ESTIMATED BUDGET EFFECTS OF TITLES I—VIII OF THE CONFERENCE AGREEMENT RELATING TO H.R. 2676, THE ''INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE RESTRUCTURING AND REFORM ACT OF 1998''—Continued

[Fiscal years 1998–2007, in millions of dollars]

Provision	Effective	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	1998–2002	2003–2007	1998–2007
Subtotal, Revenue Offsets		626	1,157	1,500	795	435	240	255	2,637	3,150	3,131	4,513	9,413	13,926
Title VIII. Limited Tax Benefits Under the Line Veto Act		*No Revenue Effect*												
Net Total (Reserved for Future Tax Reduction)		608	1,087	270	−535	−933	−1,218	−1,320	788	1,211	1,093	496	553	1,050
Revenue Effect From Emergency Legislation Per Section 252(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act:														
1. Abate interest on underpayments by taxpayers in Presidentially declared disaster areas.	dda 12/31/97	−8	−25	−25	−25	−25	−25	−25	−25	−25	−25	−108	−126	−234

[1] Loss of less than $1 million.
[2] Estimate provided by the Congressional Budget Office.
[3] Loss of less than $5 million.
[4] Loss of less than $25 million.
[5] Loss of less than $50 million.
[6] Generally effective for collection actions commencing after the date of enactment; collections at ACS sites effective for levies imposed after 12/31/00.
[7] Effective for requests to extend the statute of limitations made after 12/31/99 and to all extensions of the statute of limitations on collections that are open after 12/31/99.
[8] Loss of less than $500,000.
[9] Gain of less than $500,000.

Legend for ''Effective'' column: ai=advice issued; aoa=actions occurring after; aptiao/a=amounts properly taken into account on or after; caia=collection actions initiated after; cmo/a=communications made on or after; dda=disasters declared after; DOE=date of enactment; drma=deposits required to be made after; eca=examinations commencing after; iapma=installment agreement payments made after; laa=liability arising after; lia=levies imposed after; Lia=levies issued after; lma=levies made after; nia=notices issued after; nma=notices mailed after; paa=penalties assessed after; pca=proceedings commencing after; rdnrb=removal designation not required before; rfa=refunds filed after; rpa=refunds payable after; saa=software acquired after; scqa=succeeding calendar quarters beginning after; sia=summonses issued after; soa=seizures occurring after; Soa=sales occurring after; sotmpa=selections of tax matters partners after; ssa=summonses served after; taa=taxes assessed after; tyba=taxable years beginning after; tyea=taxable years ending after; tybbo/a=taxable years beginning before, on, or after; tyoo/a=taxable years open on or after; ulb=unpaid liability before; wa=withdrawals after; 1ya=1 year after; 6ma=6 months after; 18ma=18 months after; 60da=60 days after; 90da=90 days after; and 180da=180 days after.

Note.—Details may not add to totals due to rounding.
Source: Joint Committee on Taxation.

BILL ARCHER,
NANCY L. JOHNSON,
ROB PORTMAN,
CHARLES B. RANGEL,
WILLIAM J. COYNE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

BILL ROTH,
JOHN H. CHAFEE,
CHUCK GRASSLEY,
ORRIN HATCH,
FRANK H. MURKOWSKI,
DON NICKLES,
PHIL GRAMM,
DANIEL P. MOYNIHAN,
MAX BAUCUS,
BOB GRAHAM,
JOHN BREAUX,
BOB KERREY,

From the Committee on Governmental Affairs:

FRED THOMPSON,
SAM BROWNBACK,
THAD COCHRAN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 482 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4101.

□ 1428

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4101) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, with Mr. LaHood in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) had been postponed.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 482, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order: The amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN); the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER); and the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COBURN

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 223, noes 202, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 260]

AYES—223

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bereuter
Berry
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Forbes
Fossella
Fox
Gallegly
Gekas
Gibbons
Gillmor
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
John
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kildee
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manton
Manzullo
Mascara
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Metcalf
Mica
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Murtha
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Portman
Poshard
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Redmond
Regula
Riggs
Riley
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Traficant
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—202

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Bilbray
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonior
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Campbell
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Coyne
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Edwards
Ehrlich
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Foley
Ford
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gilman
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Klug
Kolbe
Lampson
Lantos
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moran (VA)
Morella
Nadler
Neal
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Ramstad
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sisisky
Skaggs
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Tanner
Tauscher
Thomas
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
White
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—8

Cannon
Dingell
Doyle
Gonzalez
Gordon
Hamilton
Markey
Slaughter

□ 1449

Mr. PORTMAN and Mr. BONILLA changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MILLER OF FLORIDA

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

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 167, noes 258, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 261]

AYES—167

Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Barr
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bass
Berman
Bilirakis
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bono
Borski
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Campbell
Capps
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Coburn
Collins
Cook
Cox
Coyne
Crane
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeLay
Deutsch
Dickey
Doggett
Duncan
Dunn
Ehrlich
Engel
English
Ensign
Fawell
Forbes
Fossella
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hansen
Hayworth
Hefley
Hilleary
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (CT)
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kim
Kind (WI)
Kingston
Klug
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
Largent
LaTourette
Lazio
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Myrick
Nadler
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pappas
Pascrell
Paul
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pitts
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Rogan
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Rush
Salmon
Sanford
Sawyer
Scarborough
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Skaggs
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Souder
Sununu
Tauscher
Tierney
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Wamp
Waxman
Weldon (PA)
White
Wolf
Yates
Young (FL)

NOES—258

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barton
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berry
Bilbray
Bishop
Bliley
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Carson
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Cramer
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Foley
Ford
Fowler
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Graham
Granger
Green
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilliard
Hinojosa
Holden
Hooley
Houghton
Hunter
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Kildee
Kilpatrick
King (NY)
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Latham
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Livingston
Lofgren
Lucas
Luther
Manton
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Murtha
Neal
Nethercutt
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickering
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Redmond
Reyes
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ryun
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Saxton
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Vento
Walsh
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (AK)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Sisisky

NOT VOTING—7

Cannon
Dingell
Doyle
Gonzalez
Hamilton
Markey
Slaughter

□ 1506

Mr. ISTOOK changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. ARCHER, MALONEY of Connecticut, and BARTLETT of Maryland changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a five-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 118, noes 307, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 262]

AYES—118

Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Barr
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Bilbray
Blagojevich
Boehlert
Borski
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Callahan
Campbell
Castle
Chabot
Coburn
Collins
Cox
Coyne
Crane
Davis (VA)
DeFazio
DeLay
Doggett
Duncan
Ehlers
Ehrlich
English
Ensign
Fattah
Fawell
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Gejdenson
Gillmor
Goss
Hastert
Hayworth
Hefley
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kolbe
Kucinich
Largent
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Manzullo
Mascara
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDade
McInnis
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Miller (FL)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Neumann
Ney
Olver
Pascrell
Paul
Petri
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Ramstad
Rivers
Rogan
Rohrabacher
Rothman
Royce
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Stark
Sununu
Taylor (MS)
Tierney
Vento
Visclosky
Wamp
Waxman
Weldon (PA)

NOES—307

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cramer
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Deal
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fazio
Filner
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Hooley
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Livingston
Lofgren
Lucas
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Murtha
Nethercutt
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Walsh
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Cannon
Dingell
Doyle
Gonzalez
Hamilton
Markey
Slaughter
Torres

□ 1515

Mr. BOEHLERT changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SANDERS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SANDERS:

Insert before the short title the following new section:

SEC. ____. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by adding an amount for programs included in Section 402 of PL 104–127 $10,000,000.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to offer this bipartisan amendment with the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO) to increase nutrition programs for senior citizens by $10 million.

Last year, the gentleman from New Jersey and I offered a similar amendment which passed on the floor of this House, but which did not survive the conference committee. This year, we are going to do our best to see that it does survive the conference.

Mr. Chairman, the truth of the matter is that as a wealthy Nation we do not treat our senior citizens with the kind of respect that we should. Half of the seniors in this country have incomes of under $15,000 a year. Four million live in poverty, and 16 million in near poverty.

Most shamefully in this country today, which recently has seen a proliferation of millionaires and billionaires, tens and tens of thousands of senior citizens are malnourished and do not get the kind of nutritious diet they require. Sixteen percent of the people who receive food from emergency food banks are elderly people 65 years of age or older.

Studies conducted at the University of Florida found that over 66 percent of beneficiaries of senior nutrition programs are at moderate to high risk of malnutrition.

Mr. Chairman, that is not what should be going on in the United States of America. We must do better. And the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO) and I are trying to do that.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment funds senior commodity programs which provide grants, either food or cash, to States so that local organizations can prepare meals delivered to elderly persons in congregate settings or delivered to their homes through such programs as the Meals on Wheels program.

Senior nutrition programs are a cost-effective, intelligent program which provide nutritious meals to some of the most vulnerable citizens in our country, senior citizens who are too weak and too frail to prepare their own meals.

This program also provides funding to congregate meal sites where seniors not only get nutrition, but where they are able to get a chance to get out of their homes, to mingle with other senior citizens and to improve their quality of life. In Vermont and throughout this country, these are wonderful programs which work very, very well.

Mr. Chairman, this is an enormously cost-effective program. For every $1 spent on senior nutrition programs, $3 were saved from Medicare and Medicaid. It is obviously that if we keep seniors healthy, they need to go to the doctor less, they need to go to the hospital less, they need less for prescription drugs.

Mr. Chairman, the problem that we are facing is that 41 percent of the Meals on Wheels programs have a waiting list. That is part of the problem that the gentleman from New Jersey and I are addressing. This is an excellent program, but there are long waiting lists all over this country.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment increases funding in this program from $141 million to $151 million. This simply brings us back to where we were in fiscal year 1996. This money is offset by a $10 million cut already brought about in the Bass-DeFazio amendment on animal damage control that was passed yesterday.

The bottom line is that the needs of senior citizens are great. We have hungry seniors. That should not be the case in this country. This is a cost-effective program, and I urge support for this program.

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

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) for his work on this issue last year and again this year.

I want to associate myself with the remarks that the gentleman from Vermont made about some of the aspects of this program that are so very important for my colleagues, for all of us to understand.

