United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 20, 1995 No. 118

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. EMERSON].

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 20, 1995.

I hereby designate the Honorable BILL EMERSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Reverend Dr. William Hobbs, Spring Glen Church, Hamden, CT, offered the following prayer:

Sovereign God, holy and gracious, be known in this Chamber where men and women wield authority with far-reaching implications. Make these servants who were clever enough to get elected wise enough to serve the public good, and both fair and compassionate enough to address the needs of all the people, placing people above politics, regarding them as neighbors to be served and joined in service.

Protect them from the terrible temptation of the love of power so they may know the power of love. Let them see across these aisles not enemies to be ridiculed and defeated, but compatriots to join in common enemies of poverty, fear, insecurity, and injustice.

So let Your reign of peace with justice find support here and everywhere, most gracious and almighty God. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TIAHRT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

A WARM WELCOME FOR REV. BILL HOBBS

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it brings me great pleasure to welcome here this morning the Reverend Bill Hobbs, my constituent, to the House of Representatives, to the people's House.

Reverend Hobbs indeed serves the people. He is from Hamden, CT, where he presides over the community's largest Protestant congregation at the Spring Glen Church.

Since arriving in 1984, Reverend Hobbs has led his congregation in countless community service efforts. Among their many projects are the food and fuel bank programs. These are critical efforts. The Spring Glen Church has willingly accepted the responsibility of feeding its community's hungry. This, along with helping to provide heat to low-income households during the cold Connecticut winters, is a testament to the congregation's commitment to those in need.

The church is a valuable community resource. It has opened its doors to several civic and community organizations in need of its support. The congregation generously provides to these groups whatever it can. Reverend Hobbs and his congregation help to bridge a critical gap to those who do not qualify for State and Federal aid, and yet still require assistance.

I salute the generous efforts of Reverend Hobbs and Hamden's Spring Glen Church for their selfless service to the community. I thank them for their continuing commitment to these ongoing efforts.

It is our distinct pleasure to have the Reverend Hobbs with us today, and we thank you, Reverend Hobbs, for joining with us today and for your blessing.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces that 1-minutes will be limited to 20 today, 10 to each side.

THE NATIONAL DIALOG ON MEDICARE

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

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, it has been several weeks now since the Board of Trustees of Medicare issued their report saying that by 2002 Medicare will be broke. We are now engaged in a national dialog on this subject. And where have we come in this dialog?

I think that the little plate here shows it very well. Are we talking about Medicare, or are we talking about MediScare. The last thing this country needs, Mr. Speaker, is all of the half-truths and untruths that are issuing from the other side of the aisle, that are meant to frighten our senior citizens.

Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

What we need is a considered debate on this subject. Apparently my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are content to maintain the status quo by these scare tactics, and let Medicare go bankrupt.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority will not let this happen. We are committed to preserving, protecting, and strengthening Medicare for this generation and future generations.

ARBITRARY CUTS IN MEDICARE ARE IMPRUDENT

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

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on behalf of our communities, hospitals, and the health of today's and tomorrow's senior citizens. If we are to bring about Medicare reform which will prove to be truly beneficial, we must first reach a consensus that reforms must achieve specified goals without creating new, more difficult problems

In the Pittsburgh area alone, there are seven hospitals which would face almost certain shutdown as a result of these proposed cuts. It is neither prudent nor logical to make devastating cuts to Medicare in such an arbitrary fashion. The sound-thinking, hard-working people of western Pennsylvania and across this country will tell you that putting the cart before the horse will get Medicare nowhere fast.

A recent national poll shows that 72 percent of the American public oppose Medicare cuts being made to pay for tax breaks. One has to question how making major cuts to Medicare in part to fund tax breaks could be construed by anyone as fiscally conservative.

I urge my colleagues to oppose these ill-conceived and reckless cuts which not only shake the current foundation, but cause irreparable damage to the future stability of the Medicare system.

ACT NOW TO SAVE MEDICARE, NOT LATER

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, the liberals are continuing their scare campaign against the seniors of our country, telling them that Republicans are going to take away their Medicare benefits. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the liberals sound like they want to change the name from Medicare to MediScare.

But I would like to tell you something: I like Medicare, I like providing seniors with crucial medical security. And let me tell you what else I like. I like the idea of Medicare lasting a long, long time, so that future generations will also enjoy medical security.

But the President's Board of Trustees on Medicare tells us the system is going bankrupt in 7 years. Unless we act now, the future looks bleak.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell my liberal colleagues, let us forget the MediScare tactics. Let us channel our energy into something productive. Work with us to save Medicare, and please stop scaring our senior Americans.

WE NEED SPECIFICS ON CHANGES IN MEDICARE

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I believe it was old Will Rogers who said all I know is what I read in the papers, and were he around today, he would have a great deal in common with the seniors and the people who care about seniors, who are concerned about Medicare.

Because you see, all that our Republican colleagues have had to say about their specific plan to change and alter and reform and refine Medicare is that they think that ought to be done. If American seniors or Will Rogers were to have read the Times on Monday, they would have learned one of the specifics of this particular secret plan, that the Republicans think that Medicare beneficiaries should be discouraged from buying insurance to cover what Medicare does not cover already.

The Republicans evidently believe that MediGap coverage insulates patients from the cost of care; in essence, that our seniors are not paying enough for the care that they receive today.

We have had two Members this morning come up and talk about Medicare. They have failed to outline one specific change. They should be talking about MediScare, because they are scared to death to tell the American people how they are going to increase the cost of Medicare to every senior in this land.

DURBIN HARASS-THE-TOBACCO-FARMER AMENDMENT

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

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose what I call the Durbin harass-the-tobacco-farmer amendment to the Agriculture appropriations bill. Having lived in Georgia's farm belt all my adult life, I understand farm programs. Representing the 10th largest tobacco producing district in the country, I understand the importance of the tobacco program to family farmers in my State and across this country.

Now there is a big difference between improving farm programs and harassing farm families. The Durbin amendment is clearly downright harassment of tobacco farm families.

It does not improve the program, it strangles the farmers who participate. For example, if the Durbin amendment passes, the farmer would not have information on the safest use of chemicals and he would not benefit from his required participation in the crop insurance program.

But the Durbin amendment goes farther. In fact, it would not just affect the farmer, it would affect us all. This provision has the potential to prevent a buy-out of the program which could cost the taxpayers of this country an unbelievable $1 billion.

If you do not want to throw a blindsided knockout punch to family farmers and to rural districts of America then I urge you to vote ''no'' on the Durbin amendment.

MEDICARE CUTS TO FUND TAX BREAKS

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, indeed there is a MediScare, and there is a MediScare because the seniors know the truth about what is happening. They know that the new Republican majority has found this little piggy bank, this little piggy bank that had ''Medicare Trust Fund'' written on it, and they have crossed out ''Trust Fund'' and they are not using the Medicare piggy bank to pay for the crown jewel of their contract.

What is the crown jewel of their contract? Tax breaks for people who make over $350,000 a year. Seniors think that is unfair, when they also hear that Medicare is going broke. Let me tell you how much faster it is going to go broke if you keep using it as a piggy bank to pay for tax cuts.

When you look at the Medicare tax cut and you look at what it is going to cost to give everybody who makes more than $350,000 a year a $20,000 a year per person tax cut, it almost looks identical.

That is why there is MediScare, and they ought to absolutely be believing there is a MediScare. We ought to stop it.

TAX CUTS AND TAX INCREASES HAVE NO IMPACT ON MEDICARE TRUST FUND

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

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I think that the Members on the other side of the aisle do not understand how Medicare is funded. It is funded by a 1.45-percent payroll tax that is levied on employees and matched by employers, and if that tax is not paid, it will not be funded at all. It does not come from the general revenues of the Federal Government, it comes from a trust fund.

It does not matter if we raise one penny of taxes other than the 1.45 percent. It does not matter if we raise those or if we cut them. It has no impact whatsoever. The trust fund will go bankrupt completely in 7 years, regardless of what we do with those taxes. So

tax cuts and tax increases in the general revenue have absolutely no impact on the Medicare trust fund.

TAX BREAK DETRIMENTAL TO NATION

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

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow the extreme right wing agenda of the Republican party to ruin this Nation in order to give a shameless tax break to their wealthy supporters. How can the Republicans cut programs like Medicare and Medicaid for seniors, and health programs for mothers and infants, and, yes, still propose this obscene tax break for the rich?

Mr. Speaker, this shameless tax break is bad for the working men and women of America, and, if it is bad for them, it is bad for Americans. And, yes, Republican are bad for America.

REPUBLICANS HAVE HEEDED WARNINGS ON MEDICARE CAPS

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

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I do not know what we are talking about here when the other side is talking about cuts in Medicare. It seems to me that going from $4,800 per recipient per year to $6,700 is an increase.

Mr. Speaker, unlike the liberals on the other side of the aisle, Republicans have heeded the warnings of the Medicare Trustees Report. That report concluded that immediate action is needed to save Medicare for future generations.

Republicans are fully aware that millions of Americans rely on Medicare to help meet their health care needs. That is why it is called Medi-Care, because it provides care for our parents and grandparents.

On the other hand, liberal Democrats want to exploit this issue. To them this is MediScare. They want to scare people into believing something that is not true. Their tactics are fear, and their goal is to divide the American people.

Mr. Speaker, Medicare is too important a program to be allowed to go bankrupt. The American people must know that Republicans intend to protect and preserve Medicare. We will protect it for current and future beneficiaries, and we will not allow Medicare to become MediScare.

TAXES, TAXES, TAXES

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, retirement tax, income tax, property tax, excise tax, sales tax, beer tax, tobacco tax, cable tax, telephone tax, gasoline tax, hotel tax, surtaxes, taxes on taxes, and, don't forget when you die, inheritance tax. But also how about tolls, user fees, service charges, licenses, transfers. And some experts around the country are saying we don't need tax reform.

Beam me up, Mr. Speaker. Maybe, just maybe, these so-called experts are so dumb, we could throw them at the ground and they would probably miss.

REAL CUTS BEING MADE IN FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

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

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I am very disappointed once again this morning to hear the other side of the aisle talking about imaginary cuts to Medicare, cuts which have never been proposed by the Republicans and which we never plan to implement. I want to show you the cuts that the Republicans are implementing, and this chart shows the beginning of that effort.

We might call it a Sav-O-Meter. The legislative branch we have cut by $150 million; foreign aid by $1.5 billion; the energy and water budget by $1.6 billion; the Interior budget by $1.6 billion.

We are just starting. We are only partway through the appropriations process, and we have already cut $5 billion out of the Federal budget compared to last year. We expect to go up to about $21 billion.

What does this mean to Mr. and Mrs. Taxpayer of America? Roughly at this point about $50 per family in cuts already. We expect to get up in the neighborhood of $210 to $250 in cuts for the average American family. Those are real cuts. Those are cuts the people will notice. They are not the imaginary cuts the other side talks about.

PROGRAMS DESPERATELY NEEDED BY CHILDREN BEING CUT

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, just this week Columbia University released a poll where they asked our Nation's children what is your biggest fear or concern in school today, in 1995?

Well, what would you guess they answered? Was it an equation in an algebra test? That would have been my biggest worry. No. Was it a biology test? No. Was it drugs in school? Yes.

By a 2-to-1 margin, our children are more worried about drugs in school than algebra, biology, or even guns in school. So what are we doing about that? What did the Republicans do with our Drug Free School Program, which has received bipartisan support through the years? They cut it by 60 percent; 23 million children are going to be cut off Drug Free School Programs.

Now, unless you have got a lobbyist around here, sometimes it means that you do not fair very well. Let's cut the space station. Let's cut B–2 bombers. Let's not cut something our children desperately need.

INTRODUCTION OF THE GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

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

Mr. MARTINI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concern over the Supreme Court's recent decision in Hubbard versus United States. In that decision the high court overturned a Federal statute that has been used to prosecute Members of Congress and others who intentionally and knowingly release false or deceptive information to Congress. The current law no longer is applicable to such situations.

As a former Federal prosecutor, I know that section 1001 of 18 U.S. Code is a critical provision of law, which protects the Federal Government from potential waste, fraud, and abuse.

That's why in response to the Supreme Court's decision, I have introduced the Government Accountability Act (H.R. 1678) which will extend the false statement statute to all three branches of the Federal Government.

If Congress fails to act, unscrupulous public officials, contractors, and private citizens will be able to engage in acts of fraud and misconduct against the Federal Government without fear of punishment.

Mr. Speaker, we are here to serve the American people not ourselves.

In closing, I urge my colleagues to cosponsor H.R. 1678 which brings accountability back to the Federal Government.

□ 1020

TAX BREAKS FOR THE WEALTHY

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a modern day Robin Hood story to tell. Except this one, unlike the original story, does not have a noble ending. You see, the Robin Hood of Capitol Hill has it backward: He is stealing from the poor to give to the rich.

Of course, Republicans do not want to admit this. But how else can we describe the Republican plan to cut Medicare to pay for tax breaks for the wealthy?

Consider this: The median income of senior citizens in 1993 was about $15,000 for males and $8,500 for females. About 3.8 million seniors lived below the poverty level in that year.

It is this group of citizens—27 million of them—that will have about $1,060

per year in Medicare benefits taken from each of them in order to give 1.1 million of America's richest people a $20,000 tax break.

Now if the Republicans want to have a substantive debate about how to improve Medicare and rein in its costs to ensure future solvency, then let us have that talk. But the Republicans' current effort is not about that. It is about finding ways to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy under the guise of saving Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans are not so stealthy that their Robin Hood-in-reverse crusade will go unnoticed by seniors.

MEDICARE

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

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, Medicare is not a Republican issue—it is not a Democrat issue—it is an American issue. Recently, a bipartisan group appointed by both Republican and Democrat administrations reported to the Congress that Medicare will go bankrupt within 7 years if we take no action.

I believe we must prevent bankruptcy by simplifying and strengthening Medicare. We must simplify the system so that Medicare patients can more easily understand the program. In addition, we must strengthen Medicare to make it financially safe and secure for both current and future beneficiaries.

We must work to ensure that senior Americans have the same rights to health care services as Members of Congress.

In response to critics who are already claiming that this reform is a cut in the Medicare Program, I say this is simply not true. By enacting these modest reforms, Medicare will continue to increase—just at a slower rate.

In fact, costs per beneficiary will continue to increase from $4,800 per participant in 1995, to $6,400 per recipient in 2002. Now you tell me, how is this a cut?

To play politics with this issue does not help in finding a solution to this problem. To do nothing is totally irresponsible, and unacceptable.

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

(Mrs. CLAYTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend President Clinton for his eloquent, thoughtful, and perceptive statement on a very sensitive and difficult subject—affirmative action.

The President outlined an approach to this issue which not only conforms to the state of the law, including the Adarand case, but takes into account the muddied history of discrimination in this Nation, and takes into account the concerns that some have raised about affirmative action.

I agree with the President that fraud and abuse, fronts and pass-throughs, in affirmative action programs should not and will not be tolerated.

I also agree with the President that reverse discrimination, quotas, and promoting unqualified individuals has no place in our society.

The President's words went a long way to begin the important process of healing in America—urging us to ''reach beyond our fears and our divisions''.

The President pointed out that, ''When affirmative action is done right, it is flexible, it is fair, and it works.''

While we begin to debate the issues surrounding affirmative action we must not get caught up in the political rhetoric and fervor that plays on fears and insecurities. We must focus on the realities and the meaningful, productive, work left to be done.

WHERE IS THE DEMOCRAT'S MEDICARE PLAN?

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

Mr. KIM. Mr. speaker, I would like to talk about Medicare this morning. Let us take a look at this chart closely. The red one is the existing plan which is leading to bankruptcy. The red one, bottom, is trust fund balance. As you can see, in the year 2002 the money will be totally depleted.

The blue one is the Republican plan. What we are trying to do is slow down the increase, slow down the rate of increase.

Right above is the green plan, which is the Clinton plan. As you can see, the Clinton plan, the Republican plan, there are not that many differences. The only difference is the Republican plan tries to save Medicare, which is 7 years, and the Clinton plan is stretching out to 10 years.

My colleagues from the other side are complaining and bashing and attacking us. Let us see what their plan is.

Here it is. Nothing. They have absolutely no plan, no idea, no vision, except attack and attack and bash. I think it is silly.

LET US NOT ROB OUR CHILDREN'S FUTURE

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, there go our Republican friends again. First they cut Medicare to give tax breaks to the rich, and now they are cutting education, our children's future, to give tax breaks to the rich.

A subcommittee today is cutting $3.9 billion off education, robbing America's children. Goals 2000, setting education standards, cut; safe and drug-free schools, cut; chapter 1 funding to help our schools, cut; Eisenhower Program for teacher training, cut; and adult and vocational training, cut. And why? To give tax breaks for the rich.

What will this mean to middle class America? More students per class, and local and State property taxes increasing. Student loans were taken away from our children by the Republicans, and now, on top of Medicare, they are going to cut education again.

These are middle-class kids that are going to suffer. Eighty-nine percent of jobs created in this country require postsecondary training. What are the Republicans doing for that? Cut again.

We have a plan. It is a plan of compassion. Let us fix what needs to be fixed, but let us not cut and rob our children's future.

FRAUD IN MEDICARE

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, Medicare was established to help our seniors, not to make unscrupulous companies wealthy at their expense.

Today I am talking about the fraud in Medicare. Listen to the items that ABC Home Health Care put on their Medicare tab: Maid service payments for condominiums; golf pro shop expenses; airplane and automobile expenses for personal trips; and lobbying expenses.

They use promotional and marketing gimmicks such as gourmet popcorn, golf tees, earrings, cufflinks, combs, and sewing kits to recruit new members.

This is not a club but a home health care service. We should all be concerned.

Taxpayers are footing the bill for these luxury items.

Money was no object because ABC Home Health Care put it on the Medicare tab. Medicare was billed to the tune of $14 million for just 1 year.

We cannot allow this to happen, this fraud to continue in the Medicare Program.

MEDICARE FRAUD AND ABUSE

(Ms. ESHOO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the GAO issued a report outlining charges against ABC Home Health Care for defrauding American taxpayers through the Medicare Program. The Democrats want to reform the Medicare system, but you do not do it by picking the seniors' health care pockets dry.

What we want to do is to scrap the tax break plan and stop this private sector ripoff of the public sector.

The GAO said that this Georgia company did do this: $140,000 for airplane costs; $21,000 for a pilot's salary; $16,000 for alcohol at a leadership conference.

Get this one: $84,000 for gourmet popcorn. My mother and father have never done this. This is, again, a ripoff by the providers and the private sector of the public sector. Scrap the tax break plan and stop picking at our senior citizens.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit today while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule: The Committee on Banking and Financial Services, the Committee on Commerce, the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, the Committee on International Relations, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Resources, the Committee on Small Business, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

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

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

Mr. MCNULTY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, my colleague from New York is correct. We have consulted with the ranking members of these committees, and we have no objection to the request.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2058, CHINA POLICY ACT OF 1995, AND HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 96, DISAPPROVING EXTENSION OF MOST-FAVORED-NATION TREATMENT TO THE PRODUCTS OF CHINA

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 193 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 193

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2058) establishing United States policy toward China. The bill shall be debatable for ninety minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. The motion to recommit may include instructions only if offered by the minority leader or his designee.

SEC. 2. After disposition of H.R. 2058, it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 96) disapproving the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (most-favored-nation treatment) to the products of the People's Republic of China. The joint resolution shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by Representative Wolf of Virginia and Representative Archer of Texas or their designees. Pursuant to sections 152 and 153 of the Trade Act of 1974, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to table, if offered by Representative Wolf or his designee. The provisions of sections 152 and 153 of the Trade Act of 1974 shall not apply to any other joint resolution disapproving the extension of most-favored-nation treatment to the People's Republic of China for the remainder of the first session of the One Hundred Fourth Congress.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON]. During the consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

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

Mr. Speaker, this rule was unanimously adopted by the Committee on Rules, and I am proud to say that the arrangement worked out by this rule was unanimously agreed to on a bipartisan basis by the principal parties involved with the legislation.

What the rule does is to first make in order in the House the bill, H.R. 2058, the China Policy Act of 1995, as introduced by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

The rule provides for 90 minutes of general debate, equally divided between the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations. While we originally considered limiting this to 1 hour of debate, we expanded the debate time at the request of the bipartisan group that had negotiated a compromise with Mr. BEREUTER.

The rule further provides for one motion to recommit the bill, which, if containing instructions, may be offered by the minority leader or his designee. I would point out to my colleagues that this latter provision is in keeping with the new House rule adopted on January 4 of this year which guarantees to the minority the right to offer a motion to recommit with instructions, and I quote from rule XI, clause 4(b), ''if offered by the minority leader or his designee.'' That is what is contained in the House rules.

This is a guarantee we Republicans were denied on numerous occasions when we were in the minority but which we promised to give the minority if we became the majority.

Mr. Speaker, the rule goes on to provide that after the disposition of H.R. 2058, the House may proceed to the consideration in the House of House Joint Resolution 96, introduced by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], disapproving the extension of most-favored-nation status to the products of the People's Republic of China.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, divided equally between the gentleman from Virginia and the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER].

Pursuant to the terms of the fast track procedures, the previous question is considered as ordered to final passage on the joint resolution, except that one motion to table the resolution is in order, if offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] or his designee.

Finally, the rule provides that the fast track procedures of the Trade Act shall not apply to any other disapproval resolution relating to MFN for China for the remainder of this session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, before I turn to the policy aspects of the measures before us, I just want to comment on the cooperation we have received from the parties on all sides of the issue involved here in crafting this rule. As I mentioned earlier, this was reported from the Committee on Rules on a unanimous vote, thanks to the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON] who is managing for the minority. This was also due in no small part to the cooperation and compromise among all concerned that has taken place in crafting the legislative bill made in order by the rule.

I especially want to pay tribute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] for his open-mindedness and willingness to listen to other Members. I also commend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] who have labored for so long in these vineyards, for their accommodating attitudes in reaching agreement on a consensus bill.

I would be remiss if I did not single out the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], and the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], and the Committee on International Relations chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] for all their work on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good rule, a fair rule and a bipartisan rule that will enable us to debate the issues and vote on two distinct yet related propositions relating to the People's Republic of China. I hope that we will adopt this rule.

Turning now, Mr. Speaker, to the substance of the issue itself, I cannot avoid making the observation that two things have remained constant since the House began having this annual

China MFN debate 5 years ago. Those two constants are simply these: Our trade deficit with China keeps going up, and the conditions within China itself keep going down, keep getting worse.

Is there a single problem that troubles the United States-China relationship which has gotten better in the last 5 years? I ask all of my colleagues listening to this debate today to answer that question. Has anything gotten better since we debated this 1 year ago? The Chinese Communists' brutal disregard for human rights, how about that? The severe restrictions on freedom of speech, press and assembly and association, have they gotten better? Members know the answer. The continued denial of prison visits by international observers, has that improved? No. The continued jamming of Voice of America, still going on. The ongoing sales of missiles and weapons of mass destruction to terrorist regimes, still going on. The unrestrained use of prison labor in the manufacture of export products, in competition to the shirt that I am wearing, made by Americans in the United States of America, has that gotten better? No, it has gotten worse, and the proof is out there.

The massive military buildup, particularly in offensive weapons systems. I mention again, offensive weapons systems, which threaten the peace of the entire East Asian region.

Do my colleagues know that the People's Republic of China has more than doubled its defense budget in the last 5 years while other countries, like the United States of America and all of our NATO allies, all countries around the world have decreased their military spending?

□ 1040

There is China's continued reliance on predatory trade practices, and I could just go on and on. To top it all off, the Chinese regime has arrested a man named Harry Wu, an American citizen, whose only crime was to tell the world the truth about China's gulag and the prison labor system. That is his only crime. Yet, he is being detained. God knows what is going to happen to him.

Mr. Speaker, the list of abuses goes on and on and on. Every one of these problems has gotten worse during a period of time in which China's exports to the United States have gone up, listen to this, have gone up 233 percent. And our trade deficit against China has gone up by a staggering 377 percent since 1989, and we sit here and allow this to continue to happen, putting Americans out of work.

That is what is wrong with giving an outlaw regime MFN status. The trade becomes a one-way street. In 1989, the year of Tiananmen Square, about 23 percent of China's total exports came to the United States, 23 percent. By last year, that figure had risen to nearly 37 percent, and yet the Chinese Communist regime continues to thumb its nose at everything our country stands for. America, the leader of democracy throughout the world, they thumb their nose at us.

I would just ask the proponents of MFN, when do the benefits start? When can we expect to see a change in Chinese behavior? The hometown newspaper of the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] said it best.

A recent editorial in the San Francisco Examiner said that our current approach to China proves that ''Once you get rolled, it's easier to get rolled again. The Chinese have little reason to think the United States will make good on any threat,'' because we never follow through.

Continuing to read from the Examiner editorial: ''Instead of calling the shots, the United States is treated by the Chinese as a bothersome supplicant.'' Is that not something, this great Nation?

Continuing to read: ''Such back-of-the-hand treatment should not come as a surprise. For years now the United States has seen how China treats its own citizens.''

Mr. Speaker, I would simply close this portion of my remarks by noting that no Member of this body should be surprised by the current state of United States-China relations. If Members do not think about anything else today, I hope that they will at least ponder this: A China which is not at peace with its own people will not be at peace with the United States or any other country in the world. That is why human rights have to be at the center of the United States-China relationship, because American interests are ultimately inseparable from our American values. Anything and everything we do should be to promote those American values.

Mr. Speaker, we will be conducting the MFN debate this year under a different format from what we have used in previous years. The whole point of what this House will be doing today is to send a united and unmistakable message to China that the freely-elected representatives of the American people are putting human rights and American values back into the central focus of the United States-China relationship.

Reasonable men and women can have an honest disagreement over the relative merits of MFN, and there are good people on both sides of this argument, Republicans and Democrats alike. However, let there be no mistake about it, Members of this Congress are unanimous in our determination to see an end to the abuses that China's Communist regime is perpetrating on its own people and on the world at large.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of the Members to think about this point as we debate this issue over the next 3 hours.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following material:

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,[1] 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS

[As of July 19, 1995]

Rule type	103d Congress		104th Congress	
	Number of rules	Percent of total	Number of rules	Percent of total
Open/Modified-open [2]	46	44	36	72
Modified Closed [3]	49	47	12	24
Closed [4]	9	9	2	4
Totals:	104	100	50	100

[1] This table applies only to rules which provide for the original consideration of bills, joint resolutions or budget resolutions and which provide for an amendment process. It does not apply to special rules which only waive points of order against appropriations bills which are already privileged and are considered under an open amendment process under House rules.

[2] An open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule. A modified open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule subject only to an overall time limit on the amendment process and/or a requirement that the amendment be preprinted in the Congressional Record.

[3] A modified closed rule is one under which the Rules Committee limits the amendments that may be offered only to those amendments designated in the special rule or the Rules Committee report to accompany it, or which preclude amendments to a particular portion of a bill, even though the rest of the bill may be completely open to amendment.

[4] A closed rule is one under which no amendments may be offered (other than amendments recommended by the committee in reporting the bill).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS

[As of July 19, 1995]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 38 (1/18/95)	O	H.R. 5	Unfunded Mandate Reform	A: 350–71 (1/19/95).
H. Res. 44 (1/24/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 17	Social Security	A: 255–172 (1/25/95).
		H.J. Res. 1	Balanced Budget Amdt	
H. Res. 51 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 101	Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 52 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 400	Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l. Park and Preserve	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 53 (1/31/95)	O	H.R. 440	Land Conveyance, Butte County, Calif	A: voice vote (2/1/95).
H. Res. 55 (2/1/95)	O	H.R. 2	Line Item Veto	A: voice vote (2/2/95).
H. Res. 60 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 665	Victim Restitution	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 61 (2/6/95)	O	H.R. 666	Exclusionary Rule Reform	A: voice vote (2/7/95).
H. Res. 63 (2/8/95)	MO	H.R. 667	Violent Criminal Incarceration	A: voice vote (2/9/95).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS—Continued

[As of July 19, 1995]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 69 (2/9/95)	O	H.R. 668	Criminal Alien Deportation	A: voice vote (2/10/95).
H. Res. 79 (2/10/95)	MO	H.R. 728	Law Enforcement Block Grants	A: voice vote (2/13/95).
H. Res. 83 (2/13/95)	MO	H.R. 7	National Security Revitalization	PQ: 229–100; A: 227–127 (2/15/95).
H. Res. 88 (2/16/95)	MC	H.R. 831	Health Insurance Deductibility	PQ: 230–191; A: 229–188 (2/21/95).
H. Res. 91 (2/21/95)	O	H.R. 830	Paperwork Reduction Act	A: voice vote (2/22/95).
H. Res. 92 (2/21/95)	MC	H.R. 889	Defense Supplemental	A: 282–144 (2/22/95).
H. Res. 93 (2/22/95)	MO	H.R. 450	Regulatory Transition Act	A: 252–175 (2/23/95).
H. Res. 96 (2/24/95)	MO	H.R. 1022	Risk Assessment	A: 253–165 (2/27/95).
H. Res. 100 (2/27/95)	O	H.R. 926	Regulatory Reform and Relief Act	A: voice vote (2/28/95).
H. Res. 101 (2/28/95)	MO	H.R. 925	Private Property Protection Act	A: 271–151 (3/2/95)
H. Res. 103 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 1058	Securities Litigation Reform	
H. Res. 104 (3/3/95)	MO	H.R. 988	Attorney Accountability Act	A: voice vote (3/6/95)
H. Res. 105 (3/6/95)	MO			A: 257–155 (3/7/95)
H. Res. 108 (3/7/95)	Debate	H.R. 956	Product Liability Reform	A: voice vote (3/8/95)
H. Res. 109 (3/8/95)	MC			PQ: 234–191 A: 247–181 (3/9/95)
H. Res. 115 (3/14/95)	MO	H.R. 1159	Making Emergency Supp. Approps.	A: 242–190 (3/15/95)
H. Res. 116 (3/15/95)	MC	H.J. Res. 73	Term Limits Const. Amdt	A: voice vote (3/28/95)
H. Res. 117 (3/16/95)	Debate	H.R. 4	Personal Responsibility Act of 1995	A: voice vote (3/21/95)
H. Res. 119 (3/21/95)	MC			A: 217–211 (3/22/95)
H. Res. 125 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 1271	Family Privacy Protection Act	A: 423–1 (4/4/95)
H. Res. 126 (4/3/95)	O	H.R. 660	Older Persons Housing Act	A: voice vote (4/6/95)
H. Res. 128 (4/4/95)	MC	H.R. 1215	Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	A: 228–204 (4/5/95)
H. Res. 130 (4/5/95)	MC	H.R. 483	Medicare Select Expansion	A: 253–172 (4/6/95)
H. Res. 136 (5/1/95)	O	H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act of 1995	A: voice vote (5/2/95)
H. Res. 139 (5/3/95)	O	H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Auth. FY 1996	A: voice vote (5/9/95)
H. Res. 140 (5/9/95)	O	H.R. 961	Clean Water Amendments	A: 414–4 (5/10/95)
H. Res. 144 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 535	Fish Hatchery—Arkansas	A: voice vote (5/15/95)
H. Res. 145 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 584	Fish Hatchery—Iowa	A: voice vote (5/15/95)
H. Res. 146 (5/11/95)	O	H.R. 614	Fish Hatchery—Minnesota	A: voice vote (5/15/95)
H. Res. 149 (5/16/95)	MC	H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution FY 1996	PQ: 252–170 A: 255–168 (5/17/95)
H. Res. 155 (5/22/95)	MO	H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act	A: 233–176 (5/23/95)
H. Res. 164 (6/8/95)	MC	H.R. 1530	Nat. Defense Auth. FY 1996	PQ: 225–191 A: 233–183 (6/13/95)
H. Res. 167 (6/15/95)	O	H.R. 1817	MilCon Appropriations FY 1996	PQ: 223–180 A: 245–155 (6/16/95)
H. Res. 169 (6/19/95)	MC	H.R. 1854	Leg. Branch Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 232–196 A: 236–191 (6/20/95)
H. Res. 170 (6/20/95)	O	H.R. 1868	For. Ops. Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 221–178 A: 217–175 (6/22/95)
H. Res. 171 (6/22/95)	O	H.R. 1905	Energy & Water Approps. FY 1996	A: voice vote (7/12/95)
H. Res. 173 (6/27/95)	C	H.J. Res. 79	Flag Constitutional Amendment	PQ: 258–170 A: 271–152 (6/28/95)
H. Res. 176 (6/28/95)	MC	H.R. 1944	Emer. Supp. Approps.	PQ: 236–194 A: 234–192 (6/29/95)
H. Res. 185 (7/11/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 235–193 D: 192–238 (7/12/95)
H. Res. 187 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1977	Interior Approps. FY 1996 #2	PQ: 230–194 A: 229–195 (7/13/95)
H. Res. 188 (7/12/95)	O	H.R. 1976	Agriculture Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 242–185 A: voice vote (7/18/95)
H. Res. 190 (7/17/95)	O	H.R. 2020	Treasury/Postal Approps. FY 1996	PQ: 232–192 A: voice vote (7/18/95)
H. Res. 193 (7/19/95)	C	H.J. Res. 96	Disapproval of MFN to China	
H. Res. 194 (7/19/95)	O	H.R. 2002	Transportation Approps. FY 1996	

Codes: O-open rule; MO-modified open rule; MC-modified closed rule; C-closed rule; A-adoption vote; D-defeated; PQ-previous question vote. Source: Notices of Action Taken, Committee on Rules, 104th Congress.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we support the rule. As my colleague on the other side of the aisle has indicated, this rule will provide for the debate on two measures, H.R. 2058, the China Policy Act of 1995, and House Joint Resolution 96, the resolution disapproving the extension of most favored nation treatment to the People's Republic of China. The rule allows 90 minutes of debate on the China Policy Act and also provides for 1 hour of debate on the resolution disapproving MFN to China.

This is not an unusual rule for this legislation, which has critical implications for United States policy toward China. In the past, the Committee on Rules has brought two measures to the floor under one rule. My colleagues on both sides of the aisle are in total agreement with the rules resolution, and many of my colleagues, including the distinguished author of the disapproval resolution, the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. WOLF, as well as the gentlewoman from California, Ms. PELOSI, and the gentleman from Nebraska, DOUG BEREUTER, have worked many hours to reach agreement on the proper legislative approach. They have done an excellent job. They deserve, as the gentleman from New York already has, they deserve to be commended. I am glad we will have a chance to debate this issue.

The Chinese have one of the worst human rights records in the world. Individual rights of people are routinely repressed. Scholars and intellectuals are imprisoned, and women are often forced to have abortions if they try to have more than one child.

In 1989 the world was horrified when the Chinese killed their own students at Tiananmen Square. Now, 6 years later, not much has changed. China continues to violate basic human rights of its own people, and those living in Tibet as well. It also routinely contributes to nuclear weapon and missile proliferation among terrorist states.

Many of us in the Congress believe that tough economic sanctions by the United States is the only way to convince China to stop its human rights violations. By denying MFN status and reversing China's $30 billion trade surplus, we may get some concessions. If the Chinese Government refuses to hear the protests of those who respect basic human dignity, perhaps it will listen if money is at stake.

We are glad Mr. Speaker, that we will have a chance to debate this issue and to bring the bill of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] to the floor, the so-called China Policy Act, which addresses some of the serious flaws in our current policy toward China. Again we reiterate; we support this rule, and we urge our colleagues to join us in voting for it. It is a fair and a good rule.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], the vice chairman of the Committee on Rules. Even though he and I disagree on this matter, he is an expert, and I will be interested in hearing what he has to say.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Committee on Rules for his very kind remarks. As I look in the Chamber here, it was, believe it or not, exactly 1 year old today, July 20, 1994, that my colleague, the gentlewoman from California, Ms. PELOSI, my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. WOLF, my colleague, the gentleman from New York, Mr. SOLOMON, the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. HOYER, the gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, our colleague, the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. KOLBE, and the gentleman from Oregon, Mr. Kopetski, our former colleague, joined in the first bipartisan, bicameral debate on a very important question that came forward. That question was, should U.S. trade policy be used to enforce human rights?

I would say to my colleagues who participated in that, they remember very well that we had a difficult time determining exactly what the exact question was going to be. We all agreed, we all agreed that U.S. trade policy should be used to promote human rights, but we decided to take the negative position, that U.S. trade policy should not be used to enforce human rights. That is for a very simple and basic reason. I remain convinced that trade promotes private enterprise, which creates wealth, which improves

living standards, which undermines political repression.

If we look at the very serious challenges that lie ahead for the most populous Nation on the face of the Earth, a country which has five times the population of the world's only complete superpower, the United States of America, we clearly have an obligation to remain engaged.

Right here in the United States, we know full well that there are thousands and thousands of jobs that depend on our exports to the People's Republic of China. In fact, 360,000 jobs hinge on our exports, so clearly, cutting off trade with China would jeopardize economic growth right here in the United States.

Quite frankly, I believe that it is extraordinarily important for us to look at the gains which have been made in China over the past several years, since we worked to deal with this issue of engagement. As my friends here on the House floor know full well, I take a back seat to no one when it comes to demonstrating outrage at the issue of human rights violation.

The gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], and I joined with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and others in marching, following the Tiananmen Square massacre from right here in the Capitol up to the Chinese Embassy to protest the Tiananmen Square massacre. The fact of the matter is we have to realize that if we are going to continue to deal with the improvement of human rights, there is nothing, nothing that we could do to jeopardize it in a greater way than to bring to an end, bring to an end the engagement policies that we have had over the past several years.

Mr. Speaker, last year I went with my father and traveled throughout China, and had fascinating experiences there. As I talked to people who worked, peasants and others, clearly they carried the strong message that as the old leaders of China fade from the scene, they do not want to see us leave their country economically devastated. It is for that reason that they encouraged us to maintain MFN with China.

As we also look at the situation which exists there, it is very clear that there are many things that we as a country can continue to do to improve the quality of life of the people of China. Just this week we received a letter from Jack Valenti, our friend with the Motion Picture Association of America, in which he talked about that to near record crowds; the movie ''Forrest Gump'' is playing in China. Let us think about the movie ''Forrest Gump,'' that great American drama, set with the backdrop of 20th century American history. What an amazing message to have moving throughout the country of 1.2 billion people living today under political repression.

My hometown newspaper, the Los Angeles Times, just this week had a very important article talking about individuals within China from all across the economic spectrum who are benefiting from the kind of engagement that we have going on today. The benefits have been very, very great: black and white TV's are even appearing in caves in China. When one thinks about that kind of exposure to the West, we are clearly, clearly on a path toward improving the situation there.

I hope very much that we will be able to now move ahead in a bipartisan way. This is a new day, because there is recognition that while we can never tolerate the reprehensible human rights violations, the violation of Harry Wu's rights and others' rights, we need to do everything that we possibly can to move ahead with this very important policy of engagement. I thank my friends for working in a very close bipartisan way with the gentleman from California [Mr. BEREUTER], and others to bring this about.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the distinguished gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, that is music to my ears. I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON] from the Committee on Rules for being so generous in yielding, and also the chairman of the Committee on Rules, my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], for bringing this rule to the floor, and for his championing the cause of freedom throughout the world, and his relentless advocacy for human rights in China.

It is with a great deal of pleasure, Mr. Speaker, that I rise in support of the Bereuter legislation, H.R. 2058, which is designed to move United States-China policy in the right direction by sending a strong message to the Chinese Government that the United States Congress is concerned about human rights in China and Tibet.

I have been pleased to work in this endeavor with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF]. With all due respect to the previous speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], we should all take a back seat to the gentleman from Virginia as an advocate for human rights throughout the world, in his advocacy for human rights. Mr. WOLF is an inspiration to this Congress, and it is a privilege to work with him.

I was particularly pleased that the leadership of this Congress, the office of the Speaker, and of the Democratic leader worked to help us merge our bills, forge a compromise under the leadership of the gentleman from California [Mr. BEREUTER], and I am grateful to him for his leadership and his receptiveness to our ideas.

As many Members know, and I address the mechanics of this because we are on the rule, as many know, we had three options out there. We had the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] for total revocation; we had the legislation of the gentleman from California [Mr. BEREUTER]; and we had the Wolf-Pelosi legislation, which we believed was the strongest possible message on human rights for this Congress. We have, I think happily, been able to merge the Bereuter bill and the Wolf-Pelosi bill into the product we have here.

Indeed, we were very pleased to have many of the provisions in the bill of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and the bill of the gentleman from California [Mr. BEREUTER], but I commend the gentleman from California for having initiatives that were even stronger than some of ours and with which we were very pleased to associate ourselves.

As with any compromise, some people may not be happy with it, but as I say on this China issue, if it is good enough for the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] it should be good enough for the rest of us.

Why is it that we need to come here again to discuss this issue and to present a policy for China in the Congress of the United States? Our colleagues who have spoken before me, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] taking the lead, have spoken of some of the concerns that this Congress has with China. They fall into three categories, by and large: human rights, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and, obviously, unfair trade practices; and MFN is related to trade. It is appropriate that we are here.

The reason this debate comes up annually, and the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] said we were 1 year talking about this, 1 year to the day, is because the President must request a special waiver to grant MFN to China; hence, the proposed motion of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] to deny the President's request.

In those three areas of human rights, trade, and proliferation, in this past year there has been no progress. Indeed, the Chinese continue to violate international standards and norms, and the missile technology control regime, in transferring technology to Pakistan, to Iran, and making the Middle East a very dangerous neighborhood, as well as the world a less safe place.

If there were no other consideration, the issue of the proliferation of nuclear technology to unsafeguarded countries would be enough reason for us to deal with this MFN issue on this floor. What is dismaying about all of this is that instead of addressing this issue, the Clinton administration on June 30—this notice was in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 30: ''Notice of termination of the suspensions of licenses for the export of cryptographic items to the People's Republic of China—Message from the President.'' It is in the June 22, 1995, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I have it available for our colleagues.

This is all to say, Mr. Speaker, that there is a double standard with this administration when it comes to China.

We have defined Iran as a rogue country. We have made a strong point of saying we will not trade with them. We have chastised, and more, Russia for their trade with Iran.

We have looked the other way when China has done the same, and indeed, and indeed, in the same time frame, we have lifted—the President has gotten a blanket waiver against the prohibition of sale of encryption technologies to China. This is, I think, a big mistake. The human rights violations continue, highlighted, of course, by the arrest of Harry Wu, a champion of democracy, a scholar at the Hoover Institution at Stanford University, a distinguished American, an internationally recognized champion of human rights, and his release must be immediate, as the bill calls for.

However, I would also like to say that Harry's plight is not only that of an individual, but representative of the thousands and thousands and thousands of people who are in prison labor camps in China who Harry's advocacy was for. He had been arrested for 19 years for criticizing the Soviet invasion of Hungary. He knew of what he spoke in terms of brutality in slave labor camps. It continues. His telling the truth about that has landed him in a Chinese jail. As an American citizen he deserves our fullest support. I urge our colleagues to avail themselves of our yellow ribbons on his behalf.

He is not the only one, obviously, in prison that we are concerned about. There are thousands who are; in particular, Wei Jing Cheng, Bao Pong, Chen Zeming, some of the champions of Chinese democracy. Indeed, in the last few months, many leaders and intellectuals in China have been arrested for merely signing petitions asking for an end of corruption and more democratic reforms in China. Obviously, my colleagues know I could go on all day about the violations of human rights in China.

On the subject of trade, when we first started this debate in 1989, for that year, for 1989, China had a $6 billion trade surplus with the United States. That means, as Members know, within our trade relationship they profited by $6 billion. This past year, it was $30 billion. It went $6, $9, $12, $18, $24, $30. This year it will be closer to a $40 billion trade surplus, inching closer year by year to the same kind of deficit that we have with Japan, but absent the same kind of allowing of products into their markets that even Japan does. Then Members know what our complaint is with Japan.

I do not want to bring up the issue of Taiwan in terms of recognition, but just in terms of this one figure. In China there are 1.2 billion people. In Taiwan there are approximately 19 million people, and Taiwan imports from the United States twice as much as mainland China imports from the United States, so the trade issue must be addressed, not only in terms of slave labor and violations of trade agreements, but in addition to the lack of market access for American products into China, which is also a trade violation.

□ 1100

What does the administration do? The administration not only gave them MFN but this past January gave the Chinese the same trade privileges, reductions in tariffs, that World Trade Organization members have, even though China is not a member of the World Trade Organization and living up to any of the standards or requirements of the WTO.

Again, our concern is with China. The disappointment is with the administration in the way they respond to human rights, trade and proliferation violations.

This China Policy Act that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] has authored establishes a framework for diplomatic relationships between the United States and China. It calls upon the President to undertake intensified diplomatic initiatives to persuade the Chinese Government to unconditionally and immediately release Harry Wu.

The provisions of the legislation are available to our colleagues, but since it is new I will just touch on a few:

Adhere to prevailing international standards regarding proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, including halting the export of ballistic missile technology and the provision of other weapons of mass destruction to Iran, Pakistan, and other countries of concern; respect internationally-recognized human rights—we know what they are—press, freedom of religion, assembly, et cetera; releasing all political prisoners and dismantling the Chinese gulag and forced labor system; ending coercive birth control practices; respecting the rights of the people of Tibet and ethnic minorities; curtailing excessive modernization and expansion of its military capabilities. It goes on to more on that.

Adhere to rules of international trade regime; comply with the prohibition on all forced labor products coming into the United States; and reduce tension with Taiwan through dialog and confidence-building.

The bill specifies the administration should undertake diplomatic initiatives bilaterally with China and multilaterally in the United Nations, the World Bank, the World Trade Organization and in our bilateral relations with other countries.

In order to hold the President accountable for undertaking these initiatives, the bill requires a report to Congress within 30 days of enactment and at least every 6 months thereafter.

H.R. 2058 also places Congress firmly on the record in support of the pro-democracy movement in China. For the first time we commend the men and women working in the democracy movement, particularly those people who so bravely petitioned the Chinese government for the promotion of political, economic and religious freedom.

Finally, the Bereuter bill requires the administration to get Radio Free Asia up and running. This important initiative has been stalled for too long. The bill mandates that within 90 days of enactment, Radio Free Asia shall commence broadcasting to China.

I urge my colleagues to give a strong vote on the Bereuter bill, on the China Policy Act, because it will allow the United States Congress to send a unified message to the Chinese government that its continuing violations of internationally recognized human rights are not acceptable.

The reason that I am pleased with this bill and one of the reasons I support the bill is because it does hold the President accountable. Last year when the President did not abide by the Executive order he had issued the year before, he instead proposed some initiatives, a code of conduct for businesses, funding for Radio Free Asia. The list goes on and on. The fact is that the adherence to it was zero.

It is important, I think, for us to hold the administration accountable. A vote for the China Policy Act will do that. I think it is very important for this Congress. We have been engaged in advocacy for a long time. We will always be engaged in advocacy for the causes of concern to us. But absent a coherent China policy that maybe the State Department proposes, the Commerce Department appears to dispose, I think it then behooves the Congress to set forth a framework that will have a positive impact on our relationship with China.

I think the message should be very clear that a prosperous, strong and democratic China is in the best interest of the United States. We look forward to a great future with the Chinese people, but in doing so we want to do it on the basis of recognition of international norms and indeed norms that the Chinese government has signed on to but has not abided by.

By supporting the Bereuter bill, we can speak with one voice on behalf of those fighting for freedom in China. I urge my colleagues to vote for the bill.

In closing, I wish once again to commend my colleagues on that side, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], and particularly in this case the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] for his leadership in bringing this legislation to the floor. I once again thank the leadership of the House for accommodating our concerns.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I am not here today to talk about Harry Wu or Tiananmen Square or human rights. Those issues should be addressed. But I

think commerce and trade should be looked at in a little bit of a different vein here, folks.

Let me say this: America does not need to go bankrupt trying to effect some social reforms in China.

Let us look at the record. China has been convicted of dumping in American markets, placing phony ''made in America'' labels on cheap Chinese imports, violating international prison labor law, violating United States copyright law, closing Chinese markets, and that is only the tip of the iceberg. Their average wage is 17 cents an hour. They still employ slave labor.

Let us look at some facts. Right now China enjoys a one-way street, a $37 billion trade surplus with America, second only to Japan. At least Japan makes us some promises. China makes us threats. China says if you mess with MFN, they will crack down on soybeans, corn, aircraft, grain. They will not tolerate it. Unbelievable, ladies and gentlemen.

I believe that a Congress that will allow China to dictate trade terms is the same Congress that has destroyed many American jobs.

Let us talk some business. How do you compete with foreign imports with a wage factor so limited and low? Then they rip off our markets illegally and we extend the red carpet treatment, talking about all the great business we are going to attain.

This is a dream world. The Constitution is very clear on this: Congress shall regulate commerce with foreign nations. One of the main problems financially in America is the Congress of the United States talking about balanced budgets and all of these other sideline issues and missing the whole boat. You cannot balance the budget of the United States buying much more than you sell. That is what we are doing, and it is our trade problem, folks.

I am going to oppose any more most-favored-nation trade status for China for one reason: They do not deserve it. It is time to regulate trade with China.

One last thing, ladies and gentleman. We are either going to take on the trade issue in America or we will continue to have huge budget deficits and tremendous loss of jobs. You cannot separate them.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART], another outstanding member of the Committee on Rules who formerly served on the Committee on Foreign Affairs and is certainly very knowledgeable on this issue.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank our distinguished colleagues who have worked so diligently and so exhaustively on this issue: The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER]; of course the gentleman from Virginia, [Mr. WOLF], the tireless champion for human rights throughout the world; the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] who has distinguished herself in her career for her advocacy on behalf of democracy and human rights in China; the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], my chairman and dear friend; the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] who is here and who has worked so tirelessly on this issue as has the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] and others.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fair rule. I rise in support of it. I would prefer today to see a vote on the denial of the extension of MFN to China. But I will support the Bereuter legislation. I think it is a fair, well-thought-out piece of legislation.

What we are dealing with, Mr. Speaker, here today on this issue really I think is related to the following question: What is the goal, or what should be the goal of our public policy? The maximization of profit for our businesses at all costs, even at the cost of ignoring, of not even mentioning the Orwellian nature of the Chinese regime?

I know, Mr. Speaker, the geopolitics involved when we analyze China. I know that China is the historical adversary of Russia, and I know the size of China and the great number of human beings that reside there.

May I recommend to our colleagues the book by our colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FUNDERBURK], written with regard to his experience when he was United States Ambassdaor to Romania under Ceausescu, his brilliant synthesis of how those rogue regimes look to most-favored-nation status as legitimization of their conduct. They know who they are, but they want to be told by the leader of the free world, the United States in effect, and we do that with MFN, ''You're normal. We are ignoring your rogue status. We are ignoring the nature of your brutality.''

