

agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 15-minute vote, notwithstanding the Chair's prior announcement.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 346, noes 60, answered "present" 1, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 477]

AYES—346

Abercrombie	Danner	Holden
Ackerman	Davis (FL)	Hooley
Allen	Davis (IL)	Horn
Andrews	Davis (VA)	Hostettler
Armey	Deal	Houghton
Bachus	DeGette	Hoyer
Baesler	Delahunt	Hunter
Baker	DeLauro	Hutchinson
Baldacci	Deutsch	Hyde
Barcia	Diaz-Balart	Inglis
Barr	Dicks	Istook
Barrett (NE)	Dingell	Jackson (IL)
Barrett (WI)	Dixon	Jackson-Lee
Bartlett	Doggett	(TX)
Barton	Dooley	Jefferson
Bass	Doolittle	Jenkins
Bateman	Doyle	John
Bentsen	Dreier	Johnson (CT)
Bereuter	Duncan	Johnson, E. B.
Berman	Dunn	Johnson, Sam
Berry	Edwards	Jones
Bilbray	Ehlers	Kanjorski
Bilirakis	Ehrlich	Kaptur
Bishop	Emerson	Kasich
Blagojevich	Engel	Kelly
Bliley	Ensign	Kennedy (MA)
Blumenauer	Eshoo	Kennedy (RI)
Blunt	Etheridge	Kildee
Boehlert	Evans	Kilpatrick
Boehner	Everett	Kim
Bonilla	Ewing	Kind (WI)
Bono	Farr	Kingston
Boswell	Fattah	Klecza
Boucher	Fawell	Klug
Boyd	Foley	Knollenberg
Brady (PA)	Forbes	Kolbe
Brady (TX)	Ford	LaHood
Brown (FL)	Fossella	Lampson
Brown (OH)	Frank (MA)	Lantos
Bunning	Franks (NJ)	Largent
Burr	Frelinghuysen	Latham
Burton	Frost	LaTourette
Buyer	Furse	Lazio
Calvert	Galleghy	Leach
Camp	Ganske	Levin
Campbell	Gejdenson	Lewis (CA)
Canady	Gekas	Lewis (KY)
Cannon	Gilchrest	Linder
Capps	Gillmor	Lofgren
Cardin	Gilman	Lowe
Castle	Gonzalez	Lucas
Chabot	Goode	Luther
Chambliss	Goodlatte	Maloney (NY)
Christensen	Goodling	Manton
Clayton	Gordon	Manzullo
Clement	Graham	Markey
Coble	Granger	Mascara
Coburn	Greenwood	Matsui
Collins	Gutknecht	McCarthy (MO)
Combest	Hall (OH)	McCarthy (NY)
Condit	Hall (TX)	McCollum
Conyers	Hamilton	McCrery
Cook	Hansen	McDade
Cooksey	Hastert	McGovern
Cox	Hastings (WA)	McHale
Coyne	Hayworth	McHugh
Cramer	Herger	McInnis
Crapo	Hill	McIntosh
Cubin	Hinojosa	McIntyre
Cummings	Hobson	McKeon
Cunningham	Hoekstra	McKinney

Meehan	Rahall	Smith (TX)
Meek (FL)	Redmond	Smith, Adam
Meeks (NY)	Regula	Smith, Linda
Metcalf	Reyes	Snyder
Mica	Riggs	Solomon
Millender-McDonald	Riley	Souder
Miller (FL)	Rivers	Spence
Minge	Rodriguez	Spratt
Mink	Roemer	Stabenow
Moakley	Rogers	Stark
Mollohan	Rohrabacher	Stearns
Morella	Ros-Lehtinen	Stokes
Murtha	Rothman	Stump
Myrick	Roukema	Sununu
Nadler	Roybal-Allard	Talent
Neal	Royce	Tanner
Nethercutt	Rush	Taylor (NC)
Neumann	Ryun	Thomas
Ney	Salmon	Thornberry
Northup	Sanchez	Thune
Norwood	Sanders	Thurman
Nussle	Sandlin	Tiahrt
Ortiz	Sanford	Tierney
Owens	Sawyer	Torres
Oxley	Saxton	Trafigant
Packard	Scarborough	Turner
Pappas	Schaefer, Dan	Upton
Pascarell	Schumer	Walsh
Pastor	Scott	Wamp
Serrano	Sensenbrenner	Watkins
Sessions	Serrano	Watt (NC)
Shadegg	Sessions	Watts (OK)
Shaw	Shadegg	Weldon (FL)
Shays	Shaw	Weldon (PA)
Sherman	Shays	Wexler
Shimkus	Sherman	Weygand
Shuster	Shimkus	White
Sisisky	Shuster	Whitfield
Skaggs	Sisisky	Wilson
Skeen	Skaggs	Wise
Skelton	Skeen	Wolf
Smith (MI)	Skelton	Woolsey
Smith (NJ)	Smith (MI)	Yates
Smith (OR)	Smith (NJ)	Young (AK)
	Smith (OR)	Young (FL)

NOES—60

Aderholt	Hilliard	Pickett
Becerra	Hinchey	Ramstad
Bonior	Hulshof	Rangel
Borski	Johnson (WI)	Rogan
Brown (CA)	Klink	Sabo
Chenoweth	Kucinich	Schaffer, Bob
Costello	LaFalce	Slaughter
Crane	Lee	Stenholm
Dickey	Lewis (GA)	Strickland
English	LoBiondo	Tauscher
Fazio	Maloney (CT)	Taylor (MS)
Filner	McDermott	Thompson
Fox	McNulty	Towns
Gephardt	Menendez	Velazquez
Gibbons	Miller (CA)	Vento
Green	Moran (KS)	Visclosky
Gutierrez	Oberstar	Waters
Hastings (FL)	Obey	Weller
Hefner	Olver	Wicker
Hilleary	Pallone	Wynn

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Carson

NOT VOTING—27

Archer	Goss	Parker
Ballenger	Harman	Pickering
Bryant	Hefley	Pitts
Callahan	Kennelly	Poshard
Clay	King (NY)	Pryce (OH)
Clyburn	Lipinski	Snowbarger
DeFazio	Livingston	Stupak
DeLay	Martinez	Tauzin
Fowler	Moran (VA)	Waxman

□ 1421

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

RREREFERRAL OF H.R. 4614, FEDERAL LAND TRANSFER IN NEW CASTLE, NEW HAMPSHIRE TO COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastruc-

ture be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4614) to provide for the conveyance of Federal land in New Castle, New Hampshire to the town of New Castle, New Hampshire, and to require the release of certain restrictions with respect to land in such town, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

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

Mr. CLEMENT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) to explain the request.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I make the request because H.R. 4614 directs the administrator of general services to convey this property and specifically waives section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949.

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1995

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1995.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, on September 14, I inadvertently voted "yea" on roll-call vote 428. I ask that the RECORD reflect I intended a "nay" vote on House Concurrent Resolution 254.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4101, AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-764) on the resolution (H. Res. 567) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany 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, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 567 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 567

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

SEC. 2. House Resolution 551 is laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Dayton, Ohio (Mr. HALL), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, this rule waives all points of order against the agriculture appropriations conference report in order to allow its prompt consideration today on the House floor. Today is the second day of fiscal year 1999, and it is important to get this conference report through Congress and on its way to the White House as soon as possible.

In order to further expedite the process, this rule provides that the conference report will be considered as read.

Finally the rule lays on the table the old rule providing for consideration of H.R. 4618, the separate agriculture emergency spending bill. The provisions of that bill have been incorporated in this conference report and, therefore, the old rule is no longer necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, and the very distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), ranking minority member, for the long hours that they have put into producing this conference report.

I particularly want to thank them for upholding the 1995 farm bill as it concerns milk marketing orders, the lifeblood of every dairy farmer in America. This provision will prohibit the Department of Agriculture from changing the rules until we have gone through both a legislative and an appropriations cycle next year.

Mr. Speaker, the agricultural appropriations conference agreement provides necessary funding for agricultural programs and related programs, such as school lunch programs and assistance for Women, Infants and Children, the WIC program. It also provides for rural development.

I support the rule and the conference report it will permit this House to consider.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) be allowed to manage the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON), for yielding me the time.

As he explained, this rule waives all points of order against the conference report to accompany H.R. 4104, which is the agriculture appropriations bill. The bill appropriates funds for agriculture, rural development and food and nutrition programs.

This is one of the most important of the 13 appropriation bills that we pass each year. It contains funding to help American farmers, and it is the crops they grow which feed the world.

This bill also funds food and nutrition assistance programs for the Nation's poor and hungry, so it is not an exaggeration to say that the programs funded by this bill are life sustaining for millions of people in America and around the world.

Unfortunately, this bill does not go far enough. We have had a year of droughts and flooding and other natural disasters that has created a crisis on our Nation's farms. However, the emergency aid to farmers contained in this bill is too little to offset the massive crop loss. The conferees rejected a proposal to remove caps from loan rates, and this would have enabled farmers to receive an infusion of capital to pay bills while waiting for markets to rebound. Although we are blessed with a prosperous economy and a declining poverty rate, one out of every five American children still live in poverty, and 21 million of our citizens face hunger on a regular basis.

□ 1430

Emergency food needs have risen dramatically over the past 2 years, and private donations are not keeping pace with demand at our Nation's food banks. It is estimated that more than 15 percent of requests for emergency food are being turned down because of insufficient supplies.

This bill provides hunger relief for the poor through the emergency food assistance program known as TEFAP. The conference level for the program is \$90 million, which represents a cut from the administration's request of \$100 million. While I would like to have seen full funding, this level is better than the Senate bill, which appropriated only \$80 million.

I am very grateful to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations for maintaining the funding at the higher level. He kept his word and I appreciate it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to vigorously oppose this rule because the agriculture appropriations bill continues to punish dairy farmers in Wisconsin and, indeed, across the Midwest.

For years the dairy producers in Wisconsin have been forced to work under an outdated dinosaur policy that our government calls the dairy policy. It is a policy that has disregarded the advance of time and transportation and technology. In spite of all the talk here about a global economy, the government has spent more than 60 years rewarding dairy farmers with higher prices based on the distance of their farm and their cows located from Eau Claire, Wisconsin. As a result, Wisconsin farmers who live and work in America's dairyland have struggled, and dairy producers elsewhere have thrived.

This Congress seems to like ripping up the government by the root, yet when it comes to dairy pricing, this Congress sticks with the status quo, even when the status quo penalizes the dairy farmers in Wisconsin and, indeed, in the Midwest.

Back in 1996, Wisconsin dairy farmers were promised real reform by April of 1999. And now, as the reform just nears, Congress backs out of the agreement and delays reform for another 6 months. We have waited long enough for dairy price reform. The delay has added insult to hard-working Wisconsin farmers.

And to make matters worse, the Congress has also agreed to extend the Northeast Dairy Compact, a cartel that gives further unfair leverage to farmers in the Northeast at the expense of those in the Midwest.

With our pricing system and this Northeast Compact, this Congress is pitting region against region and, unfortunately, farmer against farmer. The Senate was right to resist placing riders in the appropriations bill, but the House leadership used their back room tactics to negotiate an unfair position in this conference that is before us.

This bill represents not a forward movement but, I think, indeed a giant leap backward. I have said it before, the Congress wants a return to the Stone Ages of dairy policy, and I ask people to oppose this rule.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE).

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Ohio for yielding me this time. I would also like to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague from Wisconsin.

The Minnesota-Wisconsin, or the M-W, price for milk is a price that we all know has been the lowest in the country. We have discriminated against the heart of America's dairy production for decades. A Congress which we thought was going to address these grievances has abandoned the principle of equity when it comes to dairy production in America and is driving this policy

backwards. I think the time has come for us to make sure that all of our colleagues in the country understand what we are being asked to accept here this afternoon.

I would also like to address another aspect of this bill, and that is the emergency or the disaster assistance portion of the legislation. I also expect that most of us are now well aware that we have a combination of a crop production failure or yield failure, and a price collapse that is affecting much of American agriculture. Those crops that are hardest hit are wheat, corn, and oilseeds, particularly soybeans. Hog prices and cattle prices are also very low.

It is important that we take responsive measures to deal with this price collapse and the yield problems, and this bill does make a good start in that direction. However, I am very disappointed that on the price side of it we have chosen to put all of our eggs, so to speak, in one basket, and that is by inserting an additional AMTA, or transition payment, to agriculture.

These transition payments are the ones established in the '96 farm bill that replaced the old crop-specific subsidy programs. The disadvantages of using this transitional payment approach at this time are four, and I would like to briefly list them.

First, the amount of money for the typical American family farmer is nominal. A farmer in my district came up to me and said, and this fellow farms a fair amount of land, "I won't even be able to fill my tractor's tank with gasoline, or diesel fuel, for the amount of money I will be receiving." This is not an assist. This may well be interpreted by many American farmers as an insult. I think we should go back to the drawing board and reexamine that portion of the bill.

Secondly, oilseed production does not benefit at all from this approach. The transition payments do not include soybeans as base crops. So as a consequence, American soybean farmers are not being included, even though the collapse of soybean prices is one of the unfortunate conditions that they face. So the second consideration that I think counsels against this approach is the problem of not including oilseed, or specifically soybeans.

The third is, the U.S. Department of Agriculture has carefully examined the effectiveness of the transition payments in helping America's family farmers, especially those that are actually growing the crops as opposed to those that may have retired owning land, and they have determined that the transition payments have largely benefitted land ownership in the form of higher rents and higher land prices.

Query: Do we need to be investing more money for this type of benefit when we are trying to respond to our price disaster situation?