These are programs that make a difference. These are programs that are making a difference to people whose lives in many cases are very, very dark and shadowy. They are senior citizens who are shut-ins, who do not have the ability to get out on their own. In many cases this is the only social contact they have for a whole day. This is the only time they receive a hot meal and someone to check on them.

Mr. Chairman, I know that in my district I have taken the time to go out to see how some of these programs work firsthand, to actually be with volunteers who are delivering the meals. That is another aspect. In many cases there are volunteers who are giving of their own time to make a difference by participating in the program.

So when we combine all of these factors together, that it is cost-effective, that for every dollar we spend we are saving three, to combine this with the fact that for a senior citizen who may have a problem there is a volunteer who is going to be, on a daily basis, giving a physical check, how do we measure these benefits? They are far beyond the $10 million that we are asking for.

I am very appreciative that the gentleman from New Mexico (Chairman SKEEN) has agreed to consider this amendment, and I thank my colleague from Vermont.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to tell the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) that we admire his tenacity, sagacity, endurance, and what a wonderful age to be that lively. And we are willing to accept the gentleman's amendment and hope that he gets some rest this evening.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SKEEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FAZIO of California. I would just like to associate myself with the sagacity of the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) in accepting this amendment, and indicate that I would hope we could accommodate the needs of the seniors as the gentleman has outlined them as we proceed with this bill down the road.

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

Mr. SKEEN. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Mexico (Chairman SKEEN) very much for his acceptance of this amendment. It has been a long morning. I grant the gentleman that. But I think it is worth it, and I hope to work with him in conference so that we can stand up for senior citizens.

So many of them are really hurting, and I know that the gentleman agrees that this is an important program. I thank him very much.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I could not ask for better company or a better neighborhood to operate.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the amendment to HR 4101 offered today by my friend and colleague from New Jersey, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. SANDERS of Vermont. The amendment will provide an additional $10 million for Senior Nutrition Programs, which support state and local efforts, offset with a minor reduction in overhead and salaries at the Food and Drug Administration. This amendment will restore funding for this vital senior program to its FY 1996 level of $150 million.

As we make the tough choices needed to keep our budget balanced, we cannot forget the needs of our senior citizens, most of whom live on fixed incomes and have limited means.

For many of these senior-citizens, the meals provided by these programs represent their main meal for the day. In 1996, the Mercer County, New Jersey Office on Aging reported that 1,483 persons received almost 119,839 nutritious meals provided in part under the Older Americans Act. In Ocean County, Phil Rubenstein, Executive Director of the Ocean County Office of Senior Services, has stated that approximately 600 individuals a day will eat a meal and enjoy the company of others at a congregate nutrition site. The situation in Burlington County and Monmouth County are very similar.

Senior Nutrition Programs are cost effective. According to the Department of Health and Human Services, for every $1 spent, nearly $3 is saved in other health care programs like Medicare and Medicaid, Mr. Speaker, this amendment should be a ''no brainer,'' and I urge all of my colleagues to support the LoBiondo/Sanders amendment to HR 4101.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in this country, when we have a threat from a foreign government or foreign entity, we allocate or appropriate sufficient resources in the Defense Department to fight it. When we have a threat from disease, we allocate sufficient resources to the NIH, the National Institutes of Health, and through technology and science to fight it.

What I worry about, Mr. Chairman, in this bill is we have responsibility for the food safety of the American citizen, and I worry that we are not appropriating sufficient resources to protect the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I am not one as a conservative Democrat that wants to throw money at problems, so I do not come at this issue saying that we need to throw money at the food safety issue in America today. What I do say is we need to analyze the problem and allocate our resources accordingly.

First of all, with the allocation in this budget we are 82 percent less than the amount the administration requested. Eighty-two percent less than the administration requested.

Now, is that a concern, Mr. Chairman, at this time in America? I think we need to allocate more resources for three reasons.

One is we have a record number, a record number of imports of food into this country. A record number of food imports into America. Right now 9,000 Americans die and another 33 million become ill each year from food-borne pathogens. Nine thousand die, 33 million people will get sick in this country, the wealthiest country in the world.

Currently, less than two-tenths of 1 percent of all imported produce is being inspected for pathogen contamination. Let me repeat that to my colleagues. Less than two-tenths of 1 percent of all imported produce is being inspected for pathogen contamination. Now, I think that is a serious problem, Mr. Chairman. I think that is a serious concern to protect American citizens. That is the first reason we need to come up to the President's request.

The second is, it is going to cost a little money to start using science and technology instead of smelling and poking, the traditional method. We need to move from using the traditional method that we used before, that is antiquated and outdated, and move into the new century, the next century, and use the available technology that can protect the American citizen.

And lastly, Mr. Chairman, a compelling reason to allocate more resources, we have the largest outbreak of E. coli in the country's history today and last week, and last night. Four thousand Americans became sick in Illinois from E. coli. We have an outbreak on the East Coast in New England. We have an outbreak in Georgia where children are in the hospital on the critical list and potentially at risk of dying from E. coli.

□ 1530

Mr. Chairman, this is a very significant problem. We are not a developing country. We are a superpower. When we have threats in defense, we meet them. When we have threats from disease, we meet them. When we have threats in food safety, Mr. Chairman, we better meet them.

This bill does not meet them with the threat out there in the three areas that I pointed out. I would hope that our chairman, our distinguished chairman and ranking member would work

to address this very, very important issue for the safety of our children, for the food safety of our adults, for the 9,000 Americans that will die, for the 33 million Americans that will become sick, and for the lack of resources that we need to devote to science and technology at the current time.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly encourage this committee to revisit this issue and get more serious about allocating sufficient resources for the E. coli outbreak that we have, for the record imports that we have coming into this country, and for the need to protect our children.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to comment additionally on food safety. And I would like to point out what was done in terms of funding, what was done in the research authorization bill passed through the Committee on Agriculture and ultimately, law. Food safety was given a high priority. We designated in that legislation that food safety research should have a priority, both in the detection of food-borne pathogens and in reducing food-borne pathogens. In the effort to make sure that the food that America eats is healthy both the Research Authorization bill and this appropriation bill gives priority.

I would like to point out to my colleagues we included language in the authorization bill important in assuring coordination of the activities of the Department of Agriculture, the Centers for Disease Control and the Food and Drug Administration. We directed that those three agencies of government start working together now to coordinate their efforts in the event of a health risk from food-borne pathogens. A very important part of our food safety efforts must be preparedness. USDA has already designated food safety efforts as a priority. Food and Drug has already designated it as a priority, and the Centers for Disease Control has of course always had it as a priority. The coordination of efforts at the local, state and national level is important as is research and education.

I think most of us agree that this is a very important aspect of how we make sure that disease outbreaks from food-borne pathogens is minimized. As we become more and more dependent on additional food products coming in from the other countries, because of new regulations, and I might add amendments, that put our farmers at a competitive disadvantage, food safety will become an ever more important issue.

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

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the indulgence of the House to talk about an agricultural problem. Actually, the jurisdiction for the solution to this problem lies within the U.S. Customs Service. But I went to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Treasury Postal Service, and General Government this morning and asked him to enter into a colloquy with me in order that I could explain this very serious problem that ironically is facing the tree growers and the lumber manufacturers of Arizona also.

His staff informed me that he did not want to have a colloquy with me. So, Mr. Chairman, with the indulgence of the Chair, I want to talk just a few minutes.

We have the Canadians subsidizing their lumber industry and shipping lumber to the United States of America against the U.S.-Canada softwood lumber agreement, and selling it cheaper than our lumber people, our tree growers, can get it out of the mill in South Alabama, in Maine, all over this country.

Those of us on the Forestry 2000 Task Force, which represents members of this Congress who have lumber interests in our district, are coming to this body to talk about this very serious problem.

We have an agreement with Canada. Canada agreed they would not unfairly subsidize their sawmills in Canada and put our sawmills at a tremendous disadvantage. Canada is violating the agreement. The Customs Service is aware of the fact that they are breaking the agreement, yet they refuse to police it. Until sufficient time as we recognize that we cannot tolerate the Canadians or anybody else violating agreements, then we are going to continue to have this problem.

I am notifying those managing the Treasury/Postal bill that when that bill comes to the floor, many of us are going to vote against it. Until such time as Customs recognizes that they are going to enforce the law of the land and that they are going to enforce these treaties, they are going to have trouble getting their money out of the Congress of the United States.

To those members of the Forestry 2000 Task Force, I encourage them to be prepared to talk on the Treasury/Postal bill. For those of you from Arizona who have the same problems as they have in Alabama and in Texas, I encourage you to do a little bit of research and let us emphasize, even to the point of a possible amendment reducing the ability of the Customs Department's to be effective; since they are already ineffective, we will just reduce their appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the Chair's tolerance and patience on this. I know that the jurisdiction for the policing of this trade agreement does not fall within the realm of the Department of Agriculture, but it is an agricultural problem because it impacts every farmer who grows a tree in the United States of America.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not plan on taking the full 5 minutes but only a moment. I would like to associate myself in part with the comments of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

I do not know how many Members have ever had food poisoning. I bet almost every Member here has had food poisoning at one time, not only from products but even from local problems that we have. We had in California a whole mess of strawberries with hepatitis come across from Mexico. It not only hurt people's sickness but our own local strawberry growers were hurt because people were afraid to buy strawberries. So there does need to be more control. I had a child in my district die of E. coli and the parents told me, ''We prayed, we prayed for our child to die because they were in such agony.''

I mean, if you think about that and the dollars that we put into research, especially for E. coli, this is a problem that is not going to go away. They keep telling us that this goes away. This is fecal matter that sets on beef or meat products and is not cleaned off before it goes to the consumer. We have got to get a handle on this.

I laud what the committee has done as far as focusing on the issue of food safety. But it is an area in conference that we need to address.

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from California's comments. I just want to associate myself with his concern, especially for the children in this country that can potentially contract E. coli.

As the gentleman knows, children can get different strains. The strain in Illinois apparently is a less severe strain. The strain currently that has had the outbreak in Georgia is the much more severe strain that has a number of children in the hospital, that has the potential to shut down kidneys and the liver and potentially kill these children in Atlanta. And this is something that this committee and this Congress needs to do, not only for the children of the country, but for the safety of all Americans, where 9,000 people will die in this country because of this kind of threat and 33 million Americans will get sick. This is a particularly devastating, much more severe E. coli outbreak on children 5 and under.