That is what MFN is. When we deny MFN, there are no tariffs involved. It is simply a political statement which tells rogue regimes, in this case the Chinese regime, that they are not what they really are. That, in effect, is what MFN is.

I think that we have to realize and ask this question about ourselves: Are we willing to go through the trouble of at least mentioning, of at least telling the tyrants in China, ''We know who you are'' or ''We know your genuine nature.''

''We know that you murder prisoners and that you sell their organs. We know that you use slave labor. We know that you force women to have abortions.''

By not extending MFN, we would simply be telling the Chinese tyrants, ''We know who you are and we're telling the world who you are. Recognizing the geopolitics, which we are not ignoring, we're telling you who you are.''

I wish that we would have that vote today. If not, I think we are making at least some progress with the well-thought-through and negotiated legislation presented by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER]. But this is an issue that will not go away until China truly is normal. Then we can tell the world community they are not a rogue regime. They are normal.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN].

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, we should not be timid in using trade with the United States to stand up for human rights. This Nation has stood tall, sometimes alone, for the rights of people around the world against some very strong governments.

Some of the proudest moments in the history of this Nation were when we watched Soviet emigres settle in new homes around the world. We saw the destruction of the Berlin Wall, the historic elections in South Africa, knowing full well the role that we played in the United States to bring about these historic moments.

Trade was a critical tool in those changes. MFN and denying it to the Soviet Union played a critical role in the actions of the Soviet Union in Eastern Europe. Trade sanctions against South Africa was a critical tool in bringing about the changes in South Africa.

The current conditions in China, as it relates to respect for human rights, is outrageous. We should not be timid in taking economic action as it relates to China. It will work. China, as the Soviet Union of the pre-1990's before it, should not be granted unrestricted MFN. We should stand tall for human rights against these nations. It will work.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this rule. I want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] for all their good work. We must send a very strong message to China.

Mr. Speaker, we must send a strong message to China. We must let China know that if they want to join the community of nations, they must treat their people with respect and dignity. We must tell them that selling arms to Iran, a terrorist nation, is unacceptable.

Harry Wu's arrest is only the most recent reminder of China's longstanding human rights abuses. We cannot forget the day the tanks rolled into Tiananmen Square. Terrible human rights abuses continue to this day.

Political prisoners in China and Tibet are brutally tortured. Religious leaders are imprisoned. Democratic reformers are jailed. There is no freedom

of speech, no freedom of press, no freedom at all.

We have a moral obligation and a mandate to tell China to change its ways. As a Congress and as a nation, we cherish freedom, and we must speak out.

We cannot stand by while China stifles dissent and disagreement. We cannot stand by while the Chinese Government tortures its prisoners. We cannot stand by while China exports goods made in slave labor camps. We cannot stand by while China detains an American citizen, Harry Wu, and threatens him with the death penalty.

I truly believe that if you do not stand for something, you will fall for anything. We cannot have trade at any cost. We must not let the democracy movements in China and Tibet fall. We must stand with the people who are fighting for freedom. I urge my colleagues to support this Rule.

□ 1115

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] who has been one of the leaders for human rights throughout this world for many, many years in this body, and we just admire and respect him so much.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, let me say that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], especially on the issues related to China, has been a stalwart and it is so good to be working with him and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] and many others.

China is one of the worst, most egregious abusers of human rights in the world today. In report after report issued by our own State Department, and numerous human rights organizations, examples of wide-ranging abuses of human rights indicate that no aspect of human life is free from the repressive and the insidious control of the butchers of Beijing.

Mr. Speaker, last year, a year and a half ago, I thought the President had it right. He issued an Executive order. He laid down very clear, nonambiguous markers. Significant progress in human rights had to be achieved or MFN was a goner. He stated this and made very, very much about it. As a matter of fact, during his race for the Presidency, he accused Mr. Bush of coddling dictators.

But I am very sorry to say that as we saw a deterioration of the human rights situation in China and a significant regression, this President, Bill Clinton, blinked. He did a complete flip-flop, backed off a very principled stand, and then coddled the dictators, the very butchers of Beijing that he was so rightfully critical of during the campaign and during the early months of his Presidency.

It is shameless. The situation in China on religious freedom has gotten significantly worse. Li Peng issued two sweeping decrees, 144 and 145, to crack down on the house church movement and on the fledgling Catholic church in the People's Republic of China. One could be part of the officially government-sanctioned, government-run church, but if they dared to worship God and read their Bible in their home, or assemble to praise God, they are going to have their door broken down and the public security police are going to yank them off to prison for interrogation and for beatings.

The situation of Harry Wu, I think, crystallizes what is going on in China today. Here is a man who spent 19 years in the Laogai, was in the gulag system, faced unbelievable repression, the use of hunger as a means of torture.

He spoke at a subcommittee hearing. I am the chairman of the International Operations and Human Rights Subcommittee, and Harry and other survivors of the Laogai system came forward and talked about their terrible experiences in that gulag system. Many of those products which end up in our stores. They are being sold in our supermarkets and in our stores across the country.

We have what we call a memorandum of understanding with the People's Republic of China, to check out the use of gulag labor for export, and it is a farce. They do not allow us access to those. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and I went to Beijing Prison No. 1 and saw socks and jelly shoes being made, but it was one of those rare instances when we were actually able to see what was being made with prisoners and other people who were held in incarceration.

Harry Wu, Mr. Speaker, should tell us all what can happen when an American citizen traveling on a duly issued visa and passport, is held incommunicado and denied access by our own Embassy, against all the rules, and now continues to languish in China against his will. It tells us that the human rights situation is abysmal.

He has been a tremendous witness to the sorriest state of human rights in China and, thankfully, we are today beginning to bring some focus on what is actually occurring there.

On the issue of forced abortion, Mr. Speaker, which I know Members have heard me talk about since 1979 when it was first initiated in that country, just the other day I received a letter from a woman in China who heard me talking about it on Voice of America and she wrote me this letter: ''I've been hesitating to write you until today. At the end of May I heard a report on V.O.A. about your concern over China's cruel policy of forced abortion.''

''As a Chinese woman who has just been forced to have an abortion at that time, I really agree with you. What is a real woman without the personal right to have one more child, especially when she is expecting a baby and obliged by the state to kill that baby.''

Mr. Speaker, she went on to say, ''Considering human rights in China, we suffer more than any other countries, if we don't have the right even to get birth to a baby. What's the use of any other rights? Please don't mention my name in public since I could be severely punished.'' And she went on in her letter to talk about what some of her friends have gone through.

Mr. Speaker, on gulag labor, on religious repression, on forced abortion, all of these human rights abuses, the Tiananmen Square and other dissidents who continue to be rounded up. Wei Jing Cheng, who met with Assistant Secretary John Shattuck and 2 weeks later was dragged into prison. Here is the hero to the Democracy Wall movement who had the audacity to meet with the Assistant Secretary for Human Rights. He met with me 2 weeks earlier in Beijing and because he met, he was dragged off and we have not heard from him since.

This is a very cruel regime, Mr. Speaker. To be dealing with the Chinese today, and to act as if there is nothing going on human rights wise, is like dealing with the Nazis back in the 1930's. This is a cruel dictatorship. Let us not forget that. Their people do not have rights.

And when we talk about empowerment, empowerment has not worked. Yes, trains may run on time and we may be having this robust trading relationship, but they have had regression in human rights. They have gone in the opposite direction. Rather than liberalization, they have become more repressive.

There is a compromise piece of legislation that will be offered. I think it is a good start. I would have hoped that we would have revoked MFN. The President shamelessly delinked it, after making all the right noises for months. He delinked it when human rights got worse in China. For years to come, that will be seen as one of the worst decisions this President has ever made and another indication of the vacillation of the Clinton Presidency.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote for the Bereuter legislation. I do think it makes a strong statement. Radio Free Asia is needed now more than ever and language in this legislation admonishes the President to do that. It is a good bill. We could have had better, but I urge support for it.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut. [Mr. GEJDENSON].

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, we have today an opportunity to take a small step forward on behalf of human rights for the people of China. In is a very small step. It takes very little courage on our part, for we risk nothing, either economically or our own personal freedom.

There is must more that has to be done. For people listening to this debate, it must often be difficult to reconcile a country of a billion people with a focused discussion on only one

or two individuals: Harry Wu, an American citizen who had all the proper documents to enter China, sitting in prison; a handful of others that are occasionally mentioned.

What we do here today, and focusing on Harry or one or two others, it to try to get across to people what is going on today in China. I first met Harry Wu 3 or 4 years ago. He came to testify about slave labor and prison labor. He had with him a hidden camera as he met with Chinese officials.

Posing as an American businessman, Harry asked how could he be guaranteed the quality that he wanted in his products being made in a prison. In a free market, in a factory where workers come voluntarily, their pay and benefits have an impact on the product. But he asked, how could he be guaranteed the product make by people who were enslaved by the Chinese government could have that quality? And the Chinese official, on camera, took her hands and said, ''We beat them. We beat them.''

American consumers are out here today purchasing products made by men and women who are in prison and beaten to keep up the quality that international corporations demand of the products they sell across the globe.

We are going to take a small step here today, but there is an opportunity for American citizens to take a much larger step in the message to the Chinese tyrants.

When you buy something, take a look at where it is made. If you have an opportunity to buy something made in the United States or a country that respects human rights, make the purchase from that country. There are products at the same price. New Balance sneakers made in the United States cost the same as those sneakers made by people enslaved in China. Buy the American product.

If the Chinese officials see their percentage of sales in the United States drop, we will not have to wait for a Congress or an administration to take sufficient steps to get that message across to the Chinese Government.

We, as citizens in this country, together have the ability to have an impact on the policies within China. The tens of billions of dollars worth of products that are sold in this country each and every year provide the financing to sustain their system of government.

Together, we can make that difference. Every time you go out to the store, take a look at where the product is made. If the product is made in a country that oppresses human rights, as China does, try not to buy that product. Maybe you cannot make it 100 percent of the time. If you do it once in a while, if you do it twice, whatever time you can do that, you will help people like Harry Wu who have risked their lives to take this action.

When I grew up as a young man, I was told of an old Polish lady who saved my father's life. My father, a Lithuanian Jew at the time, was hiding from the Nazis. The borders have moved so often, it is hard to tell. It was Poland at that time; today it is Lithuania.

She took this man in at risk of losing their eight children. When I think of courage, I think of this woman. To save an individual's life, not a family member, she risked not only her own life, but she risked the lives of her eight children.

That courage that is asked of us here on this floor as American citizens does not come to the same chart even. We are protected by civil rights and civil liberties. We live in the greatest democracy in the world. But together we can help, without risk, the lives of those today imprisoned in China.

Join us in boycotting Chinese-made products. Write to legislators and senators who oppose the Chinese Government's continued oppression, and we will make a small difference in the lives of Chinese citizens. A billion people in China have a right to expect that they can live with some dignity and without oppression from their own government.

Today we in the Congress will make a small step in sending a message to the Chinese Government. The American citizenry together can send a much larger message. Let us not forget Harry Wu and the millions like him in China. Let us stand together for freedom and individual rights. Let us not forget the heroes of Tiananmen Square. Let us do our small part in fighting for freedom.

□ 1130

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO], a member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, the Bereuter resolution moves this country in the direction of putting additional pressure on China in terms of human rights violations. We can do that, and we can also have MFN status with China.

This country exports more than $9 billion a year of goods to China. That is close to 200,000 jobs in this country. If we do not have MFN status with China, that will be only one of eight countries with which we have no MFN status with in the entire world.

Last year, I spent an entire day with Counsel General Wang Li from China in the 16th district in Illinois, which has 1,500 factories. He told me there are 300 cities in China that have in excess of 1 million people. Seventy-five percent of those cities do not have an airport, and he said that China is in the process of building over 200 airports. This is the time to expand our trade with China.

Look what happened this past week. China signed a $1 billion agreement with Mercedes-Benz in a joint partnership to build the minivan in China. That could have been signed with Chrysler, and I hope one day eventually that will happen. What we have to do is to keep open the channels of communication.

To deny MFN status would be to close that avenue.

President Nixon said in a letter to President Bush in 1989, that ''in the current emotion of the moment our nations seem to be forgetting an important point: A modernized, unified, and effectively governed China that has good relations with us is by far the preferred solution for advancing American security interests in East Asia.'' It was true in 1989; it is true in 1995. Let us move forward and recognize that 60 percent of all world trade is occurring in the Pacific rim.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, as I yield to the next speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL]. He has taken over on his side of the aisle as the manager of this rule. He is truly one of the outstanding Members of this body, who has stood up for the oppressed people around this entire world. And we admire him and respect him as well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3¾ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], the gentleman who has led the fight for human rights all over this world.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I want to personally thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for his faithfulness over the years; also the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] for her faithfulness on this. She was like Margaret Thatcher on this, and I also want to thank the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] for his willingness to kind of work this out, and I want to thank the Speaker personally because his involvement made a difference.

So much I want to say. I tell the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO] that, if we had traded with Hitler, I do not think it would have made any difference, and I went to the Holocaust Museum and saw the documents where they said it would just have more business with Hitler, he will change, and he did not change.

There is a lot bad going on in China. This is a good resolution, it is a good bill, and I support it, but keep in mind, I will tell the gentleman when he talks about business, there are Catholic priests in jail that we now have in jail in China. How much business is it worth for our Catholic priest to be in jail? There are Protestants who have been arrested in church. How much money in trade and factories is it worth for that American? Harry Wu, an American prisoner, is in jail. They have more gulags and slave labor camps.

The gentleman met with a Chinese counselor. How about going into slave labor camps? That is the problem. When our people go to China and meet, they have dinner with Li Peng. They do not go into the house churches and into the slave labor camps.

Do not forget they are trading nuclear weapons with Iran and Iraq. Do not forget the missile violations, the chemical war violations. Do not forget they are plundering Tibet. Do not forget they have arrested the men and women connected with the Dalai Lama. There are a lot of bad things that China has done, and we should recognize this.

Although this resolution is good, because it finally gets the Congress in a bipartisan way to come together, my last comment is this:

People talk about MFN. We would not have granted MFN to the Soviet Union. When Shcharansky was in Prime Camp 35, we would not have granted MFN to the Soviet Union, and both sides know it. When Sakharov was under house arrest in Gorky, we all stood together, Republicans, Democrats, Liberals, and Conservatives, because there was pressure to do it, and God bless Ronald Reagan, and where is he when we need him now? He stood firm and called them the Evil Empire. We would not have granted MFN to Czechoslovakia when Havel was under arrest. No way we would have done it. A Member would have been embarrassed to come down to the floor and say, ''Havel is in jail, let's give him MFN.''

And I thank the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS], who is not here. We would not have lifted sanctions and done anything for South Africa when Nelson Mandela was in.

So this is a good resolution. It puts the Congress on record. But let us not drip with sour grapes and say China is going to build all these airports, and they are going to do all these wonderful things.

How about what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] and the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] will tell us? We have lost millions of jobs, millions of jobs.

This is a trade issue. Their imbalance is almost $40 billion, a trade imbalance. We have lost a million jobs. It is a slave labor issue. It is a persecution of religious faith, Catholic, Protestant, Buddhist. It is all these other issues. They sold weapons to Iraq that were used against American men and women to kill people in the gulf.

Having said that though, I just did not want the reports to go off that everything was wonderful. Having said that, the Bereuter resolution is a good resolution, and it is my prayer that we could come together and solve this problem. Every night I pray that China, in my prayers that China, will be free, and hopefully with the work that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] has done and coming together, we put pressure on, there will be freedom, and 10 years from now there will be freedom in Tiananmen Square, freedom in China, and democracy, and I want to again thank the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER]. I will be eternally grateful to the Speaker for his help, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for his faithfulness, and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] for her doggedness in staying with this issue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMERSON). The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 15 seconds.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, let me just say this rule was negotiated with the minority, the Democratic and Republican leadership. It is a good rule, it is a fair rule, and I hope Members come over here and vote for it. As a matter of fact, I hope there is not even a recorded vote on it.

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.

CHINA POLICY ACT OF 1995

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 193, I call up the bill (H.R. 2058) establishing United States policy toward China, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of H.R. 2058 is as follows:

H.R. 2058

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''China Policy Act of 1995''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The People's Republic of China comprises one-fifth of the world's population, or 1,200,000,000 people, and its policies have a profound effect on the world economy and global security.

(2) The People's Republic of China is a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council and plays an important role in regional organizations such as the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Forum and the ASEAN Regional Forum.

(3) The People's Republic of China is a nuclear power with the largest standing army in the world, and has been rapidly modernizing and expanding its military capabilities.

(4) The People's Republic of China is currently undergoing a change of leadership which will have dramatic implications for the political and economic future of the Chinese people and for China's relations with the United States.

(5) China's estimated $600,000,000,000 economy has enjoyed unparalleled growth in recent years.

(6) Despite increased economic linkages between the United States and China, bilateral relations have deteriorated significantly because of fundamental policy differences over a variety of important issues.

(7) The People's Republic of China has violated international standards regarding the nonproliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

(8) The Government of the People's Republic of China, a member of the United Nations Security Council, is obligated to respect and uphold the United Nations Charter and Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

(9) According to the State Department Country Report on Human Rights Practices for 1994, there continue to be ''widespread and well-documented human rights abuses in China, in violation of internationally accepted norms...(including) arbitrary and lengthy incommunicado detention, torture, and mistreatment of prisoners.... The regime continued severe restrictions on freedom of speech, press, assembly and association, and tightened control on the exercise of these rights during 1994. Serious human rights abuses persisted in Tibet and other areas populated by ethnic minorities.''.

(10) The Government of the People's Republic of China continues to detain political prisoners and continues to violate internationally recognized standards of human rights by arbitrary arrests and detention of persons for the nonviolent expression of their political and religious beliefs.

(11) The Government of the People's Republic of China does not ensure the humane treatment of prisoners and does not allow humanitarian and human rights organizations access to prisons.

(12) The Government of the People's Republic of China continues to harass and restrict the activities of accredited journalists and to restrict broadcasts by the Voice of America.

(13) In the weeks leading to the 6th anniversary of the June 1989 massacre, a series of petitions were sent to the Chinese Government calling for greater tolerance, democracy, rule of law, and an accounting for the 1989 victims and the Chinese Government responded by detaining dozens of prominent intellectuals and activists.

(14) The unjustified and arbitrary arrest, imprisonment, and initiation of criminal proceedings against Harry Wu, a citizen of the United States, has greatly exacerbated the deterioration in relations between the United States and the People's Republic of China, and all charges against him should be dismissed.

(15) China has failed to release political prisoners with serious medical problems, such as Bao Tong, and on June 25, 1995, revoked ''medical parole'' for Chen-Ziming reimprisoning him at Beijing No. 2 Prison, and Chinese authorities continue to hold Wei Jingsheng incommunicado at an unknown location since his arrest on April 1, 1994.

(16) The Government of the People's Republic of China continues to engage in discriminatory and unfair trade practices, including the exportation of products produced by prison labor, the use of import quotas and other quantitative restrictions on selected products, the unilateral increasing of tariff rates and the imposition of taxes as surcharges on tariffs, the barring of the importation of certain items, the use of licensing and testing requirements to limit imports, and the transshipment of textiles and other items through the falsification of country of origin documentation.

(17) The Government of the People's Republic of China continues to employ the policy and practice of controlling all trade unions and continues to suppress and harass members of the independent labor union movement.

(18) The United States-Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992 states that Congress wishes to see the provisions of the joint declaration implemented, and declares that ''the human rights of the people of Hong Kong are of great importance to the U.S. Human Rights also serve as a basis for Hong Kong's continued prosperity,''. This together with the rule of law and a free press are essential for a successful transition in 1997.

(19) The United States currently has numerous sanctions on the People's Republic of China with respect to government-to-government assistance, arms sales, and other commercial transactions.

(20) It is in the interest of the United States to foster China's continued engagement in the broadest range of international fora and increased respect for human rights, democratic institutions, and the rule of law in China.

SEC. 3. UNITED STATES DIPLOMATIC INITIATIVES.

(a) UNITED STATES OBJECTIVES.—The Congress calls upon the President to undertake intensified diplomatic initiatives to persuade the Government of the People's Republic of China to—

(1) immediately and unconditionally release Harry Wu from detention;

(2) adhere to prevailing international standards regarding the nonproliferation of weapons of mass destruction by, among other things, immediately halting the export of ballistic missile technology and the provision of other weapons of mass destruction assistance, in violation of international standards, to Iran, Pakistan, and other countries of concern;

(3) respect the internationally-recognized human rights of its citizens by, among other things—

(A) permitting freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of assembly, freedom of association, and freedom of religion;

(B) ending arbitrary detention, torture, forced labor, and other mistreatment of prisoners;

(C) releasing all political prisoners, and dismantling the Chinese system of jailing political prisoners (the gulag) and the Chinese forced labor system (the Laogai);

(D) ending coercive birth control practices; and

(E) respecting the legitimate rights of the people of Tibet, ethnic minorities, and ending the crackdown on religious practices;

(4) curtail excessive modernization and expansion of China's military capabilities, and adopt defense transparency measures that will reassure China's neighbors;

(5) end provocative military actions in the South China Sea and elsewhere that threaten China's neighbors, and work with them to resolve disputes in a peaceful manner;

(6) adhere to a rules-based international trade regime in which existing trade agreements are fully implemented and enforced, and equivalent and reciprocal market access is provided for United States goods and services in China;

(7) comply with the prohibition on all forced labor exports to the United States; and

(8) reduce tensions with Taiwan by means of dialogue and other confidence building measures.

(b) VENUES FOR DIPLOMATIC INITIATIVES.—The diplomatic initiatives taken in accordance with subsection (a) should include actions by the United States—

(1) in the conduct of bilateral relations with China;

(2) in the United Nations and other international organizations;

(3) in the World Bank and other international financial institutions;

(4) in the World Trade Organization and other international trade fora; and

(5) in the conduct of bilateral relations with other countries in order to encourage them to support and join with the United States in taking the foregoing actions.

SEC. 4. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

The President shall report to the Congress within 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and no less frequently than every 6 months thereafter, on—

(1) the actions taken by the United States in accordance with section 3 during the preceding 6-month period;

(2) the actions taken with respect to China during the preceding 6-month period by—

(A) the United Nations and other international organizations;

(B) the World Bank and other international financial institutions; and

(C) the World Trade Organization and other international trade fora; and

(3) the progress achieved with respect to each of the United States objectives identified in section 3(a).

Such reports may be submitted in classified and unclassified form.

SEC. 5. COMMENDATION OF DEMOCRACY MOVEMENT.

The Congress commends the brave men and women who have expressed their concerns to the Government of the People's Republic of China in the form of petitions and commends the democracy movement as a whole for its commitment to the promotion of political, economic, and religious freedom.

SEC. 6. RADIO FREE ASIA.

(a) PLAN FOR RADIO FREE ASIA.—Section 309(c) of the United States International Broadcasting Act of 1994 (22 U.S.C. 6208(c)) is amended to read as follows:

''(c) SUBMISSION OF PLAN.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of the China Policy Act of 1995, the Director of the United States Information Agency shall submit to the Congress a detailed plan for the establishment and operation of Radio Free Asia in accordance with this section. Such plan shall include the following:

''(1) A description of the manner in which Radio Free Asia would meet the funding limitations provided in subsection (d)(4).

''(2) A description of the numbers and qualifications of employees it proposes to hire.

''(3) How it proposes to meet the technical requirements for carrying out its responsibilities under this section.''.

(b) INITIATION OF BROADCASTING TO CHINA.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, Radio Free Asia shall commence broadcasting to China. Such broadcasting may be undertaken initially by means of contracts with or grants to existing broadcasting organizations and facilities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 193, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] will each be recognized for 45 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7½ minutes.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, make no mistake about it. United States relations with the People's Republic of China have deteriorated to a very troubled level. Currently, United States-China relations are cool and formal, and are dominated by a series of disputes. In this environment, animosities and grievances—on both sides—could boil over and cause an irreparable breach. Indeed, a new cold war, this time with the PRC, is not entirely impossible—but it is avoidable. We must all approach this debate today with a deep sense of gravity and care regarding the long-term importance and fragility of Sino-American relations.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, a further, unnecessary deterioration in Chinese-American relations is not in the United States national interest. It would not serve our security goals; nor would it serve our human rights objectives. It would not advance our trade and economic objectives. Simply put, I emphasize to my colleagues today that what we do here today should not aim to isolate or demonize China or foster the attitude in this country that China is an enemy. They are not an enemy. We should have the objective of improving the Chinese-American relationship while, at the same time, always acting in our national interest. These goals are not incompatible.

Having said that however, this Member steadfastly believes that the United States must remain engaged with China. This does not mean that we should ignore the many legitimate differences between our two nations. It is entirely proper that we make weapons proliferation, human rights, and the proper treatment of U.S. nationals, such as Harry Wu, our foreign policy objectives of the highest order. H.R. 2058, the China Policy Act of 1995, does precisely that. It fills a crucial gap by setting forth both clear policy objectives for the United States-China relationship and appropriate directions to the executive branch.

Mr. Speaker, this Member has carefully and painstakingly worked to draft legislation that accurately and comprehensively describes the House of Representatives' objectives and our concerns with regard to the Government of the People's Republic of China. With significant contributions from the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], and with the support of the House leadership as well as bipartisan staff assistance from the House International Relations Committee, we have crafted bipartisan legislation that nearly every Member, in good conscience, can support.

The China Policy Act of 1995 concisely states the United States' foreign policy grievances with the People's Republic of China. This legislation very specifically calls upon the President of the United States to undertake the following diplomatic initiatives, to report on their progress, and to use every available diplomatic means to cause China to accomplish the following reforms:

First, permit freedom of assembly, freedom of association, freedom of press, and freedom of religion.

Second, end arbitrary detention, torture, forced labor, and other mistreatment of prisoner.

Third, release all political prisoners, including Harry Wu, and dismantle the Chinese gulag and forced labor system.

Fourth, end coercive birth control practices.

Fifth, respect the legitimate rights of ethnic minorities and the people of Tibet.

Sixth, curtail excessive modernization and expansion of China's military capabilities.

Seventh, halt provocative military actions in the South China Sea.

Eighth, implement, and enforce international trade agreements.

Ninth, comply with prohibitions on all forced labor exports to the United States.

Tenth, reduce tensions with Taiwan.

Finally, this legislation commends the petition and democracy movement in China of brave men and women who are committed to the promotion of political, economic, and religious freedom. And, it also attempts to assist them and all Chinese in their endeavors by requiring the speedy implementation of the already authorized Radio Free Asia initiative.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is both an alternative to a damaging MFN denial for China and also a positive statement of congressional concerns. It is the beginning, hopefully, of a process of formulating a clearer and more comprehensive policy toward China. Since we don't have a clear statement of policy emanating from the executive branch, we will begin the U.S. effort here today.

Of course, this legislation and the criticisms of China that it outlines, will not be welcomed by Beijing's leaders, but it will give hope to millions of Chinese who suffer from a denial of fundamental rights. Moreover, it states U.S. concerns forthrightly. Unlike a denial of normal trade status, which is really what MFN treatment entails, this legislation is not as likely to fuel the recent downward cycle of action and reaction that has gravely endangered U.S. interests.

Mr. Speaker, China is in the midst of a prolonged succession struggle. This power struggle has enormous implications for China's future and its relations with the United States, and for global security and the world economy. Since the triumph of the Communists in 1949 China had been dominated by two leaders, Mao Tse-tung and Dung Xiaoping. What leader or what collective leadership will next succeed to that mantle of power in the PRC? What will be their ideology, values, and policies? We cannot discern or determine that, but we can and must make sure that we do not give advantage to those who would take China backward economically or make it more aggressive and assertive internationally.

By extending normal trade status while simultaneously stating and acting upon our serious concerns with the practices and policies of the People's Republic of China we are making several very important points.

First, we want to see a prosperous Chinese people.

The American system of free enterprise is the envy of the world, including China. In fact, many dissidents in China support extension of most favored nation or normal trade status to China because they know that economic freedom often precedes other freedoms as well. In Taiwan, for example many people will soon vote for a President for the first time. In other Asian countries, political freedoms following economic liberalization has been the norm rather than the exception.

Second, we support the development of a Chinese Government that can protect the civil and political rights of its own people with stable and accountable institutions.

Fragmentation or chaos of the Chinese Government is neither in the interest of the United States or the people of China. Human rights abuses occur in China not only because of failed official policies of the Chinese government but also because of the corruption and lack of respect for the rule of law. Stable institutions which abide by the rule of law are essential to provide the proper protection that the Chinese people necessarily demand and should enjoy.

Third, we respect a China that can defend itself, but we must demand a China that adheres to its international commitments to coexist peacefully, respect international legal norms, and refrain from aggressive military action.

As chairman of the Asia and Pacific Subcommittee of the House International Relations Committee, this Member would note that cooperation with China has been an important key to preventing an explosive, perhaps nuclear, confrontation with North Korea. And while we have very grave concerns about a number of China's transactions with countries like Iran and Pakistan, it is important to note that we have been actively engaged with the PRC on proliferation issues. We have succeeded in preventing a number of dangerous sales, and we continue to press on other matters of concerns. I would tell my colleagues—no, I warn my colleagues—that if we disengage from China, we will have absolutely no influence over what China exports, or to whom.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pause for a moment to consider the importance of our long-term interests with China. Let me remind everyone, in all candor, that China will be one of the two or three most important strategic relationships this Nation will have in the coming decades. China will be one of the two or three most important countries in the world early in the next century. Quite simply, China is too big, and too dynamic, and too strategically important to ignore or push to an enemy status.

I raise this point not to alarm this body, for we should never be intimidated from promoting human rights and market economies. At the same time, however, we must focus on building a positive relationship with the Chinese people and their Government. We must not let our very real and substantial current problems with the PRC damage the fundamentally friendly attitude of the Chinese people toward the United States. The people of China are favorably predisposed toward the United States, and they share a general desire to embrace our freedoms.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to speak out forthrightly about our concerns, but to do it in a fashion that will ultimately bring us closer to the desired goals of freedom and human rights for all people, and a growing rapport and trust between our two governments. It must be clear that we speak with deep and serious conviction, but with friendship and constructive ends.

I urge adoption of H.R. 2058, the China Policy Act of 1995, and yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1145

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

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise here to support the Bereuter proposal. I think it is a sound, constructive proposal. I want to commend the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] and every Member, Democrat and Republican, who cooperated in putting together this sound piece of public policy.

I love the stem winding, desk thumping speeches that some of our colleagues give, but when you ask yourself what is the solution, the solution really is the Bereuter proposal. We have a terrible condition in China, but let me let you in on a secret. It has been that way for 6,000 years.

When I first went to China shortly before we began any kind of relationship with them at all over a 40-year period, they were just finishing the cultural revolution, in which millions of Chinese had been displaced and rooted out of their families and their homes and transported around the country and hundreds of thousands of Chinese had been slaughtered. Fortunately, no Americans lost their lives in there because we did not have an American national in the whole country of China at that time.

China has never experienced the types of freedoms that we in the Western world have developed so torturously over so many thousands of years. They have never had religious freedom or freedom of speech. They have never had the freedom of assembly or any of the freedoms we cherish. They need them, they want them, and they will eventually get them, but we have to lead the way, and we should never go to the same disastrous type of program that we carried out for about 40 years in which we threw ourselves out of China and isolated ourselves from China.

Our trade situation with China is not good, but it is better than the terrible situation that we had in the past. It is going to improve. I love all this discussion about slave labor, and I hope some of the people are listening to this. I do

not know of any State in the United States that does not have slave labor. All of us in our States produce goods that are sold in commerce that we Americans consume that were made by slave labor in our own prisons. It has been against the law so long as I can remember to import any of those kinds of goods in the United States.

So we have tried to keep them out. I am sorry some of them slip in, but it is against the law and anybody that is convicted of importing those kinds of goods is going to be penalized. We are doing our best to penalize Americans for knowingly doing that kind of thing.

But I doubt that there is a Member of Congress here that has not slept on a bed or sat at a desk or used a filing cabinet that was not made by prison labor in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that my time is up, but support the Bereuter amendment. It is a good, constructive proposal.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. MATT SALMON, a new member of the Committee on International Relations, who not only has lived in China for a substantial period of time, but speaks Chinese.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a cosponsor of H.R. 2058. I believe it is a big bold step in the right direction. I am really pleased that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] has taken this initiative.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to talk a little bit about my experience. I served a mission for my church in Taiwan from 1977 to 1979. Most of the people that I became friends with over there were people that lived in mainland China and escaped the oppression of China under Mao Tse-tung. At that time they watched their families, many of them being killed, murdered before their very eyes. Many of them watched their parents be severely punished, sometimes beaten, sometimes even killed, for praying in public.

As China engaged the Western world, I was heartened, I was encouraged, by her desire to become more open politically, economically and socially. But as with many Americans, much of that optimism was extinguished by Tiananmen Square, and part of me died that day. Since that day China has steadily marched backward, stifling freedom, flouting human rights, and demonstrating disregard.

I do support doing business with China. I think it is a step in the right direction, but we need to make sure they understand we will be watching and the people that do business over there need to not be accepting, but step forward and do the right thing.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI], who has been one of the prime movers on this matter of China.

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

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to congratulate both the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the two cosponsors of this legislation, and certainly to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], who actually worked very closely with both cosponsors to put together this legislation in a way I believe that all of us will be able to support; second, what I believe is important, to send a signal to the Chinese that is unified that truly represents the true feelings of this Nation. So I would like to thank them for making this debate very comfortable for all of us in this House of 435 Members.

I would have to say, and I believe I will just reiterate what the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] has said, that the United States-China relationship will probably be the most important relationship that the United States will have for the next 20 years. That is whether China is viewed by this country as our enemy, or whether this country views China as an ally, or perhaps something in between.

China has 22 percent of the world population, 1.2 billion people. Their economic growth rate is over 10 percent per year, and probably will grow much greater than that. Lloyd Bentsen, before he left as Secretary of the Treasury, said that for the next 15 years China will be building an equivalent to 18 Santa Monica freeways per day, and that means the Japanese, the Europeans, and all other countries are moving into China now, trying to influence China's behavior.

I have to say one of the experts that spoke on the rule perhaps has a little amnesia. President Clinton is basically following the policies of the Ford, Reagan, Bush, Carter, Nixon years in terms of our relations with the Chinese. That is because they all understood the permanence and importance of our relations with that country.

Now, there is no question that what the Chinese have been doing over the past decade, now coming to light, is something that we all in this country abhor, and certainly we understand that there were certain universal principles that all major great nations must comply with. But the way to really do it is not to isolate the Chinese, but to engage the Chinese.

That is what basically the Bereuter resolution does. It tells the Chinese that there are certain behaviors that we do not accept, but at the same time it attempts to normalize our relations with the Chinese. That is why this resolution, this bill, is so important for us, because ultimately it is the heirs of all of us in this room, the heirs of all of us in this country, that will benefit in terms of peace and understanding among nations and people of these nations, if in fact we can find some way with the United States, China, and other countries, to begin the normalization process with this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this bill.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman and ranking minority member of Asia and Pacific Subcommittee, Mr. BEREUTER and Mr. BERMAN, for bringing this important compromise resolution before us today. And I want to commend my colleague from Virginia, Mr. WOLF, and the gentlelady from California, Ms. PELOSI, for their hard work and participation in this issue. Their struggle on behalf of human rights in China is exemplary.

It has been 6 years since the Tiananmen Square Massacre and a full 10 years since his holiness, the Dalai Lama, visited the Congress and told us about the repression in Tibet. During this time period, whenever the Congress attempted to bring about a change in Beijing's egregious behavior we were admonished, in so many words, by State Department experts that ''now is not the time. There is a political transition period underway in China and if we took any substantive action we would be strengthening the hand of the hardliners in Beijing.''

And so for the last decade whenever the Congress attempted to respond to China's use of slave labor, oppression of religious and political speech and thought, international property rights violations, unfair trade practices, arms proliferation, repression in occupied Tibet, threatening military exercises off the coast of Taiwan, a massive military buildup, the recent aggressive actions in the South China Sea and its obstruction to Taiwan's attempt to enter the United Nations, we were told to back off.

Accordingly, I wonder when the State Department will recognize that its China policy is fundamentally flawed? It is currently a failure on trade. It is a failure on human rights. And it is a failure on arms proliferation.

We all understand the necessity of constructively engaging China. But it is all too painfully obvious from the results that we are failing in our goals of encouraging pluralism, of respect for human rights, for trade, for regional security and for recognition of the wishes of the people of Taiwan.

While I support the State Department's efforts to constructively engage China, we have yet to see positive results from the process. The State Department must find a way to overcome the debilitating flaw in its China policy that sweeps aside responsive action with broad brush stroke generalizations about transition periods.

Until the State Department does that, the Congress must step in and respond to the many seriously unacceptable actions taken by the Communist Government in Beijing. Accordingly I urge my colleagues to support the Bereuter resolution. It is a balanced, good first step toward building a more productive China policy. It sets forth some significant goal posts in our relationship with the People's Republic of China.

□ 1200

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], the minority whip.

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

I want to commend, first of all, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI], the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and all the Members who worked so very hard on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, this debate today really comes down to one very simple question: What does America stand for as a nation?

Do we stand for democracy?

Do we stand for human rights?

Are those the values this Nation holds dear?

Or do we just stand up for those things when they're convenient?

Mr. Speaker, we all know that China is a nation that tortures, abuses, and imprisons its own people.

A nation where freedom of speech and freedom of religion do not exist.

A nation where people who speak out against the Government disappear without a trace.

And by extending most-favored-nation status to China, by giving them special treatment, we put our stamp of approval on all of it.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think America should be in the business of licensing torture.

But if we as a nation can't speak out against a Communist country that arrests and imprisons our own citizens, if we can't use our leverage to bring Harry Wu home, then we really have lost our way as a nation.

Harry Wu's only crime is that he told the truth about what's happening in China today.

He had the courage to tell the world about the torture and prison labor.

He had the courage to stand up for democracy and human rights.

And for that, he got arrested.

Now he's looking to us to speak out for him.

It's time we stand up for him.

By passing the Bereuter resolution today, we will send a crystal clear message to the dictators in Beijing: Let Harry Wu go.

But it's not enough for this Nation simply to stand up for human rights when our own people are threatened.

For 200 years, we have been the beacon for democracy around the world.

If we don't stand up for the rights of the Chinese people, if we don't stand up to the butchers of Beijing then nobody else will.

This isn't just in our moral interests.

This is in our economic interest as well.

Today, China is running a $30 billion trade surplus with the United States.

A good part of the reason is that China pays its people about 17 cents an hour.

They export products to America made with prison labor.

By extending most-favored-nation status to China, we are taking jobs away from our own people.

Mr. Speaker, we shouldn't be afraid to use trade to promote democracy and human rights.

MFN isn't a gift to be awarded. It's a privilege that must be earned.

China has not earned the right to receive special treatment from the United States.

I urge my colleagues: Support the Bereuter resolution.

And let the world know that America stands for democracy and human rights.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], a member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights, which I chair, finally got the opportunity to hear the real-life stories in open hearing from some of the Chinese women who have had their baby killed by forced abortion in the People's Republic of China.

After having had to take the extraordinary step of issuing subpoenas to bring these women out of U.S. prisons where they have been held for 2 years by the Clinton administration, which is trying to deport these women back to their tormentors, yesterday we heard these women describe the horror, the humiliation, the suffering, the pain and the loss of being subjected to both forced abortion and forced sterilization.

Even though these and many other women like them have been found to be completely credible by the INS, these victims are poised to be forced back to their oppressors in China because the Clinton administration reversed a very human policy of the Bush administration, by providing asylum to women who have had a forced abortion or have a well-founded fear of force abortion or forced sterilization.

Bill Clinton, Mr. Speaker, has turned his back on these victims, and he is trying to force them back. Hu Shu Ye broke down in tears yesterday as she described the pain and suffering of being dragged by the family planning cadres in China to the abortion mill to have her six-month-old unborn child destroyed. When she was able to regain her composure during the hearing, later in the hearing, she told us that she as bleeding so profusely that the Chinese officials were unable to involuntarily sterilize her. But 5 months later they were back at her door physically dragging her to be forcibly sterilized.

These women, their tears that they shed yesterday at the hearing and their profound suffering is the reality of tens of millions of women in the People's Republic of China, in that terrible dictatorship.

I have led two human rights missions to China, Mr. Speaker. Religious repression has intensified since the Clinton administration delinked MFN from human rights. Oppression of political dissidents has gotten worse. For every prominent dissident they have released, usually on the eve of some important decision in the United States, they have taken many, many others and many of those that we do not know about. And now they have taken a U.S. citizen, Harry Wu.

Not only do these human rights problems get worse every single month that we continue to truckle to China, but they keep discovering new horrors. The PRC dictatorship times the executions, for example, of prisoners for the convenience of rich foreigners who pay for the harvest of the prisoners' organs. Now we learn that states who supported abortion clinics sell human embryos, and there are even some credible reports that late-term unborn children are actually being consumed as a new health food. Mr. Speaker, ideas have consequences, and the central organizing idea behind the PRC dictatorship is the utter devaluation of the individual human being. They have consequences.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude. There is no moral or practical difference between trading with the PRC dictatorship and trading with the Nazis.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following information:

JULY 18, 1995.

[Primary Sources: The Pueblo Institute, Amnesty International, The Cardinal Kung Foundation]

ROMAN CATHOLICS IMPRISONED AND DETAINED IN CHINA

1. Father Fan Da-Duo. A priest of Beijing Diocese. Reportedly under house arrest and unable to administer sacraments.

2. Father Guo Qiushan: A priest of Fu'an, Fujian province. Arrested July 27, 1990. Released in August 1991 for health reasons. Currently under house arrest.

3. Father Guo Shichum: A priest of Fu'an, Fujian province. Arrested July 27, 1990. Released in August 1991 for health reasons. Currently under house arrest.

4. Bishop John Yang Shudao: Bishop of Fuzhou, Fujian province. Arrested February 28, 1988. Transferred to house detention in February 1991. Restricted to home village and under close policy surveillance.

5. Bishop Mathias Lu Zhensheng: Age: 76. Bishop of Tianshui, Gansu province. Arrested late December 1989. Released about April 26, 1990 for reasons of health. Restricted to home village.

6. Bishop Casimir Wang Milu: Age: 55. Bishop of Tianshui diocese, Gansu province. Arrested April 1984. Released April 14, 1993. Activity is strictly monitored and restricted.

7. Father John Baptist Wang Ruohan: A priest from Tianshui diocese, Gansu province. Arrested June 16, 1994. Currently detained in Tianshui jail.

8. Father John Wang Ruownag: A priest from Tianshui diocese, Gansu province. Disappeared December 8, 1991. Resurfaced after a period of detention but movement and activity are closely monitored and severely restricted.

9. Father An Shi'an: Age: 81. A priest of Daming diocese, Hebei province. Arrested late December 1990. Released December 21, 1992. Current whereabouts unknown. Believed to be under restrictions of movement.

10. Father Chen Yingkui: A priest of Yixian diocese, Hebei province. Arrested in 1991. Sentenced to three years' of ''reeducation through labor.'' Reported to be released.

11. Father Chi Huitain: Arrested April 17, 1995. Currently being held at an unknown location.

12. Father Peter Cui Xingang: Age: 30. A priest of Donglu village, Qingyuan count, Hebei province. Arrested July 28, 1991. Reportedly released but activities are restricted and monitored.

13. Father Gao Fangzhan: Age: 27. A priest of Yizian diocese, Hebei province. Arrested May 1991. Currently being held without trial. Reportedly released but activities are restricted and monitored.

14. Father Peter Hu Duoer: Age: 32. Arrested December 14, 1990. Severely tortured during his detention. Reportedly released but activities are restricted and monitored.

15. Father Li Jian Jin: Age: 28. A priest of Han Dan, Hebei Province. Arrested March 4, 1994. Currently being held in Ma Pu Cun detention center.

16. Father Li Zhongpei: Arrested December 1990. Sentenced to three years' ''reeducation through labor.'' Although Chinese authorities have reportedly released him, he has not been seen since his release.

17. Father Liu Heping: Age: 28. Arrested December 13, 1991. Reportedly transferred to house arrest; actions restricted and monitored.

18. Father Liu Jin Zhong: A priest of Yixian, Hebei province. Arrested February 24, 1994. Reportedly released but activities are restricted and monitored.

19. Father Lu Dong Liang: A priest of Feng Shi, Dong Ging Liu, Hebei province. Reportedly released but activities are restricted and monitored.

20. Father Lu Gen-You: Arrested in 1994. Reportedly released but activities are restricted and monitored.

21. Father Ma Zhiyuan: Age: 28. Arrested December 13, 1991. Reportedly released but activities are restricted and monitored.

22. Father Pei Guojun: A priest of Yixian diocese, Hebei province. Arrested between mid-December 1989 and mid-January 1990. Reportedly released but activities are restricted and monitored.

23. Father Pei Xhenping: A priest of Youtong village, Hebei province. Arrested October 21, 1989. Reportedly released but activities are restricted and monitored.

24. Father Shi Wande: A priest of Baoding diocese, Hebei province. Arrested December 9, 1989. Reportedly released but activities are restricted and monitored.

25. Father Sun Hua Ping: Arrested June 30, 1994. Currently held in a detention center of Lin Ming Guan, Shi Zhuang Cun, Yong Nian Xian, Hebei province.

26. Father Wang Jiansheng: Age: 40 Arrested May 19, 1991 and sentenced to three years' ''reeducation through labor.'' Reportedly released but activities are restricted and monitored.

27. Father Xiao Shixiang: Age: 58. A priest of Yixian diocese, Hebei province. Arrested December 12, 1991. Reportedly released but activities are restricted and monitored.

28. Father Yan Chong-Zhao: A priest of Handan diocese, Hebei province. Arrested September 1993. Currently held in detention center in Guangping county, Hebei province.

29. Father Zhou Zhenkun: A priest of Dongdazhao village, Boading, Hebei province. Arrested December 21, 1992. Reportedly released but activities are restricted and monitored.

30. Bishop Guo Wenzhi: Age: 77. Bishop of Harbin, Heilongjiang province. Reportedly released but activities are restricted and monitored.

31. Father Joseph Jin Dechen: Age: 72. A priest of Nanyang diocese, henan province. Arrested December 18, 1981. Sentenced to 15 years in prison and five years deprivation of rights. Paroled May 21, 1992 but confined to his home village of Jinjiajiang where he remains under restrictions of movement and assocation.

32. Father Li Hongye (or Hongyou): Age: 76. Bishop from Luoyang, Henan province. Arrested July 7, 1994. Conflicting reports make his current status unknown. Diagnosed with stomach cancer.

33. Bishop John Baptist Liang Xishing: Age: 72. Bishop of Kaifeng diocese, Henan province. Disappeared and presumed rearrested March 18, 1994. Reportedly released but activities are restricted and monitored.

34. Father Zhu Bayou: A priest of Nanyang diocese, province. Released on parole but restricted to the village of Jingang, Henan.

35. Father Jiang Liren: Age: 80. Bishop of Hohht, Inner Mongolia. Arrested December 1989. Transferred to house arrest in April 1990.

36. Bishop Mark Yuan Wenzai: Age: 69. Bishop of Nantong, Jiangsu province. Currently under the custody of the local Patriotic Church bishop and forced to live at the church in Longshan.

37. Father Liao Haiqing: Age: 64. A priest of Fuzhou, Jiangxi province. Arrested August 11, 1994. Released in mid-November. Currently under police surveillance.

38. Father Xia Shao-Wu: Arrested December 30, 1994. Currently held by Public Security Bureau officials Hebei.

39. Bishop Zeng Jingmu: Arrested September 17, 1994. Reportedly released but activities are restricted and monitored.

40. Father Li Zhi-Xin: A priest in the city of Xining, Qinghai province. Arrested March 29, 1994. Reportedly released but activities are restricted and monitored.

41. Father Vincent Qin Guoliang: Age: 60. A priest in the city of Xining, Qinghai province. Arrested November 3, 1994. Sentenced to two years' ''reeducation through labor.'' Currently detained at Duoba labor camp.

42. Bishop Fan Yufel: Age: 60. Bishop Zhouzhi, Shaanxi province. Arrested in spring 1992. Transferred to house arrest in September 1992.

43. Bishop Lucas Li Jingfeng: Age: 68. Bishop of Fengxiang, Shaanxi province. Placed under house arrest April 1992. Reportedly released but activities are restricted and monitored.

44. Bishop Huo Guoyang: Bishop of Chongqing, Sichuan province. Arrested early January 1990. Reportedly released in early 1991 and currently under police surveillance in Chongqing City, Sichuan.

45. Bishop Li Side: Bishop of Tianjin diocese. Arrested May 25, 1992. Exiled in July 1992 to a rural parish of Liang Zhuang, Ji country and is forbidden to leave. Currently held under house arrest.

46. Bishop Shi Hongzhen: Auxiliary bishop of Tianjin diocese. Activities severely restricted. One report states he is under house arrest.

47. Father Su De-Qien: A priest of Tianjin diocese. Must report to Public Security once a month. Unable to administer the sacraments since December 1993.

48. Father Gu Zheng: Age: 50. Arrested October 6, 1994. Released late November 1994 but remains under strict police surveillance.

49. Deacon Dong Linzhong: Deacon of Dongdazhao Village, Baoding, Hebei province. Arrested December 21, 1992. Reportedly released but activities are restricted and monitored.

50. Deacon Wang Tongshang: Deacon of Baoding diocese, Hebei province. Arrested December 23, 1990. Sentenced to three years of ''reeducation through labor.'' Reportedly released but activities are restricted and monitored.

51. Sister Wang Yuqin: Age: 23. Arrested April 25, 1995. Although most of the 30–40 people arrested with her have been released, she remains in detention. Also fined 900 Chinese Yen, the equivalent of 3 months income.

52. Wang (or Wong) Ruiying: Arrested June 1994. Currently being held in a detention center in Cheng An Xian, Hebei province.

53. Zhang Guoyan: Age: 45. Sentenced in 1991 to three years' ''reeducation through labor.'' Reportedly released in March 1993.

54. Cui Maozai: Age: 42. Arrested April 26, 1995. Released but activities are restricted and monitored.

55. Gao Jianxiou: Age: 46. Arrested April 26, 1995. Released but activities are restricted and monitored.

56. Gao Shuyun: Age: 45. Arrested April 1995. Currently held at Chongren Sein detention center. Reportedly beaten so severely that she cannot feed herself. Released but activities are restricted and monitored.

