606,000 | -1,425,000 |
| Total, ACIF expenses | 243,766,000 | 227,258,000 | 221,541,000 | 227,258,000 | 221,541,000 | -22,225,000 |
| Total, Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund | 396,590,000 | 414,763,000 | 377,146,000 | 409,068,000 | 399,385,000 | +2,795,000 |
| (Loan authorization) | (3,184,755,000) | (3,203,867,000) | (3,008,250,000) | (3,182,446,000) | (3,160,750,000) | (-24,005,000) |
| Total, Farm Assistance Programs | 1,193,351,000 | 1,233,204,000 | 1,168,183,000 | 1,220,605,000 | 1,198,034,000 | +4,683,000 |
| CORPORATIONS | | | | | | |
| Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: | | | | | | |
| Federal crop insurance corporation fund | 219,107,000 | 1,263,708,000 | 1,263,708,000 | 1,263,708,000 | 1,263,708,000 | +1,044,601,000 |

## FY 1996 AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1976) — continued

| | FY 1995 Enacted | FY 1996 Estimate | House | Senate | Conference | Conference compared with enacted |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Commodity Credit Corporation: | | | | | | |
| Reimbursement for net realized losses | 15,500,000,000 | 10,400,000,000 | 10,400,000,000 | 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) | (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 | 11,663,708,000 | 11,663,708,000 | -5,055,399,000 |
| Total, title I, Agricultural Programs | 21,093,658,000 | 16,151,090,000 | 15,894,067,000 | 16,076,325,000 | 16,032,325,000 | -5,061,333,000 |
| (By transfer) | (201,852,000) | (215,516,000) | (209,780,000) | (215,497,000) | (209,780,000) | (+7,928,000) |
| (Loan authorization) | (3,184,755,000) | (3,203,867,000) | (3,008,250,000) | (3,182,446,000) | (3,160,750,000) | (-24,005,000) |
| (Limitation on administrative expenses) | (104,838,000) | (106,245,000) | (106,245,000) | (106,245,000) | (106,245,000) | (+1,407,000) |
| TITLE II - CONSERVATION PROGRAMS | | | | | | |
| Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment | 677,000 | 696,000 | 677,000 | 677,000 | 677,000 | ..... |
| Natural Resource Conservation Service: | | | | | | |
| Conservation operations | 556,062,000 | 645,735,000 | 629,986,000 | 637,860,000 | 629,986,000 | +73,924,000 |
| 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 | ..... | 8,369,000 | ..... | -12,970,000 |
| Watershed planning | 10,546,000 | 7,542,000 | ..... | 5,630,000 | ..... | -10,546,000 |
| Watershed and flood prevention operations | 70,000,000 | 100,000,000 | 100,000,000 | 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 | ..... | ..... | 36,000,000 | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| Resource conservation and development | 32,845,000 | 28,900,000 | ..... | 27,000,000 | 29,000,000 | -3,845,000 |
| Great Plains conservation program | 15,172,000 | 11,000,000 | ..... | ..... | ..... | -15,172,000 |
| Forestry incentives program | 6,625,000 | 6,625,000 | ..... | 6,325,000 | 6,325,000 | -300,000 |
| Colorado River Basin salinity control program | 4,500,000 | 2,681,000 | ..... | 2,681,000 | 2,681,000 | -1,819,000 |
| Wetlands reserve program | 93,200,000 | 210,000,000 | 210,000,000 | 77,000,000 | 77,000,000 | -16,200,000 |