And finally, some ag economists, in looking at where commodity prices are headed, have indicated that cotton and rice does not appear to be suffering from the same price problems as the feed grains and wheat. If this is the

case, query: Is this a good investment of the American taxpayer dollar, to send money out through the transition payments which benefit those crops as well as the ones where assistance is needed?

For these reasons, I submit that this committee ought to be reexamining the disaster program that it is bringing to the floor.

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

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to Section 2 of House Resolution 567, House Resolution 551 is laid on the table.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 567, I call up the conference report on 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.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 567, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see prior proceedings of the House of today.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. Kaptur) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN).

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring before the House today the conference report on H.R. 4101, making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, the Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies.

The House approved our bill on June the 24th by a vote of 373 to 48. This conference report has almost \$55 million in additional discretionary spending which we have put into research, food safety and rural development.

Although the budget situation is extremely tight, we did manage to hold the higher House number of \$90 million on The Emergency Food Assistance Program. WIC is fully funded to meet the expected participation levels, with a nearly \$200 million carryover for emergencies. School lunch and school breakfast and the Child and Adult Food Program are all funded at the administration request.

The Food Safety Initiative is increased by almost \$51.9 million over last year and the two main food safety agencies in the government, the Food and Drug Administration and the Food Safety and Inspection Service, have both received substantial increases.

Research, which is the foundation of our agricultural system, has strong support in this bill. The Agricultural Research Service is funded at \$37 million over last year, and the Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service has a \$61 million increase.

Many of our rural development programs remain at the same levels as the previous years, as requested by the administration. And, frankly, I think we need to do better next year. But in this bill we have been able to improve some of the most critical programs, such as water and sewer and farm labor housing.

I am sure that every Member is aware of the problems in rural America caused by the extreme weather, low prices and loss of important overseas markets. This bill also includes approximately \$4.2 billion in emergency assistance to farmers, ranchers and fishermen for losses due to natural disasters and other emergencies.

And while I have highlighted some of the individual program increases, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to give the impression that we have reversed the course on spending. In fact, we have to deal with another very difficult budget situation and the discretionary spending level in this bill, \$13.65 billion, is \$100 million less than last year.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to my colleagues that every one of our constituents needs this bill every day of their lives. This bill delivers a safe and bountiful food supply. It supports feeding and nutrition programs for mothers, infants and senior citizens. And it ensures consumers of safe supplies of medicine and medical devices.

This bill also protects and enhances our soil and water resources, which are critical not only to rural areas but to suburban and urban areas as well. This bill not only serves farmers and ranchers, indeed, they get only a small percentage of the benefits in this bill. This bill serves all Americans, no matter where they live.

I deeply appreciate the help that Members from both sides of the aisle have given us in putting this bill together. It has always been a bipartisan effort and I want it to stay that way. I ask all to vote "aye" on this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I provide for the RECORD tabular material regarding H.R. 4101:

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

	FY 1998 Enacted	FY 1999 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
TITLE I - AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS						
Production, Processing, and Marketing						
Office of the Secretary.....	3,379,000	2,941,000	2,941,000	2,836,000	2,836,000	-543,000
Executive Operations:						
Chief Economist.....	5,048,000	5,823,000	5,973,000	5,048,000	5,820,000	+572,000
Commission on 21st Century Production Agriculture		350,000				
National Appeals Division	11,718,000	13,297,000	12,204,000	11,718,000	11,718,000	
Office of Budget and Program Analysis.....	5,986,000	6,045,000	6,120,000	5,986,000	6,120,000	+134,000
Office of the Chief Information Officer	4,773,000	7,222,000	5,551,000	5,551,000	5,551,000	+778,000
Total, Executive Operations	27,525,000	32,737,000	29,848,000	28,303,000	29,009,000	+1,484,000
Office of the Chief Financial Officer	4,283,000	4,562,000	4,283,000	4,283,000	4,283,000	
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration.....	613,000	636,000	636,000	613,000	613,000	
Agriculture buildings and facilities and rental payments.....	131,085,000	147,689,000	137,184,000	137,184,000	137,184,000	+6,099,000
Payments to GSA	(98,600,000)	(108,057,000)	(108,057,000)	(108,057,000)	(108,057,000)	(+9,457,000)
Building operations and maintenance	(24,785,000)	(24,127,000)	(24,127,000)	(24,127,000)	(24,127,000)	(-658,000)
Repairs, renovations, and construction	(5,000,000)	(15,505,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	
Relocation expenses.....	(2,700,000)					(-2,700,000)
Hazardous waste management	15,700,000	15,700,000	15,700,000	15,700,000	15,700,000	
Departmental administration.....	29,231,000	32,168,000	32,168,000	27,034,000	32,168,000	+2,937,000
Outreach for socially disadvantaged farmers	3,000,000	10,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations	3,668,000	3,814,000	3,668,000	3,668,000	3,668,000	
Office of Communications	8,138,000	8,319,000	8,138,000	8,138,000	8,138,000	
Office of the Inspector General	63,128,000	87,689,000	67,178,000	63,128,000	65,128,000	+2,000,000
Office of the General Counsel.....	28,759,000	30,446,000	30,396,000	28,759,000	29,194,000	+435,000
Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education and Economics						
Economic Research Service	540,000	560,000	560,000	540,000	540,000	
National Agricultural Statistics Service.....	71,604,000	55,839,000	67,282,000	53,109,000	65,757,000	-5,847,000
Census of Agriculture.....	118,048,000	107,190,000	105,082,000	103,964,000	103,964,000	-14,084,000
Agricultural Research Service	(36,327,000)	(23,741,000)	(23,141,000)	(23,599,000)	(23,599,000)	(-12,728,000)
Buildings and facilities	744,382,000	776,828,000	755,816,000	768,221,000	781,950,000	+37,568,000
Total, Agricultural Research Service	825,012,000	812,728,000	817,196,000	800,151,000	838,387,000	+13,375,000
Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service:						
Research and education activities	431,410,000	412,589,000	431,125,000	432,982,000	481,216,000	+49,806,000
Native American Institutions Endowment Fund.....	(4,600,000)	(4,600,000)	(4,600,000)	(4,600,000)	(4,600,000)	
Extension activities	423,376,000	418,651,000	418,789,000	432,181,000	434,122,000	+10,746,000
Total, Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service.....	854,786,000	831,240,000	847,914,000	865,163,000	915,338,000	+60,552,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs						
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service:						
Salaries and expenses	618,000	642,000	642,000	618,000	618,000	
AQI user fees	425,932,000	417,752,000	424,500,000	419,473,000	425,803,000	-129,000
Buildings and facilities	(88,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(88,000,000)	(88,000,000)	(88,000,000)	
Total, Animal & Plant Health Inspection Service.....	420,000	5,200,000	5,200,000	4,200,000	7,700,000	+3,500,000
Total, Animal & Plant Health Inspection Service.....	430,132,000	422,952,000	429,700,000	423,673,000	433,503,000	+3,371,000
Agricultural Marketing Service:						
Marketing Services	46,567,000	58,469,000	46,567,000	45,567,000	46,000,000	-567,000
New user fees	(4,000,000)	(4,000,000)	(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)	(59,521,000)	(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	10,998,000	10,998,000	+308,000
Payments to states and possessions.....	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	
Total, Agricultural Marketing Service.....	58,457,000	70,967,000	58,765,000	57,765,000	58,198,000	-259,000
Grain Inspection, Packers & Stockyards Administration.....						
Inspection and Weighing Services (limitation on administrative expenses, from fees collected)	25,390,000	11,797,000	27,542,000	26,390,000	26,787,000	+1,397,000
Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety.....	(43,092,000)	(42,557,000)	(42,557,000)	(42,557,000)	(42,557,000)	(-535,000)
Food Safety and Inspection Service	446,000	598,000		446,000	446,000	
Lab accreditation fees 1/	588,761,000	149,566,000	609,250,000	605,149,000	609,250,000	+20,489,000
Total, Production, Processing, and Marketing.....	3,292,303,000	2,840,480,000	3,299,073,000	3,259,614,000	3,383,709,000	+91,406,000
Farm Assistance Programs						
Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services						
	572,000	597,000	597,000	572,000	572,000	

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

	FY 1998 Enacted	FY 1999 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Farm Service Agency:						
Salaries and expenses	699,579,000	723,478,000	724,498,000	710,842,000	714,499,000	+ 14,920,000
(Transfer from export loans)	(589,000)	(672,000)	(589,000)	(589,000)	(589,000)
(Transfer from P.L. 480)	(815,000)	(845,000)	(815,000)	(815,000)	(815,000)
(Transfer from ACIF)	(209,861,000)	(227,873,000)	(209,861,000)	(209,861,000)	(209,861,000)
Total, salaries and expenses.....	(910,844,000)	(952,868,000)	(935,764,000)	(922,107,000)	(925,764,000)	(+ 14,920,000)
State mediation grants	2,000,000	4,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Dairy indemnity program	550,000	450,000	450,000	450,000	450,000	-100,000
Total, Farm Service Agency	702,129,000	727,928,000	726,949,000	713,292,000	716,949,000	+ 14,820,000
Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account:						
Loan authorizations:						
Farm ownership loans:						
Direct	(78,320,000)	(85,000,000)	(75,000,000)	(85,649,000)	(85,651,000)	(+ 7,331,000)
Guaranteed	(425,000,000)	(425,031,000)	(425,031,000)	(425,000,000)	(425,031,000)	(+ 31,000)
Subtotal	(503,320,000)	(510,031,000)	(500,031,000)	(510,649,000)	(510,682,000)	(+ 7,362,000)
Farm operating loans:						
Direct	(565,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(560,472,000)	(500,000,000)	(-65,000,000)
Guaranteed unsubsidized	(992,906,000)	(1,700,000,000)	(1,276,000,000)	(992,906,000)	(948,276,000)	(-44,630,000)
Guaranteed subsidized	(235,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(235,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(-35,000,000)
Subtotal	(1,792,906,000)	(2,400,000,000)	(1,976,000,000)	(1,788,378,000)	(1,648,276,000)	(-144,630,000)
Indian tribe land acquisition loans	(1,000,000)	(1,003,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)
Emergency disaster loans	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)
Boll weevil eradication loans	(53,467,000)	(30,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(40,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(+ 46,533,000)
Credit sales of acquired property	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(-25,000,000)
Total, Loan authorizations.....	(2,400,693,000)	(2,991,034,000)	(2,627,031,000)	(2,365,027,000)	(2,284,958,000)	(-115,735,000)
Loan subsidies:						
Farm ownership loans:						
Direct	8,329,000	12,725,000	11,228,000	12,822,000	12,822,000	+ 4,493,000
Guaranteed	19,407,000	6,758,000	6,758,000	6,758,000	6,758,000	-9,649,000
Subtotal	24,736,000	19,483,000	17,986,000	19,580,000	19,580,000	-5,156,000
Farm operating loans:						
Direct	36,823,000	34,150,000	34,150,000	38,280,000	34,150,000	-2,673,000
Guaranteed unsubsidized	11,617,000	19,720,000	11,000,000	11,518,000	11,000,000	-617,000
Guaranteed subsidized	22,654,000	17,480,000	17,480,000	20,539,000	17,480,000	-5,174,000
Subtotal	71,094,000	71,350,000	62,630,000	70,337,000	62,630,000	-8,464,000
Indian tribe land acquisition	132,000	153,000	153,000	153,000	153,000	+ 21,000
Emergency disaster loans	6,008,000	5,900,000	5,900,000	5,900,000	5,900,000	-108,000
Boll weevil loans subsidy	472,000	432,000	1,440,000	576,000	1,440,000	+ 968,000
Credit sales of acquired property	3,255,000	3,260,000	3,260,000	-3,255,000
Total, Loan subsidies	105,697,000	100,578,000	91,369,000	96,546,000	89,703,000	-15,994,000
ACIF expenses:						
Salaries and expense (transfer to FSA)	209,861,000	227,873,000	209,861,000	209,861,000	209,861,000
Administrative expenses	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Total, ACIF expenses	219,861,000	237,873,000	219,861,000	219,861,000	219,861,000
Total, Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund	325,558,000	338,251,000	311,230,000	316,407,000	309,564,000	-15,994,000
(Loan authorization)	(2,400,693,000)	(2,991,034,000)	(2,627,031,000)	(2,365,027,000)	(2,284,958,000)	(-115,735,000)
Total, Farm Service Agency	1,027,687,000	1,066,179,000	1,038,179,000	1,029,699,000	1,026,513,000	-1,174,000
Risk Management Agency:						
Administrative and operating expenses	64,000,000	66,000,000	64,000,000	64,000,000	64,000,000
Sales commission of agents	188,571,000	-188,571,000
Total, Risk Management Agency	252,571,000	66,000,000	64,000,000	64,000,000	64,000,000	-188,571,000
Total, Farm Assistance Programs	1,280,830,000	1,132,778,000	1,102,778,000	1,094,271,000	1,091,085,000	-189,745,000