57. Huang Guanghua: Age: 43. Arrested April 1995. Reportedly released but activities are restricted and monitored.

58. Huang Meiyu: Age 40. Arrested April 1995. Reportedly released but activities are restricted and monitored.

59. Lu Huiying: Age 51. Arrested April 1995. Reportedly released but activities are restricted and monitored.

60. Pan Kunming: Age 30. Arrested April 1995. Sentenced to five years in prison.

61. Rao Yanping: Age 18. Arrested April 1995. Sentenced to four years in prison.

62. Wu Jiehong: Age 46. Arrested April 1995. Released but activities are restricted and monitored.

63. Wu Yinghua: Age 30. Arrested April 1995. Released but activities are restricted and monitored.

64. You Xianyu: Age 42. Arrested April 1995. Released but activities are restricted and monitored.

65. Yu ChuiShen: Age 50. Arrested April 26, 1995. Sentenced to three years in prison.

66. Zeng Yinzai: Age 60. Arrested April 26, 1995. Released but activities are restricted and monitored.

67. Zeng Zhong-Liang: Arrested December 30, 1994. Released but activities are restricted and monitored.

68. Zhang Wenlin: Age 60. Arrested April 1995. Released but activities are restricted and monitored.

69. Zhu Changshun: Age 40. Arrested April 26, 1995. Released but activities are restricted and monitored.

70. Zhu Lianrong: Age 49. Arrested April 1995. Released but activities are restricted and monitored.

71. Wang Dao-Xian: Arrested April 21, 1994. Released but activities are restricted and monitored.

72. Xu Funian: Age 51. Arrested at the end of 1994 and sentenced to two years' ''reeducation through labor.''

73. Zhang Yousheng: Arrested in December 1990 or early 1991. Sentenced to three years'

imprisonment. Chinese authorities reported his release in June 1993. Activities are restricted and monitored.

74. Yu Qi Xiang: Age 19. Arrested April 26, 1995. Sentenced to two years in prison.

JULY 3, 1995.

[Primary Sources: Amnesty International, International Campaign for Tibet]

BUDDHIST MONKS AND NUNS IMPRISONED AND DETAINED IN TIBET

1. Apho: Age: 36. A monk of Bu Gon monastery. Arrested January 13, 1994. Currently held in Chamdo prison.

2. Bakdo: A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested May 1992. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

3. Buchung: Age 25. A monk of Sungrabling monastery. Arrested July 4, 1993. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

4. Champa Choekyi: A nun of Shungsep monastery. Arrested December 9, 1993.

5. Champa Gyatso: Age: 20. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 9, 1993. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

6. Champa Tsondrue: Age: 17. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested June 19, 1994. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

7. Chigchen: Age 21. A monk of Palkhor monastery. Arrested July 3, 1992. Currently held in Gyangtse jail.

8. Chime: Age 25. A monk Dunbu monastery. Arrested May 30, 1993.

9. Chime Drolkar: Age 18. A nun of Shungsep monastery. Arrested October 1, 1990. Sentenced to 7 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

10. Chimi: A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 16, 1993.

11. Choede: Age: 20. A monk of Yamure monastery. Arrested January 9, 1995.

12. Choekyi Gyaltsen: Age: 24. A nun of Shar Bumpa monastery. Arrested June 14, 1994. Currently held at Gutsa prison.

13. Choekyi Vangmo: Age: 20. A nun of Shar Bumpa monastery. Arrested June 14, 1994. Currently held at Gutsa prison.

14. Choekyi Tsomo: A nun of Bumthang monastery. Arrested March 13, 1994.

15. Choenyi Drolma: A nun of Shugsep monastery. Arrested December 9, 1993.

16. Choephel: A monk arrested October 20, 1993.

17. Choezom: A nun of Chubsang monastery. Arrested August 12, 1992.

18. Chung Tsering: Age: 30. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested May 13, 1994.

19. Dakar: Age: 20. A nun of Nagar monastery. Arrested August 17, 1993.

20. Damchoe Gyaltsen: Age: 24. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 15, 1992. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held at Drapchi prison.

21. Dawa: Age: 21. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 20, 1992. Currently held at Gutsa prison.

22. Dawa: Age: 27. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 20, 1992. Currently held at Gutsa prison.

23. Dawa: Age: 20. A monk of Phurchok monastery. Arrested May 24, 1994.

24. Dawa Gyaltsen: Age: 17. A monk of Tsepag monastery. Arrested June 4, 1993. Sentenced to five years in prison. Currently held at Drapchi prison.

25. Dawa Norbu: Age: 19. A monk of Palkhor monastery. Arrested July 3, 1992. Currently held in Gyantse jail.

26. Dawa Samdup: A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested between October 16 and 21, 1993. Currently held at Gutsa prison.

27. Dawa Sonam: Age: 16. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested May, 1992. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

28. Dawa Tsering: Age: 22. A monk of Dralhaluphug monastry. Arrested September 30, 1989. Sentenced to 8 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

29. Dekyi Nyima: A nun of Gura monastery. Arrested May 25, 1994.

30. Delo: Age: 23. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested May, 1992. Current held in Gutsa prison.

31. Dhundup Gyalpo: Age: 17. monk. Arrested June 26, 1993. Sentenced to 3 years in prison. Currently held in Sangyyip prison.

32. Dondrup Gyatso: Age: 20. A monk of Dranang monestry. Arrested June 6, 1993. Sentenced to 3 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

33. Dondrup: A monk of Rabkung monestry. Arrested September 30, 1990.

34. Dondup: Age: 17. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested May, 1992. Current held in Gutsa prison.

35. Dorje: Age: 25. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested April 11, 1992. Sentenced to 6–8 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

36. Dorje: Age: 15. A monk of Dunbu monastery. Arrested May 30, 1993.

37. Dorje Tsomo: Age: 18. A nun of Chubsang monastery. Arrested August 12, 1992.

38. Dradul: Age: 23. A monk of Dunbu monastery. Arrested May 30, 1993.

39. Drakpa Tsultrim: Age: 41. A monk of Ganden monestry. Arrested March 7, 1988. Sentenced to 8 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

40. Dunrup Yugyal: Age: 23 A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 3, 1993. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

41. Gokyi: Age: 23. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 16. 1993. Sentenced to 3–5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

42. Gyaltsen Choedron: Age: 25. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested August 21, 1990. Sentenced to 9 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

43. Gyaltsen Choezom: Age: 24. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested August 21, 1990. Sentenced to 9 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

44. Gyaltsen Drolkar: Age: 22. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested August 21, 1990. Sentenced to 12 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

45. Gyaltsen Drolma: Age 16. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 9, 1991. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

46. Gyaltsen Kalsang: Age 22. A nun of Chubsang monastery. Arrested March 21, 1992. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

47. Gyaltsen Kunga: Age: 23. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 14, 1990. Sentenced to 2 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

48. Gyaltsen Kunsang: Age: 22. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 14, 1993. Sentenced to 2 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

49. Gyaltsen Kunsang: Age: 25. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested between June 5 and 22, 1992. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

50. Gyaltsen Lhagdron: Age: 26. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested August 21, 1990. Sentenced to 7 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

51. Gyaltsen Lhaksam: Age: 25. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested August 21, 1990. Sentenced to 7 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

52. Gyaltsen Lhazom: Age: 25. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 9, 1991. Currently held in Gusta prison.

53. Gyaltsen Lodroe: Age: 17. A monk of Tsepak monastery. Arrested June 4, 1993. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

54. Gyaltsen Lungrig: Age: 24. A nun of Michungri monastery. Arrested August 12, 1990. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

55. Gyaltsen Nyinyi: Age: 24. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested between June 5 and 22, 1992. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

56. Gyaltsen Pema: Age: 17. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 9, 1991. Currently held in Gutsa monastery.

57. Gyaltsen Sangmo: Age: 24. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 14, 1993. Sentenced to 2-3 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

58. Gyaltsen Sherab: Age: 25. A nun of Chubsang monastery. Arrested between May 10 and 16, 1992. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

59. Gyaltsen Sherab: Age: 19. A nun of Shar Bumpa monastery. Arrested June 14, 1994. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

60. Gyaltsen Tengye: Age: 21. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested June 20 1994. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

61. Gyaltsen Tsultrim: Age: 22. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested between May 4 and 14, 1993. Sentenced to 4-5 years in prison. Currently being held in Drapchi prison.

62. Gyaltsen Zoepa: Age: 20. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested June 21, 1994.

63. Jamchok: Age: 28. A monk of Lithang monastery. Arrested August 20, 1993.

64. Jampa: Age: 26. A monk of Rame monastery. Arrested July, 1992. Currently held in Tsethang jail.

65. Jampa: Age: 30. A monk of Pomda monastery. Arrested August, 1993.

66. Jampa Choejor: Age: 16. A monk of Chamdo monastery. Arrested February 8, 1994. Currently being held in Shritang prison.

67. Jampa Dedrol: Age: 15. A nun of Michungri monastery. Arrested February 13, 1993. Currently being held in Gutsa prison.

68. Jampa Drolkar: Age: 21. A nun of Nagar monastery. Arrested August 17, 1993.

69. Jampa Gelek: Age: 18. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 9, 1993.

70. Jampa Legshe: Age: 27. A monk of Phenpo Naland monastery. Arrested July 3, 1993. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

71. Jampa Rangdrol: Age: 21. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested April 11, 1992. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

72. Jampa Tashi: Age: 26. A monk at Serwa monastery. Arrested March 29, 1994. Sentenced to 12 years in prison. Currently held in Powo Tramo prison.

73. Jampa Tenzin: Age: 20. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested May 6, 1992. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

74. Jampa Tenzin: Age: 22. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested May 13, 1992. Sentenced to 2 years in prison. Currently being held in Drapchi prison.

75. Jampa Tseten: Age: 22. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested May 6, 1992. Sentenced to 7 years in prison. Currently being held in Drapchi prison.

76. Jampel Changchub Yugyal: Age: 32. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested March or April, 1989. Sentenced to 19 years in prison. Currently being held in Drapchi prison.

77. Jampel Dorje: Age: 15. A monk of Dunbu monastery. Arrested May 30, 1993. Sentenced to 2 years, 6 months in prison.

78. Jampel Gendun: Age: 31. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 20, 1992. Sentenced to 9 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

79. Jampel Losel: Age: 27. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested April 27, 1989. Sentenced to 10 years in prison.

80. Jamyang: Age: 28. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 20, 1992. Currently being held in Gutsa prison.

81. Jamyang Dhondup: Age: 29: A monk of Lithang monastery. Arrested August 20, 1993.

82. Jamyang Dolma: Age: 23. A nun of Shar monastery. Arrested June 15, 1994.

83. Jamyang Kunga: Age: 22. A monk of Dunbu monastery. Arrested November 7, 1992. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently being held in Drapchi prison.

84. Jigme Dorje: Age: 27. A monk of Serwa monastery. Arrested March 29, 1994. Sentenced to 15 years in prison. Currently being held in Powo Tramo prison.

85. Jigme Yandron: Age: 24. A nun of Shungsep monastery. Arrested August 28, 1990. Sentenced to 12 years in prison. Currently being held in Drapchi prison.

86. Jigme Yangchen: Age: 23. A nun of Shungsep monastery. Arrested October 1, 1990. Sentenced to 7 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

87. Kagye: A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested May, 1992. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

88. Kelsang: A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested May, 1992.

89. Kelsang: Age: 16. A monk of Tsepak monastery. Arrested June 3, 1993. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

90. Kelsang Chodak: Age: 20. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested December 15, 1990. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

91. Kelsang Dawa: Age: 21. A monk of Tsome monastery. Arrested May 15, 1992. Sentenced to 3–5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

92. Kelsang Gyaltsen: Age: 25. A monk of Dingka monastery. Arrested March 17, 1991. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently being held in Drapchi prison.

93. Kelsang Phuntsog: Age: 21. A monk of Sera monastery. Arrested August 4, 1991. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

94. Kelsang Thutob: Age: 46. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested April 16, 1989. Sentenced to 18 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

95. Kelsang Tsering: A monk of Dakpo monastery. Arrested January, 1992. Currently held in Medro jail.

96. Khyentse Legrup: Age: 21. A monk of Chideshol monastery. Arrested November 7, 1992. Sentenced to 3 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

97. Kunchok Tsomo: Age: 15. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 17, 1992. Sentenced to 3 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

98. Kunsang Jampa: Age: 20. A monk of Dakpo monastery. Arrested March 1992. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

99. Legshe Phuntsog: Age: 23. A monk of Phenpo monastery. Arrested July 3, 1993. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

100. Lhagyal: Age: 23. A monk of Samye monastery. Arrested between June and September, 1991. Sentenced to 3–4 years in prison. Currently being held in Drapchi prison.

101. Lhaga: Age: 23. A monk of Chideshol monastery. Arrested August 27, 1993. Sentenced to 3 years in prison. Currently being held in Drapchi prison.

102. Lhakpa: Age: 22. A monk of Draglhaluphug monastery. Arrested between October 6 and 25, 1989. Sentenced to 8 years in prison. Currently being held in Drapchi prison.

103. Lhakpa Tsering: Age: 20. A monk of Dunbu monastery. Arrested May 30, 1993.

104. Lhundrup Monlam: Age: 26. A monk of Palkhor monastery. Arrested March 15 or 16, 1990. Sentenced to 4–5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

105. Lhundrup Togden: Age: 24. A monk of Palkhor monastery. Arrested December 1989. Sentenced to 14 years in prison. Currently being held in Drapchi prison.

106. Lhundrup Zangmo: Age: 23. A nun of Michungri monastery. Arrested between August 12 and 21, 1990. Sentenced to 9 years in prison. Currently being held in Drapchi prison.

107. Li-Ze: A monk of Dakpo monastery. Arrested January 1992. Currently being held in Medro jail.

108. Lobsang: Age: 28. A monk of Lithang monastery. Arrested August 20, 1993.

109. Lobsang: Age: 22. A monk of Dunbu monastery. Arrested May 30, 1993.

110. Lobsang Choedrak: Age: 19. A monk of Sera monastery. Arrested February 23, 1992. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

111. Lobsang Choedrag: Age: 18. A monk of Nyemo Gyache monastery. Arrested February 3, 1992. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

112. Lobsang Choedrag: Age: 18. A monk of Dakpo monastery. Arrested March 11, 1992. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

113. Lobsang Choedrak: Age: 22. A monk of Drak Yerpa monastery. Arrested September 15, 1993.

114. Lobsang Choedron: Age: 17. A nun of Michungri monastery. Arrested February 3, 1992. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

115. Lobsang Choedron: Age: 23. A nun of Michungri monastery. Arrested August 22, 1990. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

116. Lobsang Choedron: Age: 22. A nun of Michungri monastery. Arrested August 22, 1990. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

117. Lobsang Choedron: A nun of Bumthang monastery. Arrested March 13, 1994.

118. Lobsang Choejor: Age: 32. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 7, 1988. Sentenced to 9 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

119. Lobsang Choekyi: Age: 21. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested between June 5 and 22, 1992. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

120. Lobsang Choezin: Age: 17. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested June 20, 1994. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

121. Lobsang Dadak: Age: 23. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested September 1989. Sentenced to 9 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

122. Lobsang Dargye: Age: 27. A monk of Ragya monastery. Arrested November 16, 1992.

123. Lobsang Dargye: Age: 27. A monk of Serwa monastery. Arrested March 29, 1994. Sentenced to 15 years in prison.

124. Lobsang Dargye: Age: 23. A monk of Sangyak monastery. Arrested between May 11 and 16, 1992. Sentenced to 7 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

125. Lobsang Dargye: A monk of Sangyak monastery. Arrested December 7, 1994.

125. Lobsang Dolma: Age: 24. A nun of Shar Bumpa monastery. Arrested June 1994.

126. Lobsang Donyo: Age: 19. A monk of Drak Yerpa monastery. Arrested August 28, 1993. Currently held in Taktse jail.

127. Lobsang Dorje: Age: 20. A monk of Phurchok monastery. Arrested May 16, 1992. Sentenced to 9 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

128. Lobsang Dradul: Age: 18. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested June 10, 1992. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

129. Lobsang Drolma: Age: 22. A nun of Michungri monastery. Arrested February 3, 1992. Sentenced to 7 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

130. Lobsang Drolma: Age: 18. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested between June 5 and 22 1992. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

131. Lobsang Gelek: Age: 22. A monk of Sera monastery. Arrested in November or December 1989. Sentenced to 12 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

132. Lobsang Gelek: Age: 23. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested May 6, 1992. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

133. Lobsang Gendun: A monk of Sang-ngag monastery. Arrested December 2 or 7, 1993.

134. Lobsang Gyaltsen: Age: 22. A monk of Nechung monastery. Arrested May 19, 1993.

135. Lobsang Gyaltsen: Age: 22. A monk of Shelkar monastery. Arrested June 14, 1993.

136. Lobsang Gyaltsen: Age: 23. A monk of Nechung monastery. Arrested May 19, 1993.

137. Lobsang Gyaltsen: Age: 19. A monk of Tsepak monastery. Arrested June 4, 1993. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

138. Lobsang Jampa: Age: 23. A nun of Shar Bumpa monastery. Arrested June 1994.

139. Lobsang Jampa: Age: 29. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 20, 1992. Sentenced to 8 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

140. Lobsang Jampa: Age: 44. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested July 6, 1991. Currently held in Seitru prison.

141. Lobsang Kalden: A nun of Bumthang monastery. Arrested March 13, 1994.

142. Lobsang Khedrup: Age: 16. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 20, 1993. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

143. Lobsang Legshe: Age: 21. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 20, 1992. Sentenced to 5 years in prisons. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

144. Lobsang Lodrup: Age: 21. A monk of Phurchok monastery. Arrested May 16, 1992. Sentenced to 7 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

145. Lobsang Lungtok: Age: 23. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 20, 1992. Sentenced to 7 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

146. Lobsang Ngawang: Age: 22. A monk of Dakpo monastery. Arrested between March and May 1992. Sentenced to 8 years in prison. Current held in Drapchi prison.

147. Lobsang Palden: Age: 21. A monk of Phurbu Chog monastery. Arrested May 16, 1992. Sentenced to 7 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

148. Lobsang Palden: Age: 22. A monk of Shelkar monastery. Arrested June 14, 1993.

149. Lobsang Palden: Age: 32. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 7, 1988. Sentenced to 10 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

150. Lobsang Phuntsog: Age: 22. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested August 1991. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

151. Lobsang Samten: Age: 18. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 3, 1993. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

152. Lobsang Sherab: Age: 18. A monk of Purchok retreat. Arrested May 16, 1992. Sentenced to 8 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

153. Lobsang Tashi: Age: 41. A monk of Zitho monastery. Arrested March 4, 1990. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in PoZungma prison.

154. Lobsang Tengue: A monk of Sera monastery. Arrested in 1983. Currently being held in Gutsa prison.

155. Lobsang Tenzin: Age: 21. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 20, 1992. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

156. Lobsang Tenzin: Age: 18. A monk of Sera monastery. Arrested August 14, 1991. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

157. Lobsang Tenzin: A monk of Sang-ngag monastery. Arrested December 2 or 7, 1994. Currently held in Taktse prision.

158. Lobsang Thargye: A monk of Sand Nak Kha monastery. Arrested May 16, 1992.

159. Lobsang Thupten: Age: 16. A monk of Purchok monastery. Arrested August 5, 1992.

160. Lobsang Thupten: Age: 32. A monk of Sera monastery. Arrested July 6, 1992. Currently held in Gutsa monastery.

161. Lobsang Trinley: A monk of Dakpo monastery. Arrested January 6, 1992. Currently held in Medro jail.

162. Lobsang Tsegye: Age: 27. A monk of Serwa monastery. Arrested March 29, 1994. Sentenced to 15 years in prison. Currently held in Powo Tramo prison.

163. Lobsang Tsondru: A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested 1990. Sentenced to 6–7 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

164. Lobsang Yangzom: A nun of Bumthang monastery. Arrested March 13, 1994.

165. Lobsang Yarphel: Age: 20. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested between June 10 and 13, 1992. Sentenced to 7 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

166. Lobsang Yeshe: Age: 18. A nun of Shar Bumpa monastery. Arrested June 1994.

167. Lobsang Yeshe: Age: 21. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 20, 1992. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

168. Lobsang Zoepa: Age: 19. A monk of Dakpo monastery. Arrested August 22, 1992. Sentenced to 3 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

169. Loden: Age: 51 A monk of Gyu-me monastery. Arrested March 1993.

170. Lodro Pema: A nun of Shungsep monastery. Arrested December 9, 1993.

171. Migmar: Age: 17. A monk of Dunbu monastery. Arrested May 30. 1993.

172. Migmar: Age: 27 A monk of Dunbu monastery. Arrested May 30, 1993.

173. Migmar Tsering: Age: 20. A monk of Dunbu monastry. Arrested May 30. 1993.

174. Namdrol Lhamo: Age 28. A nun of Chubsang monastery. Arrested May 12, 1992. Sentenced to 12 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

175. Namgyal Ghoedron: A nun of Shungsep monastery. Arrested December 9, 1993.

176. Ngawang Bumchok: Age: 22. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested June 15, 1992. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi Prison.

177. Ngawang Chendrol: Age: 18. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 14, 1993. Sentenced to 3 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

178. Ngawang Chenma: Age: 24. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 5, 1992. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

179. Ngawang Chime: Age: 19. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 14, 1993. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

180. Ngawang Choedrak: A monk and Chant master. Arrested April 1993.

181. Ngawang Choedron: A nun of Choebup monastery. Arrested June 28, 1993.

182. Ngawang Choekyi: Age: 23. A nun of Toelung monastery. Arrested May 14, 1993. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently being held in Drapchi prison.

183. Ngawang Choekyi: Age: 21. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 14, 1993. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently being held in Drapchi prison.

184. Ngawang Choenyi: Age: 20. A monk of Kyemolong monastery. Arrested May 8, 1993. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

185. Ngawang Choekyong: A monk of Sang-Ngag monastery. Arrested between December 2 and 7, 1994. Currently held in Taktse prison.

186. Ngawang Choephel: Age: 29. A monk of Lithang monastery. Arrested August 20, 1993.

187. Ngawang Choeshe: Age: 24. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested May 13, 1992. Sentenced to 3 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

188. Ngawang Choezom: Age: 22. A nun of Chubsang monastery. Arrested March 21, 1993. Sentenced to 11 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

189. Ngawang Choglang: Age: 25. A monk of Sungrabling monastery. Arrested June 28, 1993. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently being held in Drapchi prison.

190. Ngawang Dadrol: Age: 17. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested between June 15 and 22, 1992. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

191. Ngawang Dawa: Age: 16. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested September 9, 1991. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

192. Ngawang Debam: Age: 24. A monk of Sera monastery. Arrested August 8, 1991. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

193. Ngawang Dedrol: Age: 23. A nun of Chubsang monastery. Arrested May 14, 1992. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

194. Ngawang Dedrol: Age: 24. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 14, 1993. Sentenced to 7 years in prison. Currently being held in Drapchi prison.

195. Ngawang Dipsel: A monk of Drepung monastery. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently being held in Drapchi prison.

196. Ngawang Dorje: Age: 21. A monk of Shedrupling monastery. Arrested August 12, 1992. Sentenced to 3 years in prison. Currently being held in Drapchi prison.

197. Ngawang Drolma: Age: 18. A nun of Michungri monastery. Arrested March 13, 1993. Currently held in Gusta prison.

198. Ngawang Gomchen: Age: 20. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested August 1991. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

199. Ngawang Gyaltsen: Age: 21. A monk of Sera monastery. Arrested May 3, 1991. A monk of Gutsa prison.

200. Ngawang Gyaltsen: Age: 36. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested April 4, 1989. Sentenced to 17 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

201. Ngawang Gyatso: A nun of Toelung monastery. Arrested May 13, 1992. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

202. Ngawang Jamchen: Age: 24. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested September 27, 1991. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

203. Ngawang Jigme: Age 17. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested in September or October 1991. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

204. Ngawang Jigme: Age: 20. A monk of Medro monastery. Arrested June 6, 1993. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

205. Ngawang Jinpa: A monk of Sang-Ngag monastery. Arrested between December 2 and 7, 1994.

206. Ngawang Keldron: Age: between 19 and 22. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 14, 1993. Sentenced to 5 years in prison.

207. Ngawang Kelsang: A nun of Nyemo Gyaltse monastery. Arrested June 1993.

208. Ngawang Kelzom: Age: 24. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 14, 1993. Sentenced to 2–5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

209. Ngawang Kelzom: Age: 24. A nun of Chubsang monastery. Arrested June 14, 1993. Sentenced to 2 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

210. Ngawang Khedup: Age: 24. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested June 15, 1992. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

211. Ngawang Kunsang: Age: 26. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested in January or February 1990. Sentenced to 14 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

212. Ngawang Kunsel: Age: 20. A nun of a Garu monastery. Arrested May 25, 1994.

213. Ngawang Kyema: Age: 23. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 22, 1993. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

214. Ngawang Lamchen: Age: 23. A monk of Sungrabling monastery. Arrested June 28, 1993.

215. Ngawang Lamchung: Age: 22. A monk of Kyemolung monastery. Arrested December 12, 1992. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

216. Ngawang Lamdrol: Age: 19. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested May 25, 1994.

217. Ngawang Ledoe: A monk of Sera monastery. Arrested 1983. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

218. Ngawang Legsang: Age: 22. A monk of Kyormolong monastery. Arrested 28, 1993. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

219. Ngawang Legshe: Age: 22. A monk of Kingka monastery. Arrested March 17, 1991. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

220. Ngawang Legyon: A monk of Sang-Ngag monastery. Arrested December 2 or 7, 1994.

221. Ngawang Lhaksam: Age: 24. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested May 13, 1992. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

222. Ngawang Lhundrup: Age: 22. A monk of Kingka monastery. Arrested April 1991. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

223. Ngawang Lhundrup: Age: 33. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested May 16, 1991. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

224. Ngawang Lhundrup: Age: 19. A monk of Shedrupling monastery. Arrested August 12, 1992. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

225. Ngawang Lobsang: Age: 23. A nun of Phenpo Namkar monastery. Arrested July 16, 1993. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

226. Ngawang Lochoe: Age: 23. A nun of Toelung monastery. Arrested May 14, 1992. Sentenced to 10 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

227. Ngawang Losel: A monk of Sang-Ngag monastery. Arrested between December 2 and 7, 1994. Currently held in Taktse prison.

228. Ngawang Losel: A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested June 4, 1993.

229. Ngawang Lungtok: Age: 19. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested May 13, 1992. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

230. Ngawang Namdrol: Age: 23. A nun of Toelung monastery. Arrested May 14, 1992. Sentenced to 7 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

231. Ngawang Namling: Age: 28. A monk of Drugyal monastery. Arrested June 27, 1993. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

232. Ngawang Ngondron: A nun of Toelung monastery. Arrested May 13, 1992. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

233. Ngawang Ngon-Kyen: Age: 19. A monk of Nyethang monastery. Arrested between May 7 and 31, 1994.

234. Ngawang Nordrol: Age: 23. A nun of Samdrup Drolma monastery. Arrested May 14, 1992. Sentenced to 7 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

235. Ngawang Nyidrol: Age: 23. A nun of Chubsang monastery. Arrested July 6, 1992. Sentenced to 3 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

236. Ngawang Nyima: Age: 23. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested between June 5 and 22, 1992. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently being held in Drapchi prison.

237. Ngawang Nyima: Age: 22. A nun of Chubsang monastery. Arrested May 14, 1992. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

238. Ngawang Oeser: Age: 22. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested April 16, 1989.

Sentenced to 17 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

239. Ngawang Palden: Age: 28. A monk of Dunbu monastery. Arrested August 28, 1992. Sentenced to up to 10 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

240. Ngawang Palgon: Age: 33. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested June 15, 1992. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

241. Ngawang Palmo: Age: 22. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 14, 1993. Sentenced to 3 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

242. Ngawang Palsang: Age: 20. A monk of Medro monastery. Arrested June 6, 1993. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

243. Ngawang Pekar: Age: 29. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested March 1989. Sentenced to 8 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

244. Ngawang Pelkyi: Age: 18. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 22, 1992. Sentenced to 3 years in prison. Currently held in Trisam prison.

245. Ngawang Pema: A nun of Bumthang monastery. Arrested March 13, 1994.

246. Ngawang Pemo: Age: 22. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 14, 1993. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

247. Ngawang Phulchung: Age: 34. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested April 16, 1989. Sentenced to 16 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

248. Ngawang: Age: 21. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested May 15, 1992. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

249. Ngawang Phuntsog: Age: 22. A nun of Toelung monastery. Arrested May 14, 1992. Sentenced to 7 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

250. Ngawang Phurdron: A nun of Toelung monastery. Arrested May 13, 1992. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

251. Ngawnag Rabjor: Age: 20. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested September 27, 1991. Sentenced to six years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

252. Ngawang Rigdrol: Age: 21. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested between June 5 and 22, 1992. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

253. Ngawang Rigdrol: Age: 22. A nun of Phenpo Namkar monastery. Arrested July 17, 1993. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

254. Ngawang Rigzin: Age: 29. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested April 1989. Sentenced to 9 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

255. Ngawang Samdrup: Age: 18. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 17, 1992. Sentenced to 9 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

256. Ngawang Samten: Age: 20. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 5, 1992. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

257. Ngawang Samten: Age: 22. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested between March 9 and 11, 1991. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

258. Ngawang Sangden: A nun of Bumthang monastery. Arrested March 13, 1994.

259. Ngawang Sangdrol: Age: 18. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 17, 1992. Sentenced to 9 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

260. Ngawang Sangye: A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 9, 1993. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

261. Ngawang Shenyen: Age: 25. A monk of Kyemolung monastery. Arrested March 18, 1989. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

262. Ngawang Sherab: Age: 23. A monk of Kyemolung monastery. Arrested June 16, 1993. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

263. Ngawang Sherab: Age: 24. A monk of Jamchen monastery. Arrested March 11, 1992. Sentenced to up to 10 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

264. Ngawang Sonam: Age: 21. A nun of Chubsang monastery. Arrested June 14, 1993. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

265. Ngawang Songtsen: Age: 24. A monk of Jokhang monastery. Arrested March 1989. Sentenced to 7 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

266. Ngawang Sothar: Age: 23. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested May 13, 1992. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

267. Ngawang Sungrab: Age: 20. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested September 27, 1991. Sentenced to 10 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

268. Ngawang Tendrol: Age: 18. A nun of Toelung Ngengon monastery. Arrested May 14, 1992. Sentenced to 3 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

269. Ngawang Tengye: Age: 23. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested May 1992. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

270. Ngawang Tenrab: Age: 37. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested March 16, 1992. Sentenced to 7 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

271. Ngawang Tensang: Age: 21. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested September 14, 1991. Sentenced to 10 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

272. Ngawang Tenzin: Age: 23. A nun of Chubsang monastery. Arrested May 16, 1992. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

273. Ngawang Tenzin: Age: 18. A monk of Kyemolung monastery. Arrested February 19, 1992. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

274. Ngawang Tenzin: Age: 21. A monk of Kyemolung monastery. Arrested March 18, 1989. Sentenced to 8 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

275. Ngawang Thoglam: A monk of Sang-Ngag monastery. Arrested December 2 or 7, 1994. Currently held in Taktse prison.

276. Ngawang Thupten: Age: 18. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested May 29, 1993.

277. Ngawang Thupten: Age: 19. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested September 10, 1991. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

278. Ngawang Trinley: Age: 27. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested May 13, 1992. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

279. Ngawang Tsamdrol: Age: 21. A nun of Toelung monastery. Arrested May 14, 1992. Sentenced to a total of 10 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

280. Ngawang Tsangpa: Age: 21. A monk of Nyethang monastery. Arrested between May 27 and 31, 1994.

281. Ngawang Tsedrol: Age: 22. A nun of Chubsang monastery. Arrested May 14, 1992. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

282. Ngawang Tsondru: Age: 23. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested June 1, 1993. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

283. Ngawang Tsondru: Age: 26. A monk of Dingka monastery. Arrested March 17, 1991. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

284. Ngawang Tsultrim: Age: 24. A monk of Kyemolung monastery. Arrested March 18, 1989. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

285. Ngawang Tsultrim: A monk of Sera monastery. Arrested May 1993.

286. Ngawang Wangmo: A nun of Chubsang monastery. Arrested May 14, 1992. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

287. Ngawang Woeser: Age: 28. A monk of Dingka monastery. Arrested March 1991. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

288. Ngawang Yangchen: Age: 22. A nun of Chubsang monastery. Arrested August 12, 1992. Sentenced to 3 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

289. Ngawang Yangdrol: Age: 23. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 14, 1993. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

290. Ngawang Yangkyi: A nun of Tsangkhung monastery. Arrested August 21, 1990. Currently held at Drapchi hospital.

291. Ngawang Yangkyi: Age: 22. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 4, 1993. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

292. Ngawang Yeshe: Age: 22. A monk of Serkhang monastery. Arrested February 11, 1992. Sentenced to 3 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

293. Ngawang Zangpo: Age: 20. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested August 1991. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

294. Ngawang Zoepa: Age: 25. A monk of Rong Jamchen monastery. Arrested between September 11 and 19, 1992. Sentenced to up to 10 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

295. Ngawang Zoepa: Age: 28. A monk of Dingka monastery. Arrested March 17, 1991. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

296. Norbu: Age: 20. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 9, 1993. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

297. Norbu: Age: 20. A monk of Yamure monastery. Arrested January 11, 1995.

298. Norgye: Age: 23. A monk of Rong Jamchen monastery. Arrested September 19, 1992. Sentenced to 4–5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

299. Norzang: Age: 15. A monk of Dunbu monastery. Arrested May 30, 1993.

300. Norzin: A nun of Shungsep monastery. Arrested December 9, 1993.

301. Nyidrol: A nun of Chubsang monastery. Arrested May 14, 1992. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

302. Nyima: Age: 28. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested April 2, 1994.

303. Nyima: Age: 18. A monk of Phurchok monastery. Arrested May 24, 1994.

304. Nyima Gyaltsen: Age: 23. A monk of Tsepak monastery. Arrested June 4, 1993. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

305. Nyima Tenzin: Age: 27. A monk of Pangpa monastery. Arrested December 29, 1993.

306. Nyima Tsamchoe: Age: 25. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 22, 1992. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

307. Palden Choedron: Age: 19. A nun of Shungsep monastery. Arrested October 1, 1990. Sentenced to 9 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

308. Pasang: Age: 24. A monk of Dunbu monastery. Arrested May 30, 1993.

309. Pasang: A monk of Dakpo monastery. Arrested January 1992. Currently held in Medro jail.

310. Pasang: Age: 15. A monk of Tsepak monastery. Arrested June 3, 1993. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

311. Passang: A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested June 1993.

312. Pema Drolkar: Age: 18. A nun of Michungri monastery. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

313. Pema Oeser: Age: 16. A nun of Nagar monastery. Arrested August 17, 1993.

314. Pema Tsering: Age: 23. A monk of Serwa monastery. Arrested March 29, 1994.

Sentenced to 15 years in prison. Currently held in Powo Tramo prison.

315. Pendron: A nun of Shungsen. Arrested December 12, 1993.

316. Penpa: Age: 20. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 9, 1993. Sentenced to 3 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

317. Penpa: Age: 19. A monk of Dunbu monastery. Arrested May 30, 1993.

318. Penpa: Age: 21. A monk of Sungrabling monastery. Arrested July 4, 1993. Sentenced to 3 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

319. Penpa: Age: 22. A monk of Sungrabling monastery. Arrested July 4, 1993. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

320. Penpa Wangmo: Age: 20. A nun of Michungri monastery. Arrested February 13, 1992. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

321. Pepar: Age: 21. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested May 1992. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

322. Phetho: Age: 21. A nun of Chubsang monastery. Arrested August 18, 1991. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

323. Phuntsog: Age: 21. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested May 13, 1992. Sentenced to 8 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

324. Phuntsog Changsem: Age: 18. A monk of Drepung Monastery. Arrested September 14, 1991. Sentenced to 8 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

325. Phuntsog Chenga: Age: 22. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 14, 1993. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

326. Phutsog Choedrag: A monk of Sang-Ngag monastery. Arrested December 2 or 7, 1994.

327. Phutsog Choejor: A monk of Sang-Ngag monastery. Arrested December 2 or 7, 1994.

328. Phutsog Choekyi: Age: 22. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 14, 1993. Sentenced to 6–7 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

329. Phuntsog Dadak: A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested May 13, 1992. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

330. Phuntsog Demei: Age: 22. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested May 13, 199?. Sentenced to 8 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

331. Phuntsog Dondrup: Age: 17. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested September 10, 1991. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

332. Phuntsog Gonpo: Age: 19. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested September 14, 1991. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

333. Phuntsog Gyaltsen: Age: 26. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 7, 1988. Sentenced to 12 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

334. Phuntsog Jigdral: A monk of Sang-Ngag monastery. Arrested December 2 or 7, 1994. Currently held in Taktse prison.

335. Phuntsog Jorchu: Age: 26. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested August 1991. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

336. Phuntsog Legsang: Age: 21. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested May 13, 1992. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

337. Phuntsog Lochoe: Age: 24. A nun of Chubsang monastery. Arrested March 21, 1992. Sentenced to 7 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

338. Phuntsog Lhundrup: A monk of Sang-Ngag monastery. Arrested December 2 or 7, 1994.

339. Phuntsog Namgyal: Age: 23. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested May 13, 1992. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

340. Phuntsog Nyidron: Age: 23. A nun of Michungri monastery. Arrested between October and December 1990. Sentenced to a total of 17 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

341. Phuntsog Nyimgbu: A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested October 1993. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

342. Phuntsog Pema: Age 23. A nun of Michungri monastery. Arrested between October and December 1990. Sentenced to 8 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

343. Phuntsog Peyang: Age 27. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested May 25, 1994.

344. Phuntsog Rigchog: Age 28. A monk of Nyethang monastery. Arrested May 31, 1994.

345. Phuntsog Samten: Age 24. A monk of Nyethang monastery. Arrested September 4, 1991. Sentenced to 10 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

346. Phuntsog Samten: Age 23. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested May 13, 1992. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

347. Phuntsog Segyi: Age 22. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested May 13, 1992. Sentenced to 8 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

348. Phuntsog Seldrag: Age 17. A monk of Nyethang monastery. Arrested May 31, 1994.

349. Phuntsog Tendon: Age 14. A monk of Nyethang monastery. Arrested May 31, 1994.

350. Phuntsog Thoesam: Age 23. A monk of Nyethang monastery. Arrested June 1, 1993. Sentenced to 7 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

351. Phuntsog Thrinden: Age 19. A monk of Nyethang monastery. Arrested May 31, 1994.

352. Phuntsog Thubten: Age 30. A monk of Rame monastery. Arrested June 12, 1992. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

353. Thuntog Thutop: Age 20. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested September 14, 1991. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

354. Phuntsog Tsamchoe: Age 22. A nun of Chubsang monastery. Arrested March 3, 1992. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

355. Phuntsog Tsering: Age 20. A monk of Nyethang monastery. Arrested September 4, 1991. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

356. Phuntsog Tsomo: Age 19. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested May 25, 1994.

357. Phuntsog Tsungme: Age 21. A monk of Sera monastery. Arrested May 26, 1991. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

358. Phuntsog Wangden: Age 23. A monk of Nyethang monastery. Arrested September 4, 1991. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

359. Phuntsog Wangdu: Age 25. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested June 18, 1993.

360. Phuntsog Wangmo: Age 21. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested May 25, 1994.

361. Phuntsog Zoepa: Age 19. A monk of Nyethang monastery. Arrested May 31, 1994.

362. Phurbu: Age 19. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested October 10, 1989. Sentenced to 7 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

363. Phurbu: Age 23. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested September 30, 1989. Sentenced to a total of 9 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

364. Phurbu: Age 16. A monk of Tsepak monastery. Arrested June 3, 1993. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

365. Phurbu Tashi: Age 15. A monk of Dunbu monastery. Arrested May 30, 1993. Sentenced to 2 years, 6 months in prison.

366. Phurbu Tashi: Age. 20. A monk of Pangpa monastery. Arrested December 29, 1993.

367. Phurbu Tsamchoe: A nun of Tsangkhung monastery. Arrested June 10, 1991. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

368. Phurbu Tsering: A monk of Tashi Lhunpo monastery. Arrested June 15, 1993.

369. Rigzin Choekyi: Age: 24. A nun of Shungsepmonastery. Arrested August 1990. Sentenced to 12 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

370. Rigzin Tsondru: A nun of Shungsep monastery. Arrested December 9, 1993.

371. Rinchen Drolma: Age: 23. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 14, 1993. Sentenced to 2–4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

372. Rinchen Sangmo: Age: 20. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 22, 1992. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

373. Samten Choesang: Age: 20. A nun of Phenpo Namkar monastery. Arrested July 16, 1993. Sentenced to 6 years in prison.

374. Samten Sangmo: Age: 20. A nun of Phenpo Namkar. Arrested July 16, 1993. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

375. Seldroen: Age: 17. A nun of Shar Bumpa monastery. Arrested June 14, 1994. Currently held in Guta prison.

376. Shenyen Logsang: A monk of Kyemolung monastery. Arrested June 16, 1993.

377. Sherabl Drolma: A nun of Shungsep monastery. Arrested December 9, 1993.

378. Sherab Ngawang: Age: 12. A nun of Michungri monastery. Arrested February 3, 1992. Sentended to 3 years in prison. Currently held in Trisam prison.

379. Shilok: Age: 33. A monk of Dunbu monastery. Arrested March 30, 1992. Currently held in Tsethang prison.

380. Sodor: Age: 20. A monk of Lhoka monastery. Arrested August 16, 1989. Sentenced to a total of 7 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

381. Sonam: A monk of Drak Yerpa monastery. Arrested August 1994. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

382. Sonam Bagdro: Age: 24. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 20, 1992. Sentenced to Gutsa prison.

383. Sonam Choephel: Age: 12. A monk of Cunbu monastery. Arrested May 30, 1993. Sentenced to 3 years in prison.

384. Sonam Drolkar: A nun of Dechen Khul monastery. Arrested May 16, 1992. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

385. Sonam Gyalpo: A monk of Tashilhunpo monastery. Arrested July 1, 1993.

386. Sonam Tenzin: A monk of Dakpo. Arrested January 1992. Currently held in Medro jail.

387. Sonam Tsering: Age: 20. A monk of Yamure monastery. Arrested January 11, 1995.

388. Sotop: Age: 23. A monk of Sungrabling monastery. Arrested March 1989. Sentenced to 7 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

389. Tapsang: Age: 22. A nun of Sungsep monastery. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

390. Tashi Dawa: A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested May 1992. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

391. Tendar Phuntsog: Age: 62. A monk of Potala monastery. Arrested March 8, 1989. Sentenced to up to 10 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

392. Tenpa Wangdrag: Age: 49. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 7, 1988. Sentenced to 14 years in prison. Currently held in Powo Tramo prison.

393. Tenzin: Age: 23. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested June 1, 1993. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

394. Tenzin: Age: 20. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested May 7, 1992. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

395. Tenzin: Age: 24. A monk of Bu Gon monastery. Arrested January 13, 1994.

396. Tenzin Choekyi: Age: 19. A nun of Michungri monastery. Arrested March 11, 1993.

397. Tenzin Choekyi: A nun of Choebup monastery. Arrested June 28, 1993.

398. Tenzin Choephel: Age: 16. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 9, 1993. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

399. Tenzin Dekyong: Age: 15. A nun of Michungri monastery. Arrested March 13, 1993. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

400. Tenzin Dradul: Age: 18. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 9, 1993. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

401. Tanzin Drakpa: Age: 23. A monk of Dakpo monastery. Arrested December 6, 1991. Sentenced to 8 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

402. Tenzin Dragpa: Age: 24. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested June 10, 1992. Sentenced to 8 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

403. Tenzin Kunsang: A nun of Bumthang monastery. Arrested March 12, 1994.

404. Tenzin Namdrak: Age: 23. A monk of Phakmo monastery. Arrested August 13, 1993. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

405. Tenzin Ngawang: Age: 21. A nun of Michungri monastery. Arrested between August 12 and 21, 1990. Sentenced up to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

406. Tenzin Phuntsog: Age: 24. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 20, 1992. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

407. Tenzin Rabten: Age: 21. A monk of Shelkar monastery. Arrested June 14, 1993.

408. Tenzin Thupten: Age: 20. A nun of Michungri monastery. Arrested between August 12 and 21, 1990. Sentenced up to 14 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

409. Tenzin Trinley: Age: 23. A monk of Dunbu monastery. Arrested November 7, 1992. Sentenced to 3–4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

410. Tenzin Wangdu: Age: 19. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested between June 10 and 13, 1992. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

411. Thapke: Age: 17. A monk of Dunbu monastery. Arrested May 30, 1993.

412. Tharpa: Age: 17. A monk of Phurchok monastery. Arrested May 24, 1994.

413. Thupten Geleg: Age: 16. A monk of Nyethang monastery. Arrested May 31, 1994.

414. Thupten Kelsang: Age: 18. A monk of Phurchok monastery. Arrested May 16, 1992. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

415. Thupten Kelsang: Age: 19. A monk of Lo monastery. Arrested May 4, 1992. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

416. Thupten Kunga: Age: 70. A monk of Rong Jamchen monastery. Arrested April 10, 1992.

417. Thupten Kunkhyen: Age: 17. A monk of Chideshol monastery. Arrested November 7, 1992. Sentenced to 3 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

418. Thupten Kunphel: A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested March 20, 1992. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

419. Thupten Monlam: Age: 20. A monk of Dunbu monastery. Arrested August 8, 1992. Sentenced to up to 10 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

420. Thupten Phuntsog: Age: 26. A monk of Rame monastery. Arrested June 22, 1992. Sentenced to 5 years in prison.

421. Thupten Tsering: Age: 25. A monk of Sera monastery. Arrested May 19, 1993. Currently held in Seitru prison.

422. Thupten Tsondru: Age: 23. A monk of Chideshol monastery. Arrested April 6, 1992. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

423. Topgyal: Age: 21. A monk of Bu Gon monastery. Arrested February 1994.

424. Trinley Choedron: Age: 18. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested May 13, 1995. Sentenced to 3 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

425. Trinley Choezom: Age: 18. A nun of Michungri monastery. Arrested February 3, 1992. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

426. Trinley Gyaltsen: Age: 16. A monk of Tsepak monastery. Arrested June 4, 1993. Sentenced to 3 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

427. Trinley Gyamtso: Age: 24. A monk of Labrang monastery. Arrested September 1994.

428. Trinly Tenzin: A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested either May 12 or 13, 1992. Sentenced to 3 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

429. Tsamchoe: A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested June 1, 1992.

430. Tsamchoe: Age: 19. A nun of Nagar monastery. Arrested August 17, 1993.

431. Tsering: Age: 20. A monk of Dunbu monastery. Arrested between September and November 1992.

432. Tsering: A nun of Michungri monastery. Arrested March 11, 1993.

433. Tsering: Age: 23. A monk of Lhodrak monastery. Arrested June 28, 1993.

434. Tsering Choedron: A nun of Chubsang monastery. Arrested May 14, 1992. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

435. Tsering Choedron: A nun of Shungsep monastery. Arrested December 11, 1992.

436. Tsering Choekyi: A nun of Sungsep monastery. Arrested December 12, 1992.

437. Tsering Donden: Age: 26. A monk of Dunbu monastery. Arrested May 30, 1993.

438. Tsering Dondrup: Age: 25. A monk of Nyethang monastery. Arrested September 4, 1991. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

439. Tsering Phuntsog: Age: 26. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested March 20, 1992. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

440. Tsering Phuntsog: Age: 24. A monk of Palkhor monastery. Arrested in July or August 1990. Sentenced to 13 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

441. Tsering Samdrup: Age: 21. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested June 19, 1994. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

442. Tsering Tashi: Age: 20. A monk of Sera monastery. Arrested May 26, 1991. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

443. Tseten: Age: 22. A nun of Garu monastery. Arrested January 1990. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

444. Tseten Ngodrup: Age: 19. A monk of Phagmo monastery. Arrested August 13, 1993. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

445. Tseten Nyima: A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested May 1992.

446. Tseten Samdup: Age: 17. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested May 1992.

447. Tsetob: Age: 28. A monk of Bu Gon monastery. Arrested January 13, 1994.

448. Tsetse: Age: 47. A monk of Bu Gon monastery. Arrested January 13, 1994. Currently held in Chamdo prison.

449. Tsultrim Donden: Age: 23. A monk of Drepung monastery. Arrested May 12, 1992. Sentenced to 4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

450. Tsultrim Gyaltsen: Age: 23. A monk of Sungrabling monastery. Arrested July 5, 1993.

451. Tsultrim Nyima: Age: 21. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested May 1992. Currently held in Gutsa monastery.

452. Tsultrim Sherab: Age: 19. A monk of Sungrabling monastery. Arrested July 5, 1993.

453. Tsultrim Tharchin: A nun of Shungsep monastery. Arrested December 11, 1993.

454. Tsultrim Topgyal: Age: 20. A monk of Sungrabling monastery. Arrested June 28, 1993.

455. Tsultrim Zangmo: Age: 23. A nun of Shar Bumpa monastery. Arrested June 14, 1994.

456. Tsultrim Zoepa: Age: 23. A monk of Sungrabling monastery. Arrested July 5, 1993.

456. Walgon Tsering: A monk of Qinghai monastery. Arrested September 1994. Currently held in Hainan County prison.

457. Wangdu: Age: 22. A monk of Jokhang monastery. Arrested March 8, 1989. Sentenced to a total of 8 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

458. Yangdron: A nun of Shungsep monastery. Arrested December 11, 1993.

459. Yangzom: Age: 23. A nun of Chubsang monastery. Arrested March 21, 1992. Currently held in Gutsa prison.

460. Yeshe Choezang: A nun of Shungsep monastery. Arrested December 11, 1993.

461. Yeshe Dolma: Age: 28. A nun of Shar Bumpa monastery. Arrested June 15, 1994.

462. Yeshe Drolma: Age 24. A nun of Chubsang monastery. Arrested August 12, 1992. Sentenced to 3 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

463. Yeshe Dradul: Age: 24. A monk of Sungrabling monastery. Arrested March 13, 1989. Sentenced to 5–6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

464. Yeshe Jamyang: Age: 19. A monk of Serkhang monastery. Arrested February 11, 1992. Sentenced to 3–4 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

465. Yeshe Jinpa: Age: 20. A monk of Sungrabling monastery. Arrested June 28, 1993.

466. Yeshe Kalsang: Age: 20. A monk of Gyaldoe monastery. Arrested June 6, 1993. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

467. Yeshe Khedrup: Age: 20. A monk of Ganden monastery. Arrested May 6, 1992. Sentenced to 6 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

468. Yeshe Kunsang: A nun of Shungsep monastery. Arrested December 11, 1993.

469. Yeshe Ngawang: Age: 22. A monk of Sungrabling monastery. Arrested March 13, 1989. Sentenced to a total of 14 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

470. Yeshe Samten: Age: 22. A monk of Kyemolong monastery. Arrested June 19, 1993. Sentenced to 5 years in prison. Currently held in Drapchi prison.