I would strongly recommend that we take another look at the funding levels in conference with the Senate and that we do the duty that I know the chairman, our distinguished chairman from New Mexico and our ranking member from Ohio want to do, and that we do not wait for more children to get sick, and we try to come up to the President's level to protect the people in this country.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I would say the President's budget, if we enacted the President's budget we are going to have billions of dollars in new taxes and billions of dollars in new spending. There are areas which I think we can add and this is one of them.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like this afternoon to rise and associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who talked about food safety for a moment.

It happens that the strawberries that the gentleman mentioned that were brought in and eaten by children were eaten in my district in Trenton, Michigan, in southern Genesee County. In fact, my staff persons's daughter was one of the children that ate the strawberries. Fortunately, after monitoring her health, she did not get deathly sick, but this was a very, very serious issue for the families in my district.

I would applaud the subcommittee and the committee for putting together a budget that makes sense in a number of areas. I would only urge, as has been said, that we focus more strongly, as we move towards conference committee, on the issue of food safety. We have passed an agricultural research bill that we should all celebrate, that makes sense, that does put food safety at a top priority, that does create a crisis management team for USDA to move in when there is a crisis in a community and be able to respond working with local and State officials. But there is more to be done.

I have sponsored a safe food action plan, along with the chairman today who is presiding, to focus on food safety throughout the agricultural budget, particularly not only in research but in transferring that research into technology. If we develop faster E. coli testing, and in fact that is being done in my district in Michigan, we need to be able to transfer that to the private sector so we can get tools directly into the hands of farmers and producers.

I wanted to also indicate that we have one of the premier food safety research facilities at Michigan State University, the National Food Safety and Toxicology Center, where we just recently did a national conference with USDA to focus on the top research risk factors that we should be addressing through funding.

But without the necessary dollars to invest, we will not be able to follow through on all of the plans, the research bill, the efforts that have gone on in making food safety a priority. It happens if we make it a priority in terms of resources.

Again, I commend the committee, the subcommittee's work and ask that they continue to look for ways to add resources for a very, very critical issue for all of our families.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. BASS

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify the Bass amendment No. 2 previously agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BLUNT). The Clerk will report the request.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire asks unanimous consent that in subsection (a) of the Bass amendment to H.R. 4101, previously adopted, after the word ''Program'', insert the word ''operations.''

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is a technical correction that we have made to the amendment which the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and I offered yesterday afternoon, which passed by a significant vote.

I just want to mention that since that time, many Members of Congress may have received calls from their State agriculture departments or their State aviation departments or their State fish and wildlife departments saying that in some form or fashion the Bass-DeFazio amendment would affect the funding for such programs as human health and crops and natural resources, forest and range and agriculture and so forth. That may have been the case had the unanimous consent that was just accepted not been accepted.

Unfortunately, legislative counsel made a minor drafting mistake which turned out to have a major impact on the interpretation of the amendment and now that this has been corrected, I want to assure my colleagues, each and every one of them, who have any concerns about the impact of this amendment that it will only affect the livestock protection matter which we debated yesterday.

□ 1545

I am not going to spend my time repeating the debate that we had yesterday only to point out that this is a very narrow program that affects a very few number of cattle and sheep ranchers in the West to eliminate predators at a significant cost to the Federal Government. We have been through these arguments yesterday.

I want to urge my colleagues, should there be a revote after we go out of the Committee of the Whole to support the amendment, it is the exact same vote that we had yesterday. This is an important amendment that is supported by a number of different environmental groups and taxpayers groups, including the League of Conservation Voters, the Sierra Club, Friends of the Earth, Taxpayers for Common Sense, Natural Resources Defense Council, Defenders of Wildlife, U.S. Public Interest Research Group, the Humane Society, and Wilderness Society.

Now that this amendment is corrected. I urge all of my colleagues, should we have another vote on it, to cast the same vote that they cast yesterday.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am glad that my two colleagues had the opportunity to correct their amendment from yesterday that would have cut $21 million or 53 percent of this program. We are now going to be discussing and revoting in the full House, the $10 million cut, which is 25 percent of the budget, of Wildlife Services.

In spite of the assurances of the gentleman from New Hampshire, each of my colleagues now have a letter from Secretary Glickman who is responsible for administering this program all over the United States, stating that it makes no difference whether it is $10 million, a 25 percent cut, or $21 million, a 53 percent cut, it will have a very devastating effect on other than nonlethal predator control. It is much more than that.

This is another example when Members attempt to do some very logical and, from their perspective, needed corrections to an agricultural appropriation bill. If you do not fully have knowledge of what is actually happening out in your various States, you will have unintended consequences.

Wildlife Services is a cooperative program where local entities partner with USDA and APHIS to jointly pay for wildlife management. Cooperating groups at the local level expend over, in some cases, more than 50 percent of the cost of these programs.

Slashing funding for Wildlife Services by 25 percent will result in across-the-board elimination of many important programs that protect human health. Much of this funding is also spent on efforts to develop nonlethal methods for livestock control.

Wildlife Services is much more than predator control. USDA's Wildlife Services Program provides critical assistance to public health and safety programs in every State. That is the reason why we have been hearing from our local States.

People are concerned because this is a program in which they multiply these dollars for local concern. The program provides help at more than 340 airports to prevent flocks of birds from interfering with passenger aircraft flights. That is serious.

It controls the spread of rabies in the North, East, Midwest, and the South. We have a very successful program going in all of these regions using bait in order to control rabies; coyote bait. It is a successful program.

We cannot have this amendment pass and continue that program, because the people that administer it have other duties. When we start making a 25 percent cut in a budget that is already as lean as the agricultural budget is, we will have additional nonintended consequences.

This program controls damage to fruit crops, grain, and fish farms by migratory birds such as blackbirds, saving American farmers hundreds of millions of dollars. It conducts research on humane control of animal populations that spread diseases, such as deer and rats.

It works to protect endangered species such as the Louisiana black bear and the Aleutian Canada goose, and I can go on and on.

The important thing for my colleagues to understand when we do

revote this, this is not a program that can afford a 25 percent cut. The intention of the gentleman from new Hampshire and the gentleman from Oregon are really good. But it will have the unintended consequences.

I hope when we revote this in the full House that my colleagues will overwhelmingly vote no and look to another date in order to accomplish the goal which these two people are proposing with their amendment time.

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

Mr. Chairman, this was a bad amendment yesterday, and the new version is not much better. I appreciate what the two gentlemen are doing or trying to do, but I do not think they have a real grasp of exactly what the consequences are of what they are asking us to do.

I do have a letter from Secretary Glickman saying cutting Wildlife Services is wrong, whether the cut is yesterday's $21 million or today's $10 million. This is not about endangered species. This is about a severe cut to a program that provides essential public health and safety services to every State in the Union and Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.

Many of the Members who voted for yesterday's amendment wrote to me, asking for Wildlife Services Programs at the same or increased level. This is just not possible with these proposed cuts.

If you want rabies control, programs to protect commercial aircraft from flocks of birds at 360 airports throughout the country, protection of grain and fruit crops from migratory birds, research into disease-carrying animals such as rats and deer to continue, and many other important programs, you must vote no on this amendment.

At this point I would like to include tables that reflect the bill as reported by the Committee.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1999 (H.R. 4101)

	FY 1998 Enacted	FY 1999 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
TITLE I - AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS					
Production, Processing, and Marketing					
Office of the Secretary	3,379,000	2,941,000	2,941,000	-438,000	.....
Executive Operations:					
Chief Economist	5,048,000	5,823,000	5,973,000	+925,000	+150,000
Commission on 21st Century Production Agriculture	.....	350,000	.....	.....	-350,000
National Appeals Division	11,718,000	13,297,000	12,204,000	+486,000	-1,093,000
Office of Budget and Program Analysis	5,986,000	6,045,000	6,120,000	+134,000	+75,000
Office of the Chief Information Officer	4,773,000	7,222,000	5,551,000	+778,000	-1,671,000
Total, Executive Operations	27,525,000	32,737,000	29,848,000	+2,323,000	-2,889,000
Office of the Chief Financial Officer	4,283,000	4,562,000	4,283,000	.....	-279,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration	613,000	636,000	636,000	+23,000	.....
Agriculture buildings and facilities and rental payments	131,085,000	155,689,000	155,689,000	+24,604,000	.....
Payments to GSA	(98,600,000)	(108,057,000)	(108,057,000)	(+9,457,000)	.....
Building operations and maintenance	(24,785,000)	(24,127,000)	(24,127,000)	(-658,000)	.....
Repairs, renovations, and construction	(5,000,000)	(23,505,000)	(23,505,000)	(+18,505,000)	.....
Relocation expenses	(2,700,000)	.....	.....	(-2,700,000)	.....
Hazardous waste management	15,700,000	15,700,000	15,700,000	.....	.....
Departmental administration	29,231,000	32,168,000	32,168,000	+2,937,000	.....
Outreach for socially disadvantaged farmers	3,000,000	10,000,000	3,000,000	.....	-7,000,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations	3,668,000	3,814,000	3,668,000	.....	-146,000
Office of Communications	8,138,000	8,319,000	8,138,000	.....	-181,000
Office of the Inspector General	63,128,000	87,689,000	67,178,000	+4,050,000	-20,511,000
Office of the General Counsel	28,759,000	30,446,000	30,396,000	+1,637,000	-50,000
Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education and Economics	540,000	560,000	560,000	+20,000	.....
Economic Research Service	71,604,000	55,839,000	67,282,000	-4,322,000	+11,443,000
National Agricultural Statistics Service	118,048,000	107,190,000	105,082,000	-12,966,000	-2,108,000
Census of Agriculture	(36,327,000)	(23,741,000)	(23,141,000)	(-13,186,000)	(-600,000)
Agricultural Research Service	744,382,000	776,828,000	755,816,000	+11,434,000	-21,012,000
Buildings and facilities	80,630,000	35,900,000	61,380,000	-19,250,000	+25,480,000
Total, Agricultural Research Service	825,012,000	812,728,000	817,196,000	-7,816,000	+4,468,000
Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service:					
Research and education activities	431,410,000	412,589,000	431,125,000	-285,000	+18,536,000
Native American Institutions Endowment Fund	(4,600,000)	(4,600,000)	(4,600,000)	.....	.....
Extension activities	423,376,000	418,651,000	416,789,000	-6,587,000	-1,862,000
Total, Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service	854,786,000	831,240,000	847,914,000	-6,872,000	+16,674,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs	618,000	642,000	642,000	+24,000	.....
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service:					
Salaries and expenses	425,932,000	417,752,000	424,500,000	-1,432,000	+6,748,000
AQI user fees	(88,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(88,000,000)	.....	(-12,000,000)
Buildings and facilities	4,200,000	5,200,000	5,200,000	+1,000,000	.....
Total, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	430,132,000	422,952,000	429,700,000	-432,000	+6,748,000
Agricultural Marketing Service:					
Marketing Services	46,567,000	58,469,000	46,567,000	.....	-11,902,000
New user fees	(4,000,000)	(4,000,000)	(4,000,000)	.....	.....
(Limitation on administrative expenses, from fees collected)	(59,521,000)	(60,730,000)	(60,730,000)	(+1,209,000)	.....
Funds for strengthening markets, income, and supply (transfer from section 32)	10,690,000	10,998,000	10,998,000	+308,000	.....
Payments to states and possessions	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	.....	.....
Total, Agricultural Marketing Service	58,457,000	70,667,000	58,765,000	+308,000	-11,902,000
Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration	25,390,000	11,797,000	29,042,000	+3,652,000	+17,245,000
Inspection and Weighing Services (limitation on administrative expenses, from fees collected)	(43,092,000)	(42,557,000)	(42,557,000)	(-535,000)	.....
Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety	446,000	598,000	.....	-446,000	-598,000
Food Safety and Inspection Service	588,761,000	149,566,000	609,250,000	+20,489,000	+459,684,000
Lab accreditation fees 1/	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	.....	.....
Total, Production, Processing, and Marketing	3,292,303,000	2,848,480,000	3,319,078,000	+26,775,000	+470,598,000
Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services	572,000	597,000	597,000	+25,000	.....
Farm Service Agency:					
Salaries and expenses	699,579,000	723,478,000	724,499,000	+24,920,000	+1,021,000
(Transfer from export loans)	(589,000)	(672,000)	(589,000)	.....	(-83,000)
(Transfer from P.L. 480)	(815,000)	(845,000)	(815,000)	.....	(-30,000)
(Transfer from ACIF)	(209,861,000)	(227,673,000)	(209,861,000)	.....	(-17,812,000)
Total, salaries and expenses	(910,844,000)	(952,668,000)	(935,764,000)	(+24,920,000)	(-16,904,000)