| Total, Natural Resource Conservation Service | 801,920,000 | 1,023,693,000 | 999,986,000 | 864,865,000 | 858,992,000 | +57,072,000 |
| Consolidated Farm Service Agency: | | | | | | |
| Agricultural conservation program | 100,000,000 | 50,000,000 | 75,000,000 | 50,000,000 | 75,000,000 | -25,000,000 |
| Water quality incentives program | (15,000,000) | (15,000,000) | (11,000,000) | (15,000,000) | (11,000,000) | (-4,000,000) |
| Emergency conservation program | ..... | 3,000,000 | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| Conservation reserve program | 1,743,274,000 | 1,926,370,000 | 1,781,785,000 | 1,781,785,000 | 1,781,785,000 | +38,511,000 |
| Total, Consolidated Farm Service Agency | 1,843,274,000 | 1,979,370,000 | 1,856,785,000 | 1,831,785,000 | 1,856,785,000 | +13,511,000 |
| Total, title II, Conservation Programs | 2,645,871,000 | 3,003,759,000 | 2,847,448,000 | 2,697,327,000 | 2,716,454,000 | +70,583,000 |
| 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 | 568,000 | 568,000 | ..... |
| Rural Community Advancement Program | ..... | ..... | ..... | 563,839,000 | ..... | ..... |
| Administrative expenses | ..... | ..... | ..... | 58,051,000 | ..... | ..... |
| 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) | (550,000,000) | (1,000,000,000) | (1,000,000,000) | (-200,000,000) |
| Unsubsidized guaranteed | (1,000,000,000) | (1,300,000,000) | (1,700,000,000) | (1,700,000,000) | (1,700,000,000) | (+700,000,000) |
| Housing repair (sec. 504) | (35,000,000) | (35,000,000) | (35,000,000) | (35,000,000) | (35,000,000) | ..... |
| Farm labor (sec. 514) | (15,915,000) | (16,482,000) | (15,000,000) | (15,000,000) | (15,000,000) | (-915,000) |
| Rental housing (sec. 515) 3/ | (190,476,000) | (220,000,000) | (150,000,000) | (150,000,000) | (150,000,000) | (-40,476,000) |
| Site loans (sec. 524) | (632,000) | (632,000) | (600,000) | (600,000) | (600,000) | (-32,000) |
| Credit sales of acquired property | ..... | (75,000,000) | (35,000,000) | (42,484,000) | ..... | ..... |
| Total, Loan authorizations | (2,442,023,000) | (2,847,114,000) | (2,485,600,000) | (2,943,084,000) | (2,900,600,000) | (+458,577,000) |
| Loan subsidies: | | | | | | |
| Single family (sec. 502): | | | | | | |
| Direct | 227,520,000 | 251,880,000 | 115,445,000 | 209,900,000 | 145,833,000 | -81,687,000 |
| Unsubsidized guaranteed | 17,200,000 | 2,210,000 | 2,890,000 | 2,890,000 | 2,890,000 | -14,310,000 |
| Housing repair (sec. 504) | 11,690,000 | 14,193,000 | 14,193,000 | 14,193,000 | 14,193,000 | +2,503,000 |
| Farm labor (sec. 514) | 7,911,000 | 9,482,000 | 8,629,000 | 8,629,000 | 8,629,000 | +718,000 |
| Rental housing (sec. 515): | | | | | | |
| Direct | 100,000,000 | 92,973,000 | 82,035,000 | 82,035,000 | 82,035,000 | -17,965,000 |
| Unsubsidized guaranteed | (1,000,000) | ..... | (1,000,000) | ..... | (1,000,000) | ..... |
| Credit sales of acquired property | ..... | 13,073,000 | 6,100,000 | 7,405,000 | ..... | ..... |
| Total, Loan subsidies | 364,321,000 | 383,811,000 | 229,292,000 | 325,052,000 | 253,580,000 | -110,741,000 |
| RHIF administrative expenses | 389,818,000 | 395,211,000 | 385,889,000 | 389,818,000 | 385,889,000 | -3,929,000 |