471. Yeshe Tsondu: A nun of Shungsep monastery. Arrested December 12, 1993.

July 3, 1995

[Primary Source: The Puebla Institute]

PROTESTANTS IMPRISONED AND DETAINED IN CHINA

1. Dai Gullang: Age: 45. Arrested August 25, 1993. Sentenced without trial to three years' ''reform through labor.'' Currently held in Xuancheng Labor Camp, Anhui province.

2. Dai Lanmei: Age: 27. Arrested August 25, 1993. Sentenced without trial to two years' ''reform through labor.'' Currently held in Xuancheng Labor Camp, Anhui province.

3. Fan Zhi: Arrested after August 1991.

4. Ge Xinliang: Age: 27. Arrested August 25, 1993. Sentenced without trial to two years' ''reform through labor.''

5. Guo Mengshan: Age: 41. Arrested July 20, 1993. Sentenced without trial to three years' ''reform through labor.'' Reportedly held at Xuancheng Labor Camp, Anhui province.

6. Jiang Huaifeng: Age: 61. Arrested late September 1994. Sentenced to two years' ''re-education through labor.'' Currently detained at Xuancheng Coal Mine Labor Reform Camp in southern Anhui.

7. Leng Zhaoqing: Arrested after August 1991.

8. Li Haochen: Arrested September 1993. Reportedly sentenced to three years' ''reform through labor.'' Originally held in Mengcheng county prison, but current whereabouts are unknown.

9. Liu Wenjie: Arrested July 20, 1993. Length of sentence unknown. Reportedly detained in Xuancheng Labor Camp, Anhui province.

10. Wang Yao Hua: Age: early 30s. Arrested 1993. Sentenced to three years' ''reeducation through labor.''

11. Wang Dabao: Arrested after August 1991.

12. Xu Hanrong: Arrested after August 1991.

13. Yang Mingfen: Arrested after August 1991.

14. Xu Fanian: Age: 51. Arrested late September 1994. Sentenced to two years' ''reeducation through labor.'' Currently detained in Xuancheng Coal Mine Labor Reform Camp, southern Anhui.

15. Zheng Shaoying: Arrested after August 1991.

16. Zhang Guanchun: Arrested after August 1991.

17. Zhang Jiuzhong: Arrested in 1993. Sentenced to two years' ''reform through labor.''

18. Zheng Lanyun: Arrested July 20, 1993. Reportedly detained in Xuancheng Labor Camp, Anhui province.

19. Gou Qinghui: Arrested June 3, 1994. Detained in Beijing.

20. Wang Huamin: Arrested June 3, 1994. Detained in Beijing.

21. Wu Rengang: Arrested June 3, 1994. Detained in Beijing.

22. Xu Honghai: Arrested June 3, 1994. Detained in Beijing.

23. Chen Zhuman: Age: 50. Arrested December 14, 1991. Sentenced without trial to three years' ''reeducation through labor.'' Reported detained in a prison in Quanzhou, Fujian.

24. Han Kangrui: Age: 48. Reportedly detained in Longtian town detention center.

25. He Xianzing: Age: 53. Arrested December 23, 1993. Reportedly detained in Jiangjing town detention center.

26. Lin Zilong: Age: 81. Arrested December 23, 1993. Reportedly held in administrative detention in Fuqing police station jail.

27. Yang Xinfei: Age: 67. Under police surveillance.

28. Bai Shuqian: Arrested 1983. Sentenced to 12 years' imprisonment. Reportedly detained in Kaifeng, Henan.

29. Du Zhangji: Arrested 1985. Sentenced to eight years in prison. Not known to have been released.

30. Geng Menzuan: Age: 65. Arrested July 9, 1983. Sentenced to 11 years in prison and five years deprivation of political rights.

31. He Suolie: Arrested 1985. Sentenced to five years in prison. Not known to have been released.

32. Kang Manshuang: Arrested 1985. Sentenced to four years in prison. Not known to have been released.

33. Pan Yiyuan: Age: 58. Arrested February 2, 1994. Reportedly detained in Zhangzhou Detention Center.

34. Qin Zhenjun: Age: 49. Arrested July 9, 1983. Sentenced to nine years' in prison. Reportedly released but movement is restricted and remains under police surveillance.

35. Song Yude: Age: 40. Arrested July 16, 1984. Sentenced to eight years' imprisonment. Released April 1992 but still deprived of political rights.

36. Wang Baoquan: Age: 67. Arrested July 9, 1983. Sentenced to six years' imprisonment. Reportedly released but still denied political rights.

37. Wang Xincai: Age: 31. Arrested July 9, 1983. Sentenced to 15 years' imprisonment. Currently held at Henan Provincial Prison No. 3, Yuzian.

38. Xu Yongze: Age: 52. Arrested April 16, 1988. Sentenced to three years' imprisonment. Released May 20, 1991. Remains under strict police surveillance and is reportedly forced to report periodically to the local Public Security Bureau.

39. Xue Guiwen: Age: 38. Arrested July 9, 1983. Sentenced to six years' imprisonment and deprived of political rights for 5 years. Released, but still deprived of political rights.

40. Zhao Donghai: Sentenced in 1982 or 1983 to 13 years' imprisonment.

41. Xu Fang: Age: 21. Arrested September 1993.

42. Chen Xurong: Arrested in May or June 1992. Sentenced to three years' ''reeducation through labor.'' Currently held in Wangcun, Zibo, Shandong province.

43. Fan Zueying: Arrested May or June 1992. Sentenced to two years' ''reeducation through labor.'' Currently held in Wangcun, Zibo, Shandong. Should have been released in 1994 but no release has been reported or confirmed.

44. Li Qihua: Arrested May or June 1992. Sentenced to three years' ''reeducation through labor.'' Currently held in Wangcun, Zibo, Shandong.

45. Li Cuiling: Arrested May or June 1992. Sentenced to three years' ''reeducation through labor.'' Currently held in Wangcun, Zibo, Shandong.

46. Liu Limin: Arrested May or June 1992. Sentenced to two years' ''reeducation through labor.'' Should have been released in 1994 but no release has been reported or confirmed.

47. Liu Ping: Arrested May or June 1992. Sentenced to three years' ''reeducation through labor.'' Currently held in Wangcun, Zibo, Shandong.

48. Qin Zingcai; Arrested May or June 1992. Sentenced to three years' ''reeducation through labor.'' Currently held in Wangcun, Zibo, Shandong.

49. Sun Faxia: Arrested May or June 1992. Sentenced to two years' ''reeducation through labor.'' Should have been released in 1994 but no release has been reported or confirmed.

50. Sun Fuqin: Arrested May or June 1992. Sentenced to two year's ''reeducation through labor.'' Should have been released in 1994 but no release has been reported or confirmed.

51. Sun Jingxiu: Arrested May or June 1992. Sentenced to two years' ''reeducation through labor.'' Should have been released in 1994 but no release has been reported or confirmed.

52. Wang Guiqin: Arrested May or June 1992. Sentenced to three years' ''reeducation through labor.'' Currently detained in Wangcun, Zibo, Shandong.

53. Wu Xiuling: Arrested May or June 1992. Sentenced to three years' ''reeducation through labor.'' Currently held in Wangcun, Zibo, Shandong.

54. Yang Zhuanyuan: Arrested May or June 1992. Sentenced to three years' ''reeducation through labor.'' Currently held in Wangcun, Zibo, Shandong.

55. Zheng Jikuo: Arrested June 1992. Sentenced to 9 years' imprisonment. Held in an unknown location.

56. Zheng Yunsu: Arrested June 1992. Sentenced to 12 years' imprisonment. Reported held at the Shengjian Motorcycle Factory labor camp near Jinan city.

57. Zheng (given name unknown): Son of Zheng Yunsu (No. 56). Arrested June 1992. Sentenced to five years' imprisonment. Held in an unknown location.

58. Zheng (given name unknown): Son of Zheng Yunsu (No. 56). Arrested June 1992. Sentenced to five years' imprisonment. Held in an unknown location.

59. Zhou Wenxia: Arrested May or June 1992. Sentenced to two years' ''reeducation through labor.'' Should have been released in 1994 but no release has been reported or confirmed.

60. Pei Zhongxun: (Korean name: Chun Chul) Age: 76. Ethnic Korean. Arrested August 1983. Sentenced to 15 years' imprisonment. Currently held in Shanghai Prison No. 2.

61. Xie Moshan: (Moses Xie) Age: early 70s. Arrested April 24, 1992. Released July 23, 1992 but movements are severely restricted and he is required to report periodically to the local Public Security Bureau. Mail is regularly intercepted and read by local authorities.

62. He Chengzhou: Reportedly had a bounty for his capture (dead or alive) placed on his head in early 1992.

63. Lalling (given name unknown): Reportedly being held in the Yunan State Prison near the Burmese border.

64. Nawlkung (given name unknown): Reportedly being held in the Yunan State Prison near the Burmese border.

65. Wang Jiashui: Reportedly had a bounty for his capture (dead or alive) placed on his head in early 1992.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution. What the resolution does is, it enables us to voice our very serious concerns about various Chinese policies and actions, while at the same time underscoring our desire for a good Chinese-American relationship.

I want to try to put this United States-China relationship into context. That relationship is of enormous importance to the United States and to international peace and security. It is a very complex relationship, and it is extremely difficult to manage. We have very tough disagreements and issues with the Chinese on human rights and nonproliferation and trade. It seems to me what we in the Congress ought to be doing is helping the President manage that difficult relationship. We should not make that relationship more difficult.

Let me be very blunt about it. Good Chinese-American relations are very much in the interest of the United States for several reasons.

China, already the largest country in the world, now possesses one of the world's largest economies as well. As a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council, China is not only a key country in Asia but has a significant impact on United States efforts to resolve an array of problems far removed from Asia. China is one of the world's five acknowledged nuclear weapons states. United States efforts to halt the spread of weapons of mass destruction can succeed only if China cooperates with us and the rest of the international community.

China has the world's largest standing army whose capabilities have been significantly enhanced in recent years. Stability throughout East Asia depends in large measure on Chinese intentions and objectives which are themselves in part a function of Beijing's ties with Washington.

On the economic front, American exports and American jobs are dependent upon good relations with China. Last year we sold $9 billion worth of goods to China. These exports supported 180,000 high-wage American jobs. We ignore the affairs of Asia and China at our peril. Three times in the past half century, young American men and women have laid down their lives in Asian wars. It is impossible to envision a coherent Asian policy for the United States without a policy of continual engagement with China. The United States will be greatly handicapped in promoting its interests in Asia unless we enjoy at least a decent relationship with the Chinese.

That is what this resolution is all about. It is supported by both those who support MFN for China and those who oppose MFN. But for the first time in 6 years, this House is able to speak on China with a single voice, and that is a highly welcome development.

When we frequently hear in this country conflicting signals about our views on China, there can be no misunderstanding how this House feels about China and the resolution puts it forward very clearly.

We believe China is a terribly important country with a bright future. We hope to have cordial relations with the people of China and with their government. Nonetheless, there are a lot of actions by the Chinese Government that cause us grave concern. We must balance multiple interests when we deal with China: Promoting human rights and democracy, securing China's strategic cooperation in Asia and the United Nations, controlling proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, expanding United States economic ties. An engagement with China, rather than isolation, is most likely to promote those varied United States interests. That is the message this resolution conveys.

I suspect none of us are pleased with every single clause in the resolution. But on balance, I believe this resolution does an admirable job reconciling the various points of view of Members.

There are many in this Chamber who deserve high praise for their work on this: The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], and many others. I commend them for their work.

This resolution is good for America. It is good for American interests. It places the House of Representatives clearly on the side of economic and political reform in China, while recognizing that the best way to encourage that reform is through a policy of engagement.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the Bereuter resolution.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Indiana for his excellent statement and for his help.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes and 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], one of the great experts in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, by now it is apparent that the United States-China bilateral relationship is in the worst shape it has been in at least a decade and continues in a downward spiral. The Chinese—in the throes of a prolonged leadership transition—have done little to stem the deterioration. The prolonged detention of Harry Wu, an American citizen, is unwarranted and all of us condemn it. With our vote on this bill today, we have an opportunity to send a strong message to the Chinese that such actions are repugnant to the American commitment to human rights and our sense of justice. Thus, I enthusiastically urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2058.

This bill, the China Policy of 1995, condemns the actions of the Chinese Government on issues such as its continued violation of internationally-recognized standards of human rights and nuclear nonproliferation as well as its discriminatory and unfair trade practices. It directs the administration to pursue intensified diplomatic initiatives to persuade China to alter its policies.

Just as important, and unlike the annual efforts to revoke China's most-favored-nation trade status, this bill does not jeopardize our political and economic relationship in a way that could well prove counterproductive for both nations and undermine our ability to cooperate with China on critical national security issues, such as nuclear proliferation issues in North Korea.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this legislation. It is important that we let Beijing know its abhorrent human rights, nuclear proliferation, and trade actions will not go unnoticed. However, at the same time, we must also help those within China intensify the pressure now building for political and social change.

I believe that we can accomplish this and promote human rights in China by engaging them increasingly in trade and economic relations. This policy requires extension of MFN. That is not a contradiction of terms or of policy. The best foreign policy tools available to us to encourage political reform abroad are policies that promote capitalism and economic opportunity. Such policies are powerful levers for political change precisely because they are powerful levers for economic change. That is a policy that has worked successfully in such diverse countries as South Africa, Korea, Taiwan, and Chile.

Our foreign policy toward China should embrace tools of reform and change—not condition them. These are precisely the tools we can use to promote the evolution of Chinese society so that its people can press for political reform from within. They are the tools to stimulate Chinese society to adopt a more pluralistic and democratic political process. That, in turn, will inevitably lead to a greater respect for human rights and personal liberty. There are examples previously mentioned that support this proposition. One concrete result of economic liberalization in China is the way that it has spawned a parallel civil justice system based on the rule of law, rather than rule by law. While some may question whether increasing the number of lawyers in China is true reform, I would argue that it is if the contract law that develops and other legal reforms lead to parallel development of law that protects human rights. Will it? None of us can say with certainty, but history suggests that it will.

Revocation of trade with China would almost certainly retard—not promote—the cause of human rights in China. United States economic sanctions would harm the emerging Chinese private sector and the dynamic market-oriented provinces in southern China, which depend on trade. This would weaken the very forces in Chinese society pressing hardest for reforms. We must not undermine the brave efforts of reform-minded Chinese who have come to depend on economic opportunity as a means of ultimately achieving political freedom in China. Lasting reform in China can only be driven from within. We must continue to work toward that end.

The United States-China relationship is very complex. There is no country on this globe that has brought more fascination or caused greater aggravation to Americans than China, but none of us doubt the potential for good in this world that will flow from improved political and economic relations. Today, we agonize over how we can promote human rights in China, advance peace in Asia, and protect our own national security interests in that region. But, in this debate, let us not lose sight of the common goals which should unite all of us.

Again, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 2058.

□ 1215

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to my neighbor, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT], a subcommittee chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the alternative bill offered by Mr. BEREUTER and in opposition to House Joint Resolution 96.

I think everyone agrees that improving human rights in China is a priority, and I know people on both sides of this issue are eager to see the end of human rights violations in China. But, while this is an important issue for the United States to pursue, it is not the only issue at stake and I firmly believe we will not and cannot improve human rights by revoking MFN.

As you know, on May 26, 1994, President Clinton announced his decision to

delink human rights issues in China from the extension of MFN. By Executive order, later endorsed by Congress, the President proposed a policy of broad, comprehensive engagement with China.

The President's decision, which I fully support and applaud, recognizes the fact that denying China MFN status will not prompt Chinese leaders to improve human rights conditions. In the short term, it will only harm the economies of both the United States and China. In the long term it would give European and Japanese businesses a competitive advantage, allowing them greater access to the China's huge market of 1.2 billion people.

Mr. BEREUTER's bill offers a constructive alternative for all of us who have serious concerns about human rights, weapons proliferation, abuse of American citizens in China, and other critical issues between the United States and China. I am pleased to support this bill, and urge the administration to act quickly and earnestly to fulfill its requirements. If we treat China as an enemy, it will react as an enemy. Keeping our eye on the big picture is key to a successful relationship. A little tough love never hurt anyone.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of a policy of frank and constructive engagement with China and its 1.2 billion citizens. I believe this policy can best be carried out both by renewing China's most favored nation trading status and by approving the legislation before us expressing strong disapproval of China's human rights abuses. I commend the Members involved in this debate for coming together for a policy which is good for the Chinese people and America.

Like many of my colleagues, I am frustrated by the Chinese Government's lack of progress toward democracy and respect for the rights of its own people. I am angry about the detention of Harry Wu, and I join the administration and my colleagues in condemning the detention of this American citizen in the strongest possible terms, and demanding his immediate release.

But I believe it would be a mistake to isolate China from the world community through actions such as denial of MFN. China is experiencing tremendous turmoil. Its government is in transition. Its market economy continues to expand, which I believe will lead to an inevitable clash between the freedom of the market and the lack of freedom in China's political system. We must do everything we can to ensure that when that clash occurs, freedom wins—freedom in the marketplace and freedom at the ballot box.

I believe that constructive economic engagement with the people of China will encourage such freedom.

But I also believe that we must be frank and forceful when we disagree with the policies of the Chinese Government. The bill put forth by Mr. BEREUTER and Mr. HAMILTON accomplishes both goals, and I urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California [Ms. ESHOO].

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2058, the Bereuter-Wolf bill which sets forth a clear policy on China by the Congress, and requires the President to report back to Congress every 6 months on the progress China is making toward achieving democracy as we reward them with MFN status.

It sets forth international standards of conduct on nuclear proliferation, international standards on human rights, and the lack of access to their markets.

Last year Members of Congress were told that the provision of most favored nation [MFN] for China would give an incentive to Chinese leaders to be responsible with respect to how they treat their citizens and address the trade deficit.

Since then, thousands of Chinese have been wrongfully imprisoned and persecuted and the Chinese leadership has continued to prevent freedom of association, speech, and religion.

Although China is going through political and social changes, its leaders must know that the United States stands firm in our defense of the basic principles upon which our democracy was founded—freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and freedom of affiliation. The detention of Harry Wu, an American citizen and a Hoover Institute scholar from Stanford University, which I am privileged to represent, and a globally recognized human rights leader is the most recent example of how oppressive the Chinese Government is.

This resolution addresses the significant economic inequities which exist between our two countries. In 1989 the trade deficit was $6 billion; today it is closer to $40 billion. Our trade deficit with China will exceed our trade deficit with Japan in the next few years if we do not forge a clear policy to deal with it.

But the most valuable export our great Nation has is democracy and the best lesson in democracy we can give the world are the standards upon which our democracy rests and celebrates.

I urge my colleagues to support the Bereuter-Wolf bill, which will send a strong and clear message to the Chinese leadership that the Congress of the United States insists on these values in return for granting most-favored-nation status.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Ms. DUNN], who has been very active on trade issues.

Ms. DUNN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Bereuter-Wolf bill, which sends a strong, and appropriate, message to China without jeopardizing United States national interests or United States workers.

China's continued human rights abuses are an unavoidable issue in United States-China relations. We Americans care deeply about certain inalienable rights. However, linking trade policy to these concerns by new threats to withdraw MFN for China's shortcomings would be highly counterproductive to our long-term national interests and to the release of Mr. Harry Wu.

Our Nation's trading practices and policies have been the subject of lively debate in America since the birth of our Nation. And on this particular question—MFN for China—we have wrestled for years.

The China MFN issue has been hung up on two competing policy goals: Is our goal to maximize our own United States jobs? Or is it to make the cause of human rights primary as a means to achieving our best long-term interests?

The answer, I believe, is both. The goals are not mutually exclusive.

For instance, I believe all of us can agree that compassion for the suffering in China is useless if our policy has no effect other than to put our own people out of work. We have made no difference in the life of those suffering overseas while only increasing the numbers of those suffering here at home.

Mr. Speaker, I believe, these criteria must become our compass. We should extend MFN to a nation if: They allow U.S. investors and advisors in, the rule of law is advancing in that country, a multilateral action is unattainable or unsustainable, or we have that nation's assistance on a critical geopolitical issue.

Conversely, we should deny MFN status to governments abusing their people only if an effective multilateral action is doable and the U.S. can expect no help from that government on other critical geopolitical issues, if they do not allow U.S. employers or advisors into their country, and if they do not respect the rule of law.

Mr. Speaker, the genius of the Bereuter-Wolf bill is that we give full voice to our American concerns for human rights without self-defeating linkage to trade policy. That is the appropriate response, and I want to thank both Mr. BEREUTER and Mr. WOLF for crafting this solution.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Bereuter-Wolf-Pelosi bill. I commend these sponsors for their commitment to this issue and willingness to reach compromise language. H.R. 2058 sends a strong signal

that this Chamber is deeply concerned about certain and specific activities currently occurring in the People's Republic of China. In addition to human rights issues, this bill addresses our diplomatic relationship and other pressing issues such as weapons proliferation prison labor and unfair trade practices.

All of us on this floor today share deep concerns about the continuing problems related to the rights and treatment of Chinese citizens. I recently signed a letter with over 70 of my colleagues—from both sides of the aisle—calling on China's Premier to immediately release Mr. Harry Wu.

Each year we debate the issue of China and more specifically the extension of most-favored-nation status to China [MFN]. At this juncture, I have never believed that disapproving extension of MFN would improve conditions in China.

For many years, it has been my fear that failure to extend MFN would significantly weaken our political and economic position with the central government in China. China's economic growth is booming. Its economy is expected to double by the year 2000 and will be the biggest economy into the next century. Recent growth has been driven by private- and foreign-owned enterprise surpassing state-run enterprises plagued by performance and financial problems. Economic reforms aided by foreign investment and expertise have rerouted economic power from state-run industry. Change is occurring everywhere. One can see clearly the successes of United States investment particularly in southern China and its spreading. Due to its high rate of growth, China will need to replace its aging infrastructure. The potential market for high technology and services, for example, is enormous. China will need to purchase power generating equipment, aerospace and telecommunications equipment to name a few. And we should be there.

Already we have seen shifts in the dynamics of China's Government structure. Central government control over the daily lives of Chinese citizens is weakening as economic liberalization has led to greater autonomy, expansion of basic freedoms, and improved standards of living for Chinese citizens.

China is currently undergoing domestic change both politically and economically. Furthermore, the United States-China relationship is clearly in transition. But that should not preclude us from pursuing engagement with the Chinese at all levels.

Clearly, advancing human rights must remain a priority of U.S. foreign policy. The United States-China trade relationship has increased the exposure of the Chinese people to Western cultural influences and business principles. Trade and investment are part of a greater effort to promote long-term progress toward political pluralism and democracy in China. To revoke MFN would sever our economic relationship and would remove one of our most successful means of influence in China to date.

Again, I commend my colleagues for reaching agreement and putting forth this language. I urge my colleagues to support this measure and maintain MFN for China.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FUNDERBURK], a member of the Committee on International Relations and a former Ambassador.

Mr. FUNDERBURK. Mr. Speaker, I may have to be the only person in the House to have to say this and do this, but having lived 6 years in a harsh Communist dictatorship, I cannot silently stand by and do nothing. When you have witnessed pastors and priests being killed, churches being bulldozed, and Bibles being turned into toilet paper, you learn how not to deal with Communist dictators.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us is just what Beijing ordered. Here we have legislation filled with tough-sounding but meaningless threats. This has a laundry list of demands from the Beijing Communists, ranging from asking the President to undertake new initiatives to persuade the Chinese to treat their people humanely to asking them to stop their accelerating military expansion.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, when has any Communist regime responded to friendly requests to change its behavior? Pass the Bereuter bill and all Members will hear from the Communist will be the laughs of doddering old rulers who will once again have put one over on Uncle Sam. This bill will not free one dissident, it will not close one slave camp, it will not stop the purchase of one new Soviet-made submarine. As the philosopher said, this is nonsense on stilts.

□ 1230

The deal worked out, with the possible exception of Radio Free Asia is meaningless. We ask, we request, we hope, we dream. Let's get real.

Where is the enforcement mechanism? There is none. MFN aid goes to Communist elites who line their pockets. It never goes to the people. MFN perpetuates the Communist dictatorship in power. An engagement policy did not bring about the fall of communism. Engagement via MFN keeps the Communist elites in power and perpetuates persecution, murder, and gulags.

It was building up U.S. defense and U.S. determination, peace through strength, SDI that won the cold war, not appeasement, not engagement, not stability, rhetoric. You do not stop dictatorships by preemptively caving in to their demands.

Unfortunately, they do not talk or act tough at Foggy Bottom. As Senator Richard Russell said, we need an American desk at the State Department and in the U.S. Government.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NEAL].

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is once again the time of year we discuss the renewal of MFN for China. In the past, we have attempted to link human rights to the renewal of MFN. Last Congress, we made the decision to renew MFN and to pursue other courses of action to improve human rights in China.

At this point in time, it would be counterproductive to revoke MFN status for China. Economic liberalization is a key element for improving human rights. The opening of the markets in China will provide higher wages and a better way of life for Chinese citizens. Usually, improved economic conditions help improve human rights.

American businesses conducting business in China should set an example. We need to be leaders on the issue of human rights. Our businesses need to be a model of excellence on human rights.

Human rights is an extremely important issue. Basically, it is the dignity of an individual. I commend Congressmen BEREUTER and HAMILTON for introducing H.R. 2058. This legislation reminds China that we have not forgotten about their current human rights situation.

This measure demands the immediate release of Harry Wu. In addition, the legislation recognizes various areas in which China has made human rights violations. This legislation requires the President to take action to improve the situation. The President will be required to report his progress within 30 days of enactment.

I urge you to support this legislation. This legislation states that human rights is still a priority.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WHITE], who has already become very active on trade issues in the Congress.

Mr. WHITE. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, my district overlooks both sides of the shipping lanes of Puget Sound. It is one of the biggest trading districts in the United States. China is our biggest trading partner. Every year there are billions of dollars coming into my district because of trade with China.

But, Mr. Speaker, that is not a good enough reason for me to vote for most-favored-nation status for China. We should not sell the Chinese people into slavery just to bring trading profits into our district.

Mr. Speaker, the reason to vote for this bill is because it is the only way to bring the Chinese people out of slavery. We have seen plenty of examples of that in recent history. In Eastern Europe, in Tiananmen Square, it is only after expanded contacts with the West that we see the people themselves rising up and demanding human rights from their own governments.

Mr. Speaker, it is the fax machine, not the trade sanction, that freed Eastern Europe, and it is the fax machine, not the trade sanction, that will free China.

I ask my colleagues, do not vote for this bill because it is going to bring trading profits to the United States. Vote for this bill because it is the best way, really the only way, to bring freedom, human rights, and prosperity to the Chinese people.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, it is said that the definition of a successful life is helping one person breathe easier. In those terms, I think Harry Wu is a hero because he has breathed life into a nation, into China, with his courage to fight against the human rights abuses over there.

As a strong supporter of MFN, I strongly condemn the Chinese Government for incarcerating Mr. Wu. I call on the Chinese to unconditionally and immediately release Mr. Wu from prison. This is important to strong supporters of MFN, to opponents of MFN, and to the American people. I hope the Chinese people and government are listening.

We will continue to work on this for hours and days and weeks after this resolution. With this in mind, Mr. Speaker, it is important to note from Madison to Kissinger and Nixon, our foreign policy is not based upon one person but on 3 pillars: on human rights, on economic interests, and on national security interests.

When we combine all three of those, I think we have a compelling case that we must continue to engage the Chinese, to push them and leverage them toward human rights improvements, toward opening their markets, because it is in our interests, our human rights interests, our economic interests and our middle-class job interests. Who is going to sell the next semiconductor computer chip to the Chinese? Are we just going to tell the Japanese they can have that market? Who is going to sell the next high-definition television? It is going to be an American high-definition television produced in America, and we are going to get the benefit by that.

I thank the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON]. My respect goes out to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY], a distinguished and active member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. GALLEGLY. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today, as a cosponsor, and in strong support of H.R. 2058, the China Policy Act introduced by our colleague from Nebraska and the chairman of the East Asian Subcommittee, Mr. BEREUTER.

With the end of the cold war in Europe and the transformation of Russia into a democratic government with an open market economy we must now turn our attention to China with the intent of achieving the same results.

The emergence of China as a great political and economic force and a nuclear super-power poses an enormous challenge to this nation both strategically and economically. The need for the United States to develop an open, aggressive, cohesive, and consistent policy toward Beijing is of paramount importance.

This is not to say we should close our eyes or turn a deaf ear to the unacceptable behavior of the regime in Beijing. Clearly, their poor human rights record, their recent military actions with respect to the Spratly Islands, their sale of M–9 missiles to Pakistan and perhaps Iran, their unwillingness to renounce the use of force against the Republic of Taiwan, and the recent jailing of American citizen, Harry Wu, defies every international norm and standard governing missile proliferation, the use of military force, and human rights.

However, denying most-favored-nation status at this time is not the way to actively engage the Chinese and to encourage reform, openness and respect for international standards of behavior.

The expression of our concern is what H.R. 2058 attempts to do. It says that we in this Congress do not accept China's current behavior and that we call on the President to intensify diplomatic efforts to encourage China to moderate its intolerable internal human rights policies and to respect external international norms.

I believe open dialog and continued diplomatic and economic contact is the best way to provide the United States the opportunity to promote internal economic reform, political liberalization, and respect for human rights in China. Without this constructive engagement, China is less likely to move toward the role of the responsible world power we would like China to become.

I urge the Members to vote for H.R. 2058 and against the resolution of MFN disapproval.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH], who is chairman of the Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Nebraska for yielding me the time. I want to congratulate the gentleman in the chair for the great job he is doing.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for this bill. This is a good bill. It is not a perfect bill, but I think it is the right approach. The question we hear often here in Congress is, just how long do we have to put up with the misguided conduct of the Chinese? How long? Well, just as long as we put up with it. We have all the leverage in our hands.

We have a $29 billion trade deficit with China, the second largest trade deficit with any country in the world. This year we are having a huge trade deficit, the largest in American history. We buy most of their exports. In fact, half of the Chinese exports come right here to the United States, to the detriment, I may say, many times of our workers and to the detriment of our trade deficit.

We have all the leverage. We have all the chips. The question is, do we have the will? Maybe if we had a little reciprocity before, a little tit-for-tat before, we would not have to pass this bill today. Mr. Wu would be here; an American citizen would be here in the United States where he belongs.

This bill sets forth what we expect from China. The President will report, as I interpret this bill, every 6 months on the initiative in 8 areas. We must be faithful to the goals and the commitments that we have as a Nation. I think this bill helps focus on that.

I hear others tell us that China is a giant but that we are unwilling to confront a China today. I do not think that is the case. I think we are willing to stand up for what we believe in. I think this bill helps us do that.

After all, we have to have the courage of our convictions. A great writer wrote, ''Hope is lost, much is lost. Courage is lost, all is lost.'' That is why I think this bill is the right approach. It is a measured approach.

This bill sets forth, I think, the right temper, the right approach, and I would hope that other people would endorse it and vote for this bill because I think it is the best approach, the right direction for America to take in these times.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to my friend and colleague the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS].

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Florida, for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, this House is united in wanting to have good relations with China. This House is united in recognizing how important China is. But this House is divided in deciding how we can see to it that China's abominable human rights policy, China's continued sale of weapons of mass destruction to highly questionable countries, and China's one-sided trade policy with the United States come to an end.

There is no dispute that China has one of the worst human rights records on the face of this planet. Since human rights were ''de-linked'' from the issue of giving them most-favored-nation treatment 1 year ago, human rights conditions in China have significantly deteriorated.

Thousands of Chinese citizens are imprisoned in forced labor camps for nonviolent opposition to the regime. The

repression of Tibet continues unabated. The Chinese Government enforces sickening and draconian birth control policies of forced sterilization and forced abortions.

This bill has some redeeming features. It condemns these human rights violations, but unfortunately it does not have teeth. It does not do anything but admonish the Chinese.

To give meaning to our condemnation, we have to give our action real teeth. The only way to make this condemnation meaningful is to deny MFN to the Chinese. If you vote for this bill, as I will, you should also vote for legislation to deny MFN to China.

Only by taking strong and effective action do totalitarian governments change their policies. Economic sanctions against South Africa were the key element in bringing about the end of apartheid. We were urged by the previous administration not to enact sanctions, to engage the South Africans in constructive dialog.

□ 1245

But it was only after we put sanctions on South Africa that the sickening practice of apartheid ended. We got the attention of the Chinese when this House voted for my resolution calling for the Olympic games not be held in Beijing. We got the attention of the Chinese when this House voted for my resolution calling for our Government to issue a visa to President Li of Taiwan.

China is now illegally holding an American citizen, Harry Wu, who was entrapped by the Chinese in going there. They gave him the visa, and when he arrived they arrested him. China is selling missile technology. China has a trade surplus of over $30 billion with the United States.

There are plenty of other sources of textiles and Barbie dolls and Christmas tree lights. India and lots of other developing countries would like to sell those things to us, but the Chinese have a $30 billion-plus trade surplus with us.

I commend the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] and all of my colleagues with whom I had the pleasure of working for improving human rights in China for this legislation. but we must not approve this legislation believing that this is China policy. This is a part of China policy. It lays out the problems with China. It provides no effective mechanism of enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, just as the apartheid Government of South Africa laughed at us until we provided economic sanctions, so the rulers in Beijing are capable of taking rhetoric from this body. What they are unwilling to take, and what we should force them to take, is economic sanctions. I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill, but I also urge my colleagues to vote for House Joint Resolution 96 to deny most-favored-nation treatment to China.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER], a member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2058, the Bereuter amendment, which is legislation to symbolically stand for democracy and to make a statement about human rights. Unfortunately, statements and symbolism are not enough.

We need to make tangible policy decisions, as well. And without tangible policy decisions, statements and symbolism, as are encompassed in H.R. 2058, lack meaning. So I will be supporting H.R. 2058, but we must insist, if we are sincere in this effort, on having some tangible action as well.

In fact, tyrants assume that we do not even mean what we are saying when we make statements and there is no change in policy that follows. We are confronting today a regime that controls China, a dictatorial regime that now holds one of our own citizens, Harry Wu, as prisoner, but also smashes the human rights of its own people and is more and more becoming belligerent to its own neighbors.

We are not talking about what we will do and what relations we will have with the people of China. All of us want to have good relations with the people of China. We reach out to them. We want good relations with all people of the world. The question is what will we do about this tyrannical regime, this monstrous oppressor that controls these people? Will we be on the side of the people of China, or will we be on the side of the oppressor?

We will have to do more than symbolism and statements. We must follow this measure with an elimination of most-favored-nation status with this regime, because we should believe in free trade between free people, not free trade with tyrannies and dictatorships; a trade relationship that only bolsters those in power and does nothing to further the cause of democracy.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen that in this debate over and over again where we have heard the argument that trade will improve democracy. That does not work. Let us put pressure on these people in Beijing to improve their democracy and to improve the respect for human rights and to release Harry Wu.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged at this time to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], who has coauthored the pending legislation and has continued to bring clarity to this issue.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and his kind remarks. I am only taking 1 minute now, because I had the opportunity to speak much longer earlier on the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I want to once again commend the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], for his leadership and working with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], and with me and with others, to bring together this compromise.

The previous speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER], is a gentleman whose courage and relentless advocacy for human rights is well-known to this body and I respect him enormously. I would not be supporting this legislation, though, if I thought it was just a statement.

Mr. Speaker, I think that even before we merged our two bills, Mr. BEREUTER had strong language in his legislation addressing United States concerns with China and teeth in saying that there is a reporting requirement that the President must report to this body on issues regarding trade, human rights and proliferation.

This is all very important. It is a step forward to us. I am pleased with the legislation and it comes at a time, a very critical time in China with the succession that might be likely soon, and also at a time when Harry Wu, an American citizen, a distinguished scholar, is being held by the Chinese.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that our colleagues will support this legislation and I hope that the Chinese will release Harry Wu soon.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, it has been a pleasure to work with the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], and she is correct in reminding about the reporting requirements and I could say Radio Free Asia.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], the other gentleman that I worked with who has been invaluable in working with me.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I want to again thank the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], as I did before, and thank the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI]. Both were very good. The gentleman from Nebraska was very balanced and Ms. PELOSI was like Margaret Thatcher working for something in London; she never gave up.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support. I would hope that there would be a strong, large vote; that any Members who have any reservations on each side, I would hope that they would put those reservations aside so we can send a strong bipartisan message.

Third, it puts the Congress on record for the first time in a united way. There are clear objectives. It calls for action by the administration. It calls that Radio Free Asia will be established within 3 months, whereby the people in China can hopefully hear what is happening in places like in the U.S. Congress.

It calls for a Presidential report for the first time. If anyone is listening in China, it puts the Congress on record in support of the democracy movement in China. And is that not a great day for those who gave their life in Tiananmen Square and other places to know that the Congress now has given

its official imprimatur on the democracy movement? And, as a gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] says, it makes a strong statement on Harry Wu.

Mr. Speaker, it is our hope and prayer that the Chinese see that we have come together; that the one thing they can do to give a sign of reconciliation would be the release of Harry Wu.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2058, the China Policy Act of 1995 sponsored by the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 2058 is a compromise reached after several hours of discussions between the gentlewoman from California, Representative PELOSI, the gentleman from Nebraska, Representative BEREUTER, and myself. It is a good bill because it garners support from both sides of the MFN issue and both sides of the aisle. I hope it will pass with an overwhelming majority. Passing H.R. 2058 with a unanimous vote will send a powerful message of concern to the Communist government in Beijing and a powerful message of support for the burgeoning Chinese democracy movement.

I will say that the U.S. Congress is united in its deep concern about China's treatment of Harry Wu; its continuing human rights violations; its violation of international nonproliferation standards and its unfair trading practices. This is the toughest language on China to come out of Congress in a while and it will plow new ground.

Personally, I think that the United States has no business giving nondiscriminatory trade status to the world's largest Communist government. I think revoking MFN is our strongest hook. However, I think it is more important for our ultimate goal of promoting democracy in China to speak with a united voice. That's why those of us on both sides of the issue have come together around this legislation.

The Communist government in China maintains the world's largest system of slave labor camps—the laogai—which are used as the central cog of repression to harshly stifle dissent and break the human spirit. Harry Wu, who sits in a Chinese prison right now because of his commitment to exposing China's laogai system, has documented over 1,000 forced labor camps in China.

China's strict one-child-per-family policy has resulted in gross violations of human rights, including forced abortion and sterilization. In my office, I have a 40-minute video filmed by a crew from Channel 4 in Great Britain showing the dying rooms in China's state-run orphanages where baby girls who become ill are left to die of starvation and neglect. The video also shows the abhorrent conditions in China's orphanages where children, mostly girls, are forced to grow up almost totally devoid of nurture and attention because of China's one-child-per-family policy.

We know that the Communist government in Beijing has sold nuclear weapons and technology to Iraq and Iran and M–11 missiles to Pakistan.

We know almost conclusively that the Chinese Government takes the internal organs of executed prisoners without consent, young men around 20 years old are the preferred donors, and sells them to foreign buyers for around $30,000 each. Harry Wu has documented it, the BBC has documented it, Human Rights Watch/Asia has documented it, Amnesty International has documented it, and a Hong Kong newspaper has documented it. I would be happy to share the BBC tape with any Member interested in viewing it. Even a Chinese Government official admitted it at a U.N. meeting several years ago. When asked now if this kind of despicable behavior occurs, the Chinese Government, of course, denies it. That is not surprising but it does not mean it doesn't happen.

We know that Catholics and Protestants who dare to worship independently of government control are continually thrown in jail, harassed, and in some cases beaten by Chinese security officials. Estimates indicate that there are 20–50 million Christians in China who refuse to worship in China's Government-sanctioned churches. The official Protestant and Catholic churches in China, which combined, claim a membership of only 10 million, must use the Government-sanctioned doctrine. As the Chinese Government becomes more wary of dissent and unrest in this uncertain period of transition, surveillance on Chinese Christians has been stepped up.

In Tibet, conditions have worsened since we looked at the MFN issue last year. As of April 26 of this year, there had already been more political arrests in Tibet in 1995 than there were in all of 1994. Prisoners have died in the past year as a result of mistreatment while in prison including a 24-year-old nun. Tibetan monks continue to be thrown in jail or forced into exile. The Chinese Government has placed restrictive guidelines on Tibetan monasteries and refused repeated requests by the Dalai Lama for talks to work out a peaceful settlement.

Now the Chinese Government is holding Harry Wu, a brave American citizen and human rights activist. He was detained just weeks after President Clinton renewed China's MFN status. He is being investigated for the simple crime of speaking the truth about China's laogai camps. This arrest is a clear indication that China thinks the U.S. Government is weak and more interested in appeasing business interests than speaking up for what is right.

These kinds of abuses are not new in China. They have gone on for years while the U.S. Government pursues a weak policy, or perhaps no policy. President Clinton has been unwilling to speak out boldly and forcefully and instead has promised to promote our interests through engagement. So far, it's been an empty promise. Nothing has happened and I'm not convinced—and that's saying it nicely—the administration is doing anything to promote human rights in China.

Congress as a whole has not spoken out boldly and forcefully—but that is about to change.

H.R. 2058 sets a new standard for progress. It sets out clear objectives for U.S. policy.

It demands the release of Harry Wu immediately and unconditionally.

It requires the adherence to international nonproliferation standards and requires China to immediately halt the export of ballistic missile technology and weapons of mass destruction.

It clearly and unequivocally calls on the Clinton administration to intensify diplomatic efforts to persuade the Chinese Government to respect the internationally recognized rights of its citizens and says specifically what Congress considers progress in this area.

It also commends the Chinese people's internal democracy movement—one of the most important provisions in the bill.

H.R. 2058 has teeth. It requires Radio Free Asia to be on the air in China within 3 months of enactment. Radio Free Asia will promote democracy in China and will give democracy reformers and other interested listeners news and information they will not hear from the Government-controlled media. Radio Free Europe was a powerful force in the democratization of Eastern Europe and I am convinced it will have the same effect in China. Radio Free Asia has been authorized by this body force, but so far, the U.S. Information Agency has been slow in getting it on the air. This bill steps up the pace.

Finally, the bill requires the administration to report to Congress every 6 months on the actions taken and the progress made in achieving the human rights and proliferation objectives outlined in the bill.

Again, this is tough language that requires action. We will be able to look at this issue every 6 months and see exactly what has been tried and achieved. We will also see what has not been done.

I support H.R. 2058 because it is a building block. It has the support of the major Chinese dissident groups and human rights organizations. If we pass H.R. 2058, next year we will be able to ask these questions:

Has the Chinese Government taken concrete steps to dismantle the forced labor camps?

Has the Chinese Government ended coercive birth control practices?

Has the Chinese Government ended crackdowns on Catholics and Protestants?

Has the Chinese Government begun to respect the rights of the people of Tibet?

Does the Chinese Government allow totally free worship, free press, and freedom of associations?

Have political prisoners been set free?

Does China adhere to the provisions of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and the missile technology control regime?

If the answer to any of these is no, Congress will be obligated to act. We will know where to look for progress.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the Bereuter bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution. I think everyone here on this floor should be proud that we are debating this issue of human rights in China. Indeed, if all the other democracies in this world were having this kind of a debate, I think this situation might be different.

A major problem with the use of MFN in this instance is, and has been, that we have been alone and other nations have not followed suit. Indeed, they have simply stepped into the vacuum. And so, then the issue is this, I think: If we are not going to use MFN, how are we going to be sure that we do

not leave a vacuum in several key areas; human rights, and the critical trade issue?

In the human rights area, I think this country, the administration, has been taking steps in the right direction. For example, it forced a vote at the United Nations recently to condemn China's human rights record. That failed by 1 vote, as I understand it. And I think today we are calling on the administration to continue these efforts in the United Nations; indeed to intensify them.

In the critical area of trade, as our trade deficit with Japan continues to grow, I understand the President is going to announce soon the appointment of a commission to look into Asian Pacific trade and investment policies. We need to confront, with China, trade issues as we did intellectual property. If not MFN, we have to find another method, other instrument, to make sure that there is free and fair trade with China.

So, Mr. Speaker, as we join together to support this resolution, let us be sure that it is followed up by steps both on human rights and on trade policies.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN], a member of the Committee on National Security.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] for the hard work that he and Members on both sides of the aisle have been putting in; hours and hours of burning the midnight oil trying to remove us from the horns of a dilemma.

Last night I watched ''Nightline.'' I saw Harry Wu, videotaped just weeks before he left on this last courageous journey where he has disappeared somewhere to the world's most populous nation, and I thought, if we pull away most favored nation, is it an execution order? Or even worse than execution, a disappearance, to slowly die as a missing person for 10, 15, 20 years in some Chinese gulag?

This is as hard an issue as were sanctions over South Africa. I changed regularly on that issue, always toward the same goal as those who were liberals that wanted the most severe sanctions. But trying to listen to Buthelezi on one side, and listening to the self-serving voices of the white tribe on South Africa, I may have come down on the wrong side several times.

Mr. Speaker, I want to be on the right side on this one and that is why during the vote I will be reading every word of Mr. BEREUTER's well-crafted work product.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to put a statement in the RECORD about how the Republican Party was born. It was founded over one main issue, the terrible and horrific abomination of slavery. It was a travesty and gross belittlement of one class of people. It was a national disgrace, a dark sin upon our collective conscience, and it was removable only, as Lincoln predicted, through the subsequent shedding of precious American blood.

This time, the people we must want to serve are locked up in China, a slave state. May we pray that what we do in this body serves the one goal we all want; liberty and freedom for the people in a slave state.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMON].

(Ms. HARMON asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HARMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2058, the China Policy Act, and in opposition to House Joint Resolution 96, the MFN disapproval resolution.

I have often said that the next century will be the Asian century as China, the world's largest underdeveloped economy, takes off. American companies need to gain footholds in this market early. Our competition is already poised if we retreat.

China is already an important market for America, and for California, which has exports valued at over $1.5 billion to China last year. In my congressional district, dozens of companies and thousands of jobs in a wide range of industries depend on the Chinese market. Small companies like Rainbow Sports, which produces golf equipment, and Contact Enterprises of Torrance, which manufactures industrial parts, depend on sales to China. A Hughes satellite project for China provides over 1,000 jobs in my district. As the Chinese economy grows, more opportunities to create American jobs will grow as well.

But United States interests in maintaining engagement and dialogue with China are not limited to jobs and trade. We have a strong interest in seeing China treat its people according to international human rights standards. China's trade links with the United States have resulted in economic liberalization, and a nation whose economy is increasingly free and open must afford its people rights and freedoms as well. Without such changes political upheaval is inevitable, regardless of the state of the economy.

China's military might and weapons-export policies also present the United States with urgent security concerns. As a member of the National Security Committee, I am particularly concerned about nuclear and missile proliferation. It is my firm belief that maintaining strong economic and diplomatic links with China—links which the removal of MFN would threaten—is the key to bringing China's arms export policy in line with international goals and standards.

Two consecutive administrations, with strong bipartisan support from Congress, have pursued a policy of engagement with China which has shown considerable success. China signed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty in 1992 and agreed to join the Missile Technology Control Regime. It has also agreed to further discussions with the United States on all aspects of nuclear proliferation, including China's trade with Iran and Pakistan. We must assure China meets its international obligations. By contrast, cutting off MFN will merely isolate that country, ending a constructive dialogue and imperiling the progress that must be made. The China Policy Act strikes the right balance by letting China know how immensely important this issue is to United States-China relations, without ending MFN, the basis for those relations.

Mr. Speaker, China has a long way to go toward recognizing the rights of its citizens. Harry Wu must be freed. But revoking MFN would not be a helpful step in achieving these goals. The China Policy Act, developed with bipartisan consultation, sends a strong and constructive message to China. I strongly urge its passage.

□ 1300

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS] for the generous grant of time.

Mr. Speaker, I think there is broad agreement here on the problem: the egregious violations of human rights in China, the use of prison labor, the imprisonment of Harry Wu, a United States citizen, the unfair trade practices of China, those that make the Japanese look like proponents of Adam Smith and free trade, unfair trade practices that resulted last year in a $29 billion surplus with the United States, headed towards $40 billion trade surplus with the United States this year according to the Commerce Department. That means we are going to export 8 million United States jobs to China because of their unfair trade practices. We disagree over the solution.

What does this resolution say? Intensify diplomatic initiatives. Well, we have been doing that every year now for about a decade. A report from the President. Well, we have been having reports from the President since the Reagan administration on the abuses in China. We know what they are, and it has not changed a bit, but there is one new, very serious, initiative. We are going to broadcast Radio Free Asia into China within 90 days. The geriatric oligarchy of China is quaking in their boots. Yes, they are quaking in their boots.

We will not be allowed to vote on the resolution of disapproval. A quick sleight of hand is going to move to table it. Why is that happening? Because last night, for the first time, we saw a crack in the free-trade dogma that has dictated policy under both Democrats and Republicans in this institution in the vote on the bailout of

Mexico, and suddenly, after the leaders, the Republican leaders and the Democratic administration, lost a vote on the bailout of Mexico which came to the floor, they do not want to allow a vote on the resolution of disapproval of MFN for China because they are afraid there might be an honest vote in this House where people would say we have been gumming this issue for years. The Chinese will take $40 billion in unfair trade practices and laugh all the way to the bank. They will only understand real action.

Repeal MFN.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR], my good friend and colleague.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS] for yielding this time to me and rise with a heavy heart as we discuss this entire situation involving China, and I see—as the American birthright—the ideal that this Nation and others around the world are conceived in liberty and should be dedicated to the proposition that all people are created equal with certain inalienable rights. I think that is what our Nation is here for, as a beacon to the rest of the world, but what we see so often is that our foreign policy has been directed to certain financial interests, and in fact our foreign policy, rather than being a representation of the best ideals in us, has really become a kind of deal-making exercise.

Mr. Speaker, we should probably call China MFN the Boeing MFN because supporters of MFN for China and keeping that special trade status protected say that exports to China will create jobs here. However Boeing, one of the chief beneficiaries of nearly $2 billion worth of airplane sales to China, recently announced over 5,000 people in our country are being laid off because they are going to replace that production with production in China, and I think what is so troubling is that China has done nothing to promote democracy. It has done nothing to stop China from selling missile technology to rogue nations like Pakistan. China has done nothing to end labor abuses in its own country affecting both men and women who are voiceless as we debate there today. They have done nothing to end human rights abuses like the detention and arrest of American citizen Harry Wu.

But in fact our China policy not only does not stand up for democracy, but from an economic standpoint has led to a flood of cheap imports into our country—expected to reach over $32 billion this year alone—representing an increase over last year, and in fact since China's crackdown on democracy in 1989, our country has suffered a net loss of over $100 billion in China.