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1999 (H.R. 4101)—Continued

	FY 1998 Enacted	FY 1999 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
State mediation grants	2,000,000	4,000,000	2,000,000	.....	-2,000,000
Dairy indemnity program	550,000	450,000	450,000	-100,000	.....
Total, Farm Service Agency	702,129,000	727,928,000	726,949,000	+24,820,000	-979,000
Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Farm ownership loans:					
Direct	(78,320,000)	(85,000,000)	(75,000,000)	(-3,320,000)	(-10,000,000)
Guaranteed	(425,000,000)	(425,031,000)	(425,031,000)	(+31,000)	.....
Subtotal	(503,320,000)	(510,031,000)	(500,031,000)	(-3,289,000)	(-10,000,000)
Farm operating loans:					
Direct	(565,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(-65,000,000)	.....
Guaranteed unsubsidized	(992,906,000)	(1,700,000,000)	(1,276,000,000)	(+283,094,000)	(-424,000,000)
Guaranteed subsidized	(235,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(-35,000,000)	.....
Subtotal	(1,792,906,000)	(2,400,000,000)	(1,976,000,000)	(+183,094,000)	(-424,000,000)
Indian tribe land acquisition loans	(1,000,000)	(1,003,000)	(1,000,000)	.....	(-3,000)
Emergency disaster loans	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	.....	.....
Boll weevil eradication loans	(53,467,000)	(30,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(+46,533,000)	(+70,000,000)
Credit sales of acquired property	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	.....	.....
Total, Loan authorizations	(2,400,693,000)	(2,991,034,000)	(2,627,031,000)	(+226,338,000)	(-364,003,000)
Loan subsidies:					
Farm ownership loans:					
Direct	8,329,000	12,725,000	11,228,000	+2,899,000	-1,497,000
Guaranteed	16,407,000	6,758,000	6,758,000	-9,649,000	.....
Subtotal	24,736,000	19,483,000	17,986,000	-6,750,000	-1,497,000
Farm operating loans:					
Direct	36,823,000	34,150,000	34,150,000	-2,673,000	.....
Guaranteed unsubsidized	11,617,000	19,720,000	11,000,000	-617,000	-8,720,000
Guaranteed subsidized	22,654,000	17,480,000	17,480,000	-5,174,000	.....
Subtotal	71,094,000	71,350,000	62,630,000	-8,464,000	-8,720,000
Indian tribe land acquisition	132,000	153,000	153,000	+21,000	.....
Emergency disaster loans	6,008,000	5,900,000	5,900,000	-108,000	.....
Boll weevil loans subsidy	472,000	432,000	1,440,000	+968,000	+1,008,000
Credit sales of acquired property	3,255,000	3,260,000	3,260,000	+5,000	.....
Total, Loan subsidies	105,697,000	100,578,000	91,369,000	-14,328,000	-9,209,000
ACIF expenses:					
Salaries and expense (transfer to FSA)	209,861,000	227,673,000	209,861,000	.....	-17,812,000
Administrative expenses	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	.....	.....
Total, ACIF expenses	219,861,000	237,673,000	219,861,000	.....	-17,812,000
Total, Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund	325,558,000	338,251,000	311,230,000	-14,328,000	-27,021,000
(Loan authorization)	(2,400,693,000)	(2,991,034,000)	(2,627,031,000)	(+226,338,000)	(-364,003,000)
Total, Farm Service Agency	1,027,687,000	1,066,179,000	1,038,179,000	+10,492,000	-28,000,000
Risk Management Agency:					
Administrative and operating expenses	64,000,000	66,000,000	64,000,000	.....	-2,000,000
Sales commission of agents	188,571,000	.....	.....	-188,571,000	.....
Total, Risk Management Agency	252,571,000	66,000,000	64,000,000	-188,571,000	-2,000,000
Total, Farm Assistance Programs	1,280,830,000	1,132,776,000	1,102,776,000	-178,054,000	-30,000,000
Corporations					
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation:					
Federal crop insurance corporation fund	1,584,135,000	1,504,036,000	1,504,036,000	-80,099,000	.....
Commodity Credit Corporation Fund:					
Reimbursement for net realized losses	783,507,000	8,439,000,000	8,439,000,000	+7,655,493,000	.....
Operations and maintenance for hazardous waste management (limitation on administrative expenses)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	.....	.....
Total, Corporations	2,367,642,000	9,943,036,000	9,943,036,000	+7,575,394,000	.....
Total, title I, Agricultural Programs	6,940,775,000	13,924,292,000	14,364,890,000	+7,424,115,000	+440,598,000
(By transfer)	(211,265,000)	(229,190,000)	(211,265,000)	.....	(-17,925,000)
(Loan authorization)	(2,400,693,000)	(2,991,034,000)	(2,627,031,000)	(+226,338,000)	(-364,003,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(107,613,000)	(108,287,000)	(108,287,000)	(+674,000)	.....

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1999 (H.R. 4101)—Continued

	FY 1998 Enacted	FY 1999 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
TITLE II - CONSERVATION PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment	693,000	719,000	719,000	+26,000	.....
Natural Resources Conservation Service:					
Conservation operations	632,853,000	742,231,000	641,243,000	+8,390,000	-100,988,000
Watershed surveys and planning 2/	11,190,000	.....	9,545,000	-1,645,000	+9,545,000
Watershed and flood prevention operations 3/	101,036,000	49,000,000	97,850,000	-3,186,000	+48,850,000
Resource conservation and development	34,377,000	34,377,000	35,000,000	+623,000	+623,000
Forestry incentives program	6,325,000	.....	.....	-6,325,000	.....
Total, Natural Resources Conservation Service	785,781,000	825,608,000	783,638,000	-2,143,000	-41,970,000
Total, title II, Conservation Programs	786,474,000	826,327,000	784,357,000	-2,117,000	-41,970,000
TITLE III - RURAL ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development	588,000	611,000	611,000	+23,000	.....
Rural community advancement program	652,197,000	715,172,000	745,172,000	+92,975,000	+30,000,000
Delta region economic development program	.....	26,000,000	.....	.....	-26,000,000
Rural Housing Service:					
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Single family (sec. 502)	(1,000,000,000)	(1,000,000,000)	(930,600,000)	(-69,400,000)	(-69,400,000)
Unsubsidized guaranteed	(3,000,000,000)	(3,000,000,000)	(3,000,000,000)	.....	.....
Housing repair (sec. 504)	(30,000,000)	(25,001,000)	(25,001,000)	(-4,999,000)	.....
Farm labor (sec. 514)	(15,000,000)	(32,108,000)	(20,000,000)	(+5,000,000)	(-12,108,000)
Rental housing (sec. 515)	(128,640,000)	(100,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(-28,640,000)	.....
Multifamily housing guarantees (sec. 538)	(19,700,000)	(150,000,000)	(125,000,000)	(+105,300,000)	(-25,000,000)
Site loans (sec. 524)	(600,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(+4,400,000)	.....
Credit sales of acquired property	(25,000,000)	(30,007,000)	(25,000,000)	.....	(-5,007,000)
Self-help housing land development fund	(587,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(+4,413,000)	.....
Total, Loan authorizations	(4,219,527,000)	(4,347,116,000)	(4,235,601,000)	(+16,074,000)	(-111,515,000)
Loan subsidies:					
Single family (sec. 502)	128,100,000	118,200,000	110,000,000	-18,100,000	-8,200,000
Unsubsidized guaranteed	6,900,000	2,700,000	2,700,000	-4,200,000	.....
Housing repair (sec. 504)	10,300,000	8,808,000	8,808,000	-1,492,000	.....
Multifamily housing guarantees (sec. 538)	1,200,000	3,480,000	2,900,000	+1,700,000	-580,000
Farm labor (sec. 514)	7,388,000	16,706,000	10,406,000	+3,018,000	-6,300,000
Rental housing (sec. 515)	68,745,000	48,250,000	48,250,000	-20,495,000	.....
Site loans (sec. 524)	.....	17,000	17,000	+17,000	.....
Credit sales of acquired property	3,492,000	4,672,000	3,492,000	.....	-1,180,000
Self-help housing land development fund	17,000	282,000	282,000	+265,000	.....
Total, Loan subsidies	226,142,000	203,115,000	186,855,000	-39,287,000	-16,260,000
RHIF administrative expenses (transfer to RHS)	354,785,000	367,857,000	354,785,000	.....	-13,072,000
Rental assistance program:					
(Sec. 521)	535,497,000	577,497,000	577,497,000	+42,000,000	.....
(Sec. 502(c)(5)(D))	5,900,000	5,900,000	5,900,000	.....	.....
Total, Rental assistance program	541,397,000	583,397,000	583,397,000	+42,000,000	.....
Total, Rural Housing Insurance Fund	1,122,324,000	1,154,369,000	1,125,037,000	+2,713,000	-29,332,000
(Loan authorization)	(4,219,527,000)	(4,347,116,000)	(4,235,601,000)	(+16,074,000)	(-111,515,000)
Mutual and self-help housing grants	26,000,000	26,000,000	26,000,000	.....	.....
Rural community fire protection grants	2,000,000	.....	.....	-2,000,000	.....
Rural housing assistance grants	45,720,000	46,900,000	41,000,000	-4,720,000	-5,900,000
Subtotal, grants and payments	73,720,000	72,900,000	67,000,000	-6,720,000	-5,900,000
RHS expenses:					
Salaries and expenses	57,958,000	60,978,000	57,958,000	.....	-3,020,000
(Transfer from RHIF)	(354,785,000)	(367,857,000)	(354,785,000)	.....	(-13,072,000)
Total, RHS expenses	(412,743,000)	(428,835,000)	(412,743,000)	.....	(-16,092,000)
Total, Rural Housing Service	1,254,002,000	1,288,247,000	1,249,995,000	-4,007,000	-38,252,000
(Loan authorization)	(4,219,527,000)	(4,347,116,000)	(4,235,601,000)	(+16,074,000)	(-111,515,000)
Rural Business-Cooperative Service:					
Rural Development Loan Fund Program Account:					
(Loan authorization)	(35,000,000)	(35,000,000)	(35,000,000)	.....	.....
Loan subsidy	16,888,000	17,622,000	17,622,000	+734,000	.....
Administrative expenses (transfer to RBCS)	3,482,000	3,547,000	3,499,000	+17,000	-48,000
Total, Rural Development Loan Fund	20,370,000	21,169,000	21,121,000	+751,000	-48,000