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

	FY 1998 Enacted	FY 1999 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Corporations						
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation:						
Federal crop insurance corporation fund	1,584,135,000	1,504,036,000	1,504,036,000	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	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)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)
Total, Corporations	2,367,642,000	9,943,036,000	9,943,036,000	9,943,036,000	9,943,036,000	+ 7,575,394,000
Total, title I, Agricultural Programs	6,940,775,000	13,916,292,000	14,344,885,000	14,298,921,000	14,417,830,000	+ 7,477,055,000
(By transfer)	(211,265,000)	(229,190,000)	(211,265,000)	(211,265,000)	(211,265,000)
(Loan authorization)	(2,400,693,000)	(2,991,034,000)	(2,827,031,000)	(2,365,027,000)	(2,284,958,000)	(-115,735,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(107,613,000)	(108,287,000)	(108,287,000)	(107,078,000)	(108,287,000)	(+ 674,000)
TITLE II - CONSERVATION PROGRAMS						
Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment	693,000	719,000	719,000	693,000	693,000
Natural Resources Conservation Service:						
Conservation operations	632,853,000	742,231,000	641,243,000	638,664,000	641,243,000	+ 8,390,000
Watershed surveys and planning 2/	11,190,000	9,545,000	11,190,000	10,368,000	-822,000
Watershed and flood prevention operations 3/	101,036,000	49,000,000	97,850,000	101,036,000	99,443,000	-1,593,000
Resource conservation and development	34,377,000	34,377,000	35,000,000	34,377,000	35,000,000	+ 623,000
Forestry incentives program	6,325,000	6,325,000	6,325,000
Total, Natural Resources Conservation Service	785,781,000	825,608,000	783,838,000	791,592,000	792,379,000	+ 6,598,000
Total, title II, Conservation Programs	786,474,000	826,327,000	784,357,000	792,285,000	793,072,000	+ 6,598,000
TITLE III - RURAL ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS						
Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development	588,000	611,000	611,000	588,000	588,000
Rural community advancement program	652,197,000	715,172,000	745,172,000	702,601,000	722,686,000	+ 70,489,000
Delta region economic development program	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)	(930,800,000)	(1,000,000,000)	(985,313,000)	(-34,687,000)
Unsubsidized guaranteed	(3,000,000,000)	(3,000,000,000)	(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)	(30,000,000)	(25,001,000)	(-4,999,000)
Farm labor (sec. 514)	(15,000,000)	(32,108,000)	(20,000,000)	(15,758,000)	(20,000,000)	(+ 5,000,000)
Rental housing (sec. 515)	(128,640,000)	(100,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(128,640,000)	(114,321,000)	(-14,319,000)
Multi-family housing guarantees (sec. 538)	(19,700,000)	(150,000,000)	(125,000,000)	(75,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(+ 80,300,000)
Site loans (sec. 524)	(600,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,152,000)	(+ 4,552,000)
Credit sales of acquired property	(25,000,000)	(30,007,000)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(18,930,000)	(-8,070,000)
Self-help housing land development fund	(587,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(+ 4,413,000)
Total, Loan authorizations	(4,219,527,000)	(4,347,116,000)	(4,235,601,000)	(4,284,398,000)	(4,251,717,000)	(+ 32,190,000)
Loan subsidies:						
Single family (sec. 502)	128,100,000	118,200,000	110,000,000	118,200,000	114,100,000	-14,000,000
Unsubsidized guaranteed	6,900,000	2,700,000	2,700,000	2,700,000	2,700,000	-4,200,000
Housing repair (sec. 504)	10,300,000	8,808,000	8,808,000	10,569,000	8,808,000	-1,492,000
Multi-family housing guarantees (sec. 538)	1,200,000	3,480,000	2,900,000	1,740,000	2,320,000	+ 1,120,000
Farm labor (sec. 514)	7,388,000	16,706,000	10,406,000	8,199,000	10,406,000	+ 3,018,000
Rental housing (sec. 515)	68,745,000	48,250,000	48,250,000	62,069,000	55,180,000	-13,585,000
Site loans (sec. 524)	17,000	17,000	16,000	17,000	+ 17,000
Credit sales of acquired property	3,492,000	4,672,000	3,492,000	3,826,000	3,492,000
Self-help housing land development fund	17,000	282,000	282,000	282,000	282,000	+ 265,000
Total, Loan subsidies	226,142,000	203,115,000	186,855,000	207,601,000	197,285,000	-28,857,000
RHIF administrative expenses (transfer to RHS)	354,785,000	367,857,000	354,785,000	360,785,000	360,785,000	+ 6,000,000
Rental assistance program:						
(Sec. 521)	535,497,000	577,497,000	577,497,000	577,497,000	577,497,000	+ 42,000,000
(Sec. 502(c) (5) (D))	5,900,000	5,900,000	5,900,000	5,900,000	5,900,000
Total, Rental assistance program	541,397,000	583,397,000	583,397,000	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	1,151,783,000	1,141,467,000	+ 19,143,000
(Loan authorization)	(4,219,527,000)	(4,347,116,000)	(4,235,601,000)	(4,284,398,000)	(4,251,717,000)	(+ 32,190,000)
Mutual and self-help housing grants	26,000,000	26,000,000	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	48,900,000	41,000,000	45,720,000	41,000,000	-4,720,000
Subtotal, grants and payments	73,720,000	72,900,000	67,000,000	71,720,000	67,000,000	-6,720,000

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

	FY 1998 Enacted	FY 1999 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
RHS expenses:						
Salaries and expenses	57,958,000	60,978,000	57,958,000	60,978,000	60,978,000	+ 3,020,000
(Transfer from RHIF)	(354,785,000)	(367,857,000)	(354,785,000)	(360,785,000)	(360,785,000)	(+ 8,000,000)
Total, RHS expenses	(412,743,000)	(428,835,000)	(412,743,000)	(421,763,000)	(421,763,000)	(+ 9,020,000)
Total, Rural Housing Service	1,254,002,000	1,288,247,000	1,249,995,000	1,284,481,000	1,289,445,000	+ 15,443,000
(Loan authorization)	(4,219,527,000)	(4,347,118,000)	(4,235,601,000)	(4,284,398,000)	(4,251,717,000)	(+ 32,190,000)
Rural Business-Cooperative Service:						
Rural Development Loan Fund Program Account:						
(Loan authorization)	(35,000,000)	(35,000,000)	(35,000,000)	(33,000,000)	(33,000,000)	(-2,000,000)
Loan subsidy	16,888,000	17,622,000	17,622,000	16,615,000	16,615,000	-273,000
Administrative expenses (transfer to RBCS)	3,482,000	3,547,000	3,499,000	3,482,000	3,482,000
Total, Rural Development Loan Fund	20,370,000	21,169,000	21,121,000	20,097,000	20,097,000	-273,000
Rural Economic Development Loans Program Account:						
(Loan authorization)	(25,000,000)	(15,000,000)	(15,000,000)	(23,000,000)	(15,000,000)	(-10,000,000)
Direct subsidy	5,978,000	3,783,000	3,783,000	5,801,000	3,783,000	-2,195,000
Alternative Agricultural Research and Commercialization						
Revolving Fund	7,000,000	10,000,000	7,000,000	3,500,000	-3,500,000
Rural cooperative development grants	3,000,000	5,700,000	3,300,000	3,000,000	3,300,000	+ 300,000
RBCS expenses:						
Salaries and expenses	25,680,000	26,396,000	25,680,000	25,680,000	25,680,000
(Transfer from RDLFP)	(3,482,000)	(3,547,000)	(3,499,000)	(3,482,000)	(3,482,000)
Total, RBCS expenses	(29,162,000)	(29,943,000)	(29,179,000)	(29,162,000)	(29,162,000)
Total, Rural Business-Cooperative Service	62,028,000	67,048,000	53,884,000	61,578,000	56,360,000	-5,668,000
(By transfer)	(3,482,000)	(3,547,000)	(3,499,000)	(3,482,000)	(3,482,000)
(Loan authorization)	(60,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(56,000,000)	(48,000,000)	(-12,000,000)
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)	(71,500,000)	(71,500,000)	(-53,500,000)
Telecommunications 5%	(75,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(75,000,000)	(75,000,000)	(75,000,000)
Subtotal	(200,000,000)	(105,000,000)	(146,500,000)	(146,500,000)	(146,500,000)	(-53,500,000)
Treasury rates: Telecommunications	(300,000,000)	(300,000,000)	(300,000,000)	(250,000,000)	(300,000,000)
Muni-rate: Electric	(500,000,000)	(250,000,000)	(295,000,000)	(295,000,000)	(295,000,000)	(-205,000,000)
FFB loans:						
Electric, regular	(300,000,000)	(300,000,000)	(700,000,000)	(700,000,000)	(700,000,000)	(+ 400,000,000)
Telecommunications	(120,000,000)	(120,000,000)	(120,000,000)	(120,000,000)	(120,000,000)
Subtotal	(420,000,000)	(420,000,000)	(820,000,000)	(820,000,000)	(820,000,000)	(+ 400,000,000)
Total, Loan authorizations	(1,420,000,000)	(1,075,000,000)	(1,561,500,000)	(1,511,500,000)	(1,561,500,000)	(+ 141,500,000)
Loan subsidies:						
Direct loans:						
Electric 5%	9,325,000	7,172,000	9,325,000	9,325,000	9,325,000
Telecommunications 5%	2,940,000	4,895,000	7,342,000	7,342,000	7,342,000	+ 4,402,000
Subtotal	12,265,000	12,067,000	16,667,000	16,667,000	16,667,000	+ 4,402,000
Treasury rates: Telecommunications	80,000	810,000	810,000	875,000	810,000	+ 750,000
Muni-rate: Electric	21,100,000	21,900,000	25,842,000	25,842,000	25,842,000	+ 4,742,000
FFB loans: Electric, regular	2,780,000	-2,780,000
Total, Loan subsidies	36,185,000	34,777,000	43,319,000	43,184,000	43,319,000	+ 7,134,000
RETL administrative expenses (transfer to RUS)	29,982,000	32,000,000	29,982,000	29,982,000	29,982,000
Total, Rural Electrification and						
Telecommunications Loans Program Account	66,167,000	66,777,000	73,301,000	73,168,000	73,301,000	+ 7,134,000
(Loan authorization)	(1,420,000,000)	(1,075,000,000)	(1,561,500,000)	(1,511,500,000)	(1,561,500,000)	(+ 141,500,000)
Rural Telephone Bank Program Account:						
(Loan authorization)	(175,000,000)	(175,000,000)	(175,000,000)	(140,000,000)	(157,509,000)	(-17,491,000)
Direct loan subsidy	3,710,000	4,638,000	4,638,000	3,710,000	4,174,000	+ 464,000
RTP administrative expenses (transfer to RUS)	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Total	6,710,000	7,638,000	7,638,000	6,710,000	7,174,000	+ 464,000

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

	FY 1998 Enacted	FY 1999 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Distance learning and telemedicine program:						
(Loan authorization)	(150,000,000)	(150,000,000)	(150,000,000)	(150,000,000)	(150,000,000)
Direct loan subsidy	30,000	180,000	180,000	180,000	180,000	+ 150,000
Grants	12,500,000	15,000,000	10,000,000	12,500,000	12,500,000
Total	12,530,000	15,180,000	10,180,000	12,680,000	12,680,000	+ 150,000
RUS expenses:						
Salaries and expenses	33,000,000	33,445,000	33,000,000	33,000,000	33,000,000
(Transfer from RETLP)	(29,982,000)	(32,000,000)	(29,982,000)	(29,982,000)	(29,982,000)
(Transfer from RTP)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)
Total, RUS expenses	(65,982,000)	(68,445,000)	(65,982,000)	(65,982,000)	(65,982,000)
Total, Rural Utilities Service	118,407,000	123,040,000	124,119,000	125,558,000	128,155,000	+ 7,748,000
(By transfer)	(32,982,000)	(35,000,000)	(32,982,000)	(32,982,000)	(32,982,000)
(Loan authorization)	(1,745,000,000)	(1,400,000,000)	(1,888,500,000)	(1,801,500,000)	(1,889,009,000)	(+ 124,009,000)
Total, title III, Rural Economic and Community Development Programs	2,087,222,000	2,220,118,000	2,173,781,000	2,174,804,000	2,175,234,000	+ 88,012,000
(By transfer)	(391,249,000)	(406,404,000)	(391,266,000)	(397,249,000)	(397,249,000)	(+ 6,000,000)
(Loan authorization)	(6,024,527,000)	(5,797,116,000)	(6,172,101,000)	(6,141,898,000)	(6,168,726,000)	(+ 144,199,000)
TITLE IV - DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS						
Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services	554,000	573,000	554,000	554,000
Food and Consumer Service:						
Child nutrition programs	2,612,675,000	3,887,703,000	4,166,747,000	4,171,747,000	4,128,747,000	+ 1,518,072,000
Discretionary spending	3,750,000	10,000,000	3,750,000	-3,750,000
Transfer from section 32	5,151,391,000	5,332,194,000	5,048,150,000	5,048,150,000	5,048,150,000	-103,241,000
Total, Child nutrition programs	7,767,816,000	9,229,897,000	9,218,647,000	9,219,897,000	9,176,897,000	+ 1,409,081,000
Special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children (WIC)	3,924,000,000	4,081,000,000	3,924,000,000	3,948,000,000	3,924,000,000
Reserve	(20,000,000)
Food stamp program:						
Expenses	23,736,479,000	22,365,806,000	21,165,806,000	22,365,806,000	21,159,106,000	-2,577,373,000
Reserve	100,000,000	1,000,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000
Nutrition assistance for Puerto Rico	1,204,000,000	1,236,000,000	1,236,000,000	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	80,000,000	90,000,000	-10,000,000
Total, Food stamp program	25,140,479,000	24,701,806,000	22,591,806,000	23,781,806,000	22,585,106,000	-2,555,373,000
Commodity assistance program	141,000,000	317,081,000	141,000,000	141,000,000	131,000,000	-10,000,000
Food donations programs for selected groups:						
Needy family program	1,165,000	1,081,000	1,081,000	1,081,000	-84,000
Elderly feeding program	140,000,000	140,000,000	140,000,000	140,000,000
Total, Food donations programs 4/.....	141,165,000	141,081,000	141,081,000	141,081,000	-84,000
Food program administration	107,505,000	111,848,000	108,311,000	109,069,000	108,561,000	+ 1,056,000
Total, Food and Consumer Service	37,221,965,000	38,441,632,000	36,124,845,000	37,340,853,000	36,066,645,000	-1,155,320,000
Total, title IV, Domestic Food Programs	37,222,519,000	38,442,205,000	36,124,845,000	37,341,407,000	36,067,199,000	-1,155,320,000
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	131,795,000	136,203,000	+ 4,908,000
(Transfer from export loans)	(3,231,000)	(3,413,000)	(3,231,000)	(3,231,000)	(3,231,000)
(Transfer from P.L. 480)	(1,035,000)	(1,093,000)	(1,035,000)	(1,035,000)	(1,035,000)
Total, Program level	(135,561,000)	(145,583,000)	(135,561,000)	(136,061,000)	(140,469,000)	(+ 4,908,000)
Public Law 480 Program and Grant Accounts:						
Title I - Credit sales:						
Program level	(244,508,000)	(111,558,000)	(197,514,000)	(221,083,000)	(219,724,000)	(-24,784,000)
Direct loans	(228,900,000)	(102,183,000)	(182,624,000)	(203,475,000)	(203,475,000)	(-23,425,000)
Ocean freight differential	17,608,000	9,395,000	14,890,000	17,608,000	16,249,000	-1,359,000
Title II - Commodities for disposition abroad:						
Program level	(837,000,000)	(837,000,000)	(837,000,000)	(837,000,000)	(837,000,000)
Appropriation	837,000,000	837,000,000	837,000,000	837,000,000	837,000,000
Title III - Commodity grants:						
Program level	(30,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(-5,000,000)
Appropriation	30,000,000	30,000,000	25,000,000	30,000,000	25,000,000	-5,000,000
Loan subsidies	176,596,000	88,667,000	158,499,000	176,596,000	176,596,000