Mr. Speaker, when we debated the crime bill, we talked about three strikes and you're out. It seems to me here we have got five strikes and you're out, and we ought to go back to the negotiating table and figure out what we stand for fundamentally as citizens of the freest nation on Earth.

China MFN is just another smokescreen for the rights of capital surmounting the rights of people and the ideals of democratic freedom. Free trade can only exist among free people. When is the United States of America going to recall its own birthright?

I am very upset that the Wolf amendment will not be offered here for a vote up or down in this Congress today. I stand here with a very heavy heart. I ask, ''Why don't we stand up for what our Constitution says we are here for?''

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the distinguished gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the China Policy Act.

I support the China Policy Act, because I believe that the time has come to quit coddling the tyrants in Beijing.

It is time to say to the Chinese Government that ''Human rights abuses; forced abortions; and acts, such as imprisonment of an American citizen, Harry Wu, is not tolerable.''

Mr. Speaker, we are Americans. We stand for freedom. We fight for democracy, and we have not forgotten Tiananmen Square.

To my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I want to remind you, this is not a partisan issue. This is an opportunity to do what is right. If you support democracy and human rights, vote for the China Policy Act.

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

Mr. Speaker, as I said before, China has millions more dissidents than those who openly brave the hard suppression of human rights. The one thing that unites the people in China with a narrow leadership clique, however, is the memory of the destruction of China's sovereignty during the last two centuries and the imposition of unequal treaties and other indignities on the part of first the Western powers and then Japan.

I tell my colleagues a certainty, that as nothing else the denial of normal trade status will unite China's people behind their Government and identify the United States as hostile to their interests. On the other hand, the legislation before us today recognizes the importance of China while specifying the deep concerns of the American people about the PRC and then requiring diplomatic conduct from the Presidency, and reports and Radio Free Asia.

A number of well-known China dissidents, for example, including Chi Ling and Won Won To have warned that the denial of MFN status will endanger China's current economic opening and close off current widening exposure of Chinese to the outside world. The dissident movement exists in China precisely because growing foreign investment and China's expanding foreign trade have created a fast burgeoning middle class with the same expectations as middle classes throughout the world. It thrives on a freer flow of information brought about by the introduction of Western telecommunications technology and access to the international media.

Mr. Speaker, the denial of MFN will set back the democracy movement in China even more than it sets back the Chinese economy and chokes off the prosperity of Hong Kong.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a true consensus bill and in the nature of foreign policy. It has support of a broad range of individuals who have done extraordinary work in bringing the China Policy Act to this floor. Led by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. PELOSI], and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and others, we now come to the position of being able to at least speak very clearly with reference to a consensus that has developed in this House that will not be as exacerbating as perhaps some would like for us to put forward. It does not link China policy to trade. It incorporates key additional human rights language which is and was a continuing concern of many Members of this body. It sends a clear message regarding troubling China activities such as, as has been so often mentioned and justifiably so, the unjustified detention of Harry Wu, the violation of basic human rights that we all are concerned about, the sale of missile components in violation of nonproliferation commitment, and I personally yesterday had a visit from State Department officials because I shared immense concern with reference to the potential for sale of missile components to Pakistan and to Iran. I was assured that there are sanctions in the event these allegations come to fruition that will cover these matters. It also deals with the unfair trade practices that have been mentioned by so many Members here. In short, it establishes the United States policy objectives, will expedite the startup of Radio Free Asia, and we do, for the efforts that have been ongoing, commend China in spite of the fact that we recognize that there is much more that they should do in their movement toward democracy.

It is very difficult for us to speak as clearly as we have in this measure, and I commend all of our colleagues for the extraordinary work that they have done in bringing to us a true consensus bill which, in my judgment, is how foreign policy should be made in this body.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN].

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I believe in open markets and in a vibrant international marketplace in which the United States is an active trading partner with all nations.

But, I have some real problems with extending most favored nation trading status to a country like China where the people who produce the goods that China exports to us are not free.

It is not much of an exaggeration to say that while we prohibit the import from China of goods made using prison labor, the harsh fact is that all the goods produced there are the products of prison labor.

The country is so unfree that it claims that the Government of China owns all the labor of all Chinese people.

When you want to hire a Chinese person to work for an American company, you pay the Chinese Government a lot of money, but the person who does the work never sees the money. The government pockets maybe $20 a day for a factory worker, while the worker gets less than a dollar of that.

This is not free trade. This is slavery.

The Chinese exported this system to Cuba, where the same thing happens. The Castro dictatorship is more than happy to sell the services of Cuban workers to unscrupulous foreign investors, and to keep all the money for itself while tossing a few pennies a day to the person who actually has to do the work.

Both in Cuba and in China, the system is a moral outrage and reeks of the slave trade of the 19th century.

Unfree labor is not the only problem with doing business with China.

It is a country where there is no respect whatsoever for the human rights of its citizens—nor for the human rights of American citizens.

The arrest of Harry Wu, an American citizen, is only one example of this. It is just one small element in an abysmal Chinese human rights situation.

Forced abortion. We all know this issue. We know it happens and it happens a lot.

And we know that there are many killings of born and unborn little girls.

And, we know that these practices violate every known standard of human rights since God made Man.

There are reports that aborted fetuses are sold and eaten.

The trafficking in human organs that is practiced in China is another outrage. One hears rumors of condemned prisoners being executed according to the marketing needs of those who have sold their organs to wealthy foreigners needing a heart, liver, kidney or other transplant.

I could go on and on and on with one outrage after another that is taking place in China.

I thank the gentleman for highlighting these outrages.

□ 1315

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STOCKMAN].

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that the gentlewoman was making a point. She outlined some serious allegations and some serious charges. In 1930 we heard serious charges before, and we said we are not sure, and we did nothing. Now, 50 years later, we hear the same allegations, and, again, America is doing nothing. There is something wrong.

What lessons have we learned from history? None, apparently. We should not trade with a barbarous nation such as China, and we should vote to cut their MFN.

This is more than just a symbol. We cannot even purchase anything without the label ''China'' on it. I was offended July 4 when I took out of my pocket an American flag, and on it it said ''Made in China.'' That is an outrage. We need to stop trading with these guys. It is wrong, and America needs to stand up and say so.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], the distinguished gentleman who has worked very hard on Sino-American relations and trade issues.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMERSON). The gentleman from California is recognized for 4½ minutes.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my very good friend from Nebraska, and rise in very strong support of the Bereuter resolution. The gentleman has worked long and hard on this issue, along with many of our colleagues, and I believe that this is a very important day in the history of the United States Congress and in world history.

Mr. Speaker, speaking of history, when I look back on one of the most interesting years in the last quarter of a century, 1989 has to stand out. We observed that year the crumbling of the Berlin Wall. We saw the tremendous changes take place as we saw the first transition of one democratically elected government to another in El Salvador. We saw political pluralism emerge in Nicaragua. We saw great speeches made right here in this Chamber by Vaclav Havel from then Czechoslovakia, from Lech Walesa, the leader of Poland, an electrician from the Gadansk Shipyard. To me, one of the most moving speeches came from the first democratically elected President in the history of South Korea.

Now, one of the arguments that I have made time and time again, and many of our colleagues have joined in this, is if we look over the past several years at countries where tremendous political repression has existed, we chose as a nation not to impose trade sanctions, countries like Taiwan, countries like Argentina, countries like Chile, and nations like South Korea.

Well, on October 18, 1989, just a few months after the tragic Tiananmen Square massacre, President Roh Tae Woo stood right behind me here. He does not speak English at all, but he, out of respect to this body, delivered his speech in broken English. He phonetically delivered his statement to us. And there was an item in that which to me really demonstrates where we stand today and what it is that we are trying to do.

He said:

> The forces of freedom and liberty are eroding the foundations of closed societies. The efficiency of the market economy and the benefits of an open society have become undeniable. Now these universal ideals, symbolized by the United States of America, have begun to undermine the fortresses of repression.

Mr. Speaker, that statement was made in 1989, right here in this Chamber, and we have seen tremendous changes take place in the ensuing 6 years. We proceeded during that 6-year period with engagement with China with most favored nation trading status. And my colleagues are right in talking about the fact that things have not necessarily gotten better. They have in many ways gotten worse. But it is important for us to look at some areas of improvement.

Remember, we are talking about a nation that has a history that spans four millennia. Now, we cannot expect a change to take place overnight, but we do realize that exposure to western values has gone a long way towards improving things.

We have seen the establishment of a stock market in Shanghai. The reports to come from that have been incredible. Obviously any economic visitor in Shanghai would love to have the opportunity to see how their stocks are doing. Well, how do they find those reports? It has to be printed in the newspaper.

One of the things that the government of China is having a very difficult time doing is keeping any kind of political reporting out of that information that is disseminated through the free flow of economic activity in Shanghai. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we must realize that trade promotes private enterprise, which creates wealth, which improves living standards, which undermines political repression, and that is exactly what is happening here.

We are not going to change things overnight. We have a long way to go. But if we believe for one moment that shutting the door with China will all of a sudden get Harry Wu released, that is preposterous. If we believe that closing the door will improve the plight of those many people in China who are seeking economic opportunity, we are crazy to believe that. The two southern provinces of Guangdong and Fujian see Chinese people literally clawing their way to get in there. Why? Because that

is the place that they can find economic opportunity.

So I believe that this is a very balanced approach that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] is taking, and I again congratulate him for all that he has done, the work of the Committee on International Relations, working closely with members of the Committee on Ways and Means. I believe that we have a positive solution to a very, very tough problem. Mr. Speaker, this is a great day. This is an historic day as we look towards the most important relationship between two countries on the face of the Earth.

I support the Bereuter resolution.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2058, which condemns China's violations of human rights and calls for China to grant access to American exports. H.R. 2058 crafts a reasonable compromise between those who would want to extend most-favored-nation status to China unconditionally, and those who agree with me that denial of most-favored-nation status is the best means of influencing China.

We must not forget the Tiananmen Square massacre or the Chinese Government's brutal suppression of student protestors. Rather, we must answer the Chinese peoples cry for freedom and democracy by continuing to press for adherence to international human rights standards.

Under H.R. 2058, the Congress calls for the immediate release of United States citizen Harry Wu who was recently arrested by the Chinese Government; calls on the President to pressure China to adhere to international weapons nonproliferation agreements; calls on China to release political prisoners, respect the rights of Tibetans, and end the practice of coercive abortions. It is important to note that this legislation does not in any way disturb the President's decision to extend most-favored-nation status to China for the coming year.

In addition to these human rights abuses, H.R. 2058 includes additional conditions that call on China to permit greater access by United States exporters to China's markets by ending that nations unfair trade practices. American working men and women deserve to have the support of the United States Government in the attempt to force China to adopt a fair trade policy.

All of the objectives embodied in H.R. 2058 are reasonable standards which we should expect any nation wishing to acquire most-favored-nation trading status to satisfy. Certainly no one could argue that the language of H.R. 2058 would impose too heavy a burden on the Chinese Government, or that the conditions are unduly harsh.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2058 is a fair and just bill which allows China the opportunity to reform their conduct, and make progress toward internationally recognized standards of human rights, without being punished. If there is no progress toward the goals established in this bill in China, then the denial of further favorable trade status will be necessary to convey the message to the Chinese Government that their conduct will not be tolerated by the international community. I strongly urge all my colleagues to take a stand for human rights, and vote for passage of H.R. 2058.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for the H.J. Res. 96, a bill to disapprove most-favored-nation (MFN) treatment for China. H.J. Res. 96 is carefully targeted to send a strong message to the Chinese Government that continued suppression of human rights, flaunting of international agreements on nuclear non-proliferation, and engaging in unfair trade practices cannot be tolerated, ignored, or rewarded.

Denying most-favored-nation status for China is a reasonable response to the continuing controversy over trade and human rights policy in regards to China. It is absolutely imperative that this House insist that the United States Government not reward the Chinese regime which brutally massacred pro-democracy demonstrators in Tiananmen Square just 6 years ago, and continues to hold prisoner an American citizen with carte blanche on the importation of their goods into our market. Granting most-favored-nation status for all Chinese products rewards the Chinese regime for its intransigence on human rights, and its refusal to engage in fair trade.

Mr. Speaker, despite the arguments of those who support totally unfettered trade with China, the fact remains that trade and human rights are inextricably linked. A nation that suppresses its peoples' human rights also suppresses their wages. This, in turn, leads to an unnatural advantage in trade, which adversely impacts American businesses and workers, and causes the loss of American jobs.

In fact, the United States trade deficit with China is now over $30 billion a year, second only to our trade deficit with Japan. Yet, despite the freedom we grant to Chinese imports to the United States, China does not grant most-favored-nation status to United States goods, and continues to bar certain United States goods from the Chinese market. For those who advocate free trade, it seems rather illogical and inconsistent to grant free access to our market to a country which denies free access to their market for our goods.

Nearly 30 percent of China's total exports are to the United States, which means that most-favored-nation status for their goods is vital to the Chinese economy. Therefore, most-favored-nation status is logically the most effective tool for influencing the Chinese Government to improve their record on human rights. If the United States continues to grant most-favored-nation status to Chinese goods, without requiring improvements in human rights, there is no incentive for the Chinese regime to alter their policies. I ask my colleagues who support unrestricted most-favored-nation status for China to identify what other means we have available to influence the Chinese Government? They cannot give me an answer, because they have no answer.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge all my colleagues to insist that the United States stand up for the principles of human rights, and for the freedom of the Chinese people. Vote for H.J. Res. 96 and send a clear, unmistakable message to the dictators in Beijing, and your constituents, that you believe in freedom and democracy for people all over the world.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, in the last Congress former Congresswoman Helen Bentley of Maryland and I combined to pass into law Radio Free Asia, a new surrogate radio to be aimed at repressive regimes in China, in North Korea, in Laos, in Vietnam, in Burma, and other Asian nations. Today, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] has focused his policy alternative to the withdrawal of Most Favored Nation tariff status from China on starting surrogate broadcasting to China. His is the proper way to go.

Withdrawing MFN may seem an effective means of moving the Beijing Government away from repression and toward the norms of international human rights. But it only seems so. On further examination one can see that the results of such withdrawal would likely rather be retaliation against American companies doing business in China and no progress on the rule of law. Moreover, MFN is a one-shot gun. Once fired there is no further bullet. Once withdrawn, the tariffs rise, Chinese retaliation follows, and markets change.

No, Mr. Speaker, this is not the approach that the United States should follow. Mr. BEREUTER has it right. Beam a message of truth to China—tell them the truth about what is happening in their own society to their own people—and create the pressure for change from within. Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe, the surrogate radios of the cold war, gave not only truth, but hope to millions in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union that ultimately helped to undermine and bring down their totalitarian, communist regimes. Radio Free Asia would play the same role.

I am a great supporter and believer in the effectiveness of the Voice of America which beams to China and to societies across the world the message of our country to their people. It is among the most cost effective means of promoting American values to people everywhere. Surrogate radio is not the same. Surrogate radio is radio that broadcasts the messages of their own people to those societies. That relates to them not only in their own language but by their own people and in their own cultures. It reports the truth about what is happening not only around the world but, more importantly, within that society and not within the American idiom but within theirs. Surrogate radios are not to supplant the Voice of America—our voice to the world. Surrogate radios are not to provide an alternative to the VOA. Surrogate radios have always operated right along side VOA and complemented its good work. Both are extremely effective in their different missions, both spend the relatively small sums required to sustain them effectively as well, and both are necessary to advance the purposes of our foreign policy.

Now VOA has, unfortunately, been sending a message that our radios are a zero sum game, that money put toward RFA is money taken away from VOA. I don't favor that and I don't know anyone that does. And yet it has been extremely difficult to get RFA up and running and this administration has spoken a good commitment to it without following its good words with action. It is my hope that the Bereuter amendment will receive an overwhelming vote and send a message to the White House that this is our policy of choice and that the President had better get aboard and start acting as the engineer of this train.

Last year the question of funding and starting up RFA was faced in the appropriation for Commerce, State, Justice where the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN], then the chairman, failed to fund RFA. I offered an amendment to ensure that the commitment to RFA was known to the then chairman and it passed overwhelmingly. I hope Congress will again today go on record to

send the message strongly that RFA's time has indeed come.

We should, in approving the policy choice in Bereuter, also make the commitment to provide sufficient funds to make FRA a reality. These funds should not come from VOA. But I would say, Mr. Speaker, if we continue to see from VOA the kind of effort to slow and side-track RFA start-up that has been all too evident, then, perhaps, we should, indeed, consider using VOA funds for this purpose.

Mr. Speaker, Harry Wu, is my friend, the friend of all of us, the friend of every person who loves human freedom. He returned to China, the nation of his birth, and put himself at great risk to make the truth known about China's egregious labor prison camps and its heinous market in human organs. His is just the latest example of the oppressive practices of the Beijing regime. Since last year's vote not to withdraw MFN, which I supported, human rights violations by the Chinese Government have worsened not improved. The Chinese communist regime makes it easy to generate support in Congress for RFA. They are clearly their own worst enemy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, they will argue, as they always do, that these are matters only of internal concern, that the United States is yet again intruding itself in Chinese matters, that what they do to their own people is none of our affair. Yet we need only remind them that they are signatory to the Universal Declaration, that they made a commitment—which has since rung hollow—to observe the tenents of basic rights for every human being. And I would say one thing further: that we are our brothers keeper; that the denial of Harry Wu's rights is the denial of my rights and yours and of every person in this chamber and on this Earth. That once we can convince China and the rest of the world that every person deserves respect, that every person has the right to worship and speak and write in the way he or she chooses, that governments must rule only through law created democratically by the people—then may China and other nations which deny these basic rights take their place among the nations of the world who will live in peace and harmony and work together toward a better life for all peoples. We all look forward with all the Harry Wu's—and there are hundreds of millions of them in China—to that day.

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Speaker, I support the China Policy Act, sponsored by my colleague from Nebraska, the distinguished chair of the Asia and Pacific subcommittee.

I agree with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that Congress must be concerned with the illegal and unjust arrest and current incarceration of American Harry Wu by Chinese officials. We must use all available diplomatic means to resolve this situation and see that Mr. Wu is returned to freedom.

However, we must not be so short-tempered and short-sighted as to vent our frustration by revoking Most Favored Nation status for China. Revoking MFN status is not something the United States should do lightly in any situation.

The recent deterioration of relations with China is indeed a cause for great concern. In today's Post Cold War world, the United States has many vital security concerns in Southeast Asia. In this region of the world where great strides are being made toward democratization, America must remain vigilant in our support of international human rights.

Perhaps the time has come for the United States to be more circumspect with regard to Beijing's policies and reputation. Yet, one thing is sure—the time has not come to end MFN for China and ostracize this emerging nation, which may hold the ultimate key to peace and stability in Asia. We will never succeed in fostering real democratization for millions of Chinese tomorrow if we decide to impose an economic quarantine China today.

It is possible to support MFN status for China and still fight for Harry Wu's return home—and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do just that. I urge them to support H.R. 2058 to support the safe return of Harry Wu.

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Joint Resolution 96 that would deny Most-Favored-Nation [MFN] trade status to China.

I can understand the reasons why the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] proposed an MFN disapproval resolution. But, I'm not convinced that an embargo—the effect of withdrawing MFN status—would punish China's use of prison labor, human rights abuses, and possible violations of arms control agreements.

Taking away MFN will actually strip us of a powerful tool that we can use to push for change, while having a negligible effect on China. Denying MFN to China forces us to turn our backs on Chinese human rights abuses. But MFN gives us the leverage and access needed to encourage improvements in China's treatment of its citizens.

Let's keep the lines of free ideas open through trade. Discussion between two friendly trading partners is more effective than criticism between nations involved in an embargo or trade war. Change is generated by communication and cooperation, not alienation.

I encourage my colleagues to support the committee's position in opposing this measure and support the continuation of MFN status to China. I believe we can do what's best for trade while engaging the Chinese to produce change.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, I would also like to add to the RECORD an article from Business Week magazine that highlights how increased economic activity and Western contacts have improved overall human rights, especially in the southeastern provinces in China. Change sometimes comes too slowly for Americans but I am confident that the inevitable triumph of democracy and respect for human rights will happen one day soon in China just as it has in other parts of the world.

[From Business Week, June 6, 1994]

CHINA—IS PROSPERITY CREATING A FREER SOCIETY?

The contrast is stark. Chinese authorities continue their crackdown on dissenting voices and put security forces on alert in Tiananmen Square. At the same time, in the grimy central city of Wuhan, a professor is bringing a new concept to China's heartland: the rule of law. Armed with a Yale Law School degree and a team of young associates, Wan Exiang runs China's first public-interest legal center. From his bustling offices, Wan takes on government officials—including members of the much-feared national police, the Public Security Bureau (PSB)—who have long ridden roughshod over individual rights.

Increasingly, Wan is winning. In one recent case, his Center for the Protection of the Rights of Disadvantaged Citizens came to the defense of an entrepreneur from Hangzhou who left his job as a technician at a state-backed company to start his own business. Accusing the man of taking company patents, police put him in detention, ransacked his home, and confiscated all his belongings. After a plea from the man's wife, Wan dispatched two lawyers to represent him. They won—and got the PSB to pay damages of 500 yuan—the equivalent of six weeks' salary. Altogether, the center, which is funded in part by the Ford Foundation, has received 1,600 requests for help.

As the June 4 anniversary of the 1989 Tiananmen massacre approaches, President Clinton is poised to make the politically costly decision to renew China's most-favored-nation trading status (page 102). He is doing so even though China has been cracking down hard on its most vocal dissidents. It has re-arrested Wei Jingsheng, a leader of the ''Democracy Wall'' movement of the late 1970s. Beijing has imprisoned many other political activists and has rounded up religious and labor leaders.

But no matter what an increasingly jittery leadership does to repress and control, a quiet revolution is taking place. Across the Middle Kingdom, the glimmerings of a freer society can be seen in the actions of Chinese such as Professor Wan. China's contact with the U.S. and the rest of the world is helping make that happen. Although Clinton's decision was in part based on pure commercial reasons, it does reflect a growing view among experts that the annual debate about human rights in China has been overtaken by deeper, grassroots change in the world's most populous nation.

An explosion of information technology, for example, has allowed the Chinese to link up to the world with fax machines, telephone lines, satellite dishes, and personal computers. Thanks to market-oriented reforms, millions of Chinese can now decide where to work and live instead of being told. A growing local media, aligning with regional power brokers, is spotlighting tension between provincial authorities and Beijing. And workers and peasants are becoming more vocal about protesting corruption, layoffs, and taxes.

Two or three years ago, signs of people circumventing or undermining totalitarian rule could be dismissed as anomalies. But no longer. Just as China's economic boom has brought increased prosperity to millions, so too is life for ordinary Chinese becoming easier and freer. ''There has been a substantial evolution—economic, social, and political—that makes the state less intrusive in people's lives,'' says Kenneth G. Lieberthal, a China expert at the University of Michigan.

Indeed, the central judgment that Deng Xiaoping made 15 years ago now appears to be proving faulty. Deng reckoned that by opening the door to the outside world, China could absorb foreign investment, trade, and technology while spurning the cultural and political influences, or ''bourgeois liberalization,'' that would challenge Communist Party rule.

But years of double-digit economic growth are transforming Chinese society itself, loosening Beijing's control over 1.2 billion people. In Guangdong, workers angered by dangerous factory conditions have formed more than 800 illegal trade unions. In Beijing, live talk shows allow radio listeners to discuss once-taboo subjects, from urban pollution to extramarital affairs. In a Shanghai factory, the subject at mandatory Communist Party meetings is bonuses, not politics. And in

coastal cities and interior villages, attendance at underground churches is soaring. Virtually no one accepts the ideology called communism anymore.

SHIFTING SANDS

Many of these grassroots changes have frightened the Communist Party leadership, which is already rattled by Deng's deteriorating health and an inevitable power struggle. Yet the earth continues to shift under the leadership's feet. Beijing must encourage growth to stay in power, but that only increase the potential for greater individual freedom. Only a few years ago, the government could dictate where citizens lived and worked, when they married, and when they could have a child. But today, a rising middle class is quietly challenging centralized control. ''Change is happening from the bottom up, regardless of what happens with the Communist Party,'' says David S. Goodman, a fellow at Murdoch University's Asia Research Center in Perth, Australia.

That doesn't mean China's transition to the post-Deng era will be smooth. The party still maintains its monopoly on power. Moreover, the state controls the media and arrests whomever it wants. In Tibet and Xinjiang, ethnic minorities face severe repression. Meanwhile, the tumultuous move to a market economy has created a political and social powder keg. The economy grew 12.7% in the first quarter, barely cooling off from its 13% pace in each of the past two years. Inflation is 24.6% in the big cities, and corruption among officials is widespread. In 1989, that combination led to large antigovernment demonstrations. If similar unrest breaks out after the death of 89-year-old Deng, the leadership may once again call in the troops.

As the years after Tiananmen have shown, however, the People's Liberation Army isn't interested in turning back the clock. It's making too much money in its lucrative businesses, ranging from toys to tourism. Likewise, the party can be counted on to beat back outright challenges to its rule, but its members are also making money in China's rush to get rich.

NEW SUITS

Where once the party and central government could dictate just about anything, now they must compete for power with provinces, cities, giant quasipublic corporations, and even workers and peasants. As a result, China continues to evolve away from the totalitarian model of the Maoist era and the authoritarian regime of the Deng era. ''The system is losing its central control,'' says M. Scot Tanner, an expert on Chinese politics at Western Michigan University. He argues that China is gradually becoming a ''soft authoritarian'' regime like Taiwan or South Korea in the early 1980s.

An unlikely arena for this clash of interests is the nation's rudimentary legal system. As in Wuhan, a new set of laws and property rights is evolving throughout China. In a country where the rule of law has long been subordinate to *guanxi*, or personal connections, the Chinese have started to turn to the judicial system to resolve business and personal disputes.

Chinese citizens are suing almost everyone—from local enterprises to the police. For instance, Zheng Chengsi, a slender, bespectacled professor in Beijing, brought suit against two of his former students last year after discovering they had plagiarized more than 60,000 words from his work on—of all things—intellectual-property rights. Zheng's lawyers filed the case in Beijing's East District court last year. The defendants tried, in vain, to persuade Zheng to settle. But he insisted he didn't want damages. ''My rights were violated,'' he says. ''I wanted these things to be published.'' In August, Zheng got his wish: The judge ordered the defendants to publish details of the case in nationally circulated newspapers.

Like Zheng, most Chinese plaintiffs are involved in disputes with other civilians. But some citizens are challenging government officials in court. In 1992, Liu Benyuan, an entrepreneur in Sichuan province, sued local cadres who tried to take away his mineral-water bottling plant. They were upset because Liu refused to pay them off. Besides his bottling plant, they also closed his chemical and printing factories. Liu fought back. Last February, a court ruled in his favor, giving him back his businesses.

China's legal system is ill prepared to handle the growing clamor for justice. As claims multiply, the number of lawyers is expected to quadruple, to about 200,000, by the year 2000. Many citizens continue to distrust the system's impartiality, since local officials often treat courts as arms of their governments. And when the courts do act independently, they often have great difficulty enforcing their judgments. That led editors of the official *Legal Daily* newspaper on May 23 to issue a daring call for an independent judiciary. ''The idea of economic rights is spilling over into other areas such as individual rights,'' says Helena Kolenda, a Beijing-based lawyer with the New York law firm Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison. ''It has sparked a consciousness.''

The demand for more rights is moving beyond individual lawsuits and sparking organized, large-scale protests. Two groups recently staged sit-down strikes in front of the Shanghai municipal building, protesting government secrecy and consumer ripoffs. The unrest has also spread to the countryside, where 75% of China's population lives. Last year, about 4,000 Guangdong villagers conducted a demonstration on a main thoroughfare. They were upset that local cadres had sold off prime farmland to Hong Kong real estate developers.

More worrisome to Beijing, unrest is spreading in factories, where workers increasingly are organizing. That has spooked the government, adding to worries that dissidents and intellectuals are reaching out to disgruntled workers. But as state-owned enterprises lay off employees, workers throughout China are going on strike. In March, there were 270 strikes in Liaoning, Shaanxi, and Sichuan provinces, several lasting as long as 40 days and involving 10,000 workers. In Tianjin last fall, laid-off workers marched on a state-run factory, carrying signs asking: ''How can we feed our children?'' Says Trini Leung, Chinese labor expert at the University of Hong Kong: ''Labor unrest is bubbling very hot, and the authorities are worried.''

Like peasants in the countryside, urban Chinese workers are furious about the rampant corruption and lawlessness among some well placed officials. One day last fall, a Shanghai bus driver found his way blocked by parked limousines in front of a karaoke bar frequented by government and Communist Party officials. When the bus driver told the chauffeurs to move, a group of men fatally beat him. Shanghai's bus drivers responded with a wildcat strike, refusing for several days to drive on the busy route.

The state hopes to prevent an explosion of labor unrest by encouraging laid-off workers to find jobs in the growing private and quasi-public sectors. But the unrest is not limited to the public sector. Workers at foreign joint ventures run by Taiwanese, Hong Kong, and other foreign investors have struck to protest abysmal working conditions. In Fujian province, where Taiwanese companies employ more than 400,000 people, workers often spend 16 hours a day on the job without overtime pay. Migrant workers in Guangdong joint ventures typically make $35 a month, less than half of what local residents make for the same work. Last fall, 49 workers died in fires at two factories run by investors from Hong Kong and Taiwan.

Even with its many problems, the private sector's growth has made it much harder for Big Brother to keep tabs on each citizen. Economic reform has vastly increased mobility for ordinary Chinese. That has undercut the *dang an*, or personal dossier, system. The DANG AN, which includes an employee's family background, political leanings, and class status, once was used by officials to retain workers, limit promotions, and even ruin careers. But now, Chinese are going into business for themselves, while foreign corporations don't care about such dossiers.

With the declining importance of the dossier, the party's stifling presence in the workplace has been drastically reduced. Party bosses are no longer the decision-makers. And the political meetings that were once mandatory are no longer held at wholly owned foreign ventures or at many joint ventures. Even at state enterprises, less time is spent mouthing Marxist mantras. At China Textile Machine Co. in Shanghai, political meetings have been pared from an hour a week to 20 minutes. ''The empty talk is gone,'' says Zheng Bohua, the company's deputy general manager. ''Now we discuss production.''

U.S. companies, although anxious to defend their commercial interests in China, argue that they, too, are changing the thought processes of Chinese workers. Learning how to make individual decisions does leave a deep imprint. And working for a Western company almost automatically means a higher standard of living, with better pay and benefits. ''If I were asked to go back to a state enterprise, that would be hard to deal with,'' says Ren Shouqin, 54, vice-president at China Hewlett-Packard Co. in Beijing. HP sent him to the Monterey Institute of International Studies for an MBA.

SOAPS AND CNN

At HP's headquarters in Beijing, well-heeled young women and men work at computer terminals, watch educational videos, send electronic mail, and read foreign magazines. In the Beijing area, 100,000 to 200,000 Chinese citizens work for foreign companies in offices that increasingly resemble the home office. Cai Ping, a 23-year-old manager in HP's personnel department, regularly communicates with HP staffers in Hong Kong and Palo Alto, Calif. ''It's as if we're in the same building,'' she says. ''Right now, I'm in touch with the trends of the world.''

It's not just elite workers at foreign multinational corporations who are in touch with the rest of the world. In Guangdong, millions of people get their news from two Hong Kong television stations. With a satellite dish, moreover, they can get up to 18 other stations. Despite a ban on such dishes, they are common fixtures in the Guangdong urban landscape. Millions of Chinese who understand English will soon be able to watch Cable News Network.

Of course, the state-controlled media remain on a tight leash, and authorities still strike out at individual journalists who hit too-sensitive nerves. In April, Xi Yang, a reporter for a Hong Kong newspaper who had written about plans for an interest-rate increase, was sentenced to 12 years in prison for allegedly ''stealing state financial secrets.''

But commercial imperatives are creating the potential for more reliable news. TV stations in wealthy coastal cities have stepped up coverage of social and economic news. A recent protest in Shanghai was covered by

one government station, despite efforts by city officials to black it out. Most of the time, stations stick to more popular fare to lure a broader audience—and advertisers. Taiwanese soap operas are now common, as are news stories about prostitution and corruption.

TALK RADIO

At the same time that local governments are opening commercial TV stations and newspapers, party organs are on the decline. The circulation of *People's Daily* dropped from 2.3 million in 1992 to 1.65 million last year. With the government cutting back on press subsidies, the fight is on for advertising dollars and for circulation gains. Some papers have responded by printing fewer political screeds and more alluring tales of sex and violence.

Economic change has emboldened the business press. As millions of Chinese have become stockholders for the first time, the business press has become more aggressive in shaking up China's corporations and shining a light on corruption. An increasingly influential business paper is the *Shanghai Securities News.* The paper warns of stock market shenanigans and covers civil lawsuits involving companies. A few weeks ago, the paper ran the first word of a lawsuit by a widow who sued a securities firm after her husband committed suicide. She claims the firm forced him to engage in illegal insider trading. ''This paper really tells us the truth,'' says one investor.

Radio is also slowly moving away from the party line. Talk radio abounds in the large cities, where people's frustrations and desires anonymously spill out over the airwaves. On Guangdong radio, callers regularly criticize the government, sounding off on everything from police brutality to trade policy. On one recent evening, crime is the big concern, as listeners complain about robberies on buses, highways, and city streets.

American talk radio it's not. But this profusion of media outlets has created a forum for the country's various power groups to fight their battles. In the past, the powerful Propaganda Ministry could homogenize the country's newspapers. Now, as the decentralized economy has given more power to regional chieftains, various factions are vying for control. With conservatives and reformers wielding control of media outlets, China has not one official press but several. People's Daily, controlled by the conservatives, therefore reports on strikes and rural unrest to demonstrate the dangers of policies advocated by reformers such as Vice-Premier Zhu Rongji, while Shanghai papers report on successful reforms.

Even though China's media can hardly be called free, the emergence of divergent voices means the center's ability to control people's minds has vanished. The very values upon which communism was founded are shifting. Since so few Chinese believe in its ideology, the Communist Party's leaders have no option but to press ahead with economic modernization—even as it unleashes social changes. To justify its existence, the party has to deliver prosperity, not class struggle. These pressures can only mount as more Chinese accumulate wealth.

THE DOOR IS OPEN

To contain the damage, Beijing's leaders have adopted a strategy of strategic retreats. By pulling back in certain areas, the leaders hope they can limit popular unrest and triumph in the end. But it's unlikely that 1.2 billion Chinese will be content with just the beginnings of a legal system, a freer press, and a trade-union movement. Having won those gains in the past few years, they are pressing for more.

Faced with these demands, the Communist Party will be confronted with tough choices. It can lash out, as it did in 1989. Or it can begin to transform itself, as did autocratic parties in Taiwan and South Korea. A violent crackdown would be a huge step backward and would be unlikely to work in the long term. As the years after 1989 have demonstrated, hard-liners cannot repress an entire society and still preserve economic reform.

No one is arguing that China is about to blossom into a multiparty democracy. The government's strategy is to co-opt potential pressure groups before they become independent political forces. The technocratic leaders who are gradually taking over the reins of power from the old-time revolutionaries are more willing to allow interest groups to express their viewpoints—but only as long as they remain within the confines of a single party.

For now, many Chinese say they are too busy making money to think about politics. Young Chinese, in particular, are learning that wealth means the freedom to travel, to buy foreign newspapers, to win a court case against a corrupt government official. ''If you have money,'' says a taxi driver in Fuzhou, ''then you can buy human rights.'' By this reckoning, the best thing Washington can do to nurture greater rights in China is to make sure its doors remain as open as possible to investment and ideas. ''We have confidence about the future,'' says Aven Yang, senior manager for materials at Northern Telecom Ltd.'s joint venture manager for materials at Northern Telecom Ltd.'s joint venture in Shekou. ''There is bread, and the door is open. We don't want the door to close.'' The rest of the world should make sure it doesn't.

By Joyce Barnathan in Shanghai, with Pete Engardio in Guangzhou, Lynne Curry in Beijing, Dave Lindorff in Hong Kong, and Bruce Einhorn in New York.

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to House Joint Resolution 96, legislation that would disapprove the President's decision to renew most-favored-nation [MFN] status for the People's Republic of China [PRC]. My reason for doing so is simple: While I share my colleagues concerns about the Chinese Government's actions regarding human rights, missile proliferation, and other bilateral matter, I do not believe that these issues should be linked to the basic foundation of trade between the United States and the PRC. I believe that there are more appropriate and effective means to address these important noneconomic concerns.

The People's Republic of China [PRC] has been denied permanent MFN trading status since 1951, when Congress revoked MFN status for all Communist countries. However, under the provisions of the Trade Act of 1974, the United States can grant temporary MFN status to China if the President issues a so-called ''Jackson-Vanik'' waiver.

In June of this year, President Clinton exercised this option—as he has in each of the previous years of his administration—and extended the Jackson-Vanik waiver for China for an additional year. In considering House Joint Resolution 96, we must now decide whether to exercise our congressional prerogative to disapprove this waiver—and deny MFN status for China. Following this debate, I hope Congress can move forward on the consideration of granting permanent MFN status for China and putting an end to this annual source of Sino-American tension.

In making this important decision, there are two questions that we must answer: First, is it in our national economic interest to continue MFN for China? Second, how does extending MFN for China influence our efforts to effectively address human rights and other bilateral problems between the United States and China?

The answer to the first question is unequivocally yes. Extending MFN to China would clearly yield substantial economic benefits to the United States.

China is our Nation's fastest growing major export market. America exported $9.8 billion worth of goods to China in 1994, an increase of 5.9 percent over 1993. These exports supported approximately 187,000 American jobs, many of which are in high-wage, high-technology fields.

But these benefits are only the tip of the iceberg. With a population of more than a billion people—and a GNP that has grown at an average rate of 9 percent since 1988—and 12 percent last year—the future export potential of the Chinese market is enormous. In industries such as power generation equipment, commercial jets, telecommunications, oil field machinery and computers, China represents a virtual gold mine of economic opportunity for American businesses.

The important of such a market is hard to understate: In a world where most existing major markets are saturated or are quickly maturing, it is critical that we find new and expanding markets for American products. China is just such a market. In fact, it represents one of the last reservoirs of raw economic potential left for American businesses to tap.

In short, if cultivated properly, a vigorous trading relationship with China could be a badly-needed cornerstone of American export growth—and overall economic growth—over the next few decades.

Denying MFN for China, however, would put that relationship at risk. I want to point out that MFN is a misnomer. MFN is not preferential treatment—it is equal treatment. By denying MFN for China, we would be denying China the same trading status that all but six of our trading partners have been granted.

Even worse, we would actually be punishing China by placing exorbitant ''Smoot-Hawley'' tariff rates, established earlier this century on the Chinese goods. For example, with MFN, waterbed mattresses exported to the United States from any MFN country—including China—would face a tariff of 2.4 percent. Without MFN, the tariff on this product would be 80 percent—an increase of 3,300 percent. This kind of punitive tariff would, for all intents and purposes, close the American market to Chinese products.

In other words, continuing MFN does not constitute special treatment for China—but rescinding MFN would deny China the trade status that we grant to virtually every other nation in the world.

How would China be expected to respond to such a punitive action? There's no way to know for sure * * * but I suspect that the Chinese would retaliate by quickly closing their market to American goods and would take their business elsewhere—an event that our international competitors, especially the Japanese and the EC, would note with glee.

And, even if a full-fledged trade war with China is avoided, there is still the risk of destroying all of the progress made so far on other United States-China trade issues.

For example, the United States has recently reached an historic accord with the People's

Republic of China on protection of intellectual property rights and market access. The accord contains a commitment on the part of the Chinese to crack down on piracy and to enforce intellectual property laws. It would also require China to finally open its markets to United States audio-visual products. Rescinding MFN for China would undermine this progress, and would eliminate any possibility of future progress on other trade related issues—such as full enforcement of the 1992 bilateral agreement prohibiting prison-made goods.

And there remain other serious trade problems between the U.S. and the PRC that need to be addressed.

For example, despite signing the 1958 New York Convention on Recognition and Enforcement of Arbital Awards, China refuses to enforce any claims awarded against Chinese firms under this agreement. As a result, American businesses such as Revpower, which was granted a $6.6 million arbital award for contracts that were violated and property that was unjustly expropriated, have never been able to collect what they are due. Such incidents raise questions about China's sincerity in enforcing such agreements and whether United States investments are safe in the PRC.

There are also many trade disagreements associated with the PRC's accession to the World Trade Organization [WTO] that need resolution, including the issue of permanent MFN status—which I support.

The fact is MFN provides the basic foundation to negotiate with China on these kind of trade issues. Without MFN, there is no trading relationship—and no reason for China to listen to us on trade related issues.

Finally, American consumers—especially those with limited incomes—are also penalized by denying MFN for China.

Many of the low-cost goods that American consumers have become so used to buying come from China. If we deny MFN, we will raise prices dramatically on those goods and undermine competition that lowers the price on goods from elsewhere. The result is an implicit tax increase on average American consumers, especially low-income families. For example, an extra $5–$10 dollars on a shirt may not be much for a Member of Congress, but for an average working family, this cost increase directly affects their standard of living.

In short, denying MFN for China can only have negative consequences for the United States. At a minimum, rescinding MFN would destroy the progress we have already made and would jeopardize future progress towards establishing an equitable trading relationship with the PRC. At maximum, denying MFN would cause a full-fledged trade war in which the Chinese market would be closed to American products.

Either way, the end result would be that American companies would effectively be shut out of one of the most rapidly expanding export markets in the world—sending hundreds of billions of dollars of future American exports down the drain. And in addition to these lost jobs, the standard of living of average working families will be lowered due to increased prices of consumer goods.

This scenario is easily avoidable. By continuing MFN status for China, we can take the next step toward promoting a strong economic relationship with this important trading partner—and put ourselves in position to reap the economic benefits that the Chinese market offers.

It is clear then, that extending MFN for China is in our national economic interest. However, the United States should not make foreign policy decisions based solely on raw economic benefits. In this case, we must also consider the effect that today's decision will have on our efforts to promote human rights and regional security.

I can understand the motivation of some of my colleagues who want to link MFN trade status to other issues like human rights, missile proliferation, the arrest of Harry Wu, population control activities and regional security. They are trying to fill the void on these important issues resulting from the Clinton administration's lack of a coherent, long-term China policy. I agree with them completely that this void must be filled—I disagree with the method. MFN linkage is not the way to promote progress on these other issues.

First, I believe that continuation of MFN for China will help promote further economic development and reform in the PRC. In the long term, I believe this economic reform will result in political reform. That is the exact trend that happened in Taiwan and South Korea and is currently happening in Indonesia and Malaysia.

Second, while perhaps having a short-term punitive effect on China, the denial of MFN makes it more difficult to address our long list of important non-trade concerns.

What incentives is there for China to adhere to human rights standards, comply with agreements it voluntarily made regarding missile exports and the proliferation of other weapons of mass destruction, halt nuclear testing, release Harry Wu, ensure a smooth transition in Hong Kong, and engage in responsible negotiations on regional security issues if the United States denies MFN? MFN denial is considered a hostile action by Beijing.

The struggle to succeed aged paramount leader Deng Xiaoping has already begun. Denying MFN would only exacerbate relations and play directly into the hands of the hardliners who are using tensions in Sino-American relations to bolster their position. The reformers—many of whom are dependent on further economic growth so sustain their popularity and reform program—would be undercut by the denial of MFN. And, it is these very reformers who will more likely address the human rights and proliferation concerns we have. So why give their opponents ammunition?

Mr. Speaker, if the Clinton administration had a coherent China policy which could effectively and forcefully address these serious concerns, then Congress would not feel compelled to have to step-in and fill the void. Unfortunately, we must.

However, in doing so, I urge my colleagues to do what is best for long-term American interests and not become sidetracked by short-term political expediency. I urge a ''no'' vote on the Resolution of disapproval.

Therefore, it is my hope that we will look at MFN for China, not as a point of contention between our two nations, but rather as the beginning of change that will bring new understanding within China. Economic gains result in further progress on human rights which can only promote a new era of security cooperation between the United States and China.

Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the China question has vexed American policymakers for over a century as we struggle to define our relationship.

China is the most populous nation on Earth and offers an enormous market for United States products. In 1994 United States companies had $9.3 billion in sales to China. Last year, companies in my home State of New York sold China nearly $600 million in goods, and New York ranks fourth in the Nation in total export sales to that country. Importantly, exports to China support some 180,000 United States jobs.

China remains the key to the balance of power in Asia, and is well on its way to being the leading player in the Asia-Pacific region. Many experts believe that the Chinese economy will someday be the largest in the world, larger than even our own.

The United States Government cannot ignore such a geopolitical giant, and for us to deny China MFN status would be foolish and an unwise policy. China's cooperation is essential in dealing with global challenges of nonproliferation, the environment, refugees, and controlling narcotics traffic. Moreover, a unilateral trade embargo by the United States will have little effect since Japanese and European corporations will quickly move to fill the void. Importantly, we will lose the only leverage we have over China to bring about Democratic reforms and persuade them to conform with acceptable standards of international behavior. Without a strong economic presence in China, the United States will have little, if any, capacity to influence the evolution of the Democratic process in China.

Of course, we have numerous problems with the Chinese Government. We are deeply troubled by: consistent human rights abuses; the unfair imprisonment of American citizen, Harry Wu; an unwillingness to adhere to international standards of nonproliferation of nuclear weapons; a refusal to recognize the legitimate rights of ethnic minorities; and provocative military measures in the South China Sea. These are issues which must be addressed.

The Chinese Government should not feel that renewing MFN is a reward for its behavior, and we must keep the pressure on all fronts to push for Democratic reform. The pathway to democracy is through free and open markets, and renewing China's MFN status makes sense. It is good for our commercial and strategic interests, and it lays the groundwork for sustainable long-term progress in human rights as well as promoting many other important issues. Mr. BEREUTER's China Policy Act, which I support, does this. It also sends an important signal to the Chinese Government that its continued violations of internationally recognized human rights are clearly unacceptable. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support Mr. BEREUTER's China Policy Act.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of Mr. BEREUTER's resolution.

It is fully within our rights to criticize the Chinese Government's highly inappropriate behavior, underscored recently by the case of Harry Wu. There is no doubt in my mind that we cannot stand idly by while an American citizen is treated with such disregard. The imprisonment of Mr. Wu is an insult to every American.

I also applaud Mr. WOLF's and Ms. PELOSI's support for the China Policy Act. Their efforts

were instrumental in forming the final language of this bill. With that said, I must add that House Joint Resolution 96, revoking MFN for China, must be rejected. It is the wrong message to send, and if we insist on sending it, it will hurt us. It is legislation that will accomplish nothing politically.

In that respect, what we are doing here is not symbolic. It is not kowtowing to China. It is not standing on the sidelines of the issue.

In fact, we are sending a very strongly worded message to China's leaders that we are very unhappy with their conduct. In answer to those who question a lack of action, this bill would require regular reports from the administration to Congress detailing China's progress in those areas of concern to us—particularly human rights violations, nuclear proliferation, and unfair trade practices.

We are not simply sending them a hint of our displeasure. We are actively pursuing a change in their policy. And we will be doing so without harming our own interests.

Critics of extending MFN to China counter that revocation of this status is the only way that we can affect change in China. They claim that we can only make ourselves heard, and persuade the Chinese to adhere to international norms, by disengaging ourselves economically—even at the expense of American industry. That is totally incorrect.

It has been said before, and I will reiterate it. We do need to express our displeasure with the Government and ensure that our concerns are heard and understood. For that reason, we need to remain engaged in China—economically and politically. Without those avenues, we will not have the leverage to accomplish what all of us in Congress, and in the United States, deem to be of the utmost importance—securing the full observance of human rights, democratic reforms, economic liberalization, and preventing the proliferation of China's weapons of mass destruction.

There is no argument here that we have many problems and concerns with China's internal policies and trade practices. We need to make it clear to the Chinese Government that their intolerable policies will not go unanswered. And in answering we will use all of the means necessary within our relationship to convey our views to them. However, we need to act within the construct of our established relationship, thereby working toward our goal of a free and democratic China. I commend Mr. BEREUTER on his well-written and well-directed bill, and I urge its swift passage.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, the Chinese Government, and the defense industrial companies through which it operates, has established itself as the arms supplier of choice for many of the world's rogue states. We have granted China most-favored-nation status, and Beijing has responded by becoming the most eager vendor in the international nuclear marketplace. While we, in Congress, have been appropriating billions of dollars to encourage peace and security around the world, Beijing has been selling weapons of mass destruction to the highest bidders, regardless of the consequences. Over the past several years, the Chinese Government has: Delivered missile guidance systems to Iran; sent M–11 ballistic missile technology to Pakistan and aided Pakistan's efforts to develop a covert nuclear weapons program; sold Silkworm missiles to Iraq; and provided nuclear technology to Algeria.

In addition to sending sensitive technologies to outlaw nations, China continues to increase its military muscle at home by: Pursuing a secret program to develop biological weapons; continuing its underground nuclear test explosion program despite an international testing moratorium in effect since 1992; and conducting military exercises in the East China Sea just north of Taiwan.

Mr. Speaker, Beijing has a rapsheet that would make any thug proud. But instead of getting 10 to 20, the Chinese Government keeps getting billions of dollars worth of tax breaks which have helped it run up a massive trade surplus with the United States.

Over the years, I have stood in the well of the House to speak out against a Chinese regime which ignores international security rules, systemically oppresses it own people, and demands preferential trade status while refusing to provide equal access to its own market. Since last year, the Chinese Government record has deteriorated even further: American citizen Harry Wu has been detained, political prisoners are still being held in a Chinese ''Gulag Archipelego'' stretching across the country, and China's trade and proliferation policies remain dismal.

I stand here today in support of H.R. 2058, the China Policy Act of 1995, which I believe will send a message to Beijing's ruling clique: We're watching you. We'll be checking your progress in the nonproliferation, trade, and human rights. And it's time to clean up your act.

I still however, support a complete cut-off of MFN status for China because I don't believe we should label as ''most favored'' the regime operating in Beijing. I hope that this bipartisan bill serves as a wake-up call for China's dictators.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the view that China's MFN trade status should be preserved. As the previous Bereuter bill makes clear, the Chinese Government is, in many ways, a brutal and anachronistic regime, intolerant of dissent and responsible for grave human rights abuses. Yet under this repression flourishes one of the world's largest and most rapidly growing economies.

Free-market reforms taken in the name of ''Leninist Capitalism'' have dramatically increase in the well-being of Chinese citizens to the degree that per capita income in China now doubles every 6 to 7 years, United States commercial involvement in China has been an integral part of this dramatic change, contributing significantly to the improvement of living conditions in China.