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1999 (H.R. 4101)—Continued

	FY 1998 Enacted	FY 1999 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
Rural Economic Development Loans Program Account:					
(Loan authorization)	(25,000,000)	(15,000,000)	(15,000,000)	(-10,000,000)	.....
Direct subsidy	5,978,000	3,783,000	3,783,000	-2,195,000	.....
Alternative Agricultural Research and Commercialization Revolving Fund	7,000,000	10,000,000	.....	-7,000,000	-10,000,000
Rural cooperative development grants	3,000,000	5,700,000	3,300,000	+300,000	-2,400,000
RBCS expenses:					
Salaries and expenses	25,680,000	26,396,000	25,680,000	.....	-716,000
(Transfer from RDLFP)	(3,482,000)	(3,547,000)	(3,499,000)	(+17,000)	(-48,000)
Total, RBCS expenses	(29,162,000)	(29,943,000)	(29,179,000)	(+17,000)	(-764,000)
Total, Rural Business-Cooperative Service	62,028,000	67,048,000	53,884,000	-8,144,000	-13,164,000
(By transfer)	(3,482,000)	(3,547,000)	(3,499,000)	(+17,000)	(-48,000)
(Loan authorization)	(60,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(-10,000,000)	.....
Rural Utilities Service:					
Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Direct loans:					
Electric 5%	(125,000,000)	(55,000,000)	(71,500,000)	(-53,500,000)	(+16,500,000)
Telecommunications 5%	(75,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(75,000,000)	.....	(+25,000,000)
Subtotal	(200,000,000)	(105,000,000)	(146,500,000)	(-53,500,000)	(+41,500,000)
Treasury rates: Telecommunications	(300,000,000)	(300,000,000)	(300,000,000)	.....	.....
Muni-rate: Electric	(500,000,000)	(250,000,000)	(295,000,000)	(-205,000,000)	(+45,000,000)
FFB loans:					
Electric, regular	(300,000,000)	(300,000,000)	(700,000,000)	(+400,000,000)	(+400,000,000)
Telecommunications	(120,000,000)	(120,000,000)	(120,000,000)	.....	.....
Subtotal	(420,000,000)	(420,000,000)	(820,000,000)	(+400,000,000)	(+400,000,000)
Total, Loan authorizations	(1,420,000,000)	(1,075,000,000)	(1,561,500,000)	(+141,500,000)	(+486,500,000)
Loan subsidies:					
Direct loans:					
Electric 5%	9,325,000	7,172,000	9,325,000	.....	+2,153,000
Telecommunications 5%	2,940,000	4,895,000	7,342,000	+4,402,000	+2,447,000
Subtotal	12,265,000	12,067,000	16,667,000	+4,402,000	+4,600,000
Treasury rates: Telecommunications	60,000	810,000	810,000	+750,000	.....
Muni-rate: Electric	21,100,000	21,900,000	25,842,000	+4,742,000	+3,942,000
FFB loans: Electric, regular	2,760,000	.....	.....	-2,760,000	.....
Total, Loan subsidies	36,185,000	34,777,000	43,319,000	+7,134,000	+8,542,000
RETLP administrative expenses (transfer to RUS)	29,982,000	32,000,000	29,982,000	.....	-2,018,000
Total, Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account	66,167,000	66,777,000	73,301,000	+7,134,000	+6,524,000
(Loan authorization)	(1,420,000,000)	(1,075,000,000)	(1,561,500,000)	(+141,500,000)	(+486,500,000)
Rural Telephone Bank Program Account:					
(Loan authorization)	(175,000,000)	(175,000,000)	(175,000,000)	.....	.....
Direct loan subsidy	3,710,000	4,638,000	4,638,000	+928,000	.....
RTP administrative expenses (transfer to RUS)	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	.....	.....
Total	6,710,000	7,638,000	7,638,000	+928,000	.....
Distance learning and telemedicine program:					
(Loan authorization)	(150,000,000)	(150,000,000)	(150,000,000)	.....	.....
Direct loan subsidy	30,000	180,000	180,000	+150,000	.....
Grants	12,500,000	15,000,000	10,000,000	-2,500,000	-5,000,000
Total	12,530,000	15,180,000	10,180,000	-2,350,000	-5,000,000
RUS expenses:					
Salaries and expenses	33,000,000	33,445,000	33,000,000	.....	-445,000
(Transfer from RETLP)	(29,982,000)	(32,000,000)	(29,982,000)	.....	(-2,018,000)
(Transfer from RTP)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	.....	.....
Total, RUS expenses	(65,982,000)	(68,445,000)	(65,982,000)	.....	(-2,463,000)
Total, Rural Utilities Service	118,407,000	123,040,000	124,119,000	+5,712,000	+1,079,000
(By transfer)	(32,982,000)	(35,000,000)	(32,982,000)	.....	(-2,018,000)
(Loan authorization)	(1,745,000,000)	(1,400,000,000)	(1,886,500,000)	(+141,500,000)	(+486,500,000)

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1999 (H.R. 4101)—Continued

	FY 1998 Enacted	FY 1999 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
Total, title III, Rural Economic and Community Development Programs	2,087,222,000	2,220,118,000	2,173,781,000	+86,559,000	-46,337,000
(By transfer)	(391,249,000)	(406,404,000)	(391,266,000)	(+17,000)	(-15,138,000)
(Loan authorization)	(6,024,527,000)	(5,797,116,000)	(6,172,101,000)	(+147,574,000)	(+374,985,000)
TITLE IV - DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services	554,000	573,000	.....	-554,000	-573,000
Food and Consumer Service:					
Child nutrition programs	2,612,675,000	3,887,703,000	4,166,747,000	+1,554,072,000	+279,044,000
Discretionary spending	3,750,000	10,000,000	3,750,000	.....	-6,250,000
Transfer from section 32	5,151,391,000	5,332,194,000	5,048,150,000	-103,241,000	-284,044,000
Total, Child nutrition programs	7,767,816,000	9,229,897,000	9,218,647,000	+1,450,831,000	-11,250,000
Special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children (WIC)	3,924,000,000	4,081,000,000	3,924,000,000	.....	-157,000,000
Reserve	.....	(20,000,000)	.....	.....	(-20,000,000)
Food stamp program:					
Expenses	23,736,479,000	22,365,806,000	21,165,806,000	-2,570,673,000	-1,200,000,000
Reserve	100,000,000	1,000,000,000	100,000,000	.....	-900,000,000
Nutrition assistance for Puerto Rico	1,204,000,000	1,236,000,000	1,236,000,000	+32,000,000	.....
The emergency food assistance program	100,000,000	100,000,000	90,000,000	-10,000,000	-10,000,000
Total, Food stamp program	25,140,479,000	24,701,806,000	22,591,806,000	-2,548,673,000	-2,110,000,000
Commodity assistance program	141,000,000	317,081,000	131,000,000	-10,000,000	-186,081,000
Food donations programs for selected groups:					
Needy family program	1,165,000	.....	1,081,000	-84,000	+1,081,000
Elderly feeding program	140,000,000	.....	140,000,000	.....	+140,000,000
Total, Food donations programs 4/	141,165,000	.....	141,081,000	-84,000	+141,081,000
Food program administration	107,505,000	111,848,000	108,311,000	+806,000	-3,537,000
Total, Food and Consumer Service	37,221,965,000	38,441,632,000	36,114,845,000	-1,107,120,000	-2,326,787,000
Total, title IV, Domestic Food Programs	37,222,519,000	38,442,205,000	36,114,845,000	-1,107,674,000	-2,327,360,000
TITLE V - FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS					
Foreign Agricultural Service and General Sales Manager:					
Direct appropriation	131,295,000	141,087,000	131,295,000	.....	-9,792,000
(Transfer from export loans)	(3,231,000)	(3,413,000)	(3,231,000)	.....	(-182,000)
(Transfer from P.L. 480)	(1,035,000)	(1,093,000)	(1,035,000)	.....	(-58,000)
Total, Program level	(135,561,000)	(145,593,000)	(135,561,000)	.....	(-10,032,000)
Public Law 480 Program and Grant Accounts:					
Title I - Credit sales:					
Program level	(244,508,000)	(111,558,000)	(197,514,000)	(-46,994,000)	(+85,956,000)
Direct loans	(226,900,000)	(102,163,000)	(182,624,000)	(-44,276,000)	(+80,461,000)
Ocean freight differential	17,608,000	9,395,000	14,890,000	-2,718,000	+5,495,000
Title II - Commodities for disposition abroad:					
Program level	(837,000,000)	(837,000,000)	(837,000,000)	.....	.....
Appropriation	837,000,000	837,000,000	837,000,000	.....	.....
Title III - Commodity grants:					
Program level	(30,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(-5,000,000)	(-5,000,000)
Appropriation	30,000,000	30,000,000	25,000,000	-5,000,000	-5,000,000
Loan subsidies	176,596,000	88,667,000	158,499,000	-18,097,000	+69,832,000
Salaries and expenses:					
General Sales Manager (transfer to FAS)	1,035,000	1,093,000	1,035,000	.....	-58,000
Farm Service Agency (transfer to FSA)	815,000	845,000	815,000	.....	-30,000
Subtotal	1,850,000	1,938,000	1,850,000	.....	-88,000
Total, Public Law 480:					
Program level	(1,111,508,000)	(978,558,000)	(1,059,514,000)	(-51,994,000)	(+80,956,000)
Appropriation	1,063,054,000	967,000,000	1,037,239,000	-25,815,000	+70,239,000
CCC Export Loans Program Account:					
Export credit: Loan subsidy	407,630,000	253,000,000	252,500,000	-155,130,000	-500,000
(Loan authorization)	(5,500,000,000)	(4,615,000,000)	(4,615,000,000)	(-885,000,000)	.....
Emerging markets export credit	(200,000,000)	.....	.....	(-200,000,000)	.....
Salaries and expenses (Export Loans):					
General Sales Manager (transfer to FAS)	3,231,000	3,413,000	3,231,000	.....	-182,000
Farm Service Agency (transfer to FSA)	589,000	672,000	589,000	.....	-83,000
Total, CCC Export Loans Program Account	411,450,000	257,085,000	256,320,000	-155,130,000	-765,000
Total, title V, Foreign Assistance and Related Programs	1,605,799,000	1,365,172,000	1,424,854,000	-180,945,000	+59,682,000
(By transfer)	(4,266,000)	(4,506,000)	(4,266,000)	.....	(-240,000)