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

	FY 1998 Enacted	FY 1999 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Salaries and expenses:						
General Sales Manager (transfer to FAS)	1,035,000	1,083,000	1,035,000	1,035,000	1,035,000
Farm Service Agency (transfer to FSA)	815,000	845,000	815,000	815,000	815,000
Subtotal	1,850,000	1,928,000	1,850,000	1,850,000	1,850,000
Total, Public Law 480:						
Program level	(1,111,508,000)	(978,558,000)	(1,058,514,000)	(1,088,083,000)	(1,081,724,000)	(-29,784,000)
Appropriation	1,083,054,000	967,000,000	1,037,239,000	1,063,054,000	1,056,695,000	-6,359,000
CCC Export Loans Program Account:						
Export credit: Loan subsidy	407,630,000	253,000,000	252,500,000	-407,630,000
(Loan authorization)	(5,500,000,000)	(4,615,000,000)	(4,615,000,000)	(-5,500,000,000)
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	3,231,000	3,231,000
Farm Service Agency (transfer to FSA)	589,000	672,000	589,000	589,000	589,000
Total, CCC Export Loans Program Account	411,450,000	257,085,000	256,320,000	3,820,000	3,820,000	-407,630,000
Total, title V, Foreign Assistance and Related Programs	1,605,799,000	1,365,172,000	1,424,854,000	1,198,669,000	1,196,718,000	-409,081,000
(By transfer)	(4,266,000)	(4,506,000)	(4,266,000)	(4,266,000)	(4,266,000)
TITLE VI - RELATED AGENCIES AND FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION						
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES						
Food and Drug Administration						
Salaries and expenses, direct appropriation	857,501,000	878,884,000	871,499,000	940,367,000	965,867,000	+ 108,366,000
Prescription drug user fee act	(117,122,000)	(126,845,000)	(126,845,000)	(132,273,000)	(132,273,000)	(+ 15,151,000)
Mammography clinics user fee	(13,968,000)	(14,385,000)	(14,385,000)	(14,385,000)	(14,385,000)	(+ 419,000)
Subtotal, program level	(988,589,000)	(1,020,114,000)	(1,012,729,000)	(1,087,025,000)	(1,112,525,000)	(+ 123,936,000)
Buildings and facilities	21,350,000	8,350,000	11,350,000	12,350,000	11,350,000	-10,000,000
Rental payments (FDA)	46,294,000	82,866,000	82,866,000	-46,294,000
By transfer from PDUFA	(5,428,000)	(5,428,000)
Subtotal, program level	(46,294,000)	(88,294,000)	(88,294,000)	(-46,294,000)
Total, Food and Drug Administration	925,145,000	970,100,000	965,715,000	952,717,000	977,217,000	+ 52,072,000
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	2,565,000	2,565,000	-5,163,000
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
Commodity Futures Trading Commission	58,101,000	63,360,000	62,140,000	61,000,000	61,000,000	+ 2,899,000
Farm Credit Administration (limitation on administrative expenses)	(34,423,000)	(35,800,000)	(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	1,016,282,000	1,040,782,000	+ 49,808,000
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

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

	FY 1998 Enacted	FY 1999 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
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
TITLE XI - EMERGENCY APPROPRIATIONS						
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE						
Farm Service Agency						
Salaries and expenses		40,000,000			40,000,000	+40,000,000
Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account:						
Loan authorizations:						
Farm operating loans:						
Direct					(133,806,000)	(+133,806,000)
Guaranteed unsubsidized					(150,000,000)	(+150,000,000)
Guaranteed subsidized					(156,704,000)	(+156,704,000)
Total, Loan authorizations					(440,510,000)	(+440,510,000)
Loan subsidies:						
Farm operating loans:						
Direct		15,969,000			15,969,000	+15,969,000
Guaranteed unsubsidized		1,740,000			1,740,000	+1,740,000
Guaranteed subsidized		13,696,000			13,696,000	+13,696,000
Total, Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund		31,405,000			31,405,000	+31,405,000
(Loan authorization)					(440,510,000)	(+440,510,000)
Total, Farm Service Agency		71,405,000			71,405,000	+71,405,000
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation						
Federal crop insurance corporation fund		1,545,000,000				
Purchase requirement					66,000,000	+66,000,000
Commodity Credit Corporation						
Natural disasters					1,500,000,000	+1,500,000,000
Multi-year losses					675,000,000	+675,000,000
Livestock disaster assistance fund		85,000,000			175,000,000	+175,000,000
Multi-year flooding		50,000,000				
Market loss					1,850,000,000	+1,850,000,000
Total, Commodity Credit Corporation		135,000,000			4,066,000,000	+4,066,000,000
Natural Resources Conservation Service						
Forestry incentives program					10,000,000	+10,000,000
Forest Service						
State and private forestry		10,000,000				
Total, title XI, emergency appropriations		1,761,405,000			4,147,405,000	+4,147,405,000
TITLE XIII - EMERGENCY APPROPRIATIONS						
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE						
Office of the Secretary (cotton warehouse)					5,000,000	+5,000,000
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation						
Federal crop insurance corporation fund (raisins)					3,000,000	+3,000,000
Commodity Credit Corporation						
Economic loss (Alaska)					50,000,000	+50,000,000
Honey					1,000,000	+1,000,000
Mohair fiber					27,000,000	+27,000,000
Total, Commodity Credit Corporation					78,000,000	+78,000,000
Foreign Agricultural Service and General Sales Manager						
Food for progress					25,000,000	+25,000,000
Total, title XIII, emergency appropriations					111,000,000	+111,000,000

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

	FY 1998 Enacted	FY 1999 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Grand total:						
New budget (obligational) authority.....	48,793,563,000	59,567,544,000	55,883,142,000	56,820,368,000	59,949,240,000	+10,155,877,000
Appropriations.....	(49,633,783,000)	(57,806,139,000)	(55,883,142,000)	(56,820,368,000)	(55,690,835,000)	(+8,057,072,000)
Emergency appropriations.....	(159,800,000)	(1,761,405,000)			(4,258,405,000)	(+4,098,605,000)
(By transfer).....	(606,780,000)	(640,100,000)	(606,797,000)	(612,780,000)	(612,780,000)	(+6,000,000)
(Loan authorization).....	(14,012,620,000)	(13,403,150,000)	(13,414,132,000)	(8,506,925,000)	(8,894,194,000)	(-5,118,426,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(142,036,000)	(144,087,000)	(144,087,000)	(107,078,000)	(144,087,000)	(+2,051,000)

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in support of this conference report on H.R. 4101, which is the 1999 appropriations bill for Agriculture and Related Agencies.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say how pleased we are today also that our fine and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from the State of Texas (Mr. HENRY GONZALEZ), is here for this debate, and how very much we enjoy working with him on every single issue that comes before the Nation.

□ 1445

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend our chairman, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), and as well as all the members of our subcommittee, and the committee staff, Tim, Sally, and Bobby, for their outstanding leadership in helping us put this bill together.

Without question, it keeps our Nation at the leading edge for food, fiber, fuel, and forest production as well as research, trade, and food safety. Really a full plate. Our bill contains this year \$55.88 billion in total budget authority for the fiscal year 1999, where the clock has already begun running, of which \$13.65 billion is for discretionary programs, with the vast majority, \$42.2 billion, for mandatory programs.

Over two-thirds of this bill's spending, in fact, is dedicated to mandatory programs, largely the nutrition programs, like the school lunch and the school breakfast programs and the food stamp program, which comprise nearly 70 percent of all the funding incorporated in this measure.

Now, this is a balanced bill that attempts to address the needs of farmers, food and drug safety, rural community development, consumers, and those in our population most nutritionally at risk. The chairman has fashioned a bill with our committee that is the best possible bill within the allocation that we were all dealt.

I have to say, I appreciate the bipartisanship and sensitivity of the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) to balancing the burden of these tight funding levels between various constituencies served by our bill, Members who may represent Bronx, New York, all the way to the southern third of New Mexico and Arizona. So we have a very diverse committee and a very diverse Congress.

I would be remiss if I did not point out that there remains a veto threat on this bill because of the level provided for disaster assistance in agriculture. I would hope that there would be another opportunity for this Congress to perhaps incorporate additional disaster assistance in an omnibus supplemental appropriations bill.

Funding levels are also still well below the administration's request for several of our most critically important programs in this bill. For exam-

ple, in the area of food safety; the Women, Infants, and Children's feeding program; our conservation program, so important to today and tomorrow; youth tobacco prevention; all of the rural water and sewer needs that each of us knows so well from our respective States, and certainly The Emergency Feeding and Assistance Program known as TEFAP.

Without an additional allocation of resources, we continue to betray our commitment to American farmers and to all consumers who benefit from the bounty that our farmers produce.

I am going to reference a few of the major points in the bill right now, beginning with disaster assistance.

Mr. Speaker, there is a real crisis facing most American farmers in rural communities today, and many have been unduly affected by the drought and other extreme and unusual weather conditions. Some are suffering the impact of repeated crop disease year after year, and others have been impacted by very low farm prices, falling farm prices, and increasing inability to obtain credit at prices that really work on the balance sheet.

While the rest of the country may be experiencing economic recovery, thousands and thousands of farm and ranch families, certainly so many of our dairy farmers that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), our ranking member, has so eloquently represented in these debates, and the communities that depend on them have been left behind. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) just talked about that a bit earlier during the debate on the rule.

I am pleased that we were able to provide over \$4 billion in emergency assistance to farmers in this conference report, but I remain concerned that this level of funding still remains insufficient to deal with the magnitude of the real farm crisis facing this country. We must keep in mind that this bill will provide only a 1-year fix and that prices are projected to be low again next year.

In fact, at a meeting earlier today, one of our Ohio members told me he had taken his third cutting on hay and alfalfa. That is terrific, except it means that prices are going to continue to go down. Farmers need a long-term safety net and we may need to look to other options for assistance in the future.

Let me move on to the area of food safety. Each year over 9,000 Americans die, that is 9,000, die in this country and another 33 million become ill from food-borne pathogens. Currently less than two-tenths of 1 percent, less than 1 percent of imported produce is being inspected for pathogen contamination.

This bill provides a \$51 million increase for the President's Food Safety Initiative, and we thank the administration for that initiative, with \$20 million targeted to import inspection through our Food and Drug Administration. This will go a long way toward

bolstering our Nation's food safety inspection and research efforts to assure that our food and produce are of higher quality.

I regret, however, that the conferees were unable to adopt country-of-origin labeling for produce and meat, specifically beef and lamb, which we feel is so important for our people to know where their food is coming from. Consumers have a right to know where the food that they eat originates from.

Let me move on, finally, to the area of derivatives and say I remain concerned about a provision in the bill that places a moratorium on the ability of the Commodity Futures Trading Corporation to regulate over-the-counter derivatives.

We have all seen in the recent headlines the default and bailout of the company called Long-Term Capital Management, which in essence was a hedge fund. They play in the area of risk with no assets. Many of the Members in this Chamber may already know about this situation. An emergency financial rescue of over \$3.5 billion was hurriedly put together by the Federal Reserve and several New York banks on behalf of a very few large financial institutions and wealthy individuals.

In effect, the largest banks in this country, who lent organizations money to invest in these hedge funds, are at risk because their fundamental deposits are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which means the taxpayers of this country, because our Nation guarantees bank deposits up to \$100,000. That creates the risk pool for insurance, and they are going to be faced with drawing on it very heavily if they are not able to make whole the people who play in those markets.

This federally backed rescue involved Long-Term Capital Management from Connecticut, which was not even regulated by the Federal Government. Yet the package put together was a Federal package. In essence, the taxpayers of America are becoming the insurance company of last resort for a handful of very high risk takers, institutions and individuals that are involved in the highest stakes game and are completely over-leveraged in the international markets.