There are currently over 2,000 United States companies with $6 billion invested in mainland China. A close look at these operations reveals countless separate contributions to Chinese well-being above and beyond basic employment. United States businesses offer management development programs, scholarships, on site medical clinics, and gifts to charitable causes in China. Operating under the strictest standards of safety, hygiene, and environmental protection, these firms, by their presence and example, spread United States values and ideals throughout the communities in China where they are located.

As employees of United States companies, Chinese citizens are able to interact with their government on a more independent basis than would be possible absent United States support and employment. Pluralism and personal liberty also are enhanced through government to government contacts, scientific exchanges, personal travel, and increased international awareness of Chinese Government activities.

While beneficial to the average Chinese citizen, United States commercial involvement in China also is critical to United States economic and strategic objectives. Since 1980, when MFN was first granted to China, United States exports have increased 438 percent compared to an overall increase in United States exports of 156 percent during the same time period. As other speakers will lay out, a policy that preserves United States interaction with Chinese society puts us in the best position to leverage the Chinese Government in the sensitive areas of weapons proliferation, North Korea, and market access for United States exports.

House Joint Resolution 96, would set back all progress the United States is making with China. Such a policy of unilateral confrontation must be rejected in favor of a strategy that preserves United States leadership in Asia, and maintains our commitment to the people of China, Hong Kong, and Taiwan.

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, denying most-favored-nation status to China is not in the best interest of the United States.

Because of its size and location China will be a pivotal nation in the Pacific rim well into the 21st century. The damage inflicted by revoking MFN to China will have serious consequences for our economy.

China has one of the fastest growing economies and is one of the largest markets in the world. United States businesses have made significant inroads into the Chinese market. In 1993, Tennessee companies exported $58 million in goods to China. In 1994, Tennessee companies exported $384 million to China, a 567-percent increase. Just last December, Nashville hosted the first economic summit to help Tennessee businesses learn how to capitalize on the Chinese market.

Denying MFN to China would surely result in retaliatory action against American goods, and the loss of hundreds of thousands of jobs across America which are dependent upon our future trade with China. In fact, a Chinese delegation will be visiting Tennessee to pursue joint venture projects with 30 Tennessee businesses. If we vote to deny MFN today we are voting to kill jobs, and we are robbing States such as Tennessee of millions of dollars in potential revenue.

China is an extremely fertile market with tremendous possibilities. American businesses and the American economy need China. If U.S. companies are forced to pull out, you can be sure there are plenty of other nations that will be all too happy to fill that void. Most importantly, China needs America. The presence of businesses from the West have contributed greatly to the transition of the Chinese market from that of state-run to privately owned and operated establishments.

I certainly understand my colleagues concerns about China's human rights record, and I join them in condemning these practices. I believe we should continue to push for human rights improvements in China. Trade has been the avenue which has allowed the West to make tremendous strides in bringing about a more open and free society in China.

The United States is committed to being a leader in the international community. We have been very successful because we have

led by example. It would be impossible for the United States to lead by example if we did not have a presence in China.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the defeat of this resolution.

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 96 that would deny most-favored-nation [MFN] trade status to China.

I can understand the reasons why the gentleman from Virginia proposed an MFN disapproval resolution. But, I'm not convinced that an embargo, the effect of withdrawing MFN status, would punish China's use of prison labor, human rights abuses, and possible violations of arms control agreements.

Taking away MFN will actually strip us of a powerful tool that we can use to push for change, while having a negligible effect on China. Denying MFN to China forces us to turn our backs on Chinese human rights abuses. But MFN gives us the leverage and access needed, to encourage improvements in China's treatment of its citizens.

Let's keep the lines of free ideas open through trade. Discussion between two friendly trading partners is more effective than criticism between two nations involved in an embargo or trade war. Change is generated by communication and cooperation, not alienation.

I encourage my colleagues to support the committee's position, in opposing this measure, and support the continuation of MFN status to China. I believe we can do what's best for trade while engaging the Chinese to produce change.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as we debate China's most-favored nation status, we must view American policy toward China with consideration of many issues.

Those issues include human rights, trade, the peaceful transition of Hong Kong and weapons proliferation.

Human rights must continue to be a vital consideration as America formulates its policy toward China, as well as policy toward other areas of the world.

Obviously, we are all concerned about China's recent behavior, and the detention of American Harry Wu. Regardless of our action here tonight, Mr. Wu must be released, and we should continue to pursue that result.

However, the United States must pursue policies which are specific to each of the issues which affect our relationship to China in order to achieve positive results.

The continuation of China's most-favored-nation status is a necessary part of America's policy toward China.

To be effective, to spread the word of freedom around the world, America must continue to be engaged in world events.

Through American influence, positive changes can be made in other societies, including China. The transfer of information, which our trade relationship provides, is crucial to achieving change in China, without MFN, this change will not occur.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I am very disappointed that the China Policy Act contains no teeth, and I urge support of the resolution disapproving MFN for China.

How long are we going to appease the murderous, nuclear proliferating, United States-citizen-arresting regime in Peking?

Most of us have seen the movie, ''Schindler's List.'' What is going on in China is similar: factories churn out goods made with slave labor. By giving MFN to China, we give China a $37 billion trade surplus with us—and a lot of that is blood money. The world community failed to do the right thing 50 years ago. We are failing to do the right thing now. We should be ashamed.

Yesterday, I nominated my constituent, Mr. Harry Wu, for the 1996 Nobel Peace Prize for his determined efforts on behalf of human rights. I am saddened and disappointed that the Congress will not act with the same courage as demonstrated by Mr. Wu.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 193, the previous question is ordered.

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

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

Mr. BEREUTER. 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 416, nays 10, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 536]

YEAS—416

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Christensen
Chrysler
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—10

Burton	Kaptur	Souder
Chenoweth	Pickett	Stockman
Funderburk	Scarborough	
Jones	Seastrand	

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

DeFazio

NOT VOTING—7

Bachus	Moakley	Reynolds
Collins (MI)	Nadler	
Jefferson	Owens	

□ 1346

Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. JONES, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mrs. SEASTRAND changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall No. 536 on the Bereuter amendment. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

□ 1345

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMERSON). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, did I understand the Chair to say the bill is passed? Was there not a further pending vote on the resolution of disapproval?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise the gentleman that the bill has passed. There is an addition measure to be considered.

Mr. DEFAZIO. A separate resolution?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Separate under the rule.

Pursuant to section 2 of House Resolution 193, it is now in order to consider House Joint Resolution 96.

DISAPPROVAL OF EXTENSION OF MOST-FAVORED-NATION TREATMENT TO THE PRODUCTS OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. ARCHER. Pursuant to House Resolution 193, I call up the Joint Resolution (H.J. Res. 96), disapproving the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (most-favored-nation treatment) to the products of the People's Republic of China, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of House Joint Resolution 96 is as follows:

H.R. RES. 96

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress does not approve the extension of the authority contained in section 402(c) of the Trade Act of 1974 recommended by the President to the Congress on June 2, 1995, with respect to the People's Republic of China.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 193, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] will each be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER].

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such times as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to an agreement between the minority, the majority, and the interested parties, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], will each control 10 minutes to debate the motion to table, after which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] will be recognized to move to table the motion of disapproval.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the procedure, and I will be happy to handle our time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, if I understand the majority leader, he said on a nondebatable motion, there was some agreement to debate it, 10 minutes being allocated to two Members. I am wondering if that requires unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. No, the allocation of debate time is in order under the rule.

Mr. DEFAZIO. The rule made specifically in order that a nondebatable motion to table be debatable, but not the resolution itself?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct that debate will precede the motion to table.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. LANTOS. I have a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LANTOS. I would ask, Mr. Speaker, are both sides in control of the time in favor of tabling this motion?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would note that the rule, House Resolution 193, allocates debate time for consideration of the joint resolution and does not require that the time be divided between proponents and opponents.

Mr. LANTOS. If I may continue my parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker, I believe House rules do. We have had precedent for that when there was both on the majority and minority side the determination to grant Most Favored Nation treatment to Romania. I objected on parliamentary grounds, and the Speaker at that time granted me part of the time to express the views of those who are opposed to the tabling motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that the rule was adopted pursuant to the rules of the House, and the rule that was adopted by the House is the rule that is in effect for the consideration of this resolution.

Mr. LANTOS. May I continue my parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may continue.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, is there any rule of the House which mandates that a portion of the time be allocated to opponents of a proposed legislation if both the majority and the minority are on one side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the case of a specific rule, the specific rule controls, and a specific rule has been adopted.

Mr. LANTOS. Under those circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that those of us who are opposed to tabling this motion be allocated half the time.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do feel constrained to object, because there has been agreement between the majority and the minority as to how this issue will be debated, so I am constrained to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Chair would state that the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] could ask anyone possessing time to yield to him.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas, the majority leader.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, let me begin my comments by commending Members on both sides of the aisle for the professional manner in which they have worked together to write the resolution just passed by the House. Specifically, I would like to commend the minority leader, the chairman and ranking members of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], all of whom made great efforts to ensure passage of this important resolution that sends a strong signal to the Chinese Government about the need for human rights reforms, while encouraging them to become a responsible actor in the world economy.

I believe that continuing a trade relationship with China, including encouraging the Chinese to enter the World Trade Organization on a commercial basis, where they accept all the obligations as well as the benefits of membership, combined with other

diplomatic initiatives, is the best way to move China toward human rights and democracy.

I am concerned that escalating tensions between the two nations, if allowed to continue, and Mr. Speaker, if I may again, to emphasize this point, I am concerned that escalating tensions between the two countries, if allowed to continue, will further set back our ability to encourage the march of democracy and free market in China.

The message sent by the House resolution, combined with granting MFN treatment, strikes the right balance. Accordingly, I commend the House for its action today and strongly urge my colleagues to support the following motion to table the motion of disapproval.

Mr. Speaker, if I may just finish on a personal note, where I may dare speak for all the House in this action today, what we have done today, despite our many disappointments in the behavior with respect to human rights of the Chinese Government, is to express our hopes and dreams for the Chinese people. It is our belief that a world in which they are free to trade is a world in which they can find greater freedom, greater peace, greater prosperity.

We are willing to accommodate the Chinese people's right to participate in that world, and we again emphasize on behalf of the Chinese people, on behalf of freedom throughout the globe, our encouragement to their government to observe human rights.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. AREMY. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to voice my objections to my position on the last vote. If I would have known that the rule was set in such a way, and some of my colleagues over there, that we would not have the opportunity to debate House Joint Resolution 96, I would not have voted in the affirmative on H.R. 2058.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the minority leader, and I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to control that time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a troubling moment for the House of Representatives. I would say that 95 percent of this House believed that we were going to have the opportunity to vote on an actual resolution of disapproval for MFN for China because of their human rights record, because of their unfair trade practices, because of their acting in concert with nuclear terrorists and in violation of the nonproliferation treaty.

For a whole host of reasons, a large number of Members of the House wanted to vote on a straight up-or-down resolution of disapproval. That will not be allowed, Mr. Speaker. A deal was cut, we were not informed of this deal, it was not explicit in the rule, but a deal was cut. I found out about it this morning in a meeting over on the Senate side. They knew about it, but it certainly was not provided to Members of this body.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are going to have to vote on a motion to table. Vote ''no'' on the motion to table. If Members want to vote up or down on MFN for China, if Members want to send something other than a meaningless message, they can paper it over all they want, but what did the resolution we just adopted do? Intensify diplomatic initiatives, for the 10th year in a row; a report from the President for the 10th year in a row about the abuse in China; but there is one new significant act, we are going to broadcast Radio-Free America into China, while they continue all the same unfair trade practices, the same repression of human rights, arresting of United States citizens, dealing with nuclear proliferation. That is all going to continue.

All they want is the money. They do not care what we say. They do not care about empty words and gestures. They understand one thing: money and power. Did appeasement work in Bosnia? Do Members think appeasement is going to work any better with the oligarchy, the gerontocracy that runs China? No. We are going to get one vote. Vote against the motion to table. That is the only vote we will get on MFN.

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

Mr. Speaker, as the debate here today has testified, the United States bilateral relationship with China is deeply troubled. Frankly, I do not see a time in the immediate future when relations between our countries will not be marred by difficult disputes. They arise out of authoritarianism, government repression, and vast cultural differences.

My goal for the United States is to pursue democratic reforms in China by maintaining a strong United States presence. This is the only way to influence the turbulent change that is occurring there.

House Joint Resolution 96 is the wrong approach because it would sever trade ties between United States citizens and the people in China we want to help the most. The commercial opportunities set in motion by MFN trade status have given Chinese workers and firms a strong stake in the free-market reforms occurring in China. Business relationships make possible the transmission of our values and beliefs. They put U.S. citizens in a position to lead by example.

Denying MFN to China would inflict a high cost on United States firms. The 180,000 United States jobs which are supported by United States exports to China are at stake. More difficult to quantify is the damage we would do to the future competitiveness of United States companies. Shutting them out of the Chinese market will cripple their efforts to succeed in Asia over the long term.

China's economy is now ranked as the third largest in the world, behind only the United States and Japan. Continuing to embark on massive infrastructure programs, China is spending billions of dollars annually in sectors where the United States leads—sectors such as high-technology equipment, aerospace, petroleum technology and telecommunications. With per capita income doubling every 6 or 7 years, the Chinese economy is expanding at an astounding pace.

U.S. interests on questions of national security are also at stake in this debate. If the United States is to find common ground with China on issues such as North Korea, weapons proliferation and military expansion in the South China Sea, we need a functioning bilateral relationship.

American policy toward China must continue to rest on a clear view of our long term interests, both economic and strategic. We can and should denounce human rights abuses, but without the tools of engagement, we make ourselves powerless to ease the vise of state control in China.

I commend the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] and my colleagues from both sides of the aisle for their hard work in achieving a unified House position on the message we need to send to the Chinese and the mechanism by which we have dealt with the legislation today. We need a tough but flexible approach to China that intelligently balances United States interests in this strategically important region of the world.

□ 1400

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS].

Mr. LANTOS. I thank my good friend the distinguished leader for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, what is at stake now is something far more important than MFN for China. What is at stake is the integrity of the workings of this House.

Many of us voted for the earlier resolution under the assumption, which was made very clear to us, that we will have an opportunity to vote up or down on MFN for China. Many of us spoke on the previous resolution, indicating our willingness to support the rhetoric of that resolution but demanding the opportunity of expressing ourselves vis-a-vis China in a way that China understands.

I earnestly plead with my colleagues under present circumstances to vote against the motion to table. We are not

dealing not just with the China issue. We are now dealing with the integrity of the procedures of this House.

Many of us came in here seeing that the previous resolution was verbiage, very little teeth in it, practically none. That is why we got a practically unanimous vote. The feeling of the House is divided on MFN for China, and we should have an opportunity to debate most-favored-nation treatment for China as we have had that opportunity every single year since I have served in this body.

There is no reason why the 104th Congress will decline a vote on most-favored-nation treatment for China. It will go ahead, anyway, even if we win, because the President will veto our vote and we will not have the numbers to override it. But it goes to the integrity of our procedures. I am making a sincere plea on both sides to reject the motion to table so we can have an up-or-down vote on MFN for China.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I apologize to any Member who felt that this procedure was wrong, and any part that we took in setting the procedure was not meant to knock anybody out of expressing their view.

I am going to vote to table. I am as troubled and frustrated as anyone in this country and in this body about what is happening in China. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], and the others who have talked on this issue and been vocal on this issue feel as strongly as anybody in this country.

The truth is none of us know what to do to get China to change. We do not want it to be another Soviet Union and we do not want a 40-year cold war with the largest country in the world. We are all horribly frustrated that this country does not seem to be able to change, to give its people human rights.

Whatever happens on this vote to table, and I believe we will have a vote, and probably we should have a vote, but whatever happens, China must get one message from this debate, and that is that this country will not stand by forever and have people's human rights violated to the extent this country is violating people's human rights. The day will come, if there is not change, when all 435 people in this body will say enough is enough, and we will not go forward with trading with people that will not give people basic human rights.

Time is running out for our patience. We say to China with one voice, Democrat, Republican, liberal, conservative, and moderate, ''Please, come into the world of nations, give people human rights, give people basic human decency.''

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to control that time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI]. I know of no one who is better qualified in this entire body to speak on this subject.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his kind words and for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to say to my colleagues that I hope that you will take the lead of our Democratic leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], and of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] to let this motion to table pass. I think it is in the interest of promoting human rights in China, of addressing our concerns about unfair trade practices and the proliferation issue.

I want to commend once again the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] for his leadership in working with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and with me to accommodate many of the provisions of our own Wolf-Pelosi bill into his bill.

God knows over the years the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and I have fought the fight on MFN in China. I still think an appropriate route to go might have been to condition or to target certain products for revocation of MFN. But the options that we have before us are to send a very clear, unified message of support and concern about those issues.

Not only that, and I address my colleague the gentleman from Oregon because I know of his concern on these issues, the Bereuter bill has teeth. It has a reporting requirement for the President. We have not had that before.

Let us be frank with each other about this issue. Part of the time in this body we have been trying to get leverage with the Chinese, and part of the time we have been trying to get leverage with the President of the United States to use whatever means at his disposal to improve human rights, eliminate the unfair trade practices, and address the proliferation issues. This legislation gives us leverage with the President because of the reporting requirement.

I urge my colleagues to allow the motion to table to pass, I hope without a vote, because I think a small vote on the motion to table will send a wrong message to the Chinese Government that that is the measure of support for concern in China instead of the Bereuter bill. I urge our colleagues to do as our leader has requested.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues to please follow the wise, enlightened, as well as passionate, work of the gentlewoman from California on this subject. I know of no one in this body, and I have followed this issue for 20 years, who has worked harder and more diligently and more intelligently on the very difficult problem.

As she says, and let me reiterate it, let us not dilute the message to the Chinese Government and the Chinese people that is included in the bill that we just passed by an overwhelming vote here in the House. We do not want to dilute that. We want that message to get through very clearly.

Please lay the motion to cut off MFN on the table, which is not going anywhere, will not pass, all of us know it is not going to ever become law, and let us act realistically on this. Let us act together, and follow the lead of the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBBONS. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that the motion to revoke would not pass. It may not become law. But I will not concede that we did not have that leverage with this body.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I echo the remarks of the minority leader. Let us just tell everybody on this floor right now, this is the last time. Next year there is going to be a vote on a resolution of disapproval, and we are going to revoke most-favored-nation treatment for China unless that regime becomes a decent government in this world of ours.

Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago, when President Clinton severed the link between human rights and the annual renewal of China's MFN status, and the Chinese communist regime responded by issuing an official statement through its Foreign Ministry that called upon the United States to show sincerity and to take concrete action toward improving United States/China relations.

Can you imagine that? We hand them a $29 billion trade surplus in 1994 alone and softpedal our other concerns, and still the dictators in Beijing call on us to demonstrate sincerity and to take concrete action.

That is what they said. Here is what I said. On August 9, 1994, when the House debated whether or not to renew China's MFN, I listed all of the abuses that have taken place in China ''in the context of 14 straight years of MFN treatment.''

And I concluded, ''No, Mr. Speaker, appeasing China does not earn us their respect and their cooperation. It earns us their contempt.''

Now listen to these words: ''Frankly, on the human rights front, the situation had deteriorated.'' That was Assistant Secretary of State Winston Lord last January 11—some 7 months after human rights considerations were delinked from MFN.

What a shocker. ''On the human rights front, the situation has deteriorated.''

But then Lord went on to say, ''China is a somewhat difficult partner these days.'' Well, hello?

Few things in life are more unsettling than the sight of a crestfallen U.S. diplomat expressing his disappointment at the intransigent behavior of a communist regime.

My only question is: Partner in what?

Mr. Chairman, and Members, I actually do fear that we have entered into a kind of partnership with China, but certainly not the kind of partnership that Winston Lord had in mind.

It is a partnership that reveals that some elements in the American business community are so anxious to make a quick buck in China, and their supporters in government are so anxious to curry favor with the dictators in Beijing, that there is no policy or practice carried out by the Chinese Communist regime that we are not prepared to tolerate in the interest of preserving business as usual.

United States exports to China—which were already low to start with because China does not give MFN treatment to us—rose by 60 percent in the 5 years between 1989 and 1994.

During that same period, since the Tiananmen Square massacre, Chinese exports to the United States rose by 223 percent. And our trade deficit with China has gone up by a staggering 377 percent—to a level of $29.5 billion in 1994 alone.

In 1989, about 23 percent of China's total exports came to the United States. By 1994, that figure had risen to nearly 37 percent.

The trade deficit we are running with China will approach $40 billion this year and, within 2 years, it will be larger than the one we have with Japan.

And what do we have to show for all this? More specifically, what progress can be pointed to by those who advocate trade or commercial engagement—to use the administration's term—as the means for getting the Chinese regime to modify and reform its course?

The answer is already in as far as human rights are concerned.

Things have gone from horrible to worse, if that was even possible.

One effort after another to try to get China to open up has failed. That isn't me saying it—the State Department is saying it.

Yes, China loves our money. China loves its access to American markets. It's our ideas that have made America so successful a democracy that the Chinese dictatorship cannot stand.

But, today, I want to discuss a vitally important issue that is only now starting to get the international attention it deserves.

China's defiance of the nuclear nonproliferation regime is well known.

But only now is notice being taken of the rapid and unwarranted buildup of military power that China has been pursuing since 1989.

As long ago as 1980, China successfully test-fired an ICBM capable of delivering a nuclear warhead to a target up to 8,000 miles away.

But until 1989, most credible outside observers regarded the Chinese armed forces as being a rather cumbersome, bloated, politicized, and somewhat antiquated operation that might prove to be more of a hindrance to China's superpower ambitions than anything else.

All of that has changed since 1989. The gradual decline in military spending that had been seen since the late 1970's was reversed decisively in the aftermath of Tiananmen Square.

In 1994 alone, military spending in China rose by 22 percent over the previous year, which itself had seen a 13 percent increase over the year before that. All told, military spending has more than doubled since 1989.

And these figures I have cited represent only the tip of the iceberg—they are the figures which the Chinese regime publishes officially.

The true costs of research and development, procurement, and subsidies to the defense industry are evidently spread—and hidden—throughout China's national budget.

Along with this dramatic acceleration in military spending, China has totally revised its military doctrine since 1989.

The historic reliance on a huge, land-based army has been replaced by new emphases on the building of an expanded and survivable nuclear strike capability and the development of a modern navy.

Since the late 1980's, and aside from the rapid expansion in its fleet of surface ships, China has launched 11 submarines, each to be armed with 12 short-to-intermediate range missiles capable of delivering a nuclear warhead to a target up to 3,500 miles away.

In preparing for this debate, I was astonished to learn that the authoritative Jane's Information Group, based in London, has estimated that if present economic trends in China continue, and if military spending continues to grow at its present rate, by the year 2000 China will have the second largest defense budget in the world—and it could total well over $100 billion a year.

Mr. Speaker, all of this is taking place at a time when virtually every other country on earth is reducing its military spending.

Moreover, it is coming at a time when China's borders have been more secure than at any time in at least the last 150 years.

I sadly fear that the current sabre-rattling in the Spratly Islands, which are 900 miles from China and well within the territorial waters of the Philippines, is only a small taste of what it is to come.

Mr. Speaker, I believe United States policy toward China is wrong-headed and leading us to disaster. I believed this under President Bush and I believe it under President Clinton.

When are we going to see the Chinese regime for what it truly is?

A remorseless, ambitious, amoral, self-confident, even cocky, communist dictatorship that is bent on achieving regional dominance throughout the Far East—that's what it is.

And the Far East isn't where China's ambitions stop. Believe me, a China which is not at peace with its own people will not be at peace with America.

During the cold war, there were Members of Congress who criticized—and rightly so, in certain instances—some of the unsavory characters and regimes with which our Government was pursuing a relationship in the interest of containing communism.

But what is our excuse now? Now that the Soviet Union has collapsed, what is the urgency of maintaining business-as-usual with the likes of Beijing?

From 1945 on, we were faced with the reality of Soviet power and ambition. It was there—we had no choice but to try to contain it.

But in the 1990's, we seem bound and determined to do what ever we can to help give the Chinese Communist regime the means to realize its national ambitions.

Not that the people of China will benefit. They will suffer the consequences of this folly just as surely as we will.

That is why, Mr. Speaker and Members, I believe human rights and American values have to be put back into the central focus of the United States-China relationship.

Mr. Speaker, I implore all Members to vote for the temporary cutoff of most-favored-nations-status to China until they abandon their rogue status that has no respect for human rights or human life itself.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me just say that I despise the Chinese Government as much as anybody in this body. Let me just back up before I say that and say, if there is any blame for the procedure today, it is my fault. If you blame, blame me.

We met with the dissidents, we met with those who have family members in jail, we met with the Christians in China, and they said this would be the best procedure for them. They said if we could get a good, strong vote, and in the resolution that many of you maybe did not even read, do not denigrate the resolution. It for the first time puts the Congress on record in support of the democracy movement.

Let me tell you, those of you who love MFN, it has put you on a spot, because next year if the Chinese have not stopped all they are doing, many of you are going to be morally obligated to take it away. This is good and this is what the dissidents in China said. This is what the people who are students have come and said. This helps them. And I wanted to do it.

Second of all, Harry Wu is a friend of mine. I helped bring Harry to town. I feel responsible in some respects for Harry being in jail. I have been in touch with Harry's wife for the last few weeks. She has been by my office. We have set up all the meetings. I care about Harry. What happens to Harry is partially my responsibility.

□ 1415

My colleagues are men and women who are absolved from it. They did not bring him to town. They did not hold the hearings. They did not push Harry's organ transplant video out. I did, and he is my responsibility. And if I offended anybody, I apologize, but I take the full and complete responsibility for the procedure that we are doing.

Go back into China. They are killing people in China 25 and under and using their kidneys for transplant. We know that. We know that because of Harry. We have been trying to get many of our colleagues to come and see the film; not many have come and seen the film.

We also know that they have a forced population policy. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has been a leader in that. We have a video, that we could not get many of our colleagues to come to see, that we showed

the other day where there are dying rooms. They put baby girls in these rooms and they die. They die. They do not feed them.

My colleagues say, ''What are you talking about?'' Come to my office. I will show you the video. That is what they do. We know they sold weapons. They sold weapons to Iraq that killed American men and women. We know that. We know they are selling chemical weapons. We know what they are doing with regard to their nuclear technology. They are selling weapons to the Khartoum Government in Sudan that are being used to kill black Africans in the Sudan.

I know how bad they are. I know they are worse than many of my colleagues even think they are. Do I believe that business is necessarily going to change them? I don't believe it. I am not a mercantile Republican Cato libertarian. I don't believe business necessarily changes it.

Mr. Speaker, I have been to the Holocaust Museum and I saw the people that made the same argument with Nazi Germany in 1933 and 1935 and 1937. Do a little more business and maybe it will change them. I do not believe it will.

I have met with Li Peng, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and I. He is a butcher. He has blood on his hands. The blood drips from his hands. And some day when Li Peng stands before the King of Kings and the Lord of Lords, he is going to have to explain what he did and how he killed all of those people.

But what does that get us now? We can put our frustration and offer it, and I apologize and ask my colleagues' forgiveness. I beg their forgiveness if I offended anybody. But if we get a vote with 35 or 38, we will confuse the Chinese. They do not know what that means; they know what this means.

And many of my colleagues, many of them voted for this really without reading it. This is tough. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] did a great job. And I take my hat off to the Speaker. The Speaker was involved in working this out. I do not think we could have done it if he had not put his personal prestige on the line. This was not some fly by night thing we did. This will help the democracy movement in China.

As I made a note, as I commented the first time I debated it, I said every night I pray for China. I pray that China is free. I remember once I was at a town meeting several years ago and a lady asked me, ''What happened? Why did communism fall?'' And you know what I said to her? I said what any Republican would say. I said, ''It fell because we had the B–1 and Ronald Reagan was tough and all.''

And you know what she said? She said, ''Young man that is not why it fell. Maybe that helped, but'' she said, ''communism fell because many of us as little girls and boys have been praying for the defeat of communism.''

Mr. Speaker, we should pray and we can pray for the defeat of communism in China and I believe it will come. We will all live to see it. We will live to see the day when they can sell Popsicles in Tiananmen Square and laugh and run and do all those things. Do my colleagues want that to happen? The resolution you passed is the right thing. Do not even have a vote to table, because it will confuse people.

Mr. Speaker, my last comment is the Congress has been on record and my colleagues are going to have to deal with this next year. Unless the Good Lord takes me, I am coming back next year and if there has been no change, we are going to put in a motion to disapprove.

The last thing I say to the business community, if they happen to be listening, I would have hoped that the business community would have taken the same attitude that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] and many Republicans and Democrats who have come together. The business community has been silent. They have been silent.

It reminds me of the statement about selling the rope to hang themselves. They have been silent and that has been disappointing. I would have hoped that Boeing would have spoken out and I would have hoped that TRW would have spoken out, but they went silent.

But the Congress did not go silent. We have a lot to be proud of. The message that I want the Chinese peasants to hear tomorrow morning when they listen to the little crystal set and they pick up the TV station or radio show, the United States Congress, the people's Congress, the Congress that the American people elect here, will send a message that we care deeply; that we commend, not condemn, the freedom movement; that we condemn slave labor; that we condemn the organ transplants; we condemn the forced population policy. We condemn all of them.

Mr. Speaker, we require this administration, which has been equally bad as the Bush administration on this, to make reports, so next year when this comes out we have the reports that are due.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, Radio Free Asia whereby when we go to Eastern Europe they would say that the Radio Free Europe made a difference.

I want to thank those who were involved in this. Again, it is my fault for messing up, if we messed up. It was a mistake of the heart and not of the mind, if you will.

Now, I would hope and pray that there be no vote, but I understand that Members would do it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 193, and sections 152 and 153 of the Trade Act of 1974, the previous question is ordered.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WOLF

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 193, I offer a motion.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Pursuant to House Resolution 193, Mr. WOLF moves to lay the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 96, on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] to lay the joint resolution on the table.

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

Mr. LANTOS. 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 321, nays 107, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 537]

YEAS—321

Ackerman	Cramer	Greenwood
Allard	Crane	Gunderson
Archer	Crapo	Gutknecht
Armey	Cremeans	Hall (OH)
Baesler	Cubin	Hall (TX)
Baker (LA)	Cunningham	Hamilton
Baldacci	Danner	Hancock
Barcia	Davis	Hansen
Barrett (NE)	de la Garza	Harman
Barrett (WI)	Deal	Hastert
Bartlett	DeLauro	Hastings (FL)
Barton	DeLay	Hastings (WA)
Bass	Deutsch	Hayes
Bateman	Dickey	Hayworth
Becerra	Dicks	Herger
Beilenson	Dingell	Hilleary
Bentsen	Dixon	Hinchey
Bereuter	Doggett	Hoke
Berman	Dooley	Hostettler
Bevill	Doyle	Houghton
Bilbray	Dreier	Hyde
Bilirakis	Dunn	Istook
Bishop	Durbin	Jackson-Lee
Bliley	Edwards	Jacobs
Blute	Ehlers	Johnson (CT)
Boehlert	Emerson	Johnson (SD)
Boehner	English	Johnson, E. B.
Bonilla	Ensign	Johnson, Sam
Bonior	Eshoo	Johnston
Bono	Everett	Kanjorski
Borski	Ewing	Kasich
Boucher	Farr	Kelly
Brewster	Fattah	Kennedy (RI)
Browder	Fawell	Kennelly
Brown (CA)	Fazio	Kim
Brown (FL)	Fields (TX)	Kingston
Brownback	Filner	Kleczka
Bryant (TN)	Flake	Klink
Bryant (TX)	Flanagan	Klug
Bunn	Foglietta	Knollenberg
Buyer	Foley	Kolbe
Callahan	Fowler	LaFalce
Calvert	Fox	LaHood
Camp	Franks (CT)	Largent
Canady	Franks (NJ)	Latham
Castle	Frelinghuysen	LaTourette
Chabot	Frisa	Laughlin
Chambliss	Frost	Lazio
Christensen	Furse	Leach
Chrysler	Gallegly	Levin
Clayton	Ganske	Lewis (CA)
Clement	Gekas	Lightfoot
Clinger	Gephardt	Lincoln
Clyburn	Geren	Linder
Coleman	Gibbons	Livingston
Collins (GA)	Gilchrest	LoBiondo
Collins (IL)	Gillmor	Lofgren
Combest	Gilman	Longley
Condit	Gonzalez	Lowey
Conyers	Goodlatte	Lucas
Costello	Gordon	Luther
Coyne	Green	Maloney

Manton
Manzullo
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McIntosh
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pomeroy
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schumer
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Tejeda
Thomas
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Towns
Tucker
Upton
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Ward
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—107

Abercrombie
Andrews
Baker (CA)
Ballenger
Barr
Brown (OH)
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Cardin
Chapman
Chenoweth
Coble
Coburn
Cooley
Cox
DeFazio
Dellums
Diaz-Balart
Doolittle
Dornan
Duncan
Ehrlich
Engel
Evans
Fields (LA)
Forbes
Ford
Frank (MA)
Funderburk
Gejdenson
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Gutierrez
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Hilliard
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Horn
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Inglis
Jones
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kildee
King
Lantos
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
Markey
McDermott
McInnis
McKinney
Menendez
Metcalf
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mink
Nadler
Oberstar
Olver
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Parker
Payne (NJ)
Pombo
Porter
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Royce
Sanders
Scarborough
Schroeder
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stockman
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thompson
Torricelli
Traficant
Velazquez
Vento
Waldholtz
Wamp
Waters
Watt (NC)
Weldon (PA)
Wynn

NOT VOTING—6

Bachus
Clay
Collins (MI)
Jefferson
Moakley
Reynolds

☐ 1444

Messrs. DOOLITTLE, WAMP, WYNN, COBLE, LEWIS of Kentucky, Ms. WATERS, and Messrs. MEEHAN, SPENCE, PORTER, HEFNER, and GRAHAM changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. SMITH of Michigan, WISE, ACKERMAN, CUNNINGHAM, BECERRA, RANGEL, RAHALL, REED, DICKEY, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. ORTIZ, and Mr. MEEHAN changed their vote from ''nay'' to yea.''

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, July 19, I missed two rollcall votes during consideration of H.R. 2020, the Treasury, Postal Service, general Government appropriations for fiscal year 1996, and one rollcall vote during consideration of H.R. 1976, the Agriculture appropriation for fiscal year 1996. On rollcall vote No. 527 I would have voted ''aye.'' On rollcall No. 528 I would have voted ''nay.'' On rollcall No. 535 I would have voted ''nay.''

☐ 1545

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 188 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1976.

☐ 1445

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1976) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes with Mr. KLUG in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, July 9, 1995, the amendments en bloc printed in House Report 104–185 offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] had been disposed of.

The Clerk will designate title I.

The text of title I is as follows:

H.R. 1976

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS

PRODUCTION, PROCESSING, AND MARKETING

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture, and not to exceed $75,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $10,227,000, of which $7,500,000 shall be available for InfoShare: *Provided,* That not to exceed $11,000 of this amount, along with any unobligated balances of representation funds in the Foreign Agricultural Service shall be available for official reception and representation expenses, not otherwise provided for, as determined by the Secretary.

EXECUTIVE OPERATIONS

CHIEF ECONOMIST

For necessary expenses of the Chief Economist, including economic analysis, risk assessment, cost benefit analysis, and the functions of the World Agricultural Outlook Board, as authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1622g), and including employment pursuant to the second sentence of the section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed $5,000 is for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $3,748,000.

NATIONAL APPEALS DIVISION

For necessary expenses of the National Appeals Division, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed $25,000 is for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $11,846,000.

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND PROGRAM ANALYSIS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Budget and Program Analysis, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed $5,000 is for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $5,899,000.

CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Chief Financial Officer, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed $10,000 is for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $4,133,000: *Provided,* That the Chief Financial Officer shall reinstate and market cross-servicing activities of the National Finance Center: *Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall be used to obtain, modify, re-engineer, license, operate, implement, or expand commercial off-the-shelf financial management software systems or existing commercial off-the-shelf system financial management contracts, beyond general ledger systems and accounting support software, at the National Finance Center until thirty legislative days after the Secretary of Agriculture submits to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a complete and thorough cost-benefit analysis and a certification by the Secretary of Agriculture that this analysis provides a detailed and accurate cost-benefit analysis comparison between obtaining or expanding commercial off-the-shelf software systems and conducting identical or comparable software systems acquisitions, re-engineering, or modifications in-house.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ADMINISTRATION

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration to carry out the programs funded in this Act, $596,000.

AGRICULTURE BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES AND RENTAL PAYMENTS

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For payment of space rental and related costs pursuant to Public Law 92–313, including authorities pursuant to the 1984 delegation of authority from the Administrator of General Services to the Department of Agriculture, for programs and activities of the Department which are included in this Act, $110,187,000, of which $20,216,000 shall be retained by the Department for the operation, maintenance, and repair of Agriculture buildings: *Provided,* That in the event an agency within the Department should require modification of space needs, the Secretary of Agriculture may transfer a share of that agency's appropriation made available by this Act to this appropriation, or may transfer a share of this appropriation to that agency's appropriation, but such transfers shall not exceed 5 percent of the funds made available for space rental and related costs to or from this account. In addition, for construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities as necessary to carry out the programs of the Department, where not otherwise provided, $25,587,000, to remain available until expended; making a total appropriation of $135,774,000.

ADVISORY COMMITTEES (USDA)

For necessary expenses for activities of advisory committees of the Department of Agriculture which are included in this Act, $800,000: *Provided,* That no other funds appropriated to the Department in this Act shall be available to the Department for support of activities of advisory committees.

HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Department of Agriculture, to comply with the requirement of section 107(g) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 9607(g), section 6001 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 6961, $15,700,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That appropriations and funds available herein to the Department for Hazardous Waste Management may be transferred to any agency of the Department for its use in meeting all requirements pursuant to the above Acts on Federal and non-Federal lands.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For Personnel, Operations, Information Resources Management, Civil Rights Enforcement, Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization, Administrative Law Judges and Judicial Officer, Disaster Management and Coordination, and Modernization of the Administrative Process, $27,986,000, to provide for necessary expenses for management support services to offices of the Department and for general administration and disaster management of the Department, repairs and alterations, and other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for and necessary for the practical and efficient work of the Department, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed $10,000 is for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be reimbursed from applicable appropriations in this Act for travel expenses incident to the holding of hearings as required by 5 U.S.C. 551–558.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR CONGRESSIONAL RELATIONS

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations to carry out the programs funded in this Act, including programs involving intergovernmental affairs and liaison within the executive branch, $3,797,000: *Provided,* That no other funds appropriated to the Department in this Act shall be available to the Department for support of activities of congressional relations.

OFFICE OF COMMUNICATIONS

For necessary expenses to carry on services relating to the coordination of programs involving public affairs, for the dissemination of agricultural information, and the coordination of information, work, and programs authorized by Congress in the Department, $8,198,000, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed $10,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, and not to exceed $2,000,000 may be used for farmers' bulletins.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Inspector General, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $63,639,000, including such sums as may be necessary for contracting and other arrangements with public agencies and private persons pursuant to section 6(a)(9) of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, including a sum not to exceed $50,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109; and including a sum not to exceed $95,000 for certain confidential operational expenses including the payment of informants, to be expended under the direction of the Inspector General pursuant to Public Law 95–452 and section 1337 of Public Law 97–98.

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

For necessary expenses of the Office of the General Counsel, $27,860,000.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR RESEARCH, EDUCATION AND ECONOMICS

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education and Economics to administer the laws enacted by the Congress for the Economic Research Service, the National Agricultural Statistics Service, the Agricultural Research Service and the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service, $520,000.

ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE

For necessary expenses of the Economic Research Service in conducting economic research and analysis, as authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621–1627) and other laws, $53,131,000: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225).

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS SERVICE

For necessary expenses of the National Agricultural Statistics Service in conducting statistical reporting and service work, including crop and livestock estimates, statistical coordination and improvements, and marketing surveys, as authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621–1627) and other laws, $81,107,000: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $40,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to enable the Agricultural Research Service to perform agricultural research and demonstration relating to production, utilization, marketing, and distribution (not otherwise provided for); home economics or nutrition and consumer use including the acquisition, preservation, and dissemination of agricultural information; and for acquisition of lands by donation, exchange, or purchase at a nominal cost not to exceed $100, $705,610,000: *Provided,* That appropriations hereunder shall be available for temporary employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $115,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further,* That appropriations hereunder shall be available for the operation and maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed one for replacement only: *Provided further,* That appropriations hereunder shall be available pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 2250 for the construction, alteration, and repair of buildings and improvements, but unless otherwise provided the cost of constructing any one building shall not exceed $250,000, except for headhouses or greenhouses which shall each be limited to $1,000,000, and except for ten buildings to be constructed or improved at a cost not to exceed $500,000 each, and the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 percent of the current replacement value of the building or $250,000, whichever is greater: *Provided further,* That the limitations on alterations contained in this Act shall not apply to modernization or replacement of existing facilities at Beltsville, Maryland: *Provided further,* That the foregoing limitations shall not apply to replacement of buildings needed to carry out the Act of April 24, 1948 (21 U.S.C. 113a): *Provided further,* That the foregoing limitations shall not apply to the purchase of land at Beckley, West Virginia: *Provided further,* That not to exceed $190,000 of this appropriation may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for the Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education and Economics for the scientific review of international issues involving agricultural chemicals and food additives: *Provided further,* That funds may be received from any State, other political subdivision, organization, or individual for the purpose of establishing or operating any research facility or research project of the Agricultural Research Service, as authorized by law: *Provided further,* That all rights and title of the United States in the property known as USDA Houma Sugar Cane Research Laboratory, consisting of approximately 20 acres in the City of Houma and 150 acres of farmland in Chacahula, Louisiana, including facilities and equipment, shall be conveyed to the American Sugar Cane League: *Provided further,* That all rights and title of the United States in the Agricultural Research Station at Brawley, California, consisting of 80 acres of land, including facilities and equipment, shall be conveyed to Imperial County, California: *Provided further,* That all rights and title of the United States in the Pecan Genetics and Improvement Research Laboratory, consisting of 84.2 acres of land, including facilities and equipment, shall be conveyed to Texas A&M University: *Provided further,* That the property originally conveyed by the State of Tennessee to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service, in Lewisburg, Tennessee be conveyed to the University of Tennessee.

None of the funds in the foregoing paragraph shall be available to carry out research related to the production, processing or marketing of tobacco or tobacco products.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For acquisition of land, construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities as necessary to carry out the agricultural research programs of the Department of Agriculture, where not otherwise provided, $30,200,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b): *Provided*, That funds may be received from any State, other political subdivision, organization, or individual for the purpose of establishing any research facility of the Agricultural Research Service, as authorized by law.

COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND EXTENSION SERVICE

RESEARCH AND EDUCATION ACTIVITIES

For payments to agricultural experiment stations, for cooperative forestry and other research, for facilities, and for other expenses, including $166,165,000 to carry into effect the provisions of the Hatch Act (7 U.S.C. 361a–361i); $20,185,000 for grants for cooperative forestry research (16 U.S.C. 582a–582–a7); $27,313,000 for payments to the 1890 land-grant colleges, including Tuskegee University (7 U.S.C. 3222); $31,485,000 for special grants for agricultural research (7 U.S.C. 450i(c)); $11,599,000 for special grants for agricultural research on improved pest control (7 U.S.C. 450i(c)); $98,810,000 for competitive research grants (7 U.S.C. 450i(b)); $5,051,000 for the support of animal health and disease programs (7 U.S.C. 195); $1,150,000 for supplemental and alternative crops and products (7 U.S.C. 3319d); $475,000 for rangeland research grants (7 U.S.C. 3331–3336); $3,500,000 for higher education graduate fellowships grants (7 U.S.C. 3152(b)(6)), to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b); $4,350,000 for higher education challenge grants (7 U.S.C. 3152(b)(1)); $1,000,000 for a higher education minority scholars program (7 U.S.C. 3152(b)(5)), to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b); $4,000,000 for aquaculture grants (7 U.S.C. 3322); $8,000,000 for sustainable agriculture research and education (7 U.S.C. 5811); and $6,289,000 for necessary expenses of Research and Education Activities, of which not to exceed $100,000 shall be for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109; in all, $389,372,000.

None of the funds in the foregoing paragraph shall be available to carry out research related to the production, processing or marketing of tobacco or tobacco products.

NATIVE AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS ENDOWMENT FUND

For establishment of a Native American institutions endowment fund, as authorized by Public Law 130–382 (7 U.S.C. 301 note.), $4,600,000.

EXTENSION ACTIVITIES

Payments to States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, Micronesia, Northern Marianas, and American Samoa: For payments for cooperative extension work under the Smith-Lever Act, as amended, to be distributed under sections 3(b) and 3(c) of said Act, and under section 208(c) of Public Law 93–471, for retirement and employees' compensation costs for extension agents and for costs of penalty mail for cooperative extension agents and State extension directors, $264,405,000; payments for the nutrition and family education program for low-income areas under section 3(d) of the Act, $59,588,000; payments for the pest management program under section 3(d) of the Act, $10,947,000; payments for the farm safety program under section 3(d) of the Act, $2,898,000; payments for the pesticide impact assessment program under section 3(d) of the Act, $3,363,000; payments to upgrade 1890 land-grant college research, extension, and teaching facilities as authorized by section 1447 of Public Law 95–113, as amended (7 U.S.C. 3222b), $7,664,000, to remain available until expended; payments for the rural development centers under section 3(d) of the Act, $921,000; payments for a groundwater quality program under section 3(d) of the Act, $10,897,000; payments for the agricultural telecommunications program, as authorized by Public Law 101–624 (7 U.S.C. 5926), $1,184,000; payments for youth-at-risk programs under section 3(d) of the Act, $9,700,000; payments for a food safety program under section 3(d) of the Act, $2,400,000; payments for carrying out the provisions of the Renewable Resources Extension Act of 1978, $3,241,000; payments for Indian reservation agents under section 3(d) of the Act, $1,697,000; payments for sustainable agriculture programs under section 3(d) of the Act, $3,463,000; payments for cooperative extension work by the colleges receiving the benefits of the second Morrill Act (7 U.S.C. 321–326, 328) and Tuskegee University, $24,708,000; and for Federal administration and coordination including administration of the Smith-Lever Act, as amended, and the Act of September 29, 1977 (7 U.S.C. 341–349), as amended, and section 1361(c) of the Act of October 3, 1980 (7 U.S.C. 301n), and to coordinate and provide program leadership for the extension work of the Department and the several States and insular possessions, $6,181,000; in all, $413,257,000: *Provided*, That funds hereby appropriated pursuant to section 3(c) of the Act of June 26, 1953, and section 506 of the Act of June 23, 1972, as amended, shall not be paid to any State, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, or the Virgin Islands, Micronesia, Northern Marianas, and American Samoa prior to availability of an equal sum from non-Federal sources for expenditure during the current fiscal year.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR MARKETING AND REGULATORY PROGRAMS

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs to administer programs under the laws enacted by the Congress for the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Agricultural Marketing Service, and the Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, $605,000.

ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, including those pursuant to the Act of February 28, 1947, as amended (21 U.S.C. 114b–c), necessary to prevent, control, and eradicate pests and plant and animal diseases; to carry out inspection, quarantine, and regulatory activities; to discharge the authorities of the Secretary of Agriculture under the Act of March 2, 1931 (46 Stat. 1468; 7 U.S.C. 426–426b); and to protect the environment, as authorized by law, $333,410,000, of which $4,799,000 shall be available for the control of outbreaks of insects, plant diseases, animal diseases and for control of pest animals and birds to the extent necessary to meet emergency conditions: *Provided*, That in fiscal year 1996, amounts in the agricultural quarantine inspection user fee account shall be available for authorized purposes without further appropriation: *Provided further*, That no funds shall be used to formulate or administer a brucellosis eradication program for the current fiscal year that does not require minimum matching by the States of at least 40 percent: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for field employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $40,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for the operation and maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed four, of which two shall be for replacement only: *Provided further*, That, in addition, in emergencies which threaten any segment of the agricultural production industry of this country, the Secretary may transfer from other appropriations or funds available to the agencies or corporations of the Department such sums as he may deem necessary, to be available only in such emergencies for the arrest and eradication of contagious or infectious diseases or pests of animals, poultry, or plants, and for expenses in accordance with the Act of February 28, 1947, as amended, and section 102 of the Act of September 21, 1944, as amended, and any unexpended balances of funds transferred for such emergency purposes in the next preceding fiscal year shall be merged with such transferred amounts: *Provided further*, That appropriations hereunder shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2250) for the repair and alteration of leased buildings and improvements, but unless otherwise provided the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 percent of the current replacement value of the building.

In fiscal year 1996 the agency is authorized to collect fees to cover the total costs of providing technical assistance, goods, or services requested by States, other political subdivisions, domestic and international organizations, foreign governments, or individuals, provided that such fees are structured such that any entity's liability for such fees is reasonably based on the technical assistance, goods, or services provided to the entity by the agency, and such fees shall be credited to this account, to remain available until expended, without further appropriation, for providing such assistance, goods, or services.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For plans, construction, repair, preventive maintenance, environmental support, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities, as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 2250, and acquisition of land as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 428a, $12,541,000, to remain available until expended.

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE

MARKETING SERVICES

For necessary expenses to carry on services related to consumer protection, agricultural marketing and distribution, transportation, and regulatory programs, as authorized by law, and for administration and coordination of payments to States; including field employment pursuant to section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $90,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $46,662,000, including funds for the wholesale market development program for the design and development of wholesale and farmer market facilities for the major metropolitan areas of the country: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2250) for the alteration and repair of buildings and improvements, but the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 percent of the current replacement value of the building.

Fees may be collected for the cost of standardization activities, as established by regulation pursuant to law (31 U.S.C. 9701).

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Not to exceed $58,461,000 (from fees collected) shall be obligated during the current fiscal year for administrative expenses: *Provided,* That if crop size is understated and/or other uncontrollable events occur, the agency may exceed this limitation by up to 10 percent with notification to the Appropriations Committees.

FUNDS FOR STRENGTHENING MARKETS, INCOME, AND SUPPLY (SECTION 32)

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Funds available under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c) shall be used only for commodity program expenses as authorized therein, and other related operating expenses, except for: (1) transfers to the Department of Commerce as authorized by the Fish and Wildlife Act of August 8, 1956; (2) transfers otherwise provided in this Act; and (3) not more than $10,451,000 for formulation and administration of marketing agreements and orders pursuant to the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and the Agricultural Act of 1961.

In fiscal year 1996, no more than $23,900,000 in section 32 funds shall be used to promote sunflower and cottonseed oil exports as authorized by section 1541 of Public Law 101–624 (7 U.S.C. 1464 note), and such funds shall be used to facilitate additional sales of such oils in world markets.