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1999 (H.R. 4101)—Continued

	FY 1998 Enacted	FY 1999 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
TITLE VI - RELATED AGENCIES AND FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION					
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES					
Food and Drug Administration					
Salaries and expenses, direct appropriation	857,501,000	878,884,000	871,499,000	+13,998,000	-7,385,000
Prescription drug user fee act	(117,122,000)	(126,845,000)	(126,845,000)	(+9,723,000)	.....
Mammography clinics user fee	(13,966,000)	(14,385,000)	(14,385,000)	(+419,000)	.....
Subtotal, program level	(988,589,000)	(1,020,114,000)	(1,012,729,000)	(+24,140,000)	(-7,385,000)
Buildings and facilities	21,350,000	8,350,000	11,350,000	-10,000,000	+3,000,000
Rental payments (FDA)	46,294,000	82,866,000	82,866,000	+36,572,000	.....
By transfer from PDUFA	.....	(5,428,000)	(5,428,000)	(+5,428,000)	.....
Subtotal, program level	(46,294,000)	(88,294,000)	(88,294,000)	(+42,000,000)	.....
Total, Food and Drug Administration	925,145,000	970,100,000	965,715,000	+40,570,000	-4,385,000
DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY					
Financial Management Service: Payments to the Farm Credit System Financial Assistance Corporation	7,728,000	2,565,000	2,565,000	-5,163,000	.....
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Commodity Futures Trading Commission	58,101,000	63,360,000	62,140,000	+4,039,000	-1,220,000
Farm Credit Administration (limitation on administrative expenses)	(34,423,000)	(35,800,000)	(35,800,000)	(+1,377,000)	.....
Total, title VI, Related Agencies and Food and Drug Administration	990,974,000	1,036,025,000	1,030,420,000	+39,446,000	-5,605,000
TITLE VII - EMERGENCY APPROPRIATIONS					
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE					
Farm Service Agency					
Emergency conservation program	34,000,000	.....	.....	-34,000,000	.....
Tree assistance program	14,000,000	.....	.....	-14,000,000	.....
Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account:					
Emergency insured loans:					
Loan subsidy	21,000,000	.....	.....	-21,000,000	.....
(Loan authorization)	87,400,000	.....	.....	-87,400,000	.....
Total, Farm Service Agency	69,000,000	.....	.....	-69,000,000	.....
Commodity Credit Corporation					
Livestock disaster assistance fund	4,000,000	.....	.....	-4,000,000	.....
Dairy production indemnity assistance program	6,800,000	.....	.....	-6,800,000	.....
Total, Commodity Credit Corporation	10,800,000	.....	.....	-10,800,000	.....
Natural Resources Conservation Service					
Watershed and flood prevention operations	80,000,000	.....	.....	-80,000,000	.....
Total, title VII, Emergency appropriations	159,800,000	.....	.....	-159,800,000	.....
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority	49,793,563,000	57,814,139,000	55,893,147,000	+6,099,584,000	-1,920,992,000
Appropriations	(49,633,763,000)	(57,814,139,000)	(55,893,147,000)	(+6,259,384,000)	(-1,920,992,000)
Emergency appropriations	(159,800,000)	.....	.....	(-159,800,000)	.....
(By transfer)	(606,780,000)	(640,100,000)	(606,797,000)	(+17,000)	(-33,303,000)
(Loan authorization)	(14,012,620,000)	(13,403,150,000)	(13,414,132,000)	(-598,488,000)	(+10,982,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(142,036,000)	(144,087,000)	(144,087,000)	(+2,051,000)	.....
RECAPITULATION					
Title I - Agricultural programs	6,940,775,000	13,924,292,000	14,364,890,000	+7,424,115,000	+440,598,000
Title II - Conservation programs	786,474,000	826,327,000	784,357,000	-2,117,000	-41,970,000
Title III - Rural economic and community development programs	2,087,222,000	2,220,118,000	2,173,781,000	+86,559,000	-46,337,000
Title IV - Domestic food programs	37,222,519,000	38,442,205,000	36,114,845,000	-1,107,674,000	-2,327,360,000
Title V - Foreign assistance and related programs	1,605,799,000	1,365,172,000	1,424,854,000	-180,945,000	+59,682,000
Title VI - Related agencies and Food and Drug Administration	990,974,000	1,036,025,000	1,030,420,000	+39,446,000	-5,605,000
Title VII - Emergency appropriations	159,800,000	.....	.....	-159,800,000	.....
Total, new budget (obligational) authority	49,793,563,000	57,814,139,000	55,893,147,000	+6,099,584,000	-1,920,992,000

1/ In addition to appropriation.
2/ Budget proposes to fund this account under Conservation Operations.
3/ Budget proposes to fund technical assistance for WFPO under Conservation Operations.
4/ Budget proposes to include funding for these programs under the Commodity Assistance Program in FY 1998.

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

Mr. Chairman, today I rise to support the Bass-DeFazio amendment to H.R. 4101, a bipartisan amendment to eliminate wasteful spending and to protect wildlife and the environment.

This amendment makes a surgical cut from the operations of the Wildlife Services, known to many of us for years as the Animal Damage Control Program. Mr. Chairman, this is a program that the public holds in poor regard, because it reflects a callous attitude toward wildlife and the environment and amounts to corporate welfare in the West.

For decades, Wildlife Services and Animal Damage Control have taken a jaundiced view toward wildlife problems, relying on quick-fix lethal control strategies rather than lasting solutions. They have measured their success in terms of the number of animals killed rather than the amount of livestock damage mitigated.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, the Los Angeles Times reported on September 9, 1997 ''Each cycle of control only seems to beget more coyotes. They have been shot at, trapped, snared, clubbed, strangled by the millions. The Federal Government alone dispatched 82,261 coyotes last year, more than 638,000 since 1980. Yet, in the 100 years since livestock owners began the coyote war in the West, the resourceful predator has far surpassed the wolf, the grizzly, and the cougar, tripling its numbers and its range.''

We are not winning the war against the coyote. We are wasting dollars in a futile exercise, a lethal control treadmill that leads us nowhere.

Indeed, ranchers need to protect their livestock, their investment. During the last two decades, there have been a variety of practical and effective nonlethal husbandry techniques developed and put into practical use: the use of guard animals, such as dogs, donkeys or llamas; the use of electronic sound and light devices; predator exclusion fencing; shed lambing; and night penning.

By deploying these techniques, ranchers can minimize the need for lethal responses to predators. An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

What we are advocating in supporting the Bass-DeFazio amendment is practical and workable. In fact, there is an excellent working model in the State of Kansas which has virtually no Animal Damage Control money or staff.

Instead the State Extension Service has worked with ranchers and other resource users and taught them how to deter coyote problems and how to selectively eliminate problem animals.

Kansas has spent less than $75,000 of Federal dollars in 27 years, while all other States in the West spent 8 to 50 times more. Take the case of Oklahoma which spent $1.3 million a year and maintained 28 damage control staff. In spite of the increase in spending labor, the reported wildlife problems are 20 times greater than in Kansas.

Mr. Chairman, there is a better way. The DeFazio-Bass amendment leads us in the right direction by reducing the full of dollars invested in failed and fruitless lethal predator control strategies.

I urge my colleagues to join with taxpayer defense groups and environmental and humane groups in supporting this sensible amendment to bring sanity to this program.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there is no Member of this House that I have more respect for than my colleague, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO). I congratulate his efforts along with the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS) to try to bring some additional attention in this particular program to some of the difficulties with lethal control methods that are used across this country on certain species.

However, I rise to oppose this particular amendment, as did I yesterday, because I really think that it may have consequences that the authors might not yet have anticipated.