Mr. Speaker, where are we, where is this Congress and where is our government when it comes to helping out all of the people of this land, including our farmers who are strung out, many of them, to their very last acre?

I find it ironic that this conference report includes nearly \$4 billion in emergency assistance for America's farmers, barely much more than is being provided to some of America's wealthiest individuals and largest institutions connected to long-term capital management. It is an interesting ratio to think about.

Drought and floods and deteriorating world markets are ravaging America's farm sector. Our dairy farmers are

being wiped out one after another, and regularly we see on television incidents and acts of God beyond the control of those who are making a living, a hard and difficult living, off the land. Thousands and thousands of farmers and farm families and ranchers are looking to us for this much needed assistance.

Those who speculate on financial trends, those who take major risks and never get their hands dirty, based on which direction currency and commodity prices will go, are taken care of in an instant. One could say that they are bailed out in less than a New York minute by the New York Fed's intervention.

In closing, I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) again for putting together the best bill that we could under the circumstances.

Let me just reiterate my continuing concern that we have not been able to provide in this bill country-of-origin labeling on meat, especially beef and lamb. Also, our hope to provide some certainty in the market, for mandatory price reporting in the livestock area, which would be such a simple thing for us to do, it was not included in this legislation. Those are shortcomings in this bill that we hope to overcome in future years.

Overall, it is a good bill. It is worthy of the Members' support.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to return the bouquet to the lady, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the ranking member, and thank her for all the service and the help that she has been, and also the rest of the members of the committee. They are a great bunch to work with.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SMITH), who is chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) and the ranking member for bringing forth a responsible and reasonable package that is in favor of agriculture across this country, but especially I want to visit for a moment about the disaster relief which is a portion of this program.

Seldom in our history have we ever had a situation that has occurred to us in agriculture as it has in this year, and that simply is drought and flood and disaster conditions throughout much of the country, especially in the South, and a loss of revenue at the same time which was caused by loss of markets.

The problems that we face with disasters, of course, we cannot control, and we have stepped up here today with this program, which certainly is not adequate to fulfill all the needs of farmers and ranchers but certainly will take care of many, many of the prob-

lems in disaster as we have been able to identify them around the country.

The other portion of this bill, which is brand new to us, is the restoration of some revenue loss because of market loss. The reason we are doing that is simply because it is the government's responsibility, we feel, to provide markets for agriculture and for farmers and for commodities.

We passed the 1996 Freedom in Farm bill which said no more intervention by the Federal Government in commodities, which gave freedom for the farmer to plant and to harvest and to decide his own fate and future. As a part of that, we also gave the responsibility to the government to provide markets for his products, and that he cannot provide markets for, obviously.

That has been attempted, and we have simply lost that race for the moment. We have lost 30 percent of our market in Asia, as we well know. Japan, which is a huge market for us, is fumbling in economic, questionable situations. South America is combining with their own programs, through MERCOUR and others, to trade with themselves. And we cannot get any commodities into the European Union. So here we are.

This is an adequate and important program for revenue redistribution, and that is why \$1.65 billion has been returned through increased AMTA payments to farmers who have lost revenue, who have lost some of their crops through loss of revenue. A part of that, of course, is a recognition that livestock feed is important, and part of this disaster relief goes to emergency feed for livestock people.

All in all, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this program is fair, it is reasonable. It answers farmers' questions, wherever they may be in this country, whatever kind of commodities and crops they may grow. And beyond that, it is fair to the taxpayer and to the budget.

I suggest that we pass this bill. It is important to us. It is important to farmers and it is essential to this nation.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) the very distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture, a rancher and farmer himself, from the great State of Texas.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report, commend the chairman and the ranking member for their work on this very difficult task.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report and I thank my colleague for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4101 is an important bill which funds the operations of the Department of Agriculture, the Food and Drug Administration, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission and the many functions of those agencies. The Department of Agriculture is an im-

portant partner to our nation's farmers and ranchers, and with the normal provisions of this bill the conferees have made recommendations that carefully balance program priorities.

I am particularly grateful that the conferees have risen to the occasion and provided additional funding to aid our nation's farmers and ranchers whose livelihoods are being devastated by natural crises and low prices.

Mr. Speaker, a year ago we were considering the conference report for the FY 1998 version of this bill. At that time, the El Niño weather pattern was continuing to warm the waters of the Eastern Pacific Ocean, the prices of agricultural commodities were displaying considerable volatility, and signs were appearing of trouble spots in the world's economy. We were well aware of the increasing level of uncertainty facing agriculture. With the failure to address IMF and Fast Track, I am afraid that we have ensured future uncertainty in agriculture.

Now, this uncertainty has given way to multiple, compounded disasters. Extreme weather patterns have wiped out crops and pastures, increasing stocks and plummeting economies in Asia are destroying our prices, and it has become clear that the agriculture policies we have set in place are not sufficient to help producers secure the stable revenues they need to continue in business for the long haul.

Mr. Speaker, I support the conference report because it addresses the short-term impacts of the crisis. However, I am disappointed that we were unable to focus on improving the long-term safety net for farmers and ranchers. When I look at the projections for next year's crops, I see continuing low incomes in our agricultural sector. This year's events have made it more clear than ever that we on the Agriculture Committee must commit ourselves to making long-term improvements in Federal programs and give our producers the tools they need to manage adequately production and yield risks.

Mr. Speaker, we have to move forward with this conference report. Too many producers need the assistance that will be provided. Unfortunately, we cannot at this time accurately assess the total damage inflicted on agriculture this year from natural disaster—including Hurricane Georges—or from low prices. To the extent that this bill fails to address adequately the current agricultural crisis, in the days, weeks, and months ahead, we can continue to consider the scope of difficulties in rural America and fashion the appropriate Federal response.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to disaster spending, H.R. 4101 will provide the Agriculture Department with the resources it needs to address the challenges facing rural America. Under the bill, funding is provided for cooperative efforts in agricultural research—the key to sustained economic viability for agriculture. While the bill prohibits funding for the Initiative for Future Agriculture and Food Systems which became law earlier this year, I look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure that this promising program can be up and running in the not too distant future. The bill provides funding for the administration of the basic farm programs established under the Farm Bill, and for the conservation programs which are an increasingly important focus of

the mission of USDA. The bill also funds important programs that will help rural communities address the substantial economic challenges they face.

Mr. Speaker, again I wish to thank and congratulate my colleagues who worked so hard to develop this bill, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote for its passage.

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

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to enter into the record, because the staff gets so little recognition and just reading their names does not seem to be enough, but I do have to say we have the best staff in the Congress on this subcommittee. To Tim Sanders, our hat is off to him, to Sally Chadbourne, to Bobbi Jeanquart, to John Ziolkowski, to Martin Delgado and Jim Richards. I thank them very much for helping America help our people.

□ 1500

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member on the Committee on Appropriations. There is no harder fighter in our country for the needs of farmers and ranchers, including dairy farmers in his own state.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, it is getting a little deep in here. Let me simply say that I want to express my affection for the gentleman from New Mexico and my great respect for the gentlewoman from Ohio, and I regret that I have to oppose their bill, but I want to explain why I am doing that.

Mr. Speaker, I think there are four very good reasons to vote "no" on this bill. First of all, this bill blocks the ability of Secretary of Agriculture Glickman to propose even the smallest reform of the ancient, outmoded and disgracefully discriminatory milk marketing order system. I do not think it ought to do that, and that is one reason I am voting against it.

Secondly, this bill is a very expensive admission that the Freedom to Farm bill is a spectacular failure and it has in fact become the freedom-to-fail-at-farming bill.

Last year, the farm bill provided some \$36 billion in transition payments to farmers who are moving their way into the wonderful new world of no safety net. Despite that fact, this bill now recognizes the need to add billions more, because the bottom has dropped out of the market. That is a confession of failure. I think people ought to recognize that.

The problem, however, is that while those grain farmers are getting multi-billion dollar payments from the government for the next number of years, when I asked the conferees to provide transition payments for dairy farmers that were only 4 percent as large as those transition payments for grain farmers, we were turned down flat by unanimous vote of the Republican House conferees. If that had been provided, dairy farmers would have gotten an extra 50 cents per hundred weight this year, a small amount, but certainly it would have been welcome.

Thirdly, the conferees then threw beef farmers overboard. There are three companies who control 80 percent of the market in the meat packing industry. They know with perfect understanding what the prices are that they are offering the farmers. But farmers are dispersed and they do not know what the real price is that they can get in the marketplace. We tried to get that corrected by having mandatory price reporting. Again, the House Republican conferees turned that down unanimously, even though it had been supported on a bipartisan basis in the Senate.

Then look at the fact that this bill turned its back on consumers in two ways. First of all, the Senate, again on a bipartisan basis, proposed country-of-origin food labeling on beef because of concerns about problems such as E. coli. Again, the Republican House conferees unanimously turned that down.

We then tried to pass the Senate bipartisan proposal to provide country-of-origin food labeling for fruits and vegetables because we had a cyclospora outbreak with raspberries from Guatemala and we had hepatitis outbreak because of strawberries from Mexico. Again, Republican House conferees unanimously blocked that bipartisan initiative in the Senate. Given the fact that we only inspect 2 percent of the fruits and vegetables that come into this country for pathogens, it seems to me that is the least that Congress could have done, but they chose not to do it.

Therefore, I am simply going to urge a no vote on this bill. There are many good provisions in the bill, but there are also many cases where the conferees simply gave in to the processors or continued grossly discriminatory pricing practices, and they certainly walked away from the consumer protection actions that they should have taken on these country-of-origin provisions. So I am going to vote no, and I would urge others to do likewise.

Mr. SKÉEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM) a real farmer.

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

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman very much, and I want to express my appreciation to him for working very hard through a very tough bill, and the ranking member for being so very, very helpful and accommodating.

Let me just say, first of all, the gentleman just talked about the Freedom to Farm bill, calling it the freedom-to-fail bill. I think what this bill points out is the fact that the administration has totally abandoned and failed our farmers, when you look at the fact over the last three years we have had \$1.5 billion available for this administration to use to market our grains overseas in the form of Export Enhancement Program funds, and only when the European Union dumped 30,000 met-

ric tons of feed grain barley in California did they finally use about \$7 million of this.

Let us look at what the administration's response has been to the plight of the American farmer. In their budget proposal from the other side that they brought forward they had \$573 million of new taxes on livestock producers, and these are people who are in dire straits today. But they have got \$573 million of new taxes on beef and pork producers in their budget. They cut \$35 million out of the Food for Peace program. And when we have a safety net in the farm bill as far as revenue assurance, what is the administration's response in their budget proposal? It is to cut funds out of insurance for farmers to the point where they were going to decimate the entire program for farmers to actually cover their risk out here as far as price and yield.

This is the response of an administration who pretends to be concerned about farmers? The problem is the administration has failed in enacting a good bill which finally gives farmers the freedom to make decisions for themselves.

There are people here who want to roll back the clock and go back to government control on everything, which they have never controlled price except exacerbated a real problem when we have surpluses, and that is what they want to do again.

This is a good bill which actually helps farmers. Being a farmer myself who lives on a farm and operates a farm and understands a little bit about agriculture, I hope, I hope people will support this bill.

The emergency funds in here actually go to help farmers who have need today. The alternative was to put money into a program which, if you did not have a crop this year, would give you no help at all. To raise loan caps when you do not have any grain to put under loan, does not help you.

I would also say by extending the period of the loans, let us think about this for a second, shall we? If you do not have a crop to put under loan, how does extending the loan help you? How does raising the caps on the loans help you, when you have nothing to put under loan? All their program does is give more money to people who have good crops and take money away from people who have had natural disasters. Does that make any sense at all? No, it makes no sense at all.

We have a good bill that is going to help farmers who have disasters, who need financial assistance because of the administration's policy, which has caused the low prices that we have in agriculture today. Let us support this bill. I would ask everyone to join together in making this work, because it is critical for agriculture and it is critical for this country.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the very able and dedicated gentlewoman from Connecticut

(Ms. DELAURO), who works harder than any other Member of this chamber on most days.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, let me say thank you to my good friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), for yielding me time and for the wonderfully high compliment. I am much appreciative. I also would like to recognize the gentleman from New Mexico (Chairman SKEEN) and our ranking member, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), for their outstanding work to bring this conference report to the floor.

I am pleased to rise in support of the conference report. The report omits dangerous language which would have had the chilling effect of slowing or stopping research on drugs to treat cancer, ulcers, hypertension, rheumatoid arthritis and many other serious illnesses. Science, not politics, should dictate whether drugs are approved and made available to the patients whose lives depend on them. I am pleased that this conference report reaffirms that important principle.

The conference report also provides \$4.2 billion in critical emergency aid to help agricultural families across this country recover from the terrible losses suffered due to disease, El Nino and other natural disasters, and from the Asian financial crisis and the loss of export markets. I voted in conference to increase these funds.

Farm communities are facing the worst agricultural crisis in a decade, and I believe that additional funds will be needed to address this crisis. However, I am pleased that the conference report takes an important step in the right direction to get aid to our farmers. Despite my desire for higher funding for disaster relief, WIC nutritional assistance, food safety and the FDA tobacco initiative, I would like to say thank you to the chairman and the ranking member for their hard work in putting this package together. I would also like to extend my thanks to the staff who have helped to make this possible. They make it possible for us to do our work.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. FAZIO). This is his last conference bill. I can honestly say this is a man that has worked so hard for America, for California and on our committee. We will miss his brilliance and his leadership. We hope he will come back and visit us many, many times, and we thank him for his service to America.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my dear colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), for yielding me this time and for those very generous remarks.