PAYMENTS TO STATES AND POSSESSIONS

For payments to departments of agriculture, bureaus and departments of markets, and similar agencies for marketing activities under section 204(b) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1623(b)), $1,000,000.

GRAIN INSPECTION, PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the United States Grain Standards Act, as amended, for the administration of the Packers and Stockyards Act, for certifying procedures used to protect purchasers of farm products, and the standardization activities related to grain under the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, as amended, including field employment pursuant to section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $25,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $23,058,000: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2250) for the alteration and repair of buildings and improvements, but the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 percent of the current replacement value of the building.

INSPECTION AND WEIGHING SERVICES

LIMITATION ON INSPECTION AND WEIGHING SERVICES EXPENSES

Not to exceed $42,784,000 (from fees collected) shall be obligated during the current fiscal year for inspection and weighing services: *Provided,* That if grain export activities require additional supervision and oversight, or other uncontrollable factors occur, this limitation may be exceeded by up to 10 percent with notification to the Appropriations Committees.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FOOD SAFETY

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety to administer the laws enacted by the Congress for the Food Safety and Inspection Service, $450,000.

FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE

For necessary expenses to carry on services authorized by the Federal Meat Inspection Act, as amended, the Poultry Products Inspection Act, as amended, and the Egg Products Inspection Act, as amended, $540,365,000, and in addition, $1,000,000 may be credited to this account from fees collected for the cost of laboratory accreditation as authorized by section 1017 of Public Law 102–237: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall not be available for shell egg surveillance under section 5(d) of the Egg Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 1034(d)): *Provided further,* That this appropriation shall be available for field employment pursuant to section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $75,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further,* That this appropriation shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2250) for the alteration and repair of buildings and improvements, but the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 percent of the current replacement value of the building: *Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of Agriculture to promulgate, implement, or administer any rules of the Food Safety and Inspection Service, as set forth in parts 301–391 of title 9, Code of Federal Regulations, pursuant to the agency's proposed rule: Pathogen Reduction; Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point (HACCP) Systems: Docket No. 93–016P; published on February 3, 1995, and any successor dockets published thereafter, except that the Secretary may take such action after a committee has been established, in accordance with the negotiated rulemaking procedures provided in 5 U.S.C. 561 et seq., and that committee has transmitted, within nine months of establishment of such committee, a report based on a review of (1) HACCP principles; (2) current rules and other administrative requirements; and, (3) proposed rules and petitions pending before the agency.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FARM AND FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICES

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services to administer the laws enacted by Congress for the Consolidated Farm Service Agency, Foreign Agricultural Service, and the Commodity Credit Corporation, $549,000.

CONSOLIDATED FARM SERVICE AGENCY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for carrying out the administration and implementation of programs delegated to the Consolidated Farm Service Agency by the Secretary under the Federal Crop Insurance Reform and Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994, $788,388,000: *Provided,* That the Secretary is authorized to use the services, facilities, and authorities (but not the funds) of the Commodity Credit Corporation to make program payments for all programs administered by the Agency: *Provided further,* That other funds made available to the Agency for authorized activities may be advanced to and merged with this account: *Provided further,* That these funds shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $500,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

STATE MEDIATION GRANTS

For grants pursuant to section 502(b) of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1987, as amended (7 U.S.C. 5101–5106), $2,000,000.

DAIRY INDEMNITY PROGRAM

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses involved in making indemnity payments to dairy farmers for milk or cows producing such milk and manufacturers of dairy products who have been directed to remove their milk or dairy products from commercial markets because it contained residues of chemicals registered and approved for use by the Federal Government, and in making indemnity payments for milk, or cows producing such milk, at a fair market value to any dairy farmer who is directed to remove his milk from commercial markets because of (1) the presence of products of nuclear radiation or fallout if such contamination is not due to the fault of the farmer, or (2) residues of chemicals or toxic substances not included under the first sentence of the Act of August 13, 1968, as amended (7 U.S.C. 450j), if such chemicals or toxic substances were not used in a manner contrary to applicable regulations or labeling instructions provided at the time of use and the contamination is not due to the fault of the farmer, $100,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b): *Provided,* That none of the funds contained in this Act shall be used to make indemnity payments to any farmer whose milk was removed from commercial markets as a result of his willful failure to follow procedures prescribed by the Federal Government: *Provided further,* That this amount shall be transferred to the Commodity Credit Corporation: *Provided further,* That the Secretary is authorized to utilize the services, facilities, and authorities of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the purpose of making dairy indemnity disbursements.

AGRICULTURAL CREDIT INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For gross obligations for the principal amount of direct and guaranteed loans as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1928–1929, to be available from funds in the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund, as follows: farm ownership loans, $585,000,000, of which $550,000,000 shall be for guaranteed loans; operating loans, $2,300,000,000, of which $1,700,000,000 shall be for unsubsidized guaranteed loans and $200,000,000 shall be for subsidized guaranteed loans; Indian tribe land acquisition loans as authorized by 25 U.S.C. 488, $750,000; for emergency insured loans, $100,000,000 to meet the needs resulting from natural disasters; and for credit sales of acquired property, $22,500,000.

For the cost of direct and guaranteed loans, including the cost of modifying loans as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as follows: farm ownership loans, $28,206,000, of which $20,019,000 shall be for guaranteed loans; operating loans, $91,000,000, of which $18,360,000 shall be for unsubsidized guaranteed loans and $17,960,000 shall be for subsidized guaranteed loans; Indian tribe land acquisition loans as authorized by 25 U.S.C. 488, $206,000; for emergency insured loans, $32,080,000 to meet the needs resulting from natural disasters; and for credit sales of acquired property, $4,113,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, $221,541,000, which shall be transferred to and merged with the following accounts in the following amounts: $208,446,000 to ''Salaries and Expenses''; $318,000 to ''Rural Utilities Service, Salaries and Expenses''; and $171,000 to ''Rural Housing and Community Development Service, Salaries and Expenses''.

CORPORATIONS

The following corporations and agencies are hereby authorized to make expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to make contracts and commitments without regard

to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for such corporation or agency, except as hereinafter provided.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION FUND

For payments as authorized by section 516 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, such sums as may be necessary, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b).

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION FUND

REIMBURSEMENT FOR NET REALIZED LOSSES

For fiscal year 1996, such sums as may be necessary to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for net realized losses sustained, but not previously reimbursed (estimated to be $10,400,000,000 in the President's fiscal year 1996 Budget Request (H. Doc. 104–4)), but not to exceed $10,400,000,000, pursuant to section 2 of the Act of August 17, 1961, as amended (15 U.S.C. 713a–11).

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE FOR HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT

For fiscal year 1996, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not expend more than $5,000,000 for expenses to comply with the requirement of section 107(g) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 9607(g), and section 6001 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 6961: *Provided,* That expenses shall be for operations and maintenance costs only and that other hazardous waste management costs shall be paid for by the USDA Hazardous Waste Management appropriation in this Act.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title I?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALSH

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALSH: Page 24, on line 13 after the word ''building'' strike all down through and including ''agency'' on page 25, line 5.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, in the movie ''Cool Hand Luke,'' one of my favorites, perhaps the most memorable line was that of the boss of a prison labor camp to a recalcitrant Luke: ''What we have here is a failure to communicate.''

Well, that is what we have had here with these new regulations for meat inspection. There was bad faith between and among the stakeholders—FSIS, the inspectors, consumer activists, the industry, the State departments of agriculture and the USDA.

We set about to solve this problem. My amendment would have established a negotiated rulemaking, a statutory process, formalized and detailed. It would have established this needed dialog—a process for communication.

I did this because some of the principals had no faith in the current dialog. I did it out of a concern that small businesses might be put out of business for no good reason. And I did it, in spite of what critics said, out of a concern that there would be a delay in implementing the new higher standards because of lengthy litigation.

I truly believed that given the alternatives we had, this was the best way to proceed.

Obviously others disagreed with this approach. Mr. DURBIN of our subcommittee and Secretary of Agriculture Glickman took issue. They said it was a delay, but they admitted there were problems with the process.

We worked together, sometimes at odds, but always in the direction of finding the common ground. On Tuesday the Secretary sent a letter that I reviewed with Mr. ROBERTS, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture; Mr. SKEEN, chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations; and Mr. GUNDERSON, chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee on Livestock, Dairy, and Poultry. All felt that the Secretary's personal commitment to involve himself was not only important but critical to providing good faith in a new, more inclusive process.

The Secretary pledged a number of things.

Mr. Chairman, I include the letter from Secretary Glickman for the RECORD.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, DC, July 18, 1995.

Hon. JAMES WALSH,
House of Representatives, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR JIM: I appreciated the frank exchange of ideas during our recent meeting on the meat and poultry inspection regulatory process. That and other discussions I have had with Members of Congress convince me that we are all seeking the same goal of modernizing and improving the current meat and poultry inspection system to provide the safest possible food to the American consumer. I am personally committed to ensuring a thoughtful, thorough, and objective analysis by the Department of Agriculture (USDA) of all comments.

Unfortunately, I cannot agree that your amendment which requires the Department to establish a committee and await its report before moving forward is the best means of attaining our common objective. The unnecessary delay involved in suspending the current regulatory process is not consistent with the need to move to a Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point (HACCP) based inspection system as quickly as possible.

I sincerely share the desire to ensure that the regulatory process carefully weighs all relevant viewpoints in an undertaking of this magnitude. I therefore intend to create, as part of the rulemaking process, focused and extensive public meetings for direct discussion of the key concerns that were raised during the comment period. These public meetings will begin within the next few weeks and will provide all interested parties the opportunity for direct discussion of the major issues as well as other issues identified during the comment period and possible options for resolving these issues. Participants will include representatives of all stakeholders, including industry, producers, the scientific community, consumers, the Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS) and my office. These public meetings will be held to ensure that all outstanding questions are explored thoroughly and a full and frank discussion and exchange of ideas occurs. These meetings will be part of the record upon which the final rule is based. Furthermore, I intend to host personally a food safety forum this summer to identify both legislative and regulatory mandates that need to be changed to improve and reform the system. The public meetings and forum will not unnecessarily delay the issuance of a final rule and should reassure all parties that the regulatory process has included a comprehensive debate of all significant issues and related concerns.

While the adoption of a HACCP-based inspection system is needed, it is also important to address the integration of the new HACCP system into the current meat and poultry inspection system. I fully understand the importance of preventing bureaucratic layering and ensuring the best utilization of public and private funds. To ensure this second step of regulatory modernization and integration is achieved, FSIS will soon publish a comprehensive set of rulemaking notices to review current FSIS regulations, directives, policy notices, and policy memoranda. To be consistent with the HACCP-based inspection system, USDA will then review, revise, or repeal its existing regulations, as needed. I have directed FSIS to accelerate its work in this area. I am firmly committed to seeing that all existing food safety and inspection regulations are improved so redundancy is eliminated. Our proposed regulatory actions to achieve those objectives, which will include addressing integration of the HACCP system and the current system, will be published in the Federal Register before the HACCP final rule is published and any additional regulatory actions necessary to achieve these objectives will be completed before HACCP is required to be implemented.

I am making these commitments recognizing that a successful food safety system depends upon an active partnership among government, producers, industry, processors and the consuming public. I hope that with these steps we can avoid a divisive legislative debate and proceed together toward our common goal of improving our inspection system.

Sincerely,

DAN GLICKMAN,
Secretary.

Mr. Chairman, most important is the Secretary's effort to put good faith back into this. He is a new Secretary and we need to give him this opportunity.

The agreement that Secretary Glickman, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. DURBIN, and I worked out is Government at its best. It demonstrates that the executive and legislative branches can work together in good faith to do the people's business. That is the reason we were sent by our constituents to Congress, and I firmly believe that this entire legislative process has benefitted the public, the industry, and will result in a safer food supply for American families.

Mr. Chairman, for that reason, I have made my motion to strike the bill language.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me say at the outset that this has been an important debate, I think one of the more important debates over the period of time that I have served on this subcommittee, because it has focused on an issue which is literally a life and death issue for American families.

I want to commend my colleague from New York. Over the past several weeks, we have had some real differences of opinion, but I want to salute the gentleman, because he has

made an effort in a bipartisan manner to find a reasonable solution to a very difficult problem. Let me try to describe it to you in my terms and to give you an idea of why it is so important.

It was my good fortune at an early point in my life to work in a slaughterhouse. I spend 12 months as a college student working my way through college in a slaughterhouse. I learned a lot. I still eat meat, but I learned a lot about the inspection process, its strengths and its weaknesses.

There are many weaknesses in the current meat and poultry inspection system. But let me say at the outset, the United States is blessed like no other country in the world with one of the safest food supplies. We should never lose sight of that. As consumers, we can be more confident of what we buy in a store and eat in a restaurant than we can in most any other country in the world.

But I came to understand as a young man working in that slaughterhouse that the system we have today does not reach the level of scientific sophistication which American consumers want. Literally, Federal meat and poultry inspectors stand and watch as carcasses go by on the line. If they do not see or smell something unusual, they end up giving it a blue stamp, and off it goes to the store and eventually to our refrigerators and tables.

We now know that it not enough. The tragedy in the State of Washington 2 years ago, which my colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS], will describe in a moment, riveted our attention on the fact that some of the most vulnerable people in America are subject to dangerous illness and in many cases death from contaminated meat and poultry.

So we decided to do something about it, to move beyond the inspection system which we have used for over 85 years, to something more scientific and up-to-date. What an undertaking it is. Imagine all of the different groups interested in this issue, not just the obvious groups, the meat and poultry processors and producers, but also those who are interested in health issues and consumer issues, the business side of the equation, all of these people, some 200 different groups, coming together and trying now to reach an agreement, if they can, on a new system of meat and poultry inspection.

The gentleman from New York I think accurately represented the anxiety of some of these groups that they are not being taken seriously at the table, that they do not have a voice in the process, and that their concerns are not being weighed as they should be. The gentleman has prevailed on the Secretary of Agriculture to step in personally, as we will and as he has promised, and his word is good, that he will make sure as best he can it will be an orderly process with a good conclusion.

I might add, as Secretary Glickman has personally, we cannot guarantee that everyone will end up happy when it is all over. What we can do is get everyone their day in court, everyone an opportunity to express themselves.

Over the past 2 weeks I have received phone calls from Tarpov Packing Co. in Granite City, and Hansen Packing Co. in Jerseyville, IL, small operations, saying, ''DICK DURBIN, you are our friend, we know you want to help us, but do not do something that will put us out of business.'' I understand that. We do not want to put them out of business. We want to make changes that are sensible and reasonable, that protect American consumers.

As I said before, the reason why this is a more important debate than most is it is literally a life and death issue.

Nancy Donley of Chicago is a person I have come to know over the past several weeks. I talked to her just yesterday. This Tuesday was the second anniversary of the death of her 6-year-old son Alex. Alex ate a hamburger, it was contaminated with E. coli, and it killed him. She has written letters, which I will not read to you here but which have been part of the record in our committee, which I think would touch the heart of everyone.

So as we focus on this issue, it goes beyond numbers, it goes beyond bureaucracy, it goes beyond agency, it goes to the very human tragedies which can occur if we do not do our job right.

I salute the gentleman from New York, he is doing the right thing today. I think he has made real progress on this issue. I look forward to a satisfactory conclusion.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to be very brief here. I want to commend the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, Mr. ROBERTS, and I certainly want him to have an opportunity to speak, and I know he will, for his leadership in this effort. Also, I want to complement my colleague on the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH]. Coming from the State of Washington, I see some of my colleagues from Washington State on the floor. We had a very serious E. coli breakout in our State 3 years ago. Three young children died, hundreds were sick, and so I was definitely very concerned in the appropriations committee when there was an effort to delay the implementation of the new regulations, which our ranking member, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], so carefully described, someone who has had great experience in this area.

But I think this is a model of how we should work these problems out, and I commend the gentleman from New York for engaging Secretary Glickman and the chairman of the authorizing committee and the Democratic Members, and they were able to work out a reasonable compromise on this issue. We will not delay the new regulations from going into place.

What the gentleman from New York wanted, properly, and I wanted to commend the chairman, too, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], for facilitating this, was that all the parties should be heard. He talked about a negotiated rulemaking, which I happen to believe this was too complicated an issue for that, but we got the same achievement by giving all the parties the ability to participate.

□ 1500

The most important thing is we are protecting the American consumers. Seven thousand people a year die from salmonella or E. coli and hundreds more, hundreds of thousands more are sick and ill. So this is a serious consumer issue, and some of us on the Committee on Appropriations have been very concerned that there has been a pattern of, in essence, gutting health, safety and environmental legislation in the name of helping the private sector. That is not right. The American people do not want unsafe meat. They do not want unsafe drinking water.

So I commend the gentleman from New York for working this problem out and getting a satisfactory result that is in the interest of the country and in the interest of consumers and certainly in the interest of the people of Washington State, because we went through a terrible crisis just a year or so ago.

So I commend the gentleman and I support his motion to strike.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the words of my friends, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], as well. Most of us had never heard of E. coli before a few years ago. A child in my district also was affected and died. If Members can imagine the parents, very loving parents telling them that they were relieved when their child died because of the extreme pain and agony that that child was going through, it kind of reemphasizes the issue to them.

I think, second, and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] has talked about this, E. coli is still out there. What happens in our meat processing, if you still have fecal material left on the meat and that meat moves on, it can turn into the E. coli. And they say, well, all you have to do is cook your hamburger well. I personally do not want it on there in the first place. I think it is something that in our food processing that we can. I would like to, again, thank the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], because I do not think without his leadership this whole issue would have come to resolution.

I would also like to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH], because I think at times when we look at dialog, it is good, but when we take action where children's lives are at risk, I think it is very, very important.

We have a group in San Diego called Stop, and they have been very active. And I am sure that in Washington State they have got an equal group that are parents that have gone through this disaster with their children. I would like to commend all parties. I think this is something in bipartisanship that I think is a proud day. I thank God we had not a failure to communicate on this issue.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to also take this opportunity to congratulate my friend and colleague, the gentleman from New York, [Mr. WALSH], and also especially my good friend and former colleague Secretary Glickman, for their hard work and statesmanship, I think, in resolving this very complex problem. This agreement in part grew out of a meeting between Secretary Glickman, the former chairman and current distinguished ranking minority member of the House Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. DE LA GARZA], the current chairman of the appropriate subcommittee that will be bringing a meat inspection, a food safety inspection bill to the floor, the gentleman from Wisconsin, [Mr. GUNDERSON], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER], and probably the godfather of all meat inspection legislation in regards to sound science, the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. STENHOLM], and myself.

I would like to thank each of these individuals for really coming together in a bipartisan spirit to underscore the importance of restoring really some credibility to the rulemaking process.

By doing so, I think it is obvious we have averted what had been a very divisive debate on meat inspection policy. I think that really food safety goals are better served by careful, reasoned discussion than by real emotional rhetoric. It is understandable but I think this process certainly is preferable.

Secretary Glickman has assured Mr. WALSH that he will personally take control of the rulemaking process for the Mega Reg. Secretary Glickman has also pledged that he will ensure all stakeholders, as has been indicated, consumers, small and large processors, scientists, inspector unions and producers, all now will have an opportunity to really participate in developing a balanced and workable inspection regulation.

Our problem is not that we have too little inspection and also regulation. Our problem is that we have the wrong kind. We do not need some more additional regulatory burdens. We need a sound-science, risk-based system.

So, again, I want to really credit the Secretary and I also want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin, [Mr. GUNDERSON] who will be bringing to the committee and to the floor a total comprehensive food safety plan. We are talking about meat. We are talking about poultry. And we are talking about seafood. So your House Committee on Agriculture will address this. It will be commensurate with the rulemaking process of the Secretary of Agriculture.

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

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I want to make sure that I understand exactly what we are doing. The greatest problem I probably have in the 19th Congressional District is the harassment of our small country butchers. We have never had an illness in the 19th Congressional District because of tainted meat or poultry from any of our local country butchers. The are harassed morning, noon, and night, and I am afraid they will soon all be out of business and then we will only have to rely, unfortunately, on big meat producers and packers and so on.

I think I caught the gentleman saying that the small business person will get some protection in all of this.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of Agriculture has indicated that they will give every consideration to the small business community, whether it be small meat locker plants or a small meat packing house.

I would like to point out that 98 percent of all food-borne illnesses come from handling and preparation. If everybody would simply do what their grandmother and their home economics instructor and their 4–H instructor and common sense and the Department of Agriculture recommends, wash their hands and thoroughly cook their meat, we would not have this problem.

And so I can assure the gentleman that Secretary Glickman has in effect assured me and the rest of the Members of the House Committee on Agriculture that the concerns of the small business community will be addressed. I thank the gentleman for raising this issue.

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

Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to commend all of the parties that have worked out a very satisfactory short-term compromise that gives this Member the hope for the first time in 8 years that we might actually be seeing a light at the end of the tunnel of dealing with our meat and poultry inspection system.

As one who has authored legislation and passed legislation in 1986, only to have the frustration of seeing it torn apart by the 200-plus groups that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] spoke about a moment ago, each having their own idea about how best to improve upon the best food safety system the world has ever known, I see now the chance, thanks to the leadership of Secretary Glickman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH], and the efforts that he has made and all of the other parties, I see the opportunity now through the House Committee on Agriculture and other interested parties working with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON], the chairman, and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS], I see the opportunity for us to finally come to an agreement by bringing all of the parties together, having the free and open debate in this House Chamber of how best to deal with meat and poultry inspection.

I look forward to that day, because I believe it is far overdue. Many of the tragedies that have occurred should not have occurred and would not have occurred, as Mr. ROBERTS has said, from some of the simplistic ideas but also from the standpoint that we could in fact make the necessary changes if we would all come to the table. That is not what was happening, as the proposed rulemaking was occurring. Mr. WALSH pointed that out and correctly so.

But now we have an agreement in which everyone will come together, work on a resolution. I hope it is a light at the end of the tunnel and not another train coming toward us. But I do believe today that it is truly a light at the end of the tunnel. I look forward to being a part of eventually resolving this very important issue.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman from Texas and to add my congratulations to all those who have given us truly a remarkable event in this session of the Congress, an event in which we have reached across the aisle to adopt a bipartisan accord, one that is reasonable and proper and in the public interest. It has come about because of the leadership of our chairman, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], and his steady hand at providing an opportunity for each of us to participate; for the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH] and his diligence and persistence and working with our own ranking minority member, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN]. It has truly been an excellent example of the kind of cooperation in the public interest which we need to have more of in this House.

I want to commend all of those who are party to this and urge that we make a record of our support for this amendment.

Ms. DUNN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the gentleman from New York, Mr. WALSH, and also the gentleman from Kansas, Chairman ROBERTS, and the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. GUNDERSON, the gentleman from New Mexico, Chairman SKEEN, and all the people who helped to forge this agreement with the Secretary of Agriculture, our former colleague, Dan Glickman, on

new meat safety inspection rules that will benefit all Americans.

This agreement is especially significant to those of us from Washington State, as my colleague the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] has said, because in January of 1993, my first year as a Member of Congress, three little children died and 67 were hospitalized in Washington State because of an E. coli outbreak that was traced to a local fast food outlet in my district.

Now, a little over 2 years later, with the combined efforts of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH], the committees and the other gentlemen, and the Secretary of Agriculture, we can finally put into place a meat safety regime to ensure the production of clean, safe, quality meat that restores consumer confidence.

I want to add a special note of thanks to our colleague from Washington State, Mr. NETHERCUTT, who is also a member of the subcommittee, for his help on this critical issue.

Mr. Chairman, in memory of 2-year-old Michael Nole, 2-year-old Celina Shribbs, and 17-month-old Riley Detwiler, the little children who died from E. coli, my thanks for the diligent efforts of all the Members of Congress who are involved in bringing to fruition safer food for all Americans.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

[Mr. DE LA GARZA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I rise is support of the proposed agreement between all of the parties concerned and the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH], and endorse it.

Mr. Chairman, in light of recent compromises I rise to support the removal of requirements within the Agriculture Appropriation bill which limit funding for work on the February 3, 1995, Pathogen Reduction/HACCP proposed regulation. Agriculture Secretary Glickman has offered a reasonable resolution, as laid out in his July 18, 1995, letter to Mr. WALSH, the author of the limitation language, that allows for the rule development to proceed on schedule but grants additional input for stakeholders on a major regulatory change.

The controversy surrounding the development of a rule for our meat and poultry inspection system pertaining to microbiological pathogens and Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point methodology was over the process of how the rule is developed. Unfortunately, some in the media has started to turn this controversy into a discussion over whether children would or would not die because of this particular proposed regulation. It is always a human tragedy when anyone dies due to food-borne disease and especially children who have their entire lives ahead of them. But I feel it is important to understand that the Secretary's letter makes commitments assuring that there is a continued development of a good rule that improves our meat and poultry inspection system. A rule that all can support. A rule that will minimize potential lawsuits concerning the final regulation which could cause real delays in meat and poultry inspection reforms.

It is also important to note that modernization of the inspection system through a spirit of cooperation of all stakeholders is paramount to realize real improvements in the safety of the meat supply. The most important guidelight for all interested in changes to our food safety system must be the best science that can be afforded. The entire process should be driven by sound science not politics.

I cannot emphasize enough that this rule is but a step in a continuous series of steps where the goal is reducing food-borne illness. Note that I said reducing food-borne illness, not eliminating it. Elimination of food-borne illness is not a reality. It is scientifically and economically impossible to achieve zero food-borne risks at this time and it becomes a disservice to the public to imply that the Government can supply or regulate a food delivery system into one without risks, but one we can rely on and that the people can trust and give us the maximum protection possible.

I want to thank Secretary Glickman for his involvement in the matter and his interest in restoring confidence in the process. I commend Mr. WALSH of New York for his leadership in finding a path of compromise in which all sides win.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from New York, Congressman JIM WALSH, as being a man for all seasons. He not only leads the bailout of Washington, DC, now he leads the bailout for those of us in the ag community.

I also want to speak on behalf of the Terry Joneses of the world. Terry Jones and his wife own a meat locker in Jacksonville, IL. I had the occasion to visit Terry and his wife recently about this issue of Government regulation or Government overregulation. What they told me was that, if these regulations had been put into effect, they would be out of business, as I think would many small business people who are in the meat locker business, who care a great deal about their customers and in no way would want to see harm come to them.

I do not intend to take the 5 minutes, but I want to express on behalf of all the small meat locker business men and women, not only across Illinois but across the country, that a good compromise has been worked out, and their considerations will be considered. I compliment the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], and certainly the Secretary of Agriculture. Common sense is being used and will be used, and I think all consideration will be given now so that small business people's concerns will be taken into account.

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

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to follow that of my colleagues to point out a couple of things. First and foremost, of course, is joining all my colleagues in our commendations of those who have worked out this agreement. You would think they were leaving Congress, with all the nice things we are saying about them, but we mean it. I think what has been done here is important. I want to point out three specific factors and then we will move the process along.

First and foremost, this process, this agreement that has been reached is important because it has slowed the process down, and it has guaranteed that people are going to have input. As the gentleman from Illinois before me just articulated, there are real problems with these proposed regulations, as they affect the small slaughterhouses across this country, and we have got to make sure that their concerns are heard and considered in the development of the rules.

□ 1515

Second, along that same line, the very significant part of this agreement is that the Secretary has become involved, and he has taken a personal sense of responsibility in ownership of what has been done. Those of us who have worked with and known Dan Glickman when he was a Member of this House know that when he makes this kind of commitment he is going to keep it, and I think that is very important for all of us to understand.

The third thing I want to point out, and part of the reason many of us have raised concerns about the so-called HACCP regulation, you cannot do HACCP under existing Federal statute, because they are diametrically opposed to each other in science, so if you want a science-based HACCP regulation, as I think every Member of Congress and every member of the industry and every member of the consumer groups do, then Members have to recognize there have to be some kind of statutory changes.

As the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] says, we will in my subcommittee, at the conclusion of the farm bill, continue a process that was initiated this spring, and we will bring forth comprehensive meat, poultry, and seafood legislation, and we will give this committee, we will give this Congress, a chance to modernize our legislation in that regard.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, let me add my thanks and sincere appreciation for all of the hard work for all of the members of the Committee on Appropriations and Committee on Agriculture to get these food, meat, and poultry regulations well on their way.

Members may recall that about 2 years ago we raised the issue in what was then called the Committee on Energy and Commerce, on the Subcommittee on Commerce, Consumer Protection, and Competitiveness. It is really very rewarding to see how, when the issue has been raised, even in the

last Congress, early in the last Congress, about something as important as meat and poultry safety, food safety, to be able to be here and stand on this floor and say that we have seen that dream come to real fruition.

Again, I want to sincerely thank all of those who worked so hard on this issue, because I, as well as other people, who were seriously concerned about what happened in the E. coli, the terrible things that happened to people, I am happy to say this has now happened. I cannot say enough about the hard work, the unity, and the cooperation between not only members of those committees, but between the administration of the Department of Agriculture as well. It shows government at its best, and I think we all did a good job, and everybody is to be congratulated.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask for a rollcall vote on this to establish the bipartisan support which we have discussed today on the floor, not only for the HACCP process, but for a speedy and expeditious process that brings these rules to a point where they will be protecting American families. I just wanted to make that point. I will be asking for a rollcall vote on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH]. I think it will demonstrate the bipartisan feeling we have on this issue.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ALLARD

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALLARD: No. 30: Page 2, line 11, strike ''$10,227,000, of which $7,500,000'' and insert, ''$9,204,300, of which $6,750,000''.

Page 3, line 3, strike ''$3,748,000'' and insert ''$3,373,200''.

Page 3, line 15, strike ''$5,899,000'' and insert ''$5,309,100''.

Page 3, line 21, strike ''$4,133,000'' and insert ''$3,719,700''.

Page 4, line 19, strike ''$596,000'' and insert ''$536,400''.

Page 5, line 23, strike ''$800,000'' and insert ''$720,000''.

Page 7, line 19, strike ''$3,797,000'' and insert ''$3,607,150''.

Page 8, line 3, strike ''$8,198,000'' and insert ''$7,378,200''.

Page 9, line 3, strike ''$27,860,000'' and insert ''$26,467,000''.

Page 9, line 12, strike ''$520,000'' and insert ''$468,000''.

Page 9, line 17, strike ''$53,131,000'' and insert ''$50,474,450''.

Page 10, line 3, strike ''$81,107,000'' and insert ''$77,051,650''.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, 10 minutes on each side, the time to be divided equally.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD].

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. First, Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment my colleague, the gentleman from New Mexico, for putting together a good bill which makes a firm contribution by achieving a balanced budget by 2002. I appreciate all the hard work he has put into allocating our very scarce resources among the many worthwhile projects covered by this measure.

The Committee on Appropriations has made some important cuts in this bill; however, we see no reason for the House to ignore an opportunity to make additional reductions in the bureaucracy, especially here in Washington. I realize that it has been tough for the Members of this House, and particularly the Committee on Agriculture, to struggle with what priorities we should have in the agricultural area. However, Mr. Chairman, we simply need to keep in mind that we cannot go ahead and cut those programs that benefit farmers and not let the bureaucracy here in Washington share in those cuts.

Last November, the people spoke clearly about their desire to downsize Federal Government. Taxpayers were tired of sending the hard-earned money to Washington, DC, to pay for larger Federal bureaucracies. Farmers often ask why farm programs continue to get cut while the Department of Agriculture bureaucracy goes untouched. It is time to listen to the voters and start shrinking this huge 110,000 person bureaucracy. It is in this spirit of downsizing that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK] and I offer this amendment.

In recent years the funding for the bureaucracy of the USDA has been held constant. Without our amendment, this bill would continue this trend, despite the reduced role for agriculture programs assumed in the budget resolution. Appropriations for administration for 1996 would be $313 million. This is slightly above the 1995 level. This number rises to $320 million if the new info share program is included. In times of baseline budgeting, we would have considered this to be a cut, but we have changed the way that Congress does business. Now a cut is only a cut if spending is actually reduced below the prior year's level.

Mr. Chairman, our amendment is supported by the National Taxpayers Union and Citizens for a Sound Economy. It cuts 10 percent from the offices of the Secretary, the chief economist, the office of communication, the chief financial officer, the advisory committees, the Assistant Secretary of Administration, and the Undersecretary for Research, Education, and Economics. We have provided for a 5 percent cut for the Economic Research Service, the National Agriculture Statistics Service, the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, and the general counsel. Some offices, such as the Inspector General, have been exempted entirely from this amendment, because they have offered what we consider to be a sufficient justification to retain the funding allocated to them by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is consistent with the budget resolution. The House-passed budget resolution assumed that $44 million in savings could be achieved by reduction in the funding for the administrative offices and programs covered by our amendment. We have scaled that back to $12 million in cuts. This is very reasonable in light of the over $320 million available for the Department's administrative expenses.

Mr. Chairman, let me now address the Department's reorganization. The National Performance Review states that after reorganization, personnel at the USDA headquarters should be reduced 8 percent, resulting in an annual savings of about $73 million. To date, savings in the higher administrative levels have not appeared to be anywhere near this magnitude. Similarly, the Agriculture Reorganization Act mandated personal reductions of $7,500. However, this is to be accomplished by the year 1999. This is too far away. This amendment would provide the added nudge that is necessary to start the process of downsizing the bureaucracy now.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I understand the debate was limited to 20 minutes, 10 on a side. Could the Chair tell me how the 20 minutes is divided between the majority and minority party?

The CHAIRMAN. To the best of the Chair's understanding, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD] as the proponent of the amendment, controls 10

minutes, and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKEEN] in opposition, controls 10 minutes.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control that time.

The CHAIRMAN. It is the understanding of the Chair that the gentleman from New Mexico is opposed to the amendment.

Mr. SKEEN. I am opposed to the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous consent agreement, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] will control 5 minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] will control 5 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I wonder if the gentleman from Colorado and those who are proponents to this amendment have any idea of what we have already done in the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and what we are doing in this bill.

The gentleman comes before us this afternoon with a suggestion of cutting $12 million out of 13 different agencies, $12 million is a lot of money. The gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], as chairman of the subcommittee this year, will cut $1.2 billion from discretionary spending in the Department of Agriculture. It is not as if we have not bitten the bullet. We have chewed right through it. Last year we cut $1.3 billion. This year we cut $1.2 billion. These are serious cuts. As a result of these cuts, the U.S. Department of Agriculture has had to make dramatic changes.

Let me give Members an idea of some of the things USDA has done: Totally reorganized the agency, reducing from 43 to 29 the number of agencies under USDA; field offices being restructured; 1,170 county-based offices will be closed or consolidated. As of June, offices have already been closed in 224 counties across the United States. Our goal in employee reduction is 13,000 employees over the next 6 years. It represents one-fourth of the headquarters staff, 20 percent of administrative staff years, and the savings from these reductions already in place will be over $4 billion.

What the gentleman does with his amendment is to say: ''Well, my dog is bigger than your dog. I can cut more than you can. I am a real fiscal conservative. We will find some more to cut.'' We can all play that game, but when it is all over, while this department is downsizing, can it still perform its functions?

I will say to the gentleman from Colorado, his phone will be ringing, as mine will be ringing, when farmers and others who want services from this department find their phone calls go unanswered. His phone will be ringing, as mine will, as people are calling and say, ''What happened? I am mired in bureaucracy and red tape. I cannot get an answer.'' We can all keep trumping one card higher than the other, but the fact is the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] made a substantial cut in this agency. We did the same thing last year. They are on board. In fact, they are out in front of the whole Federal Government in terms of reorganization and reinventing government. Now the gentleman just wants to do a little more. I am afraid if the gentleman does this, frankly, we will not only have to RIF people early, which may be unfair, but will in fact affect the very basic functions of this department.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would just remind the gentleman that we are only talking about less than a 4-percent reduction. My phone in already ringing from farmers who say, ''Look, what is happening to us and our programs?'' Yet the bureaucracy in Washington seems to slide along with about the same spending levels. What I am talking about as the chief economist, we are talking about offices here in Washington, not the field offices out there that serve farmers.

Mr. DURBIN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman this. In the U.S. Department of Agriculture, what is the largest single agency employer? Does the gentleman know?

Mr. ALLARD. I do not know that.

Mr. DURBIN. I will tell the gentleman, it is the Forest Service.

Mr. ALLARD. I would have guessed it is the Food Stamp Program.

Mr. DURBIN. The Food Stamp Program is administered by the States, as I am sure the gentleman knows. It is the Forest Service. The USDA has about 120,000 employees, and out of that the Forest Service has approximately 33,000 employees. It has continued to grow, and incidentally, is not under our jurisdiction in this bill, while other agencies of USDA have been held stagnant and reduced.

Therefore, if the gentleman is getting calls from people saying ''What about that bureaucracy in USDA,'' tell them it is the Forest Service. That is the area where it has grown. In the other areas it is not growing. There are an awful lot of jokes that are tossed around about how many people work at USDA, but I will tell the Members this: They do a lot of hard work and important work. I am afraid the gentleman's amendment is an effort to trump us and go a little bit better, cut a little bit deeper, and in fact, when the services are not there, people are going to say, ''Why in the heck are we paying our taxes if nobody is there to answer the phone?''

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I have looked seriously at what I have proposed here and spent some time with the Committee on Appropriations staff. We initially looked at a $28 million cut. We are looking at some of the functions that we are carrying on here in Washington that were, we felt, of high enough priority that we should not include them in the amendment, things like the National Appeals Division and some programs in Department administration, the inspector general, the buildings and facilities, and hazardous waste management. There are other programs that need to be reduced.

Mr. DURBIN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, unfortunately, the gentleman does not sit through the weeks of hearings that we sit through and listen to these agencies. Just to mention the inspector general's office, do you know what they spend half of their time investigating? Food stamp fraud.

□ 1530

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

Mr. DURBIN. The inspector general's office spends half of its time investigating food stamp fraud.

Mr. ALLARD. Would the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. DURBIN. Regular order, Mr. Chairman. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman at some point, but please allow me to use my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] has expired.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds for a correction.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I had proposed does not cut the inspector general.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK].

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. Chairman, I think some valid points have been raised here. Let me be succinct and brief on this.

There are real cuts that are taking place in the agriculture programs. There are real cuts that have been taking place since 1986. I think I have lived through a fair number of those. I was Kansas Secretary of Agriculture for the past 6 years. I think I have a little bit of an idea what that is about. They are proposed in the budget resolution that has been passed by both Houses to a further cut next year of $1 billion of what the farmers receive out of the program, $1 billion.

The bureaucracy that we are talking about, and I recognize the valid comments of the gentleman from Illinois, the bureaucracy we are talking about is flat line spent for the next several years. It is a flat level spending while the farmers get less money in their pockets.

I simply think we are going to have trouble going out to farmers and saying, yes, we have to balance the budget, make these cuts, and you are going

to have less money. They say, ''What about the USDA in Washington, the bureaucracy?'' We say, ''We have to have the same amount of money, people and everything in the centralized office.''

I think this is a good, prudent amendment. It is a 4-percent overall cut in the upper levels, the bureaucracy here, not out in the field staff, not out in the field offices.

A second point I would quickly make is, the first year I came in as Kansas Secretary of Agriculture, I was presented a 7-percent across-the-board agency cut. Recognize, I am talking millions at the State level and this is billions here, so I know the magnitude of the difference. But what it forced me to do is make real changes in my operation, the things we knew we needed to have take place but we did not have the political impetus and force to do it. It think it will help as well.

What we are talking about, ladies and gentlemen, is being able to go out and face farmers that are going to be facing real continued reductions, and we have had reductions already since 1986, real continued reductions so that, yes, we start if first in Washington, we make real cuts there, and this is going to be difficult, but this whole process is.

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the gentleman's amendment. I share the gentleman's concerns about cutting farm programs and not cutting the bureaucracy. I do not think the gentleman fully understands that this committee has made significant reductions in what he calls the bureaucracy in this bill.

This bill does make real cuts in real programs, downsizes the Federal Government and ensures the most efficient use of taxpayers' dollars. Let me just cite several examples. All the programs that the gentleman's amendment proposes to reduce, with three exceptions, have already been reduced in this bill by $2.5 million.

The Office of the Chief Economist: This office established pursuant to USDA reorganization by transfers was reduced by $66,000 below the 1995 level.

Office of Budget and Program Analysis was reduced by $104,000.

Congressional Relations: The committee recommendation consolidated all the congressional affairs and activities into one account and cut it by 25 percent.

Economic Research: The committee recommendation is $805,000 below the 1995 level, or $1.5 million below the budget request.

The National Agricultural Statistics Service is $317,000 below the 1995 level.

Mr. Chairman, we take our role very seriously in budget cutting. I think the committee has produced a bill that is responsible. I urge the Members of the House to support the committee's recommendation and defeat the gentleman's amendment. We have tried our level best to do the best we could with what we had. I think that this amendment goes too far and undoes some of the fine work that we have done.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD] for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk that calls for a $12 million reduction out of the Washington bureaucracy but puts some of that money namely, $5.5 million, back to State and county offices.

The substitute version that came out of the Committee on Rules cuts an additional $17.5 million out of State and county operations. I think that is more. If you want to talk about phone calls, where you get the phone calls is when they go into the county offices and they cannot get service.

I worked in USDA in Washington for 4 years as deputy administrator of programs; a tremendous number of hard-working, good civil servants in that department. However, today we have 10,700 employees here in Washington, DC. They should be out in the country.

I support the gentleman's amendment. I think it is reasonable. Out of that 10,000, out of every 100 employees we can reduce by 4 employees what is here in Washington, DC.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I just would like to reiterate the cuts that are already being made as a result of the reorganization of last year is one-fourth of the headquarters staff in Washington in USDA. We talk about the Chief Financial Officer alone, and you look at the cuts: a 17-percent cut from last year's spending.

We will have an amendment a little later by the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT] that will propose to add $200,000 to the account so that the Risk Assessment Office, which is awfully important to many of us in agriculture, can be adequately funded. The gentleman from Colorado would cut it $375,000 more. The gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT] already says, and correctly so, he needs $200,000 to do the job.

We are going to write a farm bill a little bit later on. There is going to be a request for a lot of information. The Chief Financial Officer will be required. We are not going to have the money to do it because we have already made the cuts.

I wish the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD] would have supported us last year in the Committee on Agriculture when we talked about this, when we had the reorganization bill up before the Committee on Agriculture. All of the things that we were talking about doing then, which are now cutting 1,170 county-based offices, are being cut as a result of actions that are already being taken. Please do not make an additional cut on top of that.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a lot about cuts that are going to go back out in the field, and they are not. I remind the Members that these are cuts for bureaucracy here in Washington. Let me point out a few of the agencies that have not been cut: General Counsel; Building and Facilities; department administration; Inspector General; Office of Budget and Program Analysis.

Let me again remind the Members of what the total budget figures look like for the bureaucracy here in Washington, DC, $314 million in 1994. In 1995, it is $311 million. And in 1996, we are looking at $313 million.

The funds available to the Department of Agriculture for administration total $313 million; $320 million if the new Info Share Program is included. This amendment is less than 4 percent of all that.

One might get the impression, listening to this debate, that our amendment proposes to eliminate offices or accounts. The fact is that we are proposing only 10 or 5 percent cuts, and a number of administrative accounts are not cut at all.

I have no doubt the department officials perform important work and that we are asking that we get by with less, but we are asking this of all aspects of the Federal Government. No one ever suggested balancing the budget would be easy. When we are cutting back on farm programs, slowing the growth of Medicare, eliminating some agencies entirely, we need to reduce bureaucracy as well. Every amendment counts.

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

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment with a great deal of reluctance. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD] is a good Member of this Congress.

I am sorry that we just did not understand his interest, along with the interest of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK], and some of the others, in making these cuts. We would have taken them under our wing in the committee and worked through this together, because right now from his own figures, we are still below the 1994 figure for the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, we have made those cuts. We have made the reductions where we can, and there must be some reason or some rationale to what we do. We should not be out here just cutting without knowing what the consequences are. We should not just be making mindless cuts.

Certainly part of our job here as legislators is to make sure that agencies

of the Federal Government operate as intended in the laws that we have enacted. Many of these cuts have severe impacts on agencies, and starting right here from headquarters all the way up and down the line.

We have made those cuts. We must understand that they have to function, the agency has to have some function left. We cannot add cuts upon cuts and still expect them to function. These cuts will not allow some of these agencies to operate if we adopt this amendment.

I would suggest that these cuts fall in the area of not very good government. We should not be here doing these cuts when we do not understand the consequences.

I urge Members to vote against this amendment. These agencies have already paid their fair share in deficit reduction. Let us not do things when we have no idea of what we are doing.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD].

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

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CAMP

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CAMP: Page 13, line 24, strike ''$31,485,000'' and insert $31,930,000''.

Page 14, line 2, strike $98,810,000'' and insert $98,365,000''.

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

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I urge support for this amendment to transfer $445,000 from competitive research grants to restore funding for special grant research for sustainable agriculture. Continuing research for sustainable agriculture is crucial to maintaining an acceptable balance between the need to protect American agriculture, the family farm, and our precious environment.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my fellow Members to support this amendment. One of the reasons that American farm families are able to provide the best food in the world at the lowest prices is because our universities have been able to conduct revolutionary research. By continuing this research, we enable the agriculture industry to find newer and safer ways to expand their crops while protecting our precious environment.

Michigan State University is on the cutting edge of such research. Their studies on the management of municipal and animal organic waste, and the use of grazing systems to improve livestock production are providing valuable data which will assist the farm families of today—and tomorrow.

Their studies, which also include the inclusion of cover crops in field crop rotations and water table management studies, are continuing to improve soil composition on American farms. This improves the health and productivity of crops and livestock which benefits us all.

In addition to assisting the American farm family with productivity, their research also studies the effect of various pesticides on our environment.

This amendment will restore the funding for Michigan State University's special research grant for sustainable agriculture. We offset the cost of this program, which is $445,000, by transferring these funds from the competitive research grants.

Michigan State is strategically located in the sensitive environmental area of Michigan which includes 2,300 miles of shoreline, 20,000 slow moving creeks, rivers and streams, and hundreds of inland lakes. Water table management is critical in this area. The lessons learned in this sensitive area can be applied elsewhere in similar situations.

In these days of global competitiveness, it is vital that American farm families are given the opportunity to grow and prosper. With this research, they can continue to provide the kind of quality products we've come to appreciate. In order to ensure that research on newer and safer ways to provide those products continues, we must support programs like this one.

Sustainable agriculture strikes a fair balance between increasing profits for the American farm families and preserving and protecting our precious environment.

This is a minimal price to pay for all that we can benefit from effective and efficient research.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BARCIA].

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

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CAMP]. I believe, also, that it is vital that we restore funds for sustainable agricultural research as part of this appropriation.

This amendment restores $445,000, the same amount as was available in fiscal 1995, to continue work which seeks to develop production methods that are profitable for farmers and have less impact on the environment.

All of our major advances in agriculture have come as a result of research. If we are to improve production practices with an eye toward a better management of the environment, then careful and sustained research will be necessary to develop better production methods.

As the fiscal 1996 hearings for the Department of Agriculture pointed out, this research effort targets compost integration, rotational grazing, cover crops, and water table-nutrient contamination management. This last element is the continuation of subirrigation research work that is vital in my part of Michigan if we are to adequately protect and efficiently use our groundwater resources.

The hearings most explicitly demonstrated that farm areas in Michigan are drained by more than 20,000 miles of slow-moving creeks and streams, and the leeching of nutrients into groundwater is a major environmental concern. This work is conducted at several locations throughout Michigan, including within my congressional district, and need to be continued.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER].

Mr. CHRYSLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague. Research in sustainable agriculture is necessary to continue to develop agricultural program methods that are profitable for farmers and have less impact on the environment. Not only will the farmers themselves benefit from this valuable research but also the economies of the surrounding communities. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for the Camp amendment.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, we accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CAMP].

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1545

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONDIT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CONDIT: Page 25, line 20, insert before the colon the following: ''(reduced by $300,000)''.

Page 3, line 3, insert before the period the following: ''(increased by $300,000)''.

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that would fulfill a commitment that the 103d Congress began on risk assessment and cost-benefit analyses. My amendment would transfer $300,000 from the salary and expenses of the consolidated Farm Service Agency to the Office of Chief Economist in the Department of Agriculture.

I understand the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] has a substitute amendment that he plans to offer to my amendment, and I want to thank the chairman and his staff for working with us over the last several days to ensure funding for this important office and what it intends to do.

This money will be used to carry out the statutory requirement of the establishing of the Office of Risk Assessment and Cost Benefit Analysis. As some of you may be aware, the USDA office of risk assessment was a mandate under the USDA department reorganization legislation signed by the President last fall.

Risk assessment and cost-benefit analysis has served as the cornerstone for regulatory reform during the first 7 months of the 104th Congress. While steps taken by the Department to put this office on the right track, the current funding in the agriculture appropriations bill would not allow the office to meet its mandated obligation, as prescribed under the USDA reorganization legislation of the 103d Congress.

I urge Members to support my amendment, and the Skeen substitute, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. CONDIT. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] who has been a strong supporter of the risk assessment effort.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to emphasize the gentleman has been a real leader in the unfunded mandates effort several Congresses ago when it was not popular, and now when it is, and his efforts to put an office of risk assessment within the Department of Agriculture was a real initiative, a real reform effort in the Committee on Agriculture during the last session.

Unfortunately, because of the budget pressures, it was not funded. We need this money. It is a good effort and I commend the gentleman and I support the amendment wholeheartedly.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SKEEN AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONDIT

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SKEEN as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. CONDIT: On page 3, line 3 strike $3,748,000 and insert $3,948,000; On page 14, line 2 strike $98,365,000 and insert $98,165,000; and

On page 14, line 20 strike $389,372,000 and insert $389,172,000.

Mr. SKEEN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I will explain the amendment. This has to do with the Office of Risk Assessment, and my amendment transfers $200,000 from the Competitive Research Grants Program under the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service to the Chief Economist.

This money is needed to supplement existing funding and will be used to both enter into contracts with experts in the field of risk assessment to provide USDA with guidance in how its Office of Risk Assessment and Cost Benefit Analysis should operate, and hire an economist to work in this office. That is the intent and the explanation of this amendment and I ask for its adoption and support its passage.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT].

The amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT], as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CASTLE

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designated the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASTLE: Page 25, line 20, strike ''$805,888,000'' and insert ''802,888,000''.

Page 31, line 19, strike $629,986,000'' and insert $612,986,000''.

Page 40, line 10, before ''for loans'' insert ''(plus $200,000,000)''.

Page 40, line 20, before '', of which'' insert ''(plus $40,000,000)''.

Page 57, line 20, strike ''$821,100,000'' and insert ''$801,100,000''.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes and that the time be equally divided.