## FY 1996 AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1976) — continued

| | FY 1995 Enacted | FY 1996 Estimate | House | Senate | Conference | Conference compared with enacted |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Rental assistance: | | | | | | |
| (Sec. 521) | 517,106,000 | 565,583,000 | 530,000,000 | 535,000,000 | 535,000,000 | +17,892,000 |
| (Sec. 502(c)(5)(D)) | 5,900,000 | 5,900,000 | 5,900,000 | 5,900,000 | 5,900,000 | ..... |
| Total, Rental assistance | 523,006,000 | 571,483,000 | 535,900,000 | 540,900,000 | 540,900,000 | +17,892,000 |
| Total, Rural Housing Insurance Fund | 1,277,147,000 | 1,350,505,000 | 1,151,081,000 | 1,255,770,000 | 1,180,369,000 | -96,778,000 |
| (Loan authorization) | (2,442,023,000) | (2,847,114,000) | (2,485,600,000) | (2,943,084,000) | (2,900,600,000) | (+458,577,000) |
| Self-Help Housing Land Development Fund: | | | | | | |
| Loan authorization | (603,000) | (603,000) | (603,000) | (603,000) | (603,000) | ..... |
| Loan subsidy | 11,000 | 31,000 | 31,000 | 31,000 | 31,000 | +20,000 |
| Administrative expenses | 14,000 | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | -14,000 |
| Community Facility Loans Program Account: | | | | | | |
| Loan authorizations: | | | | | | |
| Direct 3/ | (225,000,000) | (250,000,000) | (200,000,000) | ..... | (200,000,000) | (-25,000,000) |
| Guaranteed 3/ | (75,000,000) | (100,000,000) | (75,000,000) | ..... | (75,000,000) | ..... |
| Total, Loan authorizations | (300,000,000) | (350,000,000) | (275,000,000) | ..... | (275,000,000) | (-25,000,000) |
| Loan subsidies: | | | | | | |
| Direct 3/ | 21,375,000 | (43,600,000) | 34,880,000 | ..... | 34,880,000 | +13,505,000 |
| Guaranteed 3/ | 3,728,000 | (4,740,000) | 3,555,000 | ..... | 3,555,000 | -173,000 |
| Total, Loan subsidies | 25,103,000 | ..... | 38,435,000 | ..... | 38,435,000 | +13,332,000 |
| 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 | 24,900,000 | 24,900,000 | ..... |
| Rural housing for domestic farm labor | 10,900,000 | 10,900,000 | 10,000,000 | 10,000,000 | 10,000,000 | -900,000 |
| Mutual and self-help housing | 12,650,000 | 12,650,000 | 12,650,000 | 12,650,000 | 12,650,000 | ..... |
| Supervisory and technical assistance grants | ..... | 2,500,000 | ..... | 1,000,000 | ..... | ..... |
| Rural community fire protection grants 3/ | 3,400,000 | (3,400,000) | 1,000,000 | 3,000,000 | 2,000,000 | -1,400,000 |
| Compensation for construction defects | 495,000 | 495,000 | 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 | -11,000,000 |
| Rural housing performance partnerships program | ..... | 90,602,000 | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| Subtotal, grants and payments | 74,345,000 | 164,047,000 | 60,045,000 | 63,045,000 | 61,045,000 | -13,300,000 |
| RHCDS expenses: | | | | | | |
| Administrative expenses | ..... | 53,650,000 | 42,820,000 | 50,346,000 | 46,583,000 | +46,583,000 |
| (Transfer from RHIF) | (369,818,000) | (362,074,000) | (377,074,000) | (376,860,000) | (377,074,000) | (-12,744,000) |
| (Transfer from ACIF) | ..... | (171,000) | (171,000) | (171,000) | (171,000) | (+171,000) |
| (Transfer from CFLP) | ..... | (11,114,000) | (6,731,000) | ..... | (6,731,000) | (+6,731,000) |
| Total, RHCDS expenses | (369,818,000) | (447,009,000) | (426,796,000) | (427,377,000) | (432,559,000) | (+42,741,000) |
| Total, Rural Housing and Community Development Service | 1,376,620,000 | 1,566,233,000 | 1,301,248,000 | 1,369,192,000 | 1,335,299,000 | -41,321,000 |
| (Loan authorization) | (2,742,626,000) | (3,197,717,000) | (2,761,203,000) | (2,943,687,000) | (3,176,203,000) | (+433,577,000) |
| Rural Business and Cooperative Development Service: | | | | | | |
| Rural Business and Industry Loans Program Account: | | | | | | |
| Loan authorizations: | | | | | | |
| Direct 3/ | ..... | (50,000,000) | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| Guaranteed 3/ | (500,000,000) | (750,000,000) | (500,000,000) | ..... | (500,000,000) | ..... |
| Total, loan authorizations | (500,000,000) | (800,000,000) | (500,000,000) | ..... | (500,000,000) | ..... |
| Loan subsidies: | | | | | | |
| Direct 3/ | ..... | (3,505,000) | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| Guaranteed 3/ | 4,750,000 | (6,825,000) | 6,437,000 | ..... | 6,437,000 | +1,687,000 |
| Total, Loan subsidies | 4,750,000 | ..... | 6,437,000 | ..... | 6,437,000 | +1,687,000 |
| Administrative expenses 3/ | ..... | (19,742,000) | 14,868,000 | ..... | 14,868,000 | +14,868,000 |
| Rural Development Loan Fund Program Account: | | | | | | |
| (Loan authorization) 3/ | (88,038,000) | (90,000,000) | (7,246,000) | (37,544,000) | (37,544,000) | (-50,494,000) |
| Loan subsidy 3/ | 46,000,000 | (53,665,000) | 4,322,000 | 22,395,000 | 22,395,000 | -23,605,000 |
| Administrative expenses 3/ | 1,476,000 | (2,961,000) | ..... | 1,476,000 | 1,476,000 | ..... |
| Total, Rural Development Loan Fund | 47,476,000 | ..... | 4,322,000 | 23,871,000 | 23,871,000 | -23,605,000 |
| (Loan authorization) | (88,038,000) | (90,000,000) | (7,246,000) | (37,544,000) | (37,544,000) | (-50,494,000) |
| Rural Economic Development Loans Program Account: | | | | | | |
| Direct loans (limitation on obligations) | (12,865,000) | (14,091,000) | (12,865,000) | (12,865,000) | (12,865,000) | ..... |
| Direct subsidy | 3,077,000 | 4,085,000 | 3,729,000 | 3,729,000 | 3,729,000 | +652,000 |
| Administrative expenses | ..... | 864,000 | 584,000 | 724,000 | 654,000 | +654,000 |