I want to thank the ranking member, along with the chairman, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), for the outstanding work they have done on this bill. I rise in support of it, and want to express my deep thanks for the way in which the people I rep-

resent in agriculture in California have been treated in this bill and in prior bills. I have enjoyed greatly my opportunity to serve on this committee, and this bill reflects the impact that the very important agricultural State of California has on our national economy, and this bill at the same time responds well to that.

I thank all of my colleagues for the time I have been able to spend with them on this subject.

I rise in support of the conference report.

Each appropriation bill is an amalgam of agencies and issues, but I believe our bill—even though it is confined primarily to one department—is one of the most challenging to balance adequately. We provide funding for farm programs, for rural development and housing, for food safety and operations of the Food and Drug Administration, to promote foreign trade, for research and support for our land-grant colleges, and for human nutrition programs for our school children, for pregnant women and young children, and for others in need.

The House-Senate conference committee was a reflection of the many issues that can be raised in this bill. Although everyone may not be completely happy, I believe we resolved a number of difficult issues in as satisfactory a manner as can be expected under the circumstances.

I want to focus my remarks on one of the issues I raised at conference—methyl bromide. My amendment was agreed to without objection by House and Senate conferees.

Methyl bromide is the most important and widely used agricultural fumigant in use in the United States today and in international agricultural commerce. Despite its importance, methyl bromide is a dangerous chemical, and it is believed to deplete the ozone, so the United States and other countries have made a decision to phase out its use and have worked together in negotiating the Montreal Protocol Treaty.

As many of my colleagues know, based on the requirements of the Clean Air Act, the U.S. has been under a self-imposed methyl bromide phase-out of 2001 for many years. As 2001 has grown closer, our farmers and others who depend upon methyl bromide have experienced considerable anxiety—both because of the phase-out but, more importantly, because of the competitive disadvantage that would be imposed on them if it continues to be available to other countries.

In anticipation of this phase-out, we have provided funding in our bill for many years to the Agricultural Research Service for research into alternatives to methyl bromide. Although there is increased attention on research into alternatives for some users, there is little evidence that we are close to an all-purpose methyl bromide alternative. If cost-effectiveness is taken into account, the situation becomes even less promising.

For those who think this is an issue just related to farming, I want to point out many uses of methyl bromide that we all depend upon. Although much of methyl bromide is used for crop fumigation—especially pre-planting preparation of fields—there are many other important uses that touch home for all of us. Methyl bromide is used for fumigation of many agricultural commodities before they are shipped overseas, in fact, countries such as Japan re-

quire methyl bromide certification before accepting our U.S. agricultural commodities. On the receiving end, methyl bromide is used in U.S. ports to fumigate a variety of shipments being received from other countries—not just agricultural commodities, but essentially any pallet of goods that may be infested with unseen parasites that would cause catastrophe if released into our agriculture. In addition, methyl bromide is used for fumigating bakeries, rice mills, grain silos, and food processing plants, so it is an essential tool for federal, state and local sanitation requirements that contribute to a safe food system.

The Administration's negotiating team has attempted over several international meetings to conform the Montreal Protocol to our self-imposed 2001 phase-out under the Clean Air Act. However, they were unsuccessful, and at a September meeting just last year, a 2005 phase-out for developed countries was negotiated.

The amendment I offered at our conference and that is included in this conference report is a relatively simple conformance for the U.S. to the Montreal Protocol. It would amend the Clean Air Act in order for the U.S. to conform to the schedule that has been negotiated by the Administration—a negotiating team headed by officials from the Council on Environmental Quality and EPA. The language of each of its provisions—including a sanitation exemption and a critical uses provision—is specifically conditioned to be consistent with the Montreal Protocol.

Some opposition has been raised to my amendment and that is to be expected for a provision of this importance. I can tell you that farmers would have preferred far more—many of my farmers are competing not with developed countries but with Chile or Argentina or Mexico, who will continue to enjoy a 10-year advantage in using methyl bromide. I can tell you that some environmentalists would prefer we do nothing at all—that we adhere to the self-imposed 2001 phase-out despite its possible devastating effect on our farm economy.

But I believe there has been a recognition by this Administration and by this Congress for many years that this is an issue we need to address. President Clinton told California farmers in 1995 that he would help them resolve this issue, and Kathleen McGinty, chair of the Council on Environmental Quality has written the Commerce Committee on two occasions to indicate the Administration's willingness to work with it, yet the Administration has never taken the next step by suggesting how we might move ahead.

The Commerce Committee, for understandable reasons, has been hesitant to move ahead despite the compelling case for conforming to the rest of the world, because of the protracted fight between farmers and environmentalists that would probably have resulted.

So, with an Administration which has chosen to remain silent and a Commerce Committee that has chosen not to act, it was left to a retiring congressman who didn't have to face the voters again—namely me—to suggest the approach that is embodied in this conference report today.

While I suspect both the Administration and the Commerce Committee do not think my amendment is perfect, I urge both to support it as a common-sense solution to this problem, and I believe they will.

A provision in an appropriations bill is probably not the best way to handle an issue of this magnitude. The Appropriations Committee is approached time and time again by both authorizers who are unable to work issues through their own committees, and by constituents who are unable to get the normal processes to respond. For those who dislike Appropriations Committee intervention in major issues, I say: show us that you can make the regular process work.

This increasing desire to politicize many issues spills over to ones like this where we should have reached consensus long ago. We need to work harder to identify common ground and put together bipartisan coalitions that can speak with authority to our various constituencies whose nature is always to ask for more. In pushing too hard for the impossible, we too often lose sight of the possible, and we are left with nothing.

My amendment is a common-sense proposal that means that American farmers will not be put at a competitive disadvantage while farmers in every other country are on a different phase-out schedule. It makes sense for the American farmer, it makes sense for our international trade, and it makes sense for all Americans.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON).

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

Mr. Speaker, I was not going to speak, except that I do just want to commend both the chairman of the committee, my good friend, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), because they have brought an excellent bill to this floor.

I do not have to tell Members that in New York State, everyone thinks of it as the money capital of the world, and you would not believe that in a small area like mine, it is the 20th largest dairy producing district in America, not to mention the apples and other produce. But agriculture is the mainstay of industry in New York State, and this bill goes a long way to preserving especially the dairy industry, but all of the agricultural industry.

So I wanted to take a minute just to commend both of you, and particularly your staffs. You have some of the best staff in this entire Congress. I salute you and them and urge support of and passage of the bill.

□ 1515

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP), who really helped our committee a great deal in enlightening us on some of the civil rights damage suits pending before the U.S. Department of Agriculture and who worked so closely with us, as did the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS). Without question, this is a better bill, a much better bill because of their leadership.

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

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the conference report on H.R. 4101, the fiscal year 1999 agricultural appropriations bill, which includes disaster and market loss assistance to cover losses incurred by farmers this year.

The total farmgate losses in Georgia have been estimated by the University of Georgia to be in excess of three-quarters of a billion dollars. In light of this, the \$4.6 billion provided in the bill for all agricultural disasters throughout the United States might prove to be inadequate.

Indeed, many of the details of this bill's implementation will be entrusted to the Department of Agriculture, so I do not know that any of us is confident that every producer in our districts who has suffered a loss through acts of God or record low prices will be indemnified. However, this is a bird in the hand and I must support the bird that we have in hand.

In addition, I am pleased to say that the conferees have seen fit to respond to the Department of Agriculture and the minority farmers in this Nation in providing appropriations and report language which will assist in a long-term problem there. I am pleased to say the conferees, in addition to the overall relief provisions, have included at least three other items of importance to me, two of which I authored after listening to producers throughout South Georgia.

One provision will adjust the Conservation Reserve Program contracts to avoid a further decline in low timber prices throughout the Southeast, and the other will ensure that the Secretary makes available guaranteed loans for the purpose of irrigation installation.

The third, which I am pleased to support, offered by my friend, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), will provide for indemnity payments to compensate a number of cotton producers who, through no fault of their own, were left holding the bag when a licensed warehouseman went bankrupt earlier this year.

I urge adoption of the conference report, and it is a good bill.

The current market condition for the sale of harvested timber throughout the Southeast is poor, due in part to the increased harvesting activity in the aftermath of the fires which scorched, but did not completely destroy thousands of acres of commercial pine trees in Florida. Many farms which contain land subject to contract under the Conservation Reserve Program require thinning of pine stands in 1998 or in 1999, as a condition of continued participation in the program. Farmers with land under contract were concerned that the current market condition for timber throughout the Southeast is such that this required thinning activity could exacerbate the oversupply which has resulted in record low prices for harvested trees. I asked for and the conferees agreed to report language that a delay in this requirement is warranted, in order to give the market a chance to absorb the current glut, and for prices to rebound. Therefore, the conferees

have directed that the Secretary authorize no less than a two-year extension period on the requirement that owners of land under Conservation Reserve Program contracts should prune, thin or conduct stand improvement activities otherwise required to be completed in 1998 or 1999.

Many of the crop losses suffered through the country during 1998 were due to drought conditions, sustained by dryland farming operations. Many of the dryland farmers report that they could minimize their losses due to drought conditions in future years if they had access to loan financing for installation of irrigation systems, including retention ponds. I believe that the policy of the Congress in responding to disasters should include measures which would serve to mitigate losses from future disasters of the same nature, which are certain to occur again. I asked and the conferees have directed the Secretary to provide loans to borrowers who farm in areas subject to a past Secretarial Declaration of Disaster, due to drought conditions.

In view of the widespread drought conditions this bill is attempting to relieve, directing the Secretary to place a priority on irrigation-related lending is vital.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire as to the remaining time on this side, please?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) has 9 minutes remaining.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) who has worked so hard with us on the sanctions portion of the bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the ranking member from Ohio for yielding me this time.

I rise in support of the conference report, and I want to thank the conferees for including a provision that would give the President authority to waive sanctions that were imposed on both India and Pakistan as a result of the nuclear tests that those countries conducted earlier this year.

The sanctions imposed after the nuclear tests have disrupted a variety of bilateral assistance programs, including technical support for the very market reforms that we would like to see India and other developing countries adopt. These reforms offer short- and long-term opportunities for U.S. companies, large and small, to gain entry into India's vast consumer market and to help meet India's significant infrastructure improvement needs. Under the unilateral sanctions, we stand to lose many of these economic opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, the sanctions have not achieved the desired result; namely, gaining India's support for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. However, several rounds of negotiations between both sides have shown significant progress, and at this time of significant progress in south Asia, giving the President the authority to waive sanctions in exchange for significant agreements from India and Pakistan will help to move the process forward.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding me this time. I want to commend the chairman and the ranking member for their support in bringing the bill before the House.

This bill has many provisions that are good. It has been noted for things that are lacking, but when we balance it all, it has more good than bad. Obviously, we judge good by what things are hurting us back home, and our farmers back home are in some disarray there and they are in disarray for many reasons; not only because the prices are low, but some farmers who have been discriminated against for years are really looking forward to this bill coming, to getting some legal relief from the statute of limitations. Many farmers who have had 17 years of complaints, now this bill will at least allow them to have the legal opportunity to remove the statute of limitations.

I am also pleased about the credit provisions that are in the bill. The credit provisions amend some of the harshness of the 1996 farm bill, where it allows a person who might have defaulted or had problems with their loan to have a second chance. It does not do it as far as I would like, but I must say it is a step in the right direction.

It provides also some relief for emergency loans, if persons have had emergency loans, and again, that is in the right direction. There is not enough money for research, but through the conferees there was some restoration of some funds for research and some expansion for extension programs.

All of those go to make the agricultural community, not only the 1990 colleges, but the university for research, appreciative that the bill will mean that the agriculture community can go forward.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY), who has worked so hard on this measure.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for yielding me this time.

I rise in support of America's farmers. I think it is time for us not to try to find someone to blame this crisis on that our farmers are facing. It is clearly from natural disasters, global oversupply, diminished overseas demand, and low prices, and the last time I checked, droughts are caused by lack of rainfall and floods are caused by too much rainfall.

Now is the time for us to take appropriate action. We should not have delayed the passage of this bill even one day. The partisan fights over unrelated issues should not be allowed to impede the much-needed assistance that this bill will provide for thousands of farmers, not only in the First Congressional District of Arkansas but across this country.

Mr. Speaker, we must recognize this as a true emergency when our agriculture base is in danger of collapsing. Since this bill will deliver funding and serve as an investment in our future security for this country and our prosperity, it is essential that it be delivered without delay.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this bill.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the fighter for justice.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

I rise in support of this legislation because it provides important benefits for dairy farmers in Vermont and farmers throughout the country. Specifically for our region, it expands the Northeast Dairy Compact for another year, which is terribly important for farmers in my State who are fighting to keep their heads above water.

This legislation provides some disaster relief for farmers all over this country, including New England, which is vitally needed. It also gives us more time to address the Federal Milk Marketing Order formula, a very, very important issue, and I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) for his leadership role in that fight.

Having said that, we still have a long way to go. Family farmers are what this country is supposed to be about. We believe in decentralized agriculture. We need to significantly improve Federal policy for dairy farmers, family farmers, or else we are going to continue to lose them, and that will be a tragedy not only for New England but for every State in this country.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACCI).

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

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY), who has fought harder than anyone I know for the needs of the farmers in the Great Plains States due to the disasters that have been ravaging that part of the country. The Dakotas are lucky to have him here.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

I want to commend the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Committee on Appropriations, and the chairman of the agriculture authorizing committee, as well as the ranking members, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

Mr. Speaker, I like these individuals a lot; they have put real hard work into this bill. However, I must rise and oppose this conference report. It is not

my style, as the Members will note, to oppose agriculture appropriations bills, much less ask for a motion to recommit late on a Friday afternoon. But that is precisely what I am doing today, because the amount of relief in this bill is simply nowhere near adequate to meet the magnitude of the catastrophe unfolding in farm country.