First of all, there is a severe problem in this country with damage created by wildlife. It is not just in rural areas. We have lots of Members here, including myself, who represent major metropolitan airports where bird control is a very serious matter in order to try to preserve human life when people go into flight. In fact, a third of this particular appropriation is spent by that type of control around the country at these various facilities.

In fact, the Federal Aviation Administration admits that about $1 billion of all of the wildlife damage across this country relates to birds in flight close to airports. They do not really follow the human sonar in their flight paths. So this is not just about coyotes in the western part of the country.

Yesterday, after our debate here, Secretary Glickman at the Department of Agriculture did communicate with us, and I just want to read a portion of his letter into the record. It is important here, where he says: ''A reduction of $10 million or more would constitute a serious cut, perhaps up to one-third of the program's budget, and lead to draconian reductions of personnel in this account across the country.''

Since the program is largely cooperative and requires State and local matches, he is very concerned that what is going to happen is that the local shares will drop out. He says, ''Faced with a cut of this size, we may have no option but to eliminate work to protect endangered and threatened species, which is another function of the office, to prevent bird strikes at airports,'' which I have talked about ''and control animals that can transmit diseases to humans, such as rabies, plague, and lyme disease.''

I continue to be amazed in my own district, the largest share of which is an urban district, to watch householders want to try to bring deer to wander into their country and feed them with their backyard feeders, with lyme disease spreading. Last year, we had sightings in eastern Ohio of rabies from raccoon.

So this is not something that is just out in the middle of Oklahoma or even New Mexico. But States like Ohio, which has more urban areas than any other in the country, are severely impacted.

Truly, State and local governments cannot deal with this problem alone. A lot of the research and so forth is Federal research that benefits every single State. A lot of the tracking that is done is Federal tracking of these animals.

Secretary Glickman advises us, we believe the President's budget proposal to gradually increase cost sharing is a more reasoned reform than the amendment being offered and is consistent with the bill's report language.

Normally, I support my colleague, the gentleman from Oregon. But I think in this situation, where the Secretary of Agriculture does view this amendment as having difficulties and where we really feel that it is taking such a major share of funding that is necessary for animal control, wildlife control in different parts of the country, it really does not make sense, and it goes too far.

I do think that his emphasis on trying to get nonlethal means, where possible, of animal damage control is a very helpful suggestion and one I know that the department is working hard on and, in fact, needs this research money that is a part of this account to pursue.

I will tell you, when I see coyotes by the pack by our local metropolitan airport, which is located inside the city of Toledo, and we have coyotes running around the source systems of Los Angeles, we have a situation where this type of wild animal is breeding with dogs, and you do not produce a friendly animal as a result.

In some cases, you cannot have a nonlethal solution. So where we try to minimize the damage to animals and we try to be as humane as possible, sometimes it is just not possible in some of these situations.

With all due respect to my colleagues, the gentleman from Oregon and the gentleman from New Hampshire, I would say that the amendment goes too far, and I would urge Members to reject this amendment and follow the recommendations of our own Secretary of Agriculture.

□ 1600

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment. I should say at the outset, I am a westerner and I am a farmer. In fact, we find that one of the greatest damages to our crops are mice, and the coyotes in the neighborhood keep that mice population down,

so I think we need to be a little sophisticated when we think about coyotes.

In 1980, I ran a statewide ballot measure to ban leg-hold traps in Oregon. We did not win because the opposition said things about human health that were not true, and in fact we won a case against them, because in fact we found that a lot of the arguments they made, which are being made today, are not really true.

Let me tell my colleagues what is true about this program. It is cruel, it is wasteful, and it is a subsidy to corporate farmers. Those three things are true. It is cruel, because we are talking about lethal control. I do not know how many of my colleagues have seen a leg-hold trap. It is a steel trap. The animal put its foot into the trap, the trap snaps on the animal's foot, with tremendous pressure, and we have seen many, many examples of animals caught in these traps who have chewed their own legs off to get away from this agonizing situation.

The other uses are these poison lethal collars. Oh, they are very efficient. The only problem is that things like cougars chew on these when they see a dead sheep that has this collar on it. Lots of domestic dogs are killed by biting on these collars that are on these critters. Coyotes are not the only ones who like sheep, dead ones specially laid out for them. So they are lethal and they are wasteful.

They are wasteful in two ways: First of all they are wasteful because millions, literally millions of nontarget species die in these traps, die because of these lethal collars. Cougars. Our beautiful, beautiful bald eagle. There are many, many bald eagles which land, they see the trap, they see the food that is there in that trap, they get into it, it snaps on their foot and the wildlife is destroyed. So that is very wasteful. But it is a wasteful in a second way. It is incredibly wasteful of money. More money is spent in this program killing the predators than the value of the livestock that supposedly is being protected. It just does not make sense.

It is a corporate giveaway. Big farmers love this program. They can say that these dead sheep that died for some other reason, died because of predators, bring predator control in, you get the money from the program, it is great. But it is dreadful. It is a dreadful program. That is why the League of Conservation Voters, all the animal rights organizations, all of the large environmental organizations have said that this is a vote that they will count. It is not just them. It is not just the environmental organizations. It is the taxpayer organizations, also. They will score this vote. Because this vote is to end a program in the West that is cruel, is wasteful and is merely a subsidy. I ask my colleagues, if you voted yesterday for this amendment, vote again, and ignore all this thing you have heard that it is going to stop us getting slugs out of our garden. I do not know a slug that gets in a leg-hold trap, not one. There is a lot of nonsense about this issue. But the issue is, it is cruel, it is wasteful of our dollars and the nontarget species, and it should be ended.

I ask Members to vote with DEFAZIO and BASS on this very important amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think we are reaching the end of this debate, and I appreciate the fact that the committee members allowed us to correct the drafting error by Legislative Counsel. That means we are going to have a straight up-or-down vote, the same vote that we took yesterday, the same issues, nothing has changed.

Let us get a few facts straight. I serve on the Subcommittee on Aviation. I am certainly very concerned about bird strikes. We are not touching the money that goes to bird strikes. You can say, yes, since it is an appropriations bill, we cannot target the cut at one particular program, but we can certainly indicate where we want it to come.

Ten million of the $28 million in this program is spent for livestock protection in 17 western States, including my own State who gets nearly half a million dollars from the Federal Government. So I am not just cutting in somebody else's backyard. I think this is a bad program, it is a waste of taxpayers' money. I do believe it constitutes a subsidy. It encourages the Federal Government, sends Federal employees on to private property to undertake lethal predator control, generally pretty indiscriminate lethal predator control efforts on private lands to theoretically protect those sheep or cattle from predation. Actually the losses due to lung disease, to birthing problems, to digestive problems are about 97 percent of the losses in the West. Three percent, according to our own animal damage control people, now called Wildlife Services, come from predation. So we are spending all this money for a few people on private lands to protect predation that is not really happening.

I am puzzled by Secretary Glickman. Kansas has the most progressive program in the country. They pretty much stopped this program 10 years ago and they have an incredibly successful program with higher concentrations of coyotes than their neighboring States with very, very, very little loss because they have moved away from the indiscriminate lethal controls and gone to more effective methods, without the Federal subsidy.

So why should the other 33 States and Members from the other 33 States pay for a subsidy to these western States, to these private interests in these States? I am puzzled by that. It is not public health and safety.

If you go through the budget, if you took out $10 million out of the budget, you are right, Secretary Glickman if he wanted could say, ''Well, I'm going to teach them a lesson, I'm going to cut the money out of the airports and I'm going to put the money into the ineffective subsidized program on private lands.'' I do not believe they will do that. If we cut this $10 million, we will bring this wasteful program to an end.

The other programs are all categorized. We have here the program for property, for human health, for crop, for natural resources, for forest and range protection, and even for aquaculture protection. Those all within the administration's budget get separate little line items. Now we are going after one program and one program only, and the total amount of money that goes into that program, $10 million, $10 million spent to protect private property for private purposes with very little contribution. In my State, zero is contributed by the beneficiaries. It is paid for by State taxpayers and Federal taxpayers. That situation occurs in other States. In some States indeed there is a share paid by some of the ranchers. They can certainly continue those activities on their own or in cooperation with their State if their State legislatures want to put up general fund money for these activities. But the Federal Government has no business being involved in this.

Then to the issue of how many coyotes are running around the gentlewoman from Ohio's district or Los Angeles, that is true. This program has been going full bore for 60 years, and because they have not looked at the science and effective control methods, by going after and breaking up the alpha, killing the alphas and breaking up the packs, there are more coyotes now than there were 60 years ago before we spent hundreds of millions of dollars on these programs and hit a whole bunch of nontarget species. What we are doing is not working, it is time to admit it is not working. If the committee in its wisdom wanted to work through conference or something else and put this money totally into research or into more effective nonlethal methods, model the State program in Kansas, other things they could do, I would be supportive of that. But the point is this money is being wasted, it is ineffective, it does constitute a subsidy, and our colleagues should know that this will be the vote that will be scored, not the vote yesterday, this vote, the vote to reverse the vote.

I would hope that Members would not within a 24-hour period, given the fact that nothing has changed, reverse their vote and reverse their position.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am quoting from the USDA report and part of a letter that the Secretary sent up regarding this issue. I want to quote from a response by them:

''The animal damage control specialists perform a variety of activities to protect agricultural resources, but also help protect public health and safety, natural resources

and property. A budget reduction of $10 million would lead to a major reduction in ADC field personnel throughout the country and significantly affect the program's infrastructure.''

Mr. Chairman, this is a misguided effort by those who do not like agriculture, and obviously we have seen the results of that. People here all day long and all day yesterday, who are the enemies of agriculture, are attacking this program from every point and every source.

By the way, there will be a scoring here. I have a new scoring program. Everybody scores, so I am going to start scoring for agriculture. Now, all you are out that I have heard. There are some that may be in, but we will see how they act and how they vote. So we are going to score.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues have missed the point. They have attempted to attack agriculture, and they have really attacked the effort to manage wildlife in America. Because we have trained experts that we have in the services, in the wildlife services, and in the case of Oregon and in the case of your States wildlife specialists who have dedicated their lives to the balance of wildlife and the balance of nature. If this should pass, sure it will impact those people who raise domestic animals. But I want to re-emphasize to some Members who do not know about the predation in the West and around the country of deer and of antelope and of elk and of our wildlife. If we allow the imbalance to continue, we continue to ruin that side of our wildlife population. I do not suppose we want to do that. I doubt it. But I do not think we do. But that is exactly what we are doing if we vote for this amendment.