## FY 1996 AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1976) — continued

| | FY 1995 Enacted | FY 1996 Estimate | House | Senate | Conference | Conference compared with enacted |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Alternative Agricultural Research and Commercialization | | | | | | |
| Revolving Fund | 5,000,000 | 6,000,000 | 5,000,000 | 10,000,000 | 6,500,000 | +1,500,000 |
| Loan authorization | ..... | (25,000,000) | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| Loan subsidy | ..... | 7,138,000 | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| Administrative expenses | ..... | 500,000 | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| Rural business enterprise grants 3/ | 47,500,000 | (48,000,000) | 45,000,000 | ..... | 45,000,000 | -2,500,000 |
| Rural technology and cooperative development grants 3/ | 1,750,000 | (3,800,000) | 1,500,000 | 3,000,000 | 2,300,000 | +550,000 |
| Local technical assistance and planning grants 3/ | ..... | (2,500,000) | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| Rural business performance partnerships program | ..... | 112,315,000 | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| RBCDS expenses: | | | | | | |
| Salaries and expenses 3/ | 57,294,000 | (9,589,000) | 9,520,000 | 9,013,000 | 9,013,000 | -48,281,000 |
| Salaries and expenses, FmHA | 37,811,000 | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | -37,811,000 |
| Rural business performance partnerships program | ..... | 61,874,000 | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| (Transfer from RBILP) | ..... | (19,562,000) | (14,747,000) | ..... | (14,747,000) | (+14,747,000) |
| (Transfer from RDLFP) | (1,476,000) | (2,948,000) | ..... | (1,476,000) | (1,476,000) | ..... |
| (Transfer from RETLP) | ..... | (884,000) | (884,000) | (724,000) | (884,000) | (+884,000) |
| Self-Help HLDF (by transfer) | (14,000) | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | (-14,000) |
| RBCDS (by transfer) | ..... | (32,119,000) | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| Total, RBCDS expenses | (96,595,000) | (117,387,000) | (24,851,000) | (11,213,000) | (25,890,000) | (-70,705,000) |
| Total, Rural Business and Cooperative Development Service | 204,658,000 | 194,776,000 | 90,980,000 | 50,337,000 | 112,372,000 | -92,286,000 |
| (By transfer) | (1,490,000) | (56,513,000) | (15,331,000) | (2,200,000) | (16,877,000) | (+15,387,000) |
| (Loan authorization) | (588,038,000) | (915,000,000) | (507,246,000) | (37,544,000) | (537,544,000) | (-50,494,000) |
| 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) | (90,000,000) | (90,000,000) | (-10,000,000) |
| Telephone 5% | (54,534,000) | (75,000,000) | (70,000,000) | (70,000,000) | (70,000,000) | (+15,466,000) |
| Subtotal | (154,534,000) | (175,000,000) | (160,000,000) | (160,000,000) | (160,000,000) | (+5,466,000) |
| Treasury rate: Telephone | (297,000,000) | (300,000,000) | (300,000,000) | (300,000,000) | (300,000,000) | (+3,000,000) |
| Muni-rate: Electric | (575,250,000) | (575,250,000) | (500,000,000) | (550,000,000) | (525,000,000) | (-50,250,000) |
| FFB loans: | | | | | | |
| Electric, regular | (300,000,000) | (400,000,000) | (300,000,000) | (300,000,000) | (300,000,000) | ..... |
| Telephone | (120,000,000) | (120,000,000) | (120,000,000) | (120,000,000) | (120,000,000) | ..... |
| Subtotal | (420,000,000) | (520,000,000) | (420,000,000) | (420,000,000) | (420,000,000) | ..... |
| Total, Loan authorizations | (1,446,784,000) | (1,570,250,000) | (1,380,000,000) | (1,430,000,000) | (1,405,000,000) | (-41,784,000) |
| Loan subsidies: | | | | | | |
| Direct loans: | | | | | | |
| Electric 5% | 9,703,000 | 23,520,000 | 21,168,000 | 21,168,000 | 21,168,000 | +11,465,000 |
| Telephone 5% | 3,997,000 | 14,955,000 | 13,958,000 | 13,958,000 | 13,958,000 | +9,961,000 |
| Subtotal | 13,700,000 | 38,475,000 | 35,126,000 | 35,126,000 | 35,126,000 | +21,426,000 |
| Treasury rate: Telephone | 60,000 | 60,000 | 60,000 | 60,000 | 60,000 | ..... |
| Muni-rate, electric | 46,020,000 | 62,300,000 | 54,150,000 | 59,565,000 | 56,858,000 | +10,838,000 |
| FFB loans: Electric, regular | 450,000 | 3,360,000 | 2,520,000 | 2,520,000 | 2,520,000 | +2,070,000 |
| Negative subsidy | ..... | -1,715,000 | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| Total, Loan subsidies | 60,230,000 | 102,480,000 | 91,858,000 | 97,271,000 | 94,564,000 | +34,334,000 |
| RETLP administrative expenses | 29,982,000 | 34,385,000 | 29,982,000 | 32,183,000 | 29,982,000 | ..... |
| Total, Rural Electrification and Telephone Loans Program Account | 90,212,000 | 136,865,000 | 121,838,000 | 129,454,000 | 124,546,000 | +34,334,000 |
| (Loan authorization) | (1,446,784,000) | (1,570,250,000) | (1,380,000,000) | (1,430,000,000) | (1,405,000,000) | (-41,784,000) |
| Rural Telecommunication Partnership Loan Program Account: | | | | | | |
| Loan authorization | ..... | (15,000,000) | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| Loan subsidy | ..... | 594,000 | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| Administrative expenses | ..... | 1,110,000 | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| Total | ..... | 1,704,000 | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |

## FY 1996 AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1976) — continued

| | FY 1995 Enacted | FY 1996 Estimate | House | Senate | Conference | Conference compared with enacted |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Rural Telephone Bank Program Account: | | | | | | |
| Direct loans (limitation on obligations) | (175,000,000) | | (175,000,000) | (175,000,000) | (175,000,000) | |
| Direct loan subsidy | 770,000 | | 770,000 | 5,023,000 | 5,023,000 | +4,253,000 |
| RTB salaries and expenses | 8,794,000 | | 3,541,000 | 6,167,000 | 3,541,000 | -5,253,000 |
| Distance Learning and Medical Link Grants | 7,500,000 | 15,000,000 | 7,500,000 | 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 | 435,000,000 | | 487,868,000 | +487,868,000 |
| 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 |
| RUS salaries and expenses | | 19,627,000 | 19,211,000 | 18,449,000 | 18,449,000 | +18,449,000 |
| Electric and telephone loans (by transfer) | (29,962,000) | (34,385,000) | (29,962,000) | (32,183,000) | (29,962,000) | |
| Rural telephone bank (by transfer) | (8,794,000) | | (3,541,000) | (6,167,000) | (3,541,000) | (-5,253,000) |
| Water and waste disposal loans (by transfer) | | (17,790,000) | | | | |
| Rural Telecommunication Partnership Loan Program Account (by transfer) | | (1,110,000) | | | | |
| Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account (by transfer) | | (318,000) | (318,000) | (318,000) | (318,000) | (+318,000) |
| Rural partnership (by transfer) | | | (12,623,000) | | (12,623,000) | (+12,623,000) |
| Subtotal | (38,776,000) | (73,230,000) | (65,676,000) | (57,117,000) | (84,913,000) | (+26,137,000) |
| Total, Rural Utilities Service | 736,773,000 | 958,379,000 | 600,800,000 | 166,593,000 | 659,667,000 | -77,106,000 |
| (By transfer) | (38,776,000) | (53,603,000) | (46,464,000) | (38,666,000) | (46,464,000) | (+7,688,000) |
| (Loan authorization) | (2,352,307,000) | (1,585,250,000) | (1,380,000,000) | (1,430,000,000) | (1,405,000,000) | (-947,307,000) |
| (Limitation on obligations) | (175,000,000) | | (175,000,000) | (175,000,000) | (175,000,000) | |
| Total, title III, Rural Economic and Community Development Programs | 2,318,619,000 | 2,721,974,000 | 1,993,376,000 | 2,208,580,000 | 2,107,906,000 | -210,713,000 |
| (By transfer) | (430,084,000) | (502,475,000) | (447,771,000) | (417,899,000) | (449,317,000) | (+19,233,000) |
| (Loan authorization) | (5,682,971,000) | (5,697,987,000) | (4,648,449,000) | (4,411,231,000) | (5,118,747,000) | (-564,224,000) |
| (Limitation on obligations) | (187,865,000) | (14,091,000) | (187,865,000) | (187,865,000) | (187,865,000) | |
| TITLE IV - DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS | | | | | | |
| Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services | 540,000 | 553,000 | 440,000 | 540,000 | 440,000 | -100,000 |
| Food and Consumer Service: | | | | | | |
| Child nutrition programs | 2,202,274,000 | 2,399,942,000 | 2,354,568,000 | 2,354,752,000 | 2,348,166,000 | +145,892,000 |
| Transfer from section 32 | 5,249,077,000 | 5,520,492,000 | 5,597,858,000 | 5,597,858,000 | 5,597,858,000 | +348,781,000 |
| Total, Child nutrition programs | 7,451,351,000 | 7,920,434,000 | 7,952,424,000 | 7,952,610,000 | 7,946,024,000 | +494,673,000 |
| Special milk program | 18,089,000 | | | | | -18,089,000 |
| Special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children (WIC) | 3,450,000,000 | 3,820,000,000 | 3,729,807,000 | 3,729,807,000 | 3,729,807,000 | +279,807,000 |
| (By transfer) | | | (4,000,000) | (4,000,000) | (4,000,000) | (+4,000,000) |
| Commodity supplemental food program | 84,500,000 | 86,000,000 | | 86,000,000 | | -84,500,000 |
| Food stamp program: | | | | | | |
| Expenses | 25,187,710,000 | 26,119,887,000 | 25,954,828,000 | 25,954,828,000 | 25,954,828,000 | +767,118,000 |
| Reserve | 2,500,000,000 | 2,500,000,000 | | 1,000,000,000 | 500,000,000 | -2,000,000,000 |
| Nutrition assistance for Puerto Rico | 1,130,528,000 | 1,143,000,000 | 1,143,000,000 | 1,143,000,000 | 1,143,000,000 | +12,472,000 |
| Cattle tick eradication | 12,472,000 | | | | | -12,472,000 |
| Total, Food stamp program | 28,830,710,000 | 29,762,887,000 | 27,097,828,000 | 28,097,828,000 | 27,597,828,000 | -1,232,882,000 |
| Food donations programs for selected groups: | | | | | | |
| Needy family program | 33,154,000 | 78,639,000 | 65,000,000 | 66,000,000 | 65,000,000 | +31,846,000 |
| Elderly feeding program | 150,000,000 | 151,250,000 | 150,000,000 | 151,250,000 | 150,000,000 | |
| Subtotal | 183,154,000 | 229,889,000 | 215,000,000 | 217,250,000 | 215,000,000 | +31,846,000 |
| 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 | 257,250,000 | 215,000,000 | -8,154,000 |
| 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 | 40,000,000 | 168,000,000 | +101,000,000 |
| Nutrition initiatives: | | | | | | |
| Nutrition support | | 45,526,000 | | | | |
| Nutrition promotion | | 4,218,000 | | | | |
| Food program administration | 108,465,000 | 141,360,000 | 108,323,000 | 107,215,000 | 107,769,000 | +1,304,000 |
| Total, Food and Consumer Service | 40,229,269,000 | 42,090,314,000 | 39,271,382,000 | 40,270,710,000 | 39,762,428,000 | -466,841,000 |
| Total, title IV, Domestic Food Programs | 40,229,809,000 | 42,090,867,000 | 39,271,822,000 | 40,271,250,000 | 39,762,868,000 | -466,941,000 |