We have had a collapse of commodity prices. Wheat is down \$1.66 a bushel in the last 2 years. That is a 36 percent drop. The relief provided under the AMTA increase in this bill would amount to 13 cents a bushel. Mr. Speaker, corn is down \$2.37 a bushel; that is a 57 percent drop in market price. The relief in this bill would amount to 2 cents a bushel. Soybeans, \$1.90 a bushel drop from 2 years ago, a 27 percent fall. The relief in this bill amounts to 2 cents a bushel.

Mr. Speaker, the worst thing we can do is hold forth to the public some agriculture disaster response and then go home and let the farmers realize that it amounts to pennies on the dollar, compared to what their problems are. There is a difference as we look at what we face this fall, and the difference is, we no longer have a farm program that automatically triggers in relief when market prices collapse.

Market prices have collapsed. There has been a start made in the bill to give farmers relief for both disaster assistance and market price collapse. The disaster assistance goes a lot further to meeting the need than the market price collapse. It is a good start, but we have to do more.

The President has held out a veto threat on this bill. Let us not run this down Pennsylvania Avenue, have it vetoed, have it come back. Let us get it right the first time.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to be making a motion to recommit. My motion is going to provide that within the scope of the conference we recommit to increase the assistance available to family farmers suffering economic loss as a result of record low prices, deteriorating market conditions, and/or natural disasters.

The fact of the matter is we have not done an adequate job in this bill. We need more relief. We will lose thousands and thousands of farmers across the country, and if it was not just so darn desperate, there is no way in the world I would try and make this motion on this bill at this time, but we have to do more. Please support the motion to recommit.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BARRETT).

(Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of the conference report on H.R. 4101.

Mr. Speaker, I support the conference report on H.R. 4101. I want to thank the Chairman, Ranking Member, and the House Leadership for their efforts to address the problems in the agriculture economy, through this bill.

There's no question there's trouble in agriculture today. We've had disastrous drought and flooding, which my state was fortunate to escape this year. Exports are down and farm-gate prices are extremely low, and my producers haven't escaped that devastation.

With the 1996 farm bill, we hoped for a smooth transition from government-controlled to market-oriented agriculture. Unfortunately, the problems in Asia and incredibly abundant production worldwide, have made the transition rough going.

This bill addresses the situation in the right way. We maintain our commitment to freedom in agriculture, but we provide assistance to producers facing weather-related disasters, and every producer coping with low prices and decreased exports.

I say to my friends on the other side of the aisle, who are also good friends of agriculture, that I understand your arguments for reverting to old farm policies, and for raising loan rates. That may seem like the best, quick fix, but in the long run will do more harm than good. I understand the demand for more money. But please don't vote to put agriculture back in the hands of government, or vote to lose this piece of pie just because it's not a big enough slice.

Let's stay the course on the 1996 farm bill, but respond to the current problems. Please support this bill. This is must-pass, must-be-signed legislation for rural America.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST).

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

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4101.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference to H.R. 4101, the FY 1999 Agriculture Appropriations Act. Among other important provisions, this conference report provides emergency assistance for farmers and ranchers across the country who are facing income losses this year due to lost export markets, and devastating weather. Rural America has an extreme need for assistance right now, and I appreciate the opportunity we have today to meet that need.

Mr. Speaker, American farmers and ranchers are the most efficient in the world—it's a fact, and it benefits our nation more than we can know. But even the most insightful and efficient agricultural producers cannot predict, nor plan for the economic devastation that can occur when prices fall, or when drastic weather wipes out a year's work. In my home of West Texas this year, we are facing both sides of this crisis. Severe heat and drought have left many producers without a crop. For those who did manage to hang on, low prices and higher input costs have robbed their profitability.

The emergency assistance provided in this conference report represents the most evenhanded way to infuse a substantial amount of needed capital into the cash poor rural economy. For producers of the traditional row-crops who are suffering excessively low prices, this bill provides supplemental market

loss payments equal to 29 percent of their FY 1998 AMTA payment. For farmers who have suffered additional losses because of natural disasters, it gives the Secretary of Agriculture the ability and resources needed to provide cash indemnities. In addition, for soybean farmers, the package establishes a market for the value-added biodiesel product which should aide the industry for years to come. And lastly, for ranchers, the bill funds a livestock feed program that will reimburse a portion of any additional feed costs incurred this year.

However, let us be clear: no amount of assistance we provide this year will make producers whole. But when combined with additional support provided through the Emergency Farm and Financial Relief Act—which allows farmers to collect the full amount of their FY 1999 AMTA payments this month—and the tax package which this body passed last Saturday, the provisions of this agricultural relief package will go far in helping farmers and ranchers recover a portion of their losses. What's more, this cash assistance will roll over several times in our rural communities—bringing life to their ailing economies.

Mr. Speaker, looking beyond today, I believe the current state of our farm sector commands further attention by this Congress—particularly in the committees of jurisdiction. But I believe we are acting prudently today to only consider a disaster relief package which works within the framework of our current farm bill. In 1996, we sought to empower the American farmer to be more competitive, and to capture a larger share of the growing world market by doing away with artificial price supports and planting restrictions. To renege on these goals now, or to make hasty reforms to this policy without having full knowledge of all the costs or ramifications involved would be reckless.

Again, I want to express my strong support for this balanced disaster relief package. America's farmers and ranchers need our support. I urge the passage of this conference report.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield our remaining time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE), from the Buffalo area, one of the hardest working Members of this Chamber.

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

□ 1530

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased, and I congratulate the conferees on the agriculture appropriations bill for providing crop disaster relief that is so desperately needed by the apple growers in my district and throughout western New York, most especially Orleans County and Niagara County.

Our apple industry in New York State was devastated recently by tornado force winds on Labor Day. It could not have come at a worse time. The latest weather-related damage estimates to this year's apple crop is 41.4 million, fully 28 percent of the total crop value.

The hardest hit area was in Orleans County, in my district. The Labor Day storm there caused more than a \$5 million loss to my county's apple crop. Yields are down by as much as 70 percent on over 6,000 acres in my county, and thousands of trees were destroyed.

I applaud this \$1.5 billion new disaster grant program that is so crucial to restoring the financial health of New York apple growers. I applaud the conferees for the tremendous work they have done in inserting and including this \$1.5 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that conferees on the Agriculture Appropriations bill agreed to provide crop disaster relief that is so desperately needed by the apple growers in my district and throughout Western New York.

New York's apple industry has been both physically and financially devastated by a series of unusual weather events this past year—from last frosts in the spring to an intense hail and wind storm on Labor Day.

The tornado force winds on Labor Day could not have come at a worse time. They completely destroyed five million bushels just prior to harvest—more than 20 percent of the entire New York apple crop. The latest weather-related damage estimates to this year's apple crop is \$41.4 million—fully 28 percent of the total crop value.

One of the hardest hit areas was Orleans County in my district. The Labor Day storm caused more than a \$5 million loss to that county's apple crop. Yields are down by as much as 70 percent on 6,000 acres in the county. And thousands of trees were destroyed.

This appropriations bill will help those farmers by providing \$1.5 billion in emergency assistance for 1998 crop losses due to disasters, and an additional \$675 million for farmers who have suffered multiyear losses. I am very grateful that this critical funding has been included.

This new disaster grant program is crucial to restore the financial health of New York apple growers. Most of them are carrying huge debt loads. They simply cannot afford emergency disaster loans, no matter how low the interest rate. Without these direct payments, many of them would not be able to survive the devastating losses they have suffered this year.

I want to thank the Chairman, the gentleman from New Mexico, and the ranking Democrat, the gentlelady from Ohio, for the excellent work they've done in responding to this apple crop disaster in New York State, and to the farm crisis nationwide. I also commend the gentleman from New York, Mr. WALSH, for leading the effort on the conference committee to provide this essential disaster relief. And I thank all my New York colleagues who joined Mr. WALSH and me in urging conferees to provide this grant assistance.

I look forward to working with Mr. WALSH and with Secretary Glickman to ensure that the emergency grant assistance program is developed and implemented in a way that will most effectively help New York apple growers and other fruit producers recover from this year's weather disasters and continue producing for year to come.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me just say in closing that, again, we urge our colleagues

to vote for this bill. For those who are anxious to catch their planes to go home, let me say that the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), the chairman and I, did not select this period in which to debate our bill. We were given this time.

We feel that it is an important bill. We apologize to the Members who missed their 4 o'clock flights. It was not our choice to go up before the Committee on Rules this afternoon. I can say this, and the gentleman cannot. We ask for the Members' support of our bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues, the farmers and ranchers need this bill now. American consumers need this bill now. Do not make them wait any longer. Vote no on the motion to recommit.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I commend Chairman SKEEN and Ranking Member KAPTUR for the skill and hard work they have put into crafting this conference report. I also want to recognize the efforts of Agriculture Committee Chairman SMITH and Ranking Member STENHOLM. They have all shown great sensitivity to and understanding of the needs of our Nation's farmers, and for that I thank them. I rise in strong support of this conference report and urge all my colleagues to vote for it.

For months, parched fields forced Texas ranchers to purchase feed or hay for their herds. The dry conditions and the increased demand, however, have made hay scarce and expensive. Texas ranchers are spending an average of \$3.5 million a day in extra feed costs to support their herds. Now, many of the remaining hayfields in East Texas are being ravaged by army worms. I commend the committee for raising emergency funding for the livestock feed assistance program from the original \$75 million to \$175 million. Ranchers in east Texas are cash starved after having to purchase hay all summer, and this cash infusion is sorely needed.

All agricultural producers in Texas, not just the ranchers, are suffering through the second severe drought to hit Texas in 3 years. Total farm and ranch losses from the drought are now estimated to reach \$2.1 billion statewide, with an overall impact to the State economy estimated at \$5.8 billion. Other factors, such as a glut of foreign cotton, the depressed demand from foreign markets, and bumper crops of grain in the Midwest are driving down commodity prices and compounding an already disastrous year for Texas farmers.

Forest landowners have not escaped the devastation this year. The Texas Forestry Service estimates that 65 percent of the pine seedlings planted this year on 150,000 acres have died, at a total cost to private landowners of \$16.6 million. I especially appreciate the committee working with me to direct the forest service to use disaster relief funds for the Forestry Incentives Program in east Texas. East Texas timber producers have tremendous losses this year, and the work of this committee will aid in replanting efforts for years to come.

Mr. Speaker, the one thing I can count on hearing every time I return home is that our farmers need help this year. Our farming fami-

lies put everything they have on the line every year to feed America. This year, every farmer and rancher in Texas was dealt a hand with no rain and no demand for their products. The disaster relief package in this conference report is a vital step in returning strength to our agricultural producers and agriculture communities.

The President wants more funding in disaster relief for our farmers and I support his efforts. However, this relief is too badly needed by too many farmers in east Texas right now for me to consider opposing this bill. Any further disaster relief that is needed will have to come in an omnibus bill or a supplemental package. Texas agricultural producers need this money now.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, rural America is in a crisis. Farmers across this country are struggling to survive natural disasters and commodity prices that are at a two-decade low. Driven down by the economic slide in Asia, farmers are being forced to sell crops at prices that don't even cover production costs. They need our help.

When hedge-funds ran into trouble because of the impact of a global economic tidal wave, our government took strong action. We need to take the same kind of immediate steps to shore up the farm economy, which is as important to our economy and our national standard of living as the health and stability of the financial markets.

America's farmers have never failed us. But too often we have taken their hard work for granted. America has the best in quantity and quality of food products—produced at low prices and with an efficiency that is a model for the world. Agriculture is vital to the economic success of this country. It is one of our export leaders.

But in 1996, when we passed the Republican farm bill, we cut the safety net out from under our farmers. Now, we are reaping the effects of that misguided effort.

Thanks to the Republican Freedom to Farm bill, the only freedom farmers still have is the freedom to fail. They face hardship and even ruin because of a financial crisis not of their making and a 1996 Republican farm bill which still makes no sense.

For months we have been begging with the majority to listen to farmers—to help farmers. Farm income is projected to drop between \$7.5 and \$9 billion this year alone. It has been obvious that we needed to take immediate action to save family farmers. But Republicans were too busy doing nothing to respond. It was only a few short weeks ago that the Republican leadership reluctantly acknowledged that farm families can't pay 1990's mortgages on 1970's crop prices.

It's too little and too late. We are long past Band-Aid cures. There is only \$1.65 billion in economic assistance in this bill when the loss in farm income is five to six times higher. The Republican message to farmers is: Be happy with the crumbs off our table.

Farmers put more than crumbs on our table. We owe them the same. We must reject the Republican half-measure and take strong action to shore up prices.

We need to lift the caps Republicans put on marketing loans in 1996 so we can raise bushel prices for corn and soybeans more than 30 cents—so we can raise prices on wheat more than 60 cents. And we need to direct aid to producers who have actually suf-

fered losses, instead of using the outdated formula in this bill that will give out assistance based on historic production dating back years.

We must do better for the people who have worked so long and labored so hard to feed Americans and the world. They don't ask for more than their due; they only request a stable, decent return on their investment of time and capital.