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, how many more amendments do we plan to offer?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, it is my understanding the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], the chairman of the committee, has suggested the time limit on the Castle amendment and all amendments thereto.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I did not mean to say the whole gamut. I would like to say 20 minutes on the entire gamut of amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I will give the gentleman from Illinois 5 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The debate time will be limited to 20 minutes; 10 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] and 10 minutes in opposition, 5 minutes by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] and 5 minutes by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I am offering an amendment that is based on two principles. One is that encouraging homeownership is good for our economy and society and, two, in the effort to balance the budget, spending cuts must be allocated fairly.

My amendment would restore $200 million of the $400 million cut in the section 502 direct loan homeownership program made by yesterday's manager's amendment. The program was cut 45 percent last year and now the bill before us would reduce the 502 rural housing program by another 42 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I have the utmost respect for the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] and I know he is a supporter of rural housing. The Appropriations Committee originally recommended a level of $900 million for the 502 program. However, after the committee found that it could not include savings from certain mandatory spending programs, the chairman felt he had to make an additional $400 million cut in the 502 direct program.

I understand the difficult choices the gentleman from New Mexico has had to make. This budget is extremely tight and it has to be. I am not seeking to restore the 502 program to its fiscal year 1995 level or even to the level originally recommended by the committee. My amendment will still leave the program with $233 million less than its current year funding, a cut of 25 percent from last year.

Mr. Chairman, what do these numbers mean to real people in our rural communities? They mean a lot. The 502 direct loan program is the only affordable homeownership program that serves low- and very low-income families in rural areas.

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

This program works. It helps people who would otherwise be unable to afford a home make the step to home ownership. While these families have very low income, they pay their mortgages. The 30-day delinquent rate is only 6.8 percent and the 90-day rate is 1.6 percent. There is currently a 2- to 3-year waiting list for these loans.

We are not meeting the need with the current level of funding, much less with the cut proposed in this bill. A loan level of $900 million would assist about 14,000 new homeowners. Cutting it to $500 million would provide only 7,800 loans.

Mr. Chairman, my proposed amendment would allow us to help almost 11,000 families in rural areas across the Nation. Remember, the actual appropriations for this program are much lower than the loan levels they provide. In fiscal year 1995, an appropriation of $228 million provided $933 million in loans.

Under this bill, we would appropriate only $102.6 million to provide $500 million in loans. My amendment would add a modest $40 million to an appropriation of $142.6 million and $700 million in loans.

In southern Delaware, like many rural areas, affordable housing is scarce and often substandard. The economy in these communities is often more sluggish than more populated areas. When families can buy homes, they give the economy of the entire community a shot in the arm. Construction provides new jobs and expanded tax base for schools and other investments and increased sales and tax revenues.

A single family 502 direct loan generates 1.75 jobs, $50,201 in wages, and

$20,506 in annual tax revenues in rural America. In short, the program not only provides homes to low-income rural families, it provides jobs and tax revenues to rural communities.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a matter of fairness. The rural housing 502 direct loan program is taking a disproportionate cut in the effort to balance the budget. My amendment would simply restore some funding for home loans to low-income rural families.

The amendment is budget neutral. Most important, it would help more rural families achieve the American dream the American dream of home ownership. I urge my colleagues to approve this amendment.

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

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I understand what the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE], my friend and colleague, is trying to do here to restore money to the section 502 direct loan program. But in doing so, his amendment would seriously damage other programs which have already been cut significantly. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I have to oppose this amendment.

When we dropped the limitations against some mandatory programs and had to go back into discretionary programs to look for additional savings, we looked closely at every account and made our decisions after a great deal of deliberation. That includes all the accounts that the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] proposes to cut to restore funds to the 502 direct loan program.

The en bloc amendment, which we have agreed to, cuts an additional $17.5 million from salaries and expenses of the Consolidated Farm Service Agency. Money for PL–480 humanitarian aid has declined steadily from $1.7 billion to just about $1 billion.

The refugee situation in Bosnia grows more tragic every day and this program is essential to American aid efforts there as it is to American aid programs in central Africa.

Conservation programs have been reduced by 40 percent in the past 2 years and this amendment will mean less money for important soil erosion and water quality programs in both rural and urban areas, and I repeat, rural and urban areas.

According to the Department of Agriculture, a $21 million cut in Conservation Operations would mean a reduction of 400 staff years, permanent closing of 140 field offices, 50,000 farmers will not be able to receive technical assistance, and 3.1 million acres of land will not be treated for conservation measures such as soil erosion.

Mr. Chairman, we have tried very hard in this bill to distribute cuts fairly and to distribute the funds carefully to meet our budget-cutting obligations. The bill, as amended, does that and I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment which simply throws away many long, hard weeks of work and effort and makes severe cuts in essential programs.

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

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, very briefly, the numbers on this are on the Consolidated Farm Service Agency, after this cut, and this is not the bill cut in that it is only $3 million, it simply freezes it at the 1995 level.

The Natural Resources Conservation Service, my amendment would still provide a $22.3 million increase over this year. In the grants program on transportation, the title 2 grants, my amendment would provide over $801 million for this program, an increase over the request and only 3 percent cut from 1995, while this program is facing cuts of 45 and 44 percent in each of the last 2 years. I do not think they are even comparable.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I was chairman of the working group in the Committee on the Budget dealing with HUD and with the old Farmer's Home Administration.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, and to this body, that it should not be the goal of the U.S. Government to be in the banking business. We should be moving to guaranteed loans, which is much more effective, much less costly for taxpayers.

That is what this committee did. They moved and expanded the guaranteed loan program from $1 billion to $1.7 billion to serve many more clients than direct loan programs can. We should not be in the direct loan program.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to myself in response. The guaranteed loan programs do not serve this population. They serve a population at twice the income of this.

Mr. Chairman, and I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LATHAM].

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to say that in the 5th district of Northwest Iowa, this is extremely important and I support this amendment. We virtually have no unemployment in the area. Our problem is housing. This goes right to the heart of the real needs of the people in my district, the rural areas, and I strongly support this amendment. I thank the gentleman for offering it.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

□ 1600

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I, too, would like very much to be supportive of the gentleman's amendment today for the reasons of housing, but again it is not that simple, and, when we look at the work that the committee has done, they had a tough call to make, and they have made that call, and, when my colleague says in the area of the FSA office he is only bringing it down to freezing at last year's level, he is overlooking two rather significant facts, and that was what I tried to point out to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD] a moment ago. As a result of the reauthorization we are reducing from 43 to 29 agencies in USDA. The FSA office on the same amount of money as last year is going to have to administer two additional programs. That is part of the reorganization. So what sounds like a very innocuous, simple amendment gets very complicated when it actually gets into how to implement it out there in the country.

So this is one of those areas that we would all like to be very supportive of, but again, as a result of the reorganization ongoing and that we are plowing through ground that none of us really understand the true effects of as yet I, too, must reluctantly, but rather firmly, oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] today.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds just to rebut what the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] said.

Three million dollars is the reduction in FSA in this particular amendment, $3 million, and yet we are looking at a program that is almost savaged in terms of the cuts which are going on. I think the comparison makes ours fair.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST].

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, a couple more facts here:

Last year 130,000 people applied for what we used to call the farmer's home loan, and that is 130,000 that applied, 15,000 were able to take advantage of the money that was available. This year, under the present conditions, it would only be 8,000 people able to take advantage of it. Two years ago 27,000 people were able to take advantage of it. We have reduced those important farm programs by just a small amount. That small amount can be transferred into rural housing.

The importance of rural housing cannot be expressed enough. We have people that are working with children that must rent. They are not really contributing to the tax base of the community, they are not building up equity for their family. With a small amount of rural home loans by the Federal Government we are not only going to help those rural families, we are going to contribute to the community, and many of those rural families that we are helping with this loan money are children of farmers who deserve the dollars.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to vote for the Castle amendment.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN].

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I could not agree more with Governor CASTLE. I think that this 502 program is one of the finest government programs that has ever been concocted here in Washington. It does provide a very needed service to our American people, people who are working, people who are trying to make a substantial position in their life or their families who cannot go to a bank. It is very crucial and very important that we fund it, and I support the funding of it, but not in this way.

I say to the gentleman, Governor, I think that you're on the right track, but I think that the committee has worked hard. We have found another $10 million, and I'm going to introduce an amendment which I think is going to be accepted. That will increase the lending authority another $50 million. So that's going to help some.

The chairman of the committee has told me that they are going to try to work in the Senate with the Members of the Senate and in the conference committee to increase that, but I think that we ought to give due credit to the chairman of the committee for the hard work he has done under some very extreme circumstances, recognize he is supportive as the gentleman and I are, that we want to increase the funding for the 502 program. We are going to increase it, but just not in this manner.

So, Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly oppose the amendment and urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' in this case and trust us, and I know that that is something coming from a politician, but trust the chairman, that he is going to help us try to correct the problem that exists in the bill.

So, I encourage my colleagues to continue to support the 502 program but to vote ''no'' on this particular amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak against this amendment, and I would like to agree with the previous speaker from Alabama. What the gentleman from Delaware is setting out to do is very important. I think he has accurately identified a real problem that we face in small-town America. It applies to the State of Illinois, virtually every State, because in the smaller communities low-income families are finding it impossible to own a home and to certainly own a quality home. The average income of the families, the borrowers who applied for 502 housing, is about $15,000 a year, and to put that in simple terms, it is a husband and a wife each earning a little bit more than the minimum wage who are trying to get their first starter home, and if there is ever anything we in America value as part of the American dream, that is it, and the gentleman from Delaware is trying to find resources to put into this program, and I am with him 100 percent.

But, as the gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman from New Mexico said, he has turned to the wrong places to find them because he is causing pain in other areas which I am afraid is equal to or greater than the pain to be felt in the housing area. ''When you want to cut $21 million from conservation operations,'' I tell my friend from Delaware, ''you are going to permanently close 140 field offices across the United States, 3.1 million acres will not be treated with conservation measures, 50,000 farmers will not receive technical assistance, and 11½ million tons of soil erosion will occur.''

Mr. Chairman, if someone is listening to that, they will say, ''So what? Water flows into rivers every day.'' The so what is that in my town of Springfield, IL, in Dover, DE, in places all across the United States where we rely on a public water supply, this sedimentation causes great pain and problems from the viewpoint of the quality of water and the quantity of water. So where we think we are saving money and cutting conservation we are adding to the expense of living in a city.

The same thing can be said for other cuts proposed by the gentleman. His cuts in the consolidated Farm Service Agency of $17½ million—I am sorry; his cuts are in addition to the $17½ million made last night in the en bloc amendment. This is going to hurt that agency, in doing its job overall. The cuts in Public Law 480, on humanitarian aid: We have been cutting back in Public Law 480 year, after year, after year, and what is left is very little to try to respond to genuine world crises in a very moderate way. I know the gentleman is just as sensitive to that as I am.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would join with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], who said earlier that we want to help put more money in 502. I think the sources identified by the gentleman from Delaware are not the places to turn to, and I will be opposing his amendment.

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

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER].

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Delaware for yielding this time to me, and I certainly do recognize and commend the work of the chairman and the ranking member in coming up with a bill under very difficult circumstances, and what I hear from a number of different Members is that the very commendable amendment being proposed in its principle by the gentleman from Delaware whose amendment I support is—wants to do the right thing, but takes the money from the wrong place. But here we are cutting out of a program of housing home ownership for low-income families. We are taking that one down by about 50 percent, more than 50 percent, over a 2-year period, and the whole program is coming down, the whole program in agriculture coming down less than 10 percent in its total, so it seems to me we ought to be able to find a way of putting some more money into the program for the 502 program here.

It is a program that takes families who are on the edge of making it and allows them to have a stake in their community. It is their own chance for owning their own houses, in fact the only Federal program that gives assistance for low-income home ownership, so I would support the gentleman's amendment and hope that it would be adopted.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] and I have had conversations, and I support the direction he is going. I just disagree where he is taking his sources, and I do not know if I get in a colloquy with him to suggest later on we will have a better opportunity to discuss, and the gentleman probably disagrees with my amount and my source, but let me share with my colleagues I do support the gentleman's effort, and I do think that he and I share the right goals. It is just I do not want to devastate these other programs when that money is taken from them, leave them ineffective and inoperative.

So, I am trying to find a way to accommodate the gentleman's desire, but I am also recognizing I am going to have an amendment in title III which obviously is more ideal, and I may not have the numbers. Do I offer to lose all of the compromise?

But I think we will have a chance to visit this again, and I would just hope that the gentleman from Delaware can find it to be supportive since he wants to move in that direction anyhow. He would be able to amend mine, if necessary, to allow it to accommodate our goals.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Delaware is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, it is a very interesting amendment. I have never presented an amendment on this floor or anywhere else for that matter. Everybody got up and said, ''Gee, it is a great program, it is a great idea to fund it more. This is one of the best things we do in the United States of America, but we just simply can't do it.'' And I understand everyone's good will and am not being facetious at all when I say that, but the bottom line is I think we can do it. I think this amendment is the best vehicle in which to do it.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments of the gentlewoman from North Carolina, but the bottom line is fairly simple. The FSA concern, we are reducing that by $3 million. In the Natural Resources Conservation Service my amendment would still allow $22.3 million increase over this year, and we only have a 3-percent cut in the title II grants for the various services to foreign governments on food grants.

This is in comparison, my colleagues, to a 45-percent reduction last year in this wonderful program we run, a 42-percent reduction this year if we do not do anything about it, which is simply incredible in light of the fact that we have people standing in line, the program works, people pay back their loans, practically everybody supports it.

Mr. Chairman, in my judgment this is a program which seems to meet all the litmus tests we want of trying to balance our budget, give people an opportunity and particularly help in our rural areas where we have good people who are out there working, earning a small income but enough to be able to buy a home. I have been in these homes, I have been at these settlements, I have seen how this program works, and it is an excellent program, and I am just worried if we wait until some other time we will not be able to resolve all the problems before us.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would encourage us to go ahead with this amendment and perhaps that will be the jumping-off point for future negotiations, and I hope we would all support the Castle amendment to help keep this program we all agree is outstanding alive.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining 30 seconds of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I, too, rise in reluctant opposition to the gentleman from Delaware's amendment. We all agree on the importance of this program. The difficulty is our subcommittee has spent countless hours allocating very scarce resources to the many important programs that we have. This delicate balance that we have woven together is affected very heavily by the offsets that the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] provides, so I look forward to, in title II of this bill, supporting Mr. CALLAHAN's amendment to do precisely the same thing, just not at the same magnitude.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

□ 1615

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SANDERS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, numbered 71.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SANDERS: Page 3, line 3, insert after ''$3,748,000'' the following: ''(increased by $1,000,000).''

Page 56, line 16, insert before '', of which'' the following: ''(reduced by $3,000,000)''.

Page 60, line 15 insert before '', of which'' the following: ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, we are talking about the survival of the American family farm. I would ask for 30 minutes.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I insist on 20 minutes.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The gentleman from Vermont is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, did the chairman say 25 minutes?

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman I will meet the gentleman halfway, 25 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] that debate on this amendment and all amendment thereto be limited to 25 minutes?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Time for debate on this amendment is limited to 25 minutes, which means the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] will control 6 minutes and 15 seconds, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] will control 6 minutes and 15 seconds, and the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] will control 12 minutes and 30 seconds.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

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

Mr. Chairman, the CBO scored this amendment and found it saves both budget authority and outlays. This amendment is simple: It cuts funding for the Foreign Agricultural Service by $3 million, and adds back only $2 million, $1 million to the chief economist to report on the impact of synthetic RBGH on small dairy farms, and another $1 million to the FDA to develop an RBGH level test. The remaining $1 million goes into deficit reduction.

Mr. Chairman, injections of synthetic bovine growth hormone, otherwise known as RBGH, or BST, are presenting a very serious and multifaceted problem since the Monsanto Corp. introduced the product into the market last year.

RBGH or BST is a new genetically engineered hormone that forces cows to produce greater than normal amounts of milk. The introduction of RBGH is having the impact of lowering farm income and threatening the very existence of the family dairy farm. Soon after the introduction of BST, the Milwaukee Sentinel reported on the ''Sea of new milk triggered in part by the introduction of bovine growth hormone.''

As milk production increases, the prices that farmers receive for their product declines. Given the reality that family dairy farmers have already seen a major drop in the real prices that they receive for their milk, the further decline of milk prices because of Monsanto's BST is an absolute disaster.

The truth of the matter is that in my State of Vermont, family farmers are being driven off of the land in increasing numbers. This is happening in Wisconsin, in Minnesota, all over the America, and this is a terrible tragedy for those of us who believe in family farming.

The Office of Management and Budget estimates that dairy surpluses caused by BST injections will cost farmers $1.3 billion in lost income over the next 5 years. They acknowledge that farmers are going to be receiving significantly less income.

Let me tell you something, Mr. Chairman, that the loss of family farms in Vermont or Wisconsin is not only a tragedy for our States, it is a tragedy for America. It will be a very bad thing when a handful of large agribusiness corporations control the production and distribution of dairy products in this country. It will be a tragedy when all over this country we see family farmers going out of business. That is why this amendment provides the chief economist in the Department of Agriculture with $1 million to report on the economic impact of BST on the small dairy farms in America.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge Members to support this study and vote for this amendment.

The introduction of RBGH to dairy farming also results in higher Federal spending. Deficit hawks, listen up. With more milk being produced, more money is spent on purchasing the milk surplus. OMB estimates it will cost the Federal Government $500 million over the next 5 years to pay for the surplus created by the introduction of BST.

Further, Mr. Chairman, the irony of all ironies is that the synthetic bovine hormone serves no useful purpose other than making Monsanto, a multibillion dollar corporation, a little bit richer. That is all that it does.

If you are interested in deficit reduction, you should support this amendment that provides $1 million in direct savings and addresses this expected $500 million lost.

Synthetic BGH is not just an economic issue, it is a consumer issue. Consumer polls show us that up to 90 percent of American consumers want RBGH milk labeled. They want it labeled. State labeling legislation that has been passed in Vermont and other States clearly underscores this very strong consumer support for labeling. Labels would enable consumers to support the continued existence of family farms, deficit reduction, and the humane treatment of cows.

Consumers around the world are leery of RBGH. The European parliament voted unanimously to extend its ban on the import of dairy and meat

products from animals which had been treated with the drug.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides $1 million to the FDA to develop a simple and inexpensive test so that we will know whether the milk coming from a cow, if that cow has been injected with BST or not. It is a very important consumer issue.

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I understand where my colleague from Vermont is coming from. There is no doubt that many changes in science are changing farming, and that has been the case since the turn of the century. There is no question that these changes have forced many small operations out of existence, and they will continue to. And with their disappearance, we will lose part of the American way of life, and some of that will be to our detriment as a nation.

But it is literally impossible for us to ignore scientific change and advances and its impact on farming. This chemical, this bovine growth hormone, has a consequence of increasing the milk production of America's dairy cows.

Now, the fact is, we did not need more milk. We had plenty already, but now this chemical is helping each cow to give more milk. My dairy farmers in my district are using it because they believe it is the wave of the future. They believe that fewer cows producing more milk can be the wave of the future.

The gentleman from Vermont I am sure is correct that some dairy producers will not be able to accommodate this change and may go out of business, but we cannot turn back the hands of time. We cannot ignore the science that has come about.

I disagree with my colleague from Vermont in his suggestion that there is something inherently dangerous with this chemical. There have been no fewer than 2,000 separate studies of this chemical, and we have found no harmful effects from the bovine growth hormone. The trace elements which we find of this chemical in milk are so minute, one part per billion, and if you want to put that in perspective, I am told that is the equivalent of one second in approximately 32 years, that is the concentration we find of this chemical in milk, and it causes no problem because it is already a naturally occurring hormone in a cow's milk.

Our Nation's milk supply is the very safest in the world. It is tasted over and over and over again before it reaches the consumer. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I will not make any bones about it. I do not like BST. I do not like BGH. I think its effect on the economy and rural sociology will be profound. But we do not have to get into that to assess the desirability of the gentleman's amendment.

My good friend from Illinois says that the consequence of BGH use is to increase dairy production. That is true. That is the problem, because that leads to other consequences. And when you have a large increase in dairy production, you are going to also have a large increase in turmoil in rural communities and a great disruption of the rural economy and rural sociology.

I hate to see anything happen which further weakens rural areas, which further weakens small towns, and which, therefore, further weakens the work ethic, which I think is rooted more deeply in those small communities than any other place in America.

I would observe that all the gentleman is asking, if I understand the amendment correctly, is that in the context of an amendment which saves $1 million on the deficit, he simply asks that a study be done to determine what the economic impacts of this chemical will be.

Now, I know that many farmers in my district think that if you took every agriculture economist in the world and laid them end to end, that it would be a good thing. But nonetheless, I think that it would be very good for everybody on all sides of this issue to have a full understanding of the impact of this chemical. All the gentleman is asking for is that we know not only what the scientific effect will be in terms of increased dairy production, but what that will lead to in terms of the dairy economy, the consequences that has for rural America, and the consequences it has for the Federal budget.

Regardless of how you feel about the chemical, there is nothing wrong with this amendment. In fact, it could put a lot of political arguments about it to rest. I would urge that Members support the amendment.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH].

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friends, for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, We should all be concerned about milk safety and supply, and believe me, in Wisconsin, for example, and around the country we are. Everything is stainless steel, as clean as can be. But that is not the issue here. The issue here, as I interpret this amendment, is we are going to spend $1 million to do another study. But we have already done so many studies. Every study has shown that BGH is safe. It has even been approved by FDA.

So what is the purpose of another $1 million study? To take it out of our market promotion program? If there is anything we need in agriculture, especially in dairy, it is to sell more of our products overseas. So I do not want to see any money diverted from that for another meaningless study.

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

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman tell the people of America, his colleagues, how many family farms in Wisconsin have gone out of business and how many farmers have been thrown off the land?

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, yes, we have had too many dairy farms go out of business in the State of Wisconsin and in other parts of the country. But that is not the issue here. That is not the issue here.

BGH is not going to be decided here in this Chamber. BGH is not going to be decided on the dairy farm. You know where BGH is going to be decided? It is going to be decided by the consumer when they walk into the grocery store and supermarket, and if they buy the milk, it is going to be produced by BGH. If they do not, it will not be. It is a consumer's issue here.

Mr. SANDERS. The gentleman comes from the great State of Wisconsin. Farmers are being driven off the land in Wisconsin. I had farmers coming to my office in tears because they are working 80 hours a week and losing their farm. Here is the question: Will the gentleman tell his colleagues how many farmers in Vermont have been driven off the land because of the introduction of BST? Do you know the answer?

Mr. ROTH. No one knows the answer.

Mr. SANDERS. That is why I want the study.

Mr. ROTH. People have not been driven off the farms because of BGH. I am not in favor of BGH. We have enough milk production. There are a lot of other reasons. That is not the issue.

Mr. SANDERS. What is the issue?

Mr. ROTH. I have read your amendment. You want to take $1 million for another study, and I am saying we do not need any more studies. We already know the answer.

Let me just say that what the issue basically here is, we do not want to divert this money from the market promotion program, because that is a promotion program that is helping our dairy farmers. We already have enough studies in BGH. We do not need any more.

□ 1630

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] has 4 minutes and 15 seconds remaining, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] has 3½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] has 4 minutes and 15 seconds remaining.

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

My good friend from Wisconsin has got it wrong, and my good friend from Illinois has got it wrong. So-called progress is not necessarily a good thing. It is the function of human beings to determine what is good and what is not good.

Right now one of the reasons that family farmers all over this country are being driven off of the land is the prices that they are receiving are dropping precipitously. The reason their prices are dropping is we have too much milk. If we believe in the importance of the family farm, and I know the people in Vermont do, I know the people in Wisconsin do, and I know the people in America do, then we have a right to say, why are we using a synthetic hormone. And here is where my friend from Illinois is wrong. All of the studies that I have seen suggest that BST makes cows sicker and increases the rate of mastitis. That is not, that is an established fact by many studies. When cows get sicker, farmers are obliged to use more antibiotics.

Nobody here suggested that the milk that comes from those cows is unhealthy. What we are simply saying is, what sense does it make when we already have too much milk to be supporting a product which increases milk production, which makes cows sicker, which drives family farmers off of the land?

Whether we can do anything about that or not, I do now know. But at the very least, we can do two things:

No. 1, $1 million for a study so my friend from Wisconsin will know what the impact of BST has been on his farmers. No. 2, a simple study developed by the FDA so we can have a test to know whether the milk comes from BST cows or does not.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, a friend of mine who is a farmer in Jacksonville, IL, who has been in the business for a long time told me that when he started in the early 1950's, after getting out of World War II, it took him up to an hour to cultivate an acre of land. With today's equipment he can do it in a few minutes. He can also find out that his production on each acre has grown dramatically because of the fertilizer and the herbicides and pesticides which we have developed. So now he is farming acreage which used to be farmed by many other farmers. That is the march of science.

I would also say to my friend from Vermont, please do not create the suggestion in anyone's mind that there is anything suspicious about America's milk supply. At the Prairie Farms Dairy in Carlinville, IL, I walked into the sterile room with the stainless steel tanks and was told that that milk is tested no fewer than four different times before it reaches the consumer to find any evidence of impurity or any evidence of antibiotic. If any of it is found, the entire shipment is cast aside.

It is the safest milk supply in the world. To suggest otherwise is unfortunate.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON].

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

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment for a number of reasons. First of all, we have done the studies mandated by this Congress in the past to determine its effect before it was approved. The reality is, it is here. We cannot change that. We have got to go on from this point forward.

Second, what you are doing to fund a study that has already been done by OTA is to take money from the foreign ag service. The number one thing we can do to help America's dairy farmers is to do the export promotion after GATT, after NAFTA, so that we can get the market development. We are not going to get our dairy farmers the income we would like to through a government price support system as we balance the budget. That is not going to happen.

The only place we are going to get income for those dairy farmers is increasing our exports, tightening up our domestic supply. I want to point out to the gentleman, a year ago, just after BST was approved, the MW, the Minnesota-Wisconsin price, was 11.25. Today it is 11.42. The prices have not gone down because of BST.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HINCHEY].

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

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in support of this amendment because I believe it will help us save the small family dairy farmer, and it will also promote health and safety for dairy consumers across the country.

It has been alleged that we ought to leave this to the marketplace, let consumers decide. The fact of the matter is that consumers do not know. They do not know when they walk into the marketplace, to the supermarket whether or not the cheese or the milk that they are buying comes from cows that have been injected with bovine growth hormone. We want them to find out. We want to have it labeled, and we want that study to produce the kind of information which will result in that labeling.

This current project, this injection of this hormone is already costing family farmers more than $200 million a year. We want to get the dairy herds of the United States off of drugs. They are now getting hooked on drugs. Bovine growth hormone leads to the imposition of other drugs to alleviate the causes of the imposition of bovine growth hormone. Let us get the dairy herd of the United States off drugs.

The tests that we have currently to ensure the purity of milk in this country do not account for the presence of these drugs, so people do not know whether there is a problem with these drugs. We want that information, and that is what the Sanders amendment will produce.

Finally, the Europeans have rejected the importation of American dairy products into Europe. The European Union has said no to American dairy products because they are fearful of the effects of this bovine growth hormone on consumers in their countries. They have said that they cannot guarantee their safety. The British journal Lancet and others have recently outlined that very clearly.

Let us pass this amendment. It is very important.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, let me say that the bovine growth hormone is naturally occurring in milk now. It is virtually impossible to differentiate the synthetic growth hormone from that naturally occurring. It is in such limited concentrations that it poses no health risk based on these 2,000 studies.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, there are two main aspects to this issue. No. 1, in my view it is not inevitable that we continue to see a decline in family farms who in Vermont and throughout this country are the backbone of America.

It is important that this Congress stand up and fight as hard as we can to protect those extraordinarily hard-working Americans who have given us so much.

No. 2 is, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. HINCHEY] pointed out, this is also a consumer issue. Without getting into a great debate, the time is not now to do that, consumers do have a right to know whether the dairy products they are injecting come from cows that were injected with bST or whether they do not.

My friend from Illinois is not quite right, because tests, if made available, if developed, can tell us whether the milk comes from bST-injected cows or not. That is why we are providing funding to develop that test. My friend from New York also pointed out that in Europe they are concerned about the issue. They have placed a moratorium on the use of bST.

So, from the point of view of saving the family farm, from the point of view of giving the consumer the right to make a choice about the product he or she ingests, let us pass this amendment. It is terribly important.

I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding time to me.

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

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, as one of the few dairy farmers that still is milking cows on my farm, I would like to put out a statement in the RECORD in opposition to this amendment.

The hormone bST occurs naturally in all milk. The FDA determined that bST will neither adversely affect the health of cows, nor the individuals who consume the milk produced from the these cows. This determination was based on over 2,000 studies. Extensive testing has been going on for the past 10 years. Supplemental hormones, for example, estrogens treating women during menopause, have been used in humans for the past 20 years.

The issue now is whether the Government discourage biotechnologies which have been proven safe. I believe that producers, not Government bureaucracies, ought to make decisions involving the economics of their respective operations.

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

History is a marvelous teacher. This argument that the future, the future of the family farm will be affected by this vote, I think, is somewhat in doubt. Several hundred years ago, there was a group of individuals in England, I believe, referred to as the Luddites who opposed the imposition, ''imposition,'' of mechanization tractors on farmers. They went around hitting the tractors with hammers.

In the early 1970's, I, as a Peace Corps volunteer, went to Asia to work as an agriculture extension agent. India was a net importer of grains and there was a marvelous American scientist named Norman Borlaug who developed the triple gene variety of wheat, it was a dwarf variety of wheat that outproduced the domestic varieties, the native varieties by twofold without fertilizer, merely by just changing the seed. By adding fertilizer, you could increase yields by fourfold. The net result is India now exports wheat and rice.

Yes, we are losing family farms. New York in the 1980's lost 10 percent of its farms per year. That was 10 years before bST was licensed to be used in the United States.

It is more of a function of high property taxes that is driving small family farms out of business. Too much Government is the answer there.

Mr. Chairman, we all have concerns about bST. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON] explained quite clearly, as did the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH]. We had 10 years of testing in the laboratory before it was even brought to the farm for field tests.

And once it was brought to the farm for field tests, the results were positive. There was some increase in mastitis because the animals were milked more.

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

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, it is interesting that under this amendment, we would be labeling bST. That would give the Europeans just another reason to discriminate against our products and keep them out.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I urge opposition to this amendment.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] is recognized for 2 minutes and 15 seconds.

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

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, it is absolutely untrue what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] said. This does not call for labeling on BST.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to my friend, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] and his concerns and so forth, but he is barking up the wrong tree. He has already contradicted himself several times in his statement.

First of all, we have been doing the tests. They have been exhaustive. We have gone over and over and over this thing.

There is nothing wrong with BST. It is a naturally occurring hormone in milk today. You cannot distinguish the synthetic from the natural. It does not take family farmers off of the farm. It allows them to stay there because with fewer cows, they can produce the same amount of milk and the feed increment is a lot less. So it is also an economical concern as well. It helps small farmers compete because they do not have to increase herds to increase production. They just use the hormone.

The FDA and the World Health Organization have confirmed that milk from these supplemented cows is safe and that the level of BST is the same as in any other milk, as I have said before. FDA did not require labeling of milk from supplemented cows because the milk is safe and the same in composition as other milk.

The following facts illustrate the high degree of practical difficulty in developing a test to distinguish rbST in milk:

All milk contains bST. The level of bST is unchanged in milk from supplemented cows. bST is present in milk only in extremely minute levels. rBST and BST are biologically and functionally indistinguishable. Four variants of BST occurred naturally in all milk and the four naturally occurring variants in the Monsanto rbST all differ from each other by only one or two amino acids. These amino acids are normal constituents of bST and milk.

□ 1645

Fearmongering is a wonderful practice in this country today when it comes to food. Any time we have an issue related to food, it is easy to take it out and start fearmongering that particular product. Mr. Chairman, I think, with all due respect to the gentleman, we ought to concern ourselves with understanding the effect of our scientific improvements and not be afraid of them, because it has made this country the best producer of milk.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

Are there further amendments to title I?

If not, the Clerk will designate title II.

The text of title II is as follows:

TITLE II

CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment to administer the laws enacted by the Congress for the Forest Service and the Natural Resources Conservation Service, $677,000.

NATURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION SERVICE

CONSERVATION OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses for carrying out the provisions of the Act of April 27, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 590a–590f) including preparation of conservation plans and establishment of measures to conserve soil and water (including farm irrigation and land drainage and such special measures for soil and water management as may be necessary to prevent floods and the siltation of reservoirs and to control agricultural related pollutants); operation of conservation plant materials centers; classification and mapping of soil; dissemination of information; acquisition of lands, water, and interests therein for use in the plant materials program by donation, exchange, or purchase at a nominal cost not to exceed $100 pursuant to the Act of August 3, 1956 (7 U.S.C. 428a); purchase and erection or alteration or improvement of permanent and temporary buildings; and operation and maintenance of aircraft, $629,986,000, of which not less than $5,852,000 is for snow survey and water forecasting and not less than $8,875,000 is for operation and establishment of the plant materials centers: *Provided,* That appropriations hereunder shall be available pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 2250 for construction and improvement of buildings and public improvements at plant materials centers, except that the cost of alterations and improvements to other buildings and other public improvements shall not exceed $250,000: *Provided further,* That when buildings or other structures are erected on non-Federal land, that the right to use such land is obtained as provided in 7 U.S.C. 2250a: *Provided further,* That this appropriation shall

be available for technical assistance and related expenses to carry out programs authorized by section 202(c) of title II of the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act of 1974, as amended (43 U.S.C. 1592(c)): *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation may be expended for soil and water conservation operations under the Act of April 27, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 590a–590f) in demonstration projects: *Provided further,* That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225) and not to exceed $25,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further,* That qualified local engineers may be temporarily employed at per diem rates to perform the technical planning work of the Service.

WATERSHED AND FLOOD PREVENTION OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses to carry out preventive measures, including but not limited to research, engineering operations, methods of cultivation, the growing of vegetation, rehabilitation of existing works and changes in use of land, and only high-priority projects authorized by the Flood Control Act (33 U.S.C. 701, 16 U.S.C. 1006a), in accordance with the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act approved August 4, 1954, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1001–1005, 1007–1009), the provisions of the Act of April 27, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 590a–f), and in accordance with the provisions of laws relating to the activities of the Department, $100,000,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b): *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $200,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further,* That not to exceed $1,000,000 of this appropriation is available to carry out the purposes of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (Public Law 93–205), as amended, including cooperative efforts as contemplated by that Act to relocate endangered or threatened species to other suitable habitats as may be necessary to expedite project construction.

WATERSHED SURVEYS AND PLANNING

For necessary expenses to conduct research, investigation, and surveys of watersheds of rivers and other waterways, and for small watershed investigations and planning, in accordance with the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act approved August 4, 1954, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1001–1009), $14,000,000: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $110,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in planning and carrying out projects for resource conservation and development and for sound land use pursuant to the provisions of section 32(e) of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1011; 76 Stat. 607), and the provisions of the Act of April 27, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 590a–f), and the provisions of the Agriculture and Food Act of 1981 (16 U.S.C. 3451–3461), to carry out the program of forestry incentives, as authorized in the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2101), including technical assistance and related expenses, and for carrying out a voluntary cooperative salinity control program pursuant to section 202(c) of title II of the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act, as amended (43 U.S.C. 1592(c)), to be used to reduce salinity in the Colorado River and to enhance the supply and quality of water available for use in the United States and the Republic of Mexico, to be used for the establishment of on-farm irrigation management systems, including related lateral improvement measures, for making cost-share payments to agricultural landowners and operators, Indian tribes, irrigation districts and associations, local governmental and nongovernmental entities, and other landowners to aid them in carrying out approved conservation practices as determined and recommended by the Secretary, and for associated costs of program planning, information and education, and program monitoring and evaluation, $36,000,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209, 16 U.S.C. 590p(b)(7)): *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $50,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

WETLANDS RESERVE PROGRAM

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the wetlands reserve program pursuant to subchapter C of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3837), $210,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That the Secretary is authorized to use the services, facilities, and authorities of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the purpose of carrying out the wetlands reserve program.

CONSOLIDATED FARM SERVICE AGENCY

AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry into effect the program authorized in sections 7 to 15, 16(a), 16(f), and 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act approved February 29, 1936, as amended and supplemented (16 U.S.C. 590g–590o, 590p(a), 590p(f), and 590q), and sections 1001–1004, 1006–1008, and 1010 of the Agricultural Act of 1970, as added by the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1501–1504, 1506–1508, and 1510), and including not to exceed $15,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the United States, $75,000,000, to remain available until expended (16 U.S.C. 590o), for agreements, excluding administration but including technical assistance and related expenses (16 U.S.C. 590o), except that no participant in the agricultural conservation program shall receive more than $3,500 per year, except where the participants from two or more farms or ranches join to carry out approved practices designed to conserve or improve the agricultural resources of the community, or where a participant has a long-term agreement, in which case the total payment shall not exceed the annual payment limitation multiplied by the number of years of the agreement: *Provided,* That no portion of the funds for the current year's program may be utilized to provide financial or technical assistance for drainage on wetlands now designated as Wetlands Types 3 (III) through 20 (XX) in United States Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Circular 39, Wetlands of the United States, 1956: *Provided further,* That such amounts shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other conservation materials, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out approved farming practices as authorized by the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, as determined and recommended by the county committees, approved by the State committees and the Secretary, under programs provided for herein: *Provided further,* That such assistance will not be used for carrying out measures and practices that are primarily production-oriented or that have little or no conservation or pollution abatement benefits: *Provided further,* That not to exceed 5 percent of the allocation for the current year's program for any county may, on the recommendation of such county committee and approval of the State committee, be withheld and allotted to the Natural Resources Conservation Service for services of its technicians in formulating and carrying out the agricultural conservation program in the participating counties, and shall not be utilized by the Natural Resources Conservation Service for any purpose other than technical and other assistance in such counties, and in addition, on the recommendation of such county committee and approval of the State committee, not to exceed 1 percent may be made available to any other Federal, State, or local public agency for the same purpose and under the same conditions: *Provided further,* That not to exceed $11,000,000 of the amount appropriated shall be used for water quality payments and practices in the same manner as permitted under the program for water quality authorized in chapter 2 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985, as amended (16 U.S.C. 3838 et seq.).

CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the conservation reserve program pursuant to the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831–3845), $1,781,785,000, to remain available until expended, to be used for Commodity Credit Corporation expenditures for cost-share assistance for the establishment of conservation practices provided for in approved conservation reserve program contracts, for annual rental payments provided in such contracts, and for technical assistance.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title II?

If not, the Clerk will designate title III.

The text of title III is as follows:

TITLE III

RURAL ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR RURAL ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Economic and Community Development to administer programs under the laws enacted by the Congress for the Rural Housing and Community Development Service, Rural Business and Cooperative Development Service, and the Rural Utilities Service of the Department of Agriculture, $568,000.

RURAL HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Rural Housing and Community Development Service, including administering the programs authorized by the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, as amended, title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, and cooperative agreements, $53,315,000: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944, and not to exceed $500,000 may be used for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

RURAL HOUSING INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For gross obligations for the principal amount of direct and guaranteed loans as authorized by title V of the Housing Act of

1949, as amended, to be available from funds in the rural housing insurance fund, as follows: $2,200,000,000 for loans to section 502 borrowers, as determined by the Secretary, of which $1,700,000,000 shall be for unsubsidized guaranteed loans; $35,000,000 for section 504 housing repair loans; $15,000,000 for section 514 farm labor housing; $150,000,000 for section 515 rental housing; $600,000 for site loans; and $35,000,000 for credit sales of acquired property.

For the cost of direct and guaranteed loans, including the cost of modifying loans, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as follows: section 502 loans, $107,840,000, of which $2,890,000 shall be for unsubsidized guaranteed loans; section 504 housing repair loans, $14,193,000; section 514 farm labor housing, $8,629,000; section 515 rental housing, $82,035,000, provided the program is authorized for fiscal year 1996; and credit sales of acquired property, $6,100,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, $390,211,000, of which $377,074,000 shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''Rural Housing and Community Development Service, Salaries and Expenses''.

RENTAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

For rental assistance agreements entered into or renewed pursuant to the authority under section 521(a)(2) or agreements entered into in lieu of forgiveness or payments for eligible households as authorized by section 502(c)(5)(D) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, $535,900,000; and in addition such sums as may be necessary, as authorized by section 521(c) of the Act, to liquidate debt incurred prior to fiscal year 1992 to carry out the rental assistance program under section 521(a)(2) of the Act: *Provided,* That of this amount not more than $5,900,000 shall be available for debt forgiveness or payments for eligible households as authorized by section 502(c)(5)(D) of the Act, and not to exceed $10,000 per project for advances to nonprofit organizations or public agencies to cover direct costs (other than purchase price) incurred in purchasing projects pursuant to section 502(c)(5)(C) of the Act: *Provided further,* That agreements entered into or renewed during fiscal year 1996 shall be funded for a five-year period, although the life of any such agreement may be extended to fully utilize amounts obligated.

SELF-HELP HOUSING LAND DEVELOPMENT FUND

For the principal amount of direct loans, as authorized by section 523(b)(1)(B) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1490c), $603,000.

For the cost of direct loans, including the cost of modifying loans, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, $31,000.

COMMUNITY FACILITY LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For the cost of direct loans, $34,880,000, and for the cost of guaranteed loans, $3,555,000, as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1928 and 86 Stat. 661–664, as amended: *Provided,* That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further,* That such sums shall remain available until expended for the disbursement of loans obligated in fiscal year 1996: *Provided further,* That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed $200,000,000 and total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed $75,000,000: *Provided further,* That of the amounts available for the cost of direct loans not to exceed $1,208,000, to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount not to exceed $6,930,000, shall be available for empowerment zones and enterprise communities, as authorized by Public Law 103–66: *Provided further,* That if such funds are not obligated for empowerment zones and enterprise communities by June 30, 1996, they remain available for other authorized purposes under this head.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, $8,836,000, of which $8,731,000 shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''Salaries and Expenses''.

VERY LOW-INCOME HOUSING REPAIR GRANTS

For grants to the very low-income elderly for essential repairs to dwellings pursuant to section 504 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, $24,900,000, to remain available until expended.

RURAL HOUSING FOR DOMESTIC FARM LABOR

For financial assistance to eligible nonprofit organizations for housing for domestic farm labor, pursuant to section 516 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1486), $10,000,000, to remain available until expended.

MUTUAL AND SELF-HELP HOUSING GRANTS

For grants and contracts pursuant to section 523(b)(1)(A) of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1490c), $12,650,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b).

RURAL COMMUNITY FIRE PROTECTION GRANTS

For grants pursuant to section 7 of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (Public Law 95–313), $1,000,000 to fund up to 50 percent of the cost of organizing, training, and equipping rural volunteer fire departments.

COMPENSATION FOR CONSTRUCTION DEFECTS

For compensation for construction defects as authorized by section 509(c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, $495,000, to remain available until expended.

RURAL HOUSING PRESERVATION GRANTS

For grants for rural housing preservation as authorized by section 552 of the Housing and Urban-Rural Recovery Act of 1983 (Public Law 98–181), $11,000,000.

RURAL BUSINESS AND COOPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Rural Business and Cooperative Development Service, including administering the programs authorized by the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, as amended; section 1323 of the Food Security Act of 1985; the Cooperative Marketing Act of 1926; for activities relating to the marketing aspects of cooperatives, including economic research findings, as authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946; for activities with institutions concerning the development and operation of agricultural cooperatives; and cooperative agreements; $9,520,000: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944, and not exceed $250,000 may be used for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

RURAL BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For the cost of guaranteed loans, $6,437,000, as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1928 and 86 Stat. 661–664, as amended: *Provided,* That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further,* That such sums shall remain available until expended for the disbursement of loans obligated in fiscal year 1996: *Provided further,* That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of guaranteed loans of $500,000,000: *Provided further,* That of the amounts available for the cost of guaranteed loans including the cost of modifying loans, $148,000, to subsidize gross obligations for the loan principal, any part of which is guaranteed, not to exceed $10,842,000, shall be available for empowerment zones and enterprise communities, as authorized by Public Law 103–66: *Provided further,* That if such funds are not obligated for empowerment zones and enterprise communities by June 30, 1996, they remain available for other authorized activities under this head.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, $14,868,000, of which $14,747,000 shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''Salaries and Expenses''.

RURAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For the principal amount of direct loans, as authorized under section 313 of the Rural Electrification Act, for the purpose of promoting rural economic development and job creation projects, $12,865,000.

For the cost of direct loans, including the cost of modifying loans as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, $3,729,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct loan program, $584,000, which shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''Salaries and Expenses''.

ALTERNATIVE AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND COMMERCIALIZATION REVOLVING FUND

For necessary expenses to carry out the Alternative Agricultural Research and Commercialization Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5901–5908), $5,000,000 is appropriated to the alternative agricultural research and commercialization revolving fund.

RURAL BUSINESS ENTERPRISE GRANTS

For grants authorized under section 310B(c) and 310B(j) (7 U.S.C. 1932) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to any qualified public or private nonprofit organization, $45,000,000, of which $8,381,000 shall be available through June 30, 1996, for assistance to empowerment zones and enterprise communities, as authorized by title XIII of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993, after which any funds not obligated shall remain available for other authorized purposes under this head: *Provided,* That $500,000 shall be available for grants to qualified nonprofit organizations to provide technical assistance and training for rural communities needing improved passenger transportation systems or facilities in order to promote economic development.

RURAL TECHNOLOGY AND COOPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

For grants pursuant to section 310(f) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1932), $1,500,000.

RURAL UTILITIES SERVICE

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND TELEPHONE LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Insured loans pursuant to the authority of section 305 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U.S.C. 935), shall be made as follows: 5 percent rural electrification loans, $90,000,000; 5 percent rural telephone loans, $70,000,000; cost of money rural telephone loans, $300,000,000; municipal rate rural electric loans, $500,000,000; and loans made pursuant to section 306 of that Act, $420,000,000, to remain available until expended.

For the cost, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, including the cost of modifying loans, of direct and guaranteed loans authorized by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U.S.C. 935), as follows: cost of direct loans, $35,126,000; cost of municipal rate loans, $54,150,000; cost of money rural telephone loans, $60,000; cost of loans guaranteed pursuant to section 306, $2,520,000: *Provided,* That notwithstanding sections 305(c)(2) and 305(d)(2) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, borrower interest rates may exceed 7 percent per year.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, $29,982,000, which shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''Salaries and Expenses''.

RURAL TELEPHONE BANK PROGRAM ACCOUNT

The Rural Telephone Bank is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds available to such corporation in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out its authorized programs for the current fiscal year. During fiscal year 1996 and within the resources and authority available, gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans shall be $175,000,000.

For the cost, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, including the cost of modifying loans, of direct loans authorized by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U.S.C. 935), $770,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the loan programs, $3,541,000.

DISTANCE LEARNING AND MEDICAL LINK GRANTS

For necessary expenses to carry into effect the programs authorized in sections 2331–2335 of Public Law 101–624, $7,500,000, to remain available until expended.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT PERFORMANCE PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For the cost of direct loans, loan guarantees, and grants, as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1926, 1928, and 1932, $435,000,000, to remain available until expended, to be available for loans and grants for rural water and waste disposal and solid waste management grants: *Provided,* That the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further,* That of the total amount appropriated, not to exceed $4,000,000 shall be available for contracting with the National Rural Water Association or other equally qualified national organization for a circuit rider program to provide technical assistance for rural water systems: *Provided further,* That of the total amount appropriated, not to exceed $18,700,000 shall be available for water and waste disposal systems to benefit the Colonias along the United States/Mexico border, including grants pursuant to section 306C: *Provided further,* That of the total amount appropriated, $18,688,000 shall be for empowerment zones and enterprise communities, as authorized by Public Law 103–66: *Provided further,* That if such funds are not obligated for empowerment zones and enterprise communities by June 30, 1996, they shall remain available for other authorized purposes under this head.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out direct loans, loan guarantees, and grants, $12,740,000, of which $12,623,000 shall be transferred and merged with ''Rural Utilities Service, Salaries and Expenses''.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Rural Utilities Service, including administering the programs authorized by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, and the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, as amended, $19,211,000, of which $7,000 shall be available for financial credit reports: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944, and not to exceed $103,000 may be used for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 19, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order:

The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH]; the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD]; the amendment offered by the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE]; and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALSH

The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The clerk redesignated the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Chairman. This first vote will be 15 minutes. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 19, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on each additional amendment on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 427, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 538]

AYES—427

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen

Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—7

Collins (MI)
Conyers
Jefferson
Lewis (CA)
Moakley
Mollohan
Reynolds

□ 1706

Messrs. BLILEY, HEFLEY, and GREENWOOD changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 40 OFFERED BY MR. ALLARD

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 196, noes 232, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No 539]

AYES—196

Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bentsen
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bono
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Deal
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doggett
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Furse
Gallegly
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goss
Graham
Green
Gutknecht
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Hutchinson
Inglis
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kim
King
Kleczka
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Lewis (KY)
Lincoln
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Luther
Manzullo
Martini
McCarthy
McInnis
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Norwood
Nussle
Owens
Oxley
Paxon
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Reed
Roberts
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schumer
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torricelli
Upton
Visclosky
Waldholtz
Walker
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—232

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Baesler
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bevill
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Callahan
Canady
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cremeans
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Frost
Funderburk
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hyde
Jackson-Lee
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kingston
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Lofgren
Lowey
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McIntosh
McKinney
Meek
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Neal
Ney
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pomeroy
Poshard
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Roth
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Saxton
Schiff
Schroeder
Scott
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (TX)
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Tauzin
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Velázquez
Vento
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—6

Collins (MI)
Cubin
Jefferson
Moakley
Reynolds
Torres

Messrs. TORRICELLI, NUSSLE, TAYLOR of Washington, KLECZKA, GILMAN, FORBES, and FOLEY changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall 539, I meant to vote ''yes'' and I accidentally voted ''no.''

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MR. CASTLE

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

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 96, noes 332, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 540]

AYES—96

Andrews
Baker (LA)
Barr
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Blute
Boehlert
Boucher
Burton
Canady
Castle
Chrysler
Clinger
Cooley
Davis
DeFazio
Dickey
Doggett
Dooley
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
English
Ensign
Ewing
Fawell
Filner
Foley
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Furse
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Goss
Harman
Hefley
Hobson
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kim
King
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
Lazio
Leach
LoBiondo
Longley
Luther
Martini
McCollum
McHale
Metcalf
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Neal
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Pickett
Porter
Portman
Quinn
Ramstad
Roukema
Sanders
Saxton
Schumer
Shaw
Sisisky
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Stearns
Stockman
Torkildsen

Velazquez
Vento
Wise
Wyden
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—332

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Becerra
Beilenson
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cardin
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
de la Garza
Deal
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Dixon
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Durbin
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Flake
Flanagan
Foglietta