## FY 1996 AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1976) — continued

| | FY 1995 Enacted | FY 1996 Estimate | House | Senate | Conference | Conference compared with enacted |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| TITLE V - FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS | | | | | | |
| Foreign Agricultural Service, direct appropriation | 108,880,000 | 120,201,000 | 114,547,000 | 115,802,000 | 115,802,000 | +6,922,000 |
| (Transfer from Commodity Credit Corporation) | (4,914,000) | (5,176,000) | (5,176,000) | (5,176,000) | (5,176,000) | (+262,000) |
| (Transfer from export loans) | (2,792,000) | (3,137,000) | (2,792,000) | (2,792,000) | (2,792,000) | ..... |
| (Transfer from P.L. 480) | (1,425,000) | (1,005,000) | (1,005,000) | (1,005,000) | (1,005,000) | (-420,000) |
| Total, Program level | (118,011,000) | (129,519,000) | (123,520,000) | (124,775,000) | (124,775,000) | (+6,764,000) |
| Scientific activities overseas (foreign currency program) (limitation on administrative expenses) | (1,062,000) | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | (-1,062,000) |
| Public Law 480 Program Account: | | | | | | |
| Title I - Credit sales: | | | | | | |
| Program level | (320,342,000) | (177,957,000) | (316,342,000) | (316,342,000) | (316,342,000) | (-4,000,000) |
| Direct loans | (291,342,000) | (161,540,000) | (291,342,000) | (291,342,000) | (291,342,000) | ..... |
| Ocean freight differential | 29,000,000 | 16,417,000 | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 25,000,000 | -4,000,000 |
| Title II - Commodities for disposition abroad: | | | | | | |
| Program level | (821,100,000) | (795,703,000) | (821,100,000) | (821,100,000) | (821,100,000) | ..... |
| Appropriation | 821,100,000 | 795,703,000 | 821,100,000 | 821,100,000 | 821,100,000 | ..... |
| Title III - Commodity grants: | | | | | | |
| Program level | (117,442,000) | (50,000,000) | (50,000,000) | (50,000,000) | (50,000,000) | (-67,442,000) |
| Appropriation | 117,442,000 | 50,000,000 | 50,000,000 | 50,000,000 | 50,000,000 | -67,442,000 |
| Loan subsidies | 236,162,000 | 131,833,000 | 236,162,000 | 236,162,000 | 236,162,000 | ..... |
| Debt restructuring | ..... | 1,500,000 | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| Salaries and expenses: | | | | | | |
| General Sales Manager | 1,425,000 | 1,005,000 | 1,005,000 | 1,005,000 | 1,005,000 | -420,000 |
| CFSA | 1,036,000 | 745,000 | 745,000 | 745,000 | 745,000 | -291,000 |
| Subtotal | 2,461,000 | 1,750,000 | 1,750,000 | 1,750,000 | 1,750,000 | -711,000 |
| Total, Public Law 480: | | | | | | |
| Program level | (1,258,884,000) | (1,023,660,000) | (1,187,442,000) | (1,187,442,000) | (1,187,442,000) | (-71,442,000) |
| Appropriation | 1,206,165,000 | 997,203,000 | 1,134,012,000 | 1,134,012,000 | 1,134,012,000 | -72,153,000 |
| CCC Export Loans Program Account: | | | | | | |
| Loan guarantees: | | | | | | |
| Short-term export credit | (5,000,000,000) | (5,200,000,000) | (5,200,000,000) | (5,200,000,000) | (5,200,000,000) | (+200,000,000) |
| Intermediate export credit | (500,000,000) | (500,000,000) | (500,000,000) | (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 | 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 | 2,792,000 | 2,792,000 | ..... |
| ASCS | 589,000 | 608,000 | 589,000 | 589,000 | 589,000 | ..... |
| Total, CCC Export Loans Program Account | 397,774,000 | 378,092,000 | 377,728,000 | 377,728,000 | 377,728,000 | -20,046,000 |
| Total, title V, Foreign assistance and related programs | 1,712,819,000 | 1,495,496,000 | 1,628,287,000 | 1,627,542,000 | 1,627,542,000 | -85,277,000 |
| (By transfer) | (9,131,000) | (9,318,000) | (8,973,000) | (8,973,000) | (8,973,000) | (-158,000) |
| 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 | 819,971,000 | 819,971,000 | ..... |
| Prescription drug user fee act | (79,423,000) | (84,723,000) | (84,723,000) | (84,723,000) | (84,723,000) | (+5,300,000) |
| Mammography clinics user fee | (6,500,000) | (13,000,000) | (13,000,000) | (13,000,000) | (13,000,000) | (+6,500,000) |
| New user fees | ..... | (36,740,000) | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| Total, Program level | (905,894,000) | (965,462,000) | (917,694,000) | (917,694,000) | (917,694,000) | (+11,800,000) |
| Buildings and facilities | 18,150,000 | 8,350,000 | 15,350,000 | 8,350,000 | 12,150,000 | -6,000,000 |
| Rental payments | 46,294,000 | 46,294,000 | 46,294,000 | 46,294,000 | 46,294,000 | ..... |
| Total, Food and Drug Administration | 884,415,000 | 883,643,000 | 881,615,000 | 874,615,000 | 878,415,000 | -6,000,000 |
| 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 | 15,453,000 | 15,453,000 | -41,573,000 |
| INDEPENDENT AGENCIES | | | | | | |
| Commodity Futures Trading Commission | 49,144,000 | 59,711,000 | 49,144,000 | 54,058,000 | 53,601,000 | +4,457,000 |
| Farm Credit Administration (limitation on administrative expenses) | (40,420,000) | (39,900,000) | ..... | ..... | ..... | (-40,420,000) |
| Total, title VI, Related Agencies and Food and Drug Administration | 990,585,000 | 958,807,000 | 946,212,000 | 944,126,000 | 947,469,000 | -43,116,000 |
| (Limitation on administrative expenses) | (40,420,000) | (39,900,000) | ..... | ..... | ..... | (-40,420,000) |