I urge my colleagues to give America's farmers what they have always given us. Give them a decent, fair bill that helps farm families. Vote "yes" on the motion to recommit. Vote "no" on this conference report.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this conference report. Although this legislation doesn't contain the level of emergency funding the President requested, I believe it is critical that we provide some level of emergency assistance for farmers. As we all know, farmers throughout this nation are suffering from low prices, globalization and bad weather. The Mid-South region is no different. In my own State of Tennessee, corn farmers have been hurt by the aflatoxin fungus and drought and low prices in the Mississippi Delta have adversely affected cotton farmers.

Equally important, Mr. Speaker, this measure includes \$26 million to spur economic growth in the Lower Mississippi Delta region. The delta encompasses 219 counties in 7 States, and taken together, it is one of the poorest regions in the nation, with poverty rates exceeding 20 percent. This initiative will result in expanded agricultural exports, better schools and a modern infrastructure in the delta region.

The Ninth Congressional District of Tennessee is the hub of the delta, and as such stands to benefit greatly from this funding. I would like to thank the chairmen and ranking Democrats of both the full committee and the agriculture appropriations subcommittee and also my colleague, Mr. BERRY from Arkansas and Senator BUMPERS, from the other body, who were also instrumental in ensuring these funds were included in the bill. I urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

Mr. GILMAN. I am pleased to rise in support of the conference report to H.R. 4101, the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1999.

I especially want to thank the hard work of the distinguished subcommittee chairman, JOE SKEEN, the distinguished committee chairman, BOB SMITH, and my friend and colleague from New York, JIM WALSH for all of their diligent work in crafting a much needed emergency assistance fund for our Nation's farmers and ranchers.

Mr. Speaker, on June 13 a severe storm passed through my congressional district in Orange County, NY, severely damaging our farms throughout the Wallkill Valley. This storm included hail and high winds damaging over 5,000 acres of onions and a few thousand acres of other vegetables. In addition, excessive rainfall and additional hail passed through the Walker Valley since the initial storm, wiping out any hope of salvaging a decent crop.

Many of the growers are currently uncertain about the ultimate fate not only of their crop, but of their farms.

Marketing challenges have already arisen due to storm damages. Grocery store chains

are balking at the Orange County product. Many growers are already seeking alternative employment. Migrant labor has either been laid off and/or hiring has ceased, which also has a negative impact on our local economy.

This is nothing new to the farming community in Orange County. In fact, in the last 3 years the Walkin Valley has seen 116 farm and farm families go out of business.

It is projected that unless emergency USDA assistance is offered, another 12 farms will soon be in jeopardy of being lost forever.

Under the current USDA crop insurance program for onions, growers anticipate losing approximately \$988 to \$1,147 per acre or a total of \$38,000 to \$44,725 each. This means more of our farms will go out of business and many more will be on the brink.

Accordingly, I wholeheartedly support the efforts of the conferees in crafting a necessary emergency assistance fund which includes our onion farmers in Orange County.

In addition, I look forward to working with our Agriculture Committee chairman during the 106th Congress, to craft a workable onion crop insurance program, which will act as initially intended—a safety net. It has become clear that there are serious problems with portions of the current crop insurance program as it relates to onion crops.

Accordingly, I urge all of my colleagues to support this conference report.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed to report that tucked away in this conference report is language that could actually increase the Government subsidies provided to Big Sugar.

Big Sugar claims this is simply "clarifying" language. They claim Congress never intended the one-cent loan forfeiture penalty contained in the farm bill to be considered an effective reduction of sugar loan rates. But Congress did.

In fact, during debate on the 1996 farm bill, some members of the House Agriculture Committee told this body that the support level for sugar would effectively be reduced by one-cent per pound because of the forfeiture penalty. Sugar producers know very well this was the express intent of Congress in 1996.

Why? Because in more recent debates, defenders of the sugar program have pointed to the one-cent forfeiture penalty as evidence that Congress had reformed the sugar program in 1996, and therefore the program should not be changed further. Big Sugar keeps wanting to change the rules for their own benefit.

I am pleased that the conferees wisely opted to include this change as report language and not bill language. Nevertheless, the language in this report is simply an attempt to reinterpret the legislative history of the farm bill to prompt the Agriculture Department to raise the price of sugar. The USDA should pay no attention to it.

USDA should continue to consider the forfeiture penalties as having caused an effective reduction in the loan rates for sugar, just as Congress intended in 1996.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. POMEROY

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit this conference report, with instructions.

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

Mr. POMEROY. I am opposed to the conference report in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. POMEROY moves to recommit the conference report on the bill 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 (H.R. 4101) to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to the extent possible within the scope of conference to increase the assistance available to family farmers suffering economic loss as a result of record low prices, deteriorating market conditions and/or natural disasters, to take into account the almost 50% drop in real income that has occurred in some farming sectors since 1980; and to limit such assistance to individuals actively engaged in farming.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The motion is not debatable.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 156, nays 236, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 478]

YEAS—156

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bereuter
Berman
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Coyne

Cramer
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doyle
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Filner
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gonzalez
Goode
Gordon
Green

Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Hooley
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Kucinich
Lampson
Lantos
Leach

Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Moran (VA)

Nadler
Neal
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Roemer
Roybal-Allard
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott

Sherman
Sisisky
Skaggs
Slaughter
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Strickland
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Thune
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Velazquez
Vento
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NAYS—236

Aderholt
Andrews
Archer
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
English
Ensign
Etheridge
Everett
Ewing
Fawell

Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefner
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh

McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moran (KS)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Pascarell
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Royce
Rush
Ryun
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Latham
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence

Stearns	Traficant	Weller
Stenholm	Upton	White
Stump	Visclosky	Whitfield
Talent	Walsh	Wicker
Tanner	Wamp	Wilson
Taylor (NC)	Waters	Wolf
Thomas	Watts (OK)	Young (AK)
Thornberry	Weldon (FL)	Young (FL)
Tiahrt	Weldon (PA)	

NOT VOTING—42

Armey	Goss	Parker
Barton	Harman	Pickett
Boucher	Hefley	Pitts
Brady (PA)	Houghton	Poshard
Callahan	Hyde	Pryce (OH)
Clay	Kennelly	Salmon
Costello	Kilpatrick	Smith, Adam
Cunningham	King (NY)	Snowbarger
DeFazio	Klug	Stokes
DeLay	Lipinski	Stupak
Deutscher	Martinez	Sununu
Fattah	Meehan	Tauzin
Fowler	Menendez	Torres
Gephardt	Moakley	Wise

□ 1551

Messrs. LUCAS of Oklahoma, SAXTON, GILCHREST, JOHN, McINNIS, ROTHMAN, HALL of Texas and SHADEGG changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. KUCINICH, CRAMER, LAMPSON, HILLIARD and GEJDENSON changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 333, nays 53, not voting 48, as follows:

[Roll No. 479]

YEAS—333

Abercrombie	Burton	Dooley
Ackerman	Buyer	Doolittle
Aderholt	Calvert	Doyle
Allen	Camp	Dreier
Archer	Canady	Duncan
Armey	Cannon	Dunn
Bachus	Capps	Edwards
Baesler	Cardin	Ehlers
Baker	Carson	Ehrlich
Baldacci	Chambliss	Emerson
Ballenger	Chenoweth	Engel
Barcia	Christensen	English
Barrett (NE)	Clayton	Etheridge
Bartlett	Clement	Evans
Bass	Clyburn	Everett
Bateman	Coble	Ewing
Becerra	Coburn	Fawell
Bentsen	Collins	Fazio
Bereuter	Combest	Filner
Berry	Condit	Foley
Bilbray	Conyers	Forbes
Bilirakis	Cook	Ford
Bishop	Cooksey	Fossella
Blagojevich	Coyne	Fox
Bliley	Cramer	Frost
Blunt	Crapo	Furse
Boehlert	Cubin	Galleghy
Boehner	Cummings	Ganske
Bonilla	Danner	Gejdenson
Bonior	Davis (FL)	Gekas
Bono	Davis (IL)	Gibbons
Boswell	Davis (VA)	Gilchrest
Boucher	Deal	Gilman
Boyd	DeGette	Gonzalez
Brady (TX)	Delahunt	Goode
Brown (CA)	DeLauro	Goodlatte
Brown (FL)	Diaz-Balart	Goodling
Brown (OH)	Dickey	Gordon
Bryant	Dicks	Graham
Bunning	Dingell	Granger
Burr	Dixon	Green

Greenwood	Mascara	Sanchez
Gutierrez	Matsui	Sanders
Gutknecht	McCarthy (MO)	Sandlin
Hall (OH)	McCarthy (NY)	Sawyer
Hall (TX)	McCollum	Saxton
Hamilton	McCrery	Schaefer, Dan
Hastert	McDade	Schaffer, Bob
Hastings (FL)	McGovern	Schumer
Hayworth	McHale	Scott
Hefner	McHugh	Serrano
Herger	McInnis	Sessions
Hill	McIntyre	Shadeegg
Hilleary	McKeon	Shaw
Hilliard	McNulty	Sherman
Hinchey	Meeks (NY)	Shimkus
Hinojosa	Metcalfe	Sisisky
Hobson	Mica	Skaggs
Holden	Millender-McDonald	Skeen
Hooley	Minge	Skelton
Horn	Mink	Slaughter
Hoyer	Mollohan	Smith (MI)
Hulshof	Moran (KS)	Smith (NJ)
Hunter	Moran (VA)	Smith (OR)
Hutchinson	Morella	Smith (TX)
Inglis	Murtha	Smith, Linda
Istook	Myrick	Snyder
Jackson (IL)	Nadler	Solomon
Jackson-Lee (TX)	Neal	Souder
Jefferson	Nethercutt	Spence
Jenkins	Ney	Spratt
John	Northup	Stabenow
Johnson (CT)	Norwood	Stenholm
Johnson, E. B.	Nussle	Strickland
Jones	Olver	Stump
Kanjorski	Ortiz	Talent
Kaptur	Oxley	Tanner
Kasich	Packard	Taylor (NC)
Kelly	Pallone	Thomas
Kennedy (MA)	Pascrell	Thompson
Kennedy (RI)	Pastor	Thornberry
Kildee	Paxon	Thune
Kim	Pease	Thurman
Kingston	Pelosi	Tiahrt
Klink	Peterson (MN)	Tierney
Knollenberg	Peterson (PA)	Towns
Kolbe	Pickering	Trafficant
LaFalce	Pombo	Turner
LaHood	Porter	Upton
Lampson	Portman	Velazquez
Lantos	Price (NC)	Visclosky
Largent	Quinn	Walsh
Latham	Radanovich	Wamp
LaTourette	Rahall	Waters
Lazio	Ramstad	Watkins
Leach	Rangel	Watt (NC)
Levin	Redmond	Watts (OK)
Lewis (CA)	Regula	Waxman
Lewis (GA)	Reyes	Weldon (FL)
Lewis (KY)	Riggs	Weldon (PA)
Linder	Riley	Weller
Livingston	Rodriguez	Wexler
LoBiondo	Roemer	Weygand
Lowey	Rogan	White
Lucas	Rogers	Wicker
Luther	Ros-Lehtinen	Wilson
Maloney (CT)	Roukema	Wolf
Maloney (NY)	Roybal-Allard	Woolsey
Manton	Rush	Wynn
Manzullo	Ryun	Young (AK)
Markley	Sabo	Young (FL)

NAYS—53

Andrews	Hostettler	Payne
Barr	Johnson (WI)	Petri
Barrett (WI)	Johnson, Sam	Pomeroy
Berman	Kind (WI)	Rivers
Blumenauer	Klecza	Rohrabacher
Campbell	Kucinich	Rothman
Castle	Lee	Royce
Chabot	Lofgren	Sanford
Cox	McDermott	Scarborough
Crane	McIntosh	Sensenbrenner
Doggett	McKinney	Shays
Ensign	Miller (CA)	Stark
Eshoo	Miller (FL)	Stearns
Farr	Neumann	Tauscher
Frank (MA)	Oberstar	Taylor (MS)
Frank (NJ)	Obey	Vento
Frelinghuysen	Pappas	Yates
Hoekstra	Paul	

NOT VOTING—48

Barton	Cunningham	Gephardt
Borski	DeFazio	Gillmor
Brady (PA)	DeLay	Goss
Callahan	Deutscher	Hansen
Clay	Fattah	Harman
Costello	Fowler	Hastings (WA)

Hefley	Meek (FL)	Shuster
Houghton	Menendez	Smith, Adam
Hyde	Moakley	Snowbarger
Kennelly	Owens	Stokes
Kilpatrick	Parker	Stupak
King (NY)	Pickett	Sununu
Klug	Pitts	Tauzin
Lipinski	Poshard	Torres
Martinez	Pryce (OH)	Whitfield
Meehan	Salmon	Wise

□ 1609

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3694, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House have until midnight tonight, October 2, 1998, to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 3694) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1999 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, September 2, I was unavoidably detained because of Hurricane Georges. All flights out of Mobile, New Orleans and Gulfport, Mississippi were cancelled. Had I been here, I would have voted "no" on H.R. 3891. I would have voted "yes" on H.R. 4103. I would have voted "yes" on H.R. 4060, and I would have voted "yes" on H.R. 3150.

TRIBUTE TO VIC FAZIO

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, during the course of the consideration of the energy and water bill, I was not able to be on the floor because I was doing other business on another committee. Therefore, I did not get an opportunity to rise to pay tribute to my colleague and one of the closest friends I have, not just in this institution but in my life, and that is VIC FAZIO our colleague.

He is about to, I think, have a colloquy about the schedule, acting in his leadership capacity. Very frankly, Mr. Speaker, VIC FAZIO has been a leader of this House since I arrived here in 1981. He is an extraordinarily capable Member. He is a Member whose integrity and intellect will match anybody, not