Now, one other thing. Let us assume that the gentleman from Oregon does not know what he is talking about and let us assume that I do not know what I am talking about, and we will let the gentleman from New Hampshire go on his own, so I will make a deal with you. If you will agree that we do not know what we are talking about, why do we not turn it over to the specialists, to the wildlife specialists in this country and in Oregon to manage our wildlife and to manage this situation. If you want to take my deal, you will vote against the amendment.

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma. We have discussed the nature of coyotes. The gentleman having been involved in the livestock business a substantial part of his life, could he describe a moment to my colleagues the nature of coyotes and how they interact in certain times of the year and how they travel in packs and how they go after breeding stock and some of the other things that go along with this?

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. As the gentleman understands, there were those who I have dealt with in Oregon who believe that coyotes will never kill anything alive. I would submit to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) who runs sheep, we have been trying to get rid of them for some time in cattle country, and coyotes are helping, but it is awful what can happen with a pack of coyotes at certain times of the year, and in the spring of the year when calves are small and when sheep are producing to see the relentless enjoyment of just killing when packs of coyotes run together. That is the answer.

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma. That literally a cow or a sheep is defenseless from a pack when they are on the move together, a factor that we need to bear in mind.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BLUNT). The Clerk will read the final lines of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the ''Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999''.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in favor of this bill, which appropriates funds for important Federal agriculture and social programs.

Our nation was founded by farmers, and they are still a vital part of our economy, and our identity as Americans. For the better part of the history of this nation, farmers were our pioneers, our philosophers, our engineers, and our statesmen. I hope that we do not turn our back on them as we move forward into the Age of Information.

This bill appropriates funds that will be used by farmers and other agriculture-oriented businesses across America. The bill increases last years appropriations by $6.4 billion, which amounts to a 13% increase. This amount is the minimum increase needed in order to assure that these federal programs are meaningful and worthwhile to the people that they are supposed to assist.

Many farmers need federal support to generate income and maintain their livelihood. Typically, federal assistance comes in the form of low-interest federal loans, which are not unlike those that we provide college and university students. Like education, these loans are an investment in something that will bring great rewards in the near future. Like university students, farmers need these loans in order to avoid highly cumbersome private loans which would negatively effect the way that they do their business. We must maintain these programs, so that American Farmers can feed themselves, and their families.

As a Member of the Congressional Black Caucus, I am also happy to report that this bill contains a provision which assists black farmers in their quest for fairness in the system. It does so by waiving certain statutes of limitation which have effectively barred many claims of racial discrimination that have remained unaddressed and unresolved by the proper authorities. I give my wholehearted thanks to the Rules Committee Members who allowed this provision to be made part of H.R. 4101.

As Founder and Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, and as a member of the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues, I also support this bill because it contains funding for many programs which are relied upon by children and families everywhere. The most important of these programs is Food Stamps. This bill appropriates $22.6 billion for that program, which has become an important part of the lives of many low-income, single-parent, and minority families. By supporting this budget, we assure that thousands of innocent children will not know the meaning of hunger.

Two other programs important to our families and our future which are funded under this set of appropriations, are the Federal School Breakfast and Lunch programs. Private and public studies have shown the link between nutrition and effective learning, therefore, we must continue these programs in order to ensure that our investment in education will be realized by this Nation's children.

I appreciate the bipartisan effort which went into the drafting of this bill. United States agriculture feeds our Nation, and it is time to do our part to make sure that none of our citizens go hungry. I encourage you all to vote for this bill.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Market Access Program (MAP) and oppose any attempt to further debilitate the program's capacity to aid in the exportation of U.S. agricultural commodities. The Market Access Program boosts agriculture and international trade, and promotes small business and American-made products. Put simply, MAP helps develop foreign markets for U.S. exports. The MAP provides cost-share funds to nearly 800 U.S. businesses, cooperatives, and non-profit trade associations to promote their products overseas. The funding is limited to U.S. entities.

America's farmers are still adjusting to ''Freedom to Farm,'' and it would be unwise and unfair to take away other underlying support programs like the MAP. I have said the same thing about research funding and funding for adequate revenue and crop insurance. Congress promised America's farmers certain fundamental support mechanisms as we moved to ''Freedom to Farm.'' Although producers no longer can rely on the government to come through and pick up the tab when commodity prices are lower than target prices, they need to be able to depend on certain supplemental programs run by the Department of Agriculture that keep producers' heads above an already narrow margin.

American agriculture is continually threatened by subsidized foreign competition. The European Union and other foreign competitors maintain a 10 to 1 advantage over the U.S. in terms of export subsidies, and with that advantage they can expand their share of the world market at the expense of U.S. farmers and ranchers.

In my state of North Dakota, the USDA-Bureau of Census tells us the MAP contributes indirectly to the promotion of approximately $1.7 billion in exports, and 29,300 jobs. Specifically, farmer cooperative-members of the Minn-Dak sugarbeet growers, and North American Bison Cooperative benefit directly from MAP funding. These direct benefits, for instance, produce indirect benefits throughout many facets of the economy.

Rural income depends on—and is at the mercy of—many variables. Weather and domestic supply are examples. But the ability to export overseas and compete with foreign markets is another integral piece to maintaining rural income. The MAP offers one small

opportunity for American farmers to compete in the international market—during a time when agriculture is our nation's most export-dependent industry and exports account for one-third of U.S. production. The elimination of MAP would represent unilateral disarmament in the face of continued subsidized foreign competition.

Oppose reductions to the MAP. Don't take away this important tool which provides access for U.S. farmers to assistance which knocks down foreign barriers and reduces the costs of competing in the world market.

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in favor of this appropriations measure, which is of such enormous importance to the 19th District of Illinois. I commend Chairman SKEEN and Congresswoman KAPTUR for their efforts in crafting a bill which will help farmers and rural communities across the country.

In addition, I am very pleased to note that H.R. 4101 includes $34 million in funding for implementation of the FDA's tobacco regulations, designed to combat teenage smoking. It is critical that this body demonstrate its support of the FDA's efforts to protect underage consumers from the dangers of tobacco, and I thank the members of the subcommittee for recognizing the importance of this issue.

Mr. Chairman, we must not relax our efforts where America's children are concerned. The time has come to take a stand against the devastating effect of tobacco on our nation's youth, and this bill will help us to do that. I urge my colleagues to support this measure and to continue to fight for the health and safety of our children.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. If there are no further amendments, under the rule the Committee now rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PEASE) having assumed the chair, Mr. BLUNT, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4101) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 482, he reported the bill, as amended pursuant to that rule back to the House with further sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the so-called Bass amendment.

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

The amendments were agreed to.

□ 1615

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: Insert before the short title the following new section.

SEC. (A) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—Not more than $18,800,000 of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the Wildlife Services Program operation under the heading ''ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE''.

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION IN FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided by this Act for salaries and expenses under the heading ''ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE'' is hereby reduced by $10,000,000.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, if no other record vote or debate intervenes before the question of passage, then the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on the question on passage.

There was no objection.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 192, noes 232, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 263]

AYES—192

Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Baldacci
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Becerra
Berman
Bilirakis
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Brady (PA)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Campbell
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Duncan
Ehlers
Engel
English
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Filner
Forbes
Ford
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gilman
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Horn
Houghton
Inglis
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Jones
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
Lantos
LaTourette
Lazio
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Moakley
Moran (VA)
Morella
Nadler
Neal
Neumann
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Petri
Porter
Poshard
Price (NC)
Ramstad
Rangel
Rivers
Roemer
Rogan
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Shays
Sherman
Skaggs
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Adam
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Sununu
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Wamp
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOES—232

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berry
Bilbray
Bishop
Bliley
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clayton
Clement
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Deal
DeLay
Dickey
Dooley
Doolittle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehrlich
Emerson
Ensign
Etheridge
Everett
Ewing
Fazio
Foley
Fossella
Fowler
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gillmor
Goode
Goodlatte
Graham
Granger
Green
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Istook
Jenkins
John
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Largent
Latham
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
Lucas
Manzullo
Martinez
Mascara
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Meek (FL)
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Murtha
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rodriguez
Rogers
Ryun
Salmon
Sanchez
Sandlin
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Traficant
Turner
Visclosky
Walsh
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)

White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Cannon
Dingell
Doyle
Gonzalez
Hamilton
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Markey
McDade
Slaughter

☐ 1638

Messrs. HOEKSTRA, EHRLICH and SNYDER and Ms. MEEK of Florida changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. BRADY of Pennsylvania, GILMAN, LAZIO of New York, DICKS and TORRES changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPALANTION

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 263, the Bass/DeFazio Amendment to Protect Wildlife, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

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

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

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

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

This will be a 5 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were— yeas 373, nays 48, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 264]

YEAS—373

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chambliss
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dixon
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Pastor
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Rogan
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryun
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—48

Andrews
Barr
Barrett (WI)
Berry
Campbell
Chabot
Chenoweth
Collins
Crane
Doggett
Dooley
Ensign
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Hall (TX)
Hefley
Johnson (WI)
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Kucinich
Lofgren
Lowey
McDermott
Meehan
Menendez
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Oberstar
Obey
Paul
Petri
Portman
Ramstad
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Royce
Sabo
Salmon
Sanford
Scarborough
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Stark
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Taylor (MS)
Tierney

NOT VOTING—12

Cannon
Dingell
Doyle
Emerson
Ford
Gonzalez
Hamilton
Markey
McDade
Miller (CA)
Northup
Slaughter

☐ 1647

Mr. BARR of Georgia changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. BERMAN and Ms. LEE changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, due to the death of a family member, I was unavoidably absent on the afternoon of Wednesday, June 24, 1998, and as a result, missed rollcall votes 260 through 264.

Had I been present, I would have voted yes on rollcall 260, yes on rollcall 261, yes on rollcall 262, yes on rollcall 263, and yes on rollcall 264.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 264, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2646) ''An Act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow tax-free expenditures from education individual retirement accounts for elementary and secondary school expenses, to increase the maximum annual amount of contributions to such accounts, and for other purposes.''.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4103, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 484 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 484

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4103) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 2(l)(6) of rule XI, clause 7 of rule XXI, or section 306 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and