## FY 1996 AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1976) — continued

| | FY 1995 Enacted | FY 1996 Estimate | House | Senate | Conference | Conference compared with enacted |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grand total: | | | | | | |
| New budget (obligational) authority | 68,991,361,000 | 66,421,993,000 | 62,579,232,000 | 63,825,150,000 | 63,194,564,000 | -5,796,797,000 |
| (By transfer) | (641,087,000) | (727,309,000) | (670,894,000) | (646,369,000) | (672,070,000) | (+31,003,000) |
| (Loan authorization) | (14,567,726,000) | (14,601,834,000) | (13,368,889,000) | (13,293,677,000) | (13,979,497,000) | (-588,229,000) |
| (Limitation on administrative expenses) | (146,320,000) | (146,145,000) | (108,245,000) | (108,245,000) | (108,245,000) | (-40,075,000) |
| (Limitation on obligations) | (187,865,000) | (14,091,000) | (187,865,000) | (187,865,000) | (187,865,000) | ..... |
| RECAPITULATION | | | | | | |
| Title I - Agricultural programs | 21,093,658,000 | 16,151,090,000 | 15,894,067,000 | 16,076,325,000 | 16,032,325,000 | -5,061,333,000 |
| Title II - Conservation programs | 2,645,871,000 | 3,003,759,000 | 2,847,448,000 | 2,897,327,000 | 2,716,454,000 | +70,583,000 |
| Title III - Farmers Home and Rural development programs | 2,318,619,000 | 2,721,974,000 | 1,993,376,000 | 2,206,580,000 | 2,107,906,000 | -210,713,000 |
| Title IV - Domestic food programs | 40,229,809,000 | 42,090,867,000 | 39,271,822,000 | 40,271,250,000 | 39,762,868,000 | -466,941,000 |
| Title V - Foreign assistance and related programs | 1,712,819,000 | 1,495,496,000 | 1,626,267,000 | 1,627,542,000 | 1,627,542,000 | -85,277,000 |
| Title VI - Related agencies and Food and Drug Administration | 990,585,000 | 958,807,000 | 946,212,000 | 944,126,000 | 947,469,000 | -43,116,000 |
| Total, new budget (obligational) authority | 68,991,361,000 | 66,421,993,000 | 62,579,232,000 | 63,825,150,000 | 63,194,564,000 | -5,796,797,000 |

1/ Such sums as available from AQI user fee account for FY 1996.
2/ In addition to appropriation.
3/ On 5/2/95 the Administration amended its FY 1996 request (H.Doc. 104-63). This table reflects the program levels as submitted in the original budget.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend our chairman, the gentleman from New Mexico, and our ranking member, the gentleman from Illinois, for their outstanding leadership in shepherding this bill through conference. While I believe this bill provides adequate funding for agriculture programs and continues our support for American farmers which are the most productive in the world, I have serious concerns with two provisions in the conference report.

First, the conference agreement includes language allowing the Secretary of Agriculture to fund all costs for agricultural equine quarantine inspection services in connection with the 1996 summer games. Mr. Speaker, what we are talking about here is using American tax dollars to pay the fees foreign countries would owe a U.S. Government agency [USDA APHIS] for inspecting horses competing in the equestrian events at the Olympic Games. Let me repeat, this conference report includes language which forgives the fees foreign countries are required to pay for quarantine costs of horses competing in the equestrian competition at the Olympics and then forces U.S. taxpayers to pay the bill. Supporters of this provision in the conference argued that this was a goodwill gesture which will only cost approximately $300,000; $300,000 here, $300,000 there and soon you are talking about real money which can reduce the deficit.

We all know that the days of struggling amateur athletes competing in the Olympic Games are long gone. Individuals often receive government support to compete or have the benefit of corporate sponsorship or endorsement contracts. Why should our taxpayers pay this bill? The Olympic organizers or the corporate sponsors who will make millions on this event should bear this cost.

In addition, I object to the inclusion of language in the conference agreement which prohibits the USDA from enforcing regulations it recently issued, that would have prohibited processors from labeling poultry products chilled to below 26 degrees as fresh. On August 25 USDA issued regulations to take effect 1 year from now which would overturn longstanding USDA policy which allowed chickens that had been chilled to as low as 1 degree Fahrenheit to be labelled as fresh when they are put on sale. Consumers have a right to know whether the chicken they buy is truthfully labelled as fresh and has never been frozen. Everyone agrees that its a bad idea to re-freeze thawed chicken. Yet if the Senate language contained in the conference report prevails, consumers will not know if the chicken they are moving from the fridge to the freezer is being handled correctly.

Mr. Speaker, California passed a law which would have prohibited the sale of frozen chickens as fresh. This law was struck down in Federal court. USDA, after 15 months of study, issued rules which give consumers truth in labelling. Under the rule, only chicken 26 degrees and above is labelled as fresh; 0 to 26 degrees must be labeled as hard chilled or previously hard chilled; and chicken at 0 or below must be labelled as frozen or previously frozen. Industry has two concerns, a 2 degree temperature variance is needed in order to ship chickens in extreme climates and that consumers will not buy chickens labelled as hard chilled. I appreciate industry's concerns but common sense dictates that you do not scrap a rule arrived at after 15 months of review and scientific study. Playing politics with food safety is wrong.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the fiscal year 1996 Agriculture appropriations bill, H.R. 1976. In particular, I would like to thank the conferees for providing an additional $500,000 to the Agriculture Research Service to begin research on a virus that threatens California's citrus industry—Citrus Tristeza Virus [CTV].

California's citrus industry is a $1.5 billion industry. CTV puts at risk the only remaining disease free budwood stock as well as our $485 million export market. The ARS' work on CTV in California will compliment ongoing private sector research in the State. Ultimately, I hope it will give our farmers the tools to eradicate this threat. I believe funding for this research is an investment in the long-term health of California's economy.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, at this point I certainly am.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves to recommit the conference report on the bill, H.R. 1976 to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to disagree to the Senate amendment numbered 150.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 158, nays 264, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 707]

YEAS—158

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baker (CA)
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bilbray
Bonior
Borski
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Calvert
Cardin
Clay
Clayton
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cunningham
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Durbin
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Foley
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Green
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herger
Hinchey
Horn
Hunter
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McDermott
McHale
McKeon
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mink
Moorhead
Moran
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Orton
Packard
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Pombo
Poshard
Radanovich
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roberts
Rohrabacher
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Seastrand
Serrano
Skaggs
Slaughter
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Thomas
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Vento
Visclosky
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Williams
Woolsey
Wyden
Yates
Zimmer

NAYS—264

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brownback
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Livingston
Longley
Lucas
Manton
Manzullo
Martini
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKinney
McNulty
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Morella
Murtha

Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Oxley
Parker
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wynn
Young (AK)
Zeliff

NOT VOTING—10

Baldacci
Dornan
Fields (LA)
Kennelly
Moakley
Owens
Tejeda
Tucker
Volkmer
Young (FL)

☐ 1206

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Ms. DANNER, Mr. HILLIARD, Mrs. CHENOWETH, and Messrs. EVERETT, LEWIS of Georgia, and RAHALL changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PACKARD, Mrs. SEASTRAND, Mr. COX of California, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Messrs. HORN, CUNNINGHAM, MORAN, and LEWIS of California changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The question is on the conference report.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 288, nays 132, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 708]

YEAS—288

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Armey
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chambliss
Chapman
Christensen
Chrysler
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dooley
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Evans
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Graham
Green
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson-Lee
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Manton
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meek
Metcalf
Minge
Mink
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Sabo
Sawyer
Saxton
Schiff
Scott
Seastrand
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stenholm
Stockman
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Traficant
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wynn
Young (AK)

NAYS—132

Allard
Archer
Bachus
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bilbray
Blute
Borski
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Burton
Buyer
Chabot
Chenoweth
Clay
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Coyne
Crane
Crapo
Dellums
Dixon
Doggett
Doolittle
Ehlers
Engel
Ensign
Eshoo
Everett
Fattah
Flake
Foglietta
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Gibbons
Goodlatte
Goss
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hancock
Harman
Hefley
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Johnston
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy (MA)
Kleczka
Klug
Lantos
Largent
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lofgren
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
McDermott
McIntosh
Meehan
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Moorhead
Moran
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Payne (NJ)
Petri
Pombo
Ramstad
Rangel
Roberts
Rohrabacher
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schroeder
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Skaggs
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Stark
Stearns
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Taylor (MS)
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torricelli
Towns
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Waters
Waxman
Williams
Woolsey
Wyden
Yates
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—12

Baldacci
Condit
Dornan
Fields (LA)
Jacobs
Kennelly
Moakley
Owens
Tejeda
Tucker
Volkmer
Young (FL)

☐ 1224

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Baldacci for, with Mr. Dornan against.

Ms. ESHOO changed her vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PROVIDING FOR MARKING THE CELEBRATION OF THE FOUNDING OF THE CITY OF JERUSALEM

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Oversight be discharged from further consideration of the Senate Concurrent Resolution (S. Con. Res. 29) providing for marking the celebration of Jerusalem on the occasion of its 3,000th anniversary, and ask for its consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

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

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I will yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] for a statement, and then I have a few comments.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, the Speaker of the House and the leadership join me in urging all Members to support what is an occasion that I think will allow us to focus on our humanness in a way that we are rarely able to do it.

In the resolution talking about the celebration of Jerusalem in the Rotunda of its 3,000th anniversary, it says: ''Whereas Jerusalem, the City of Peace, has held a unique place and exerted a unique influence on the moral development of Western Civilization;'' I think Jerusalem plays an even more significant role than that, if that is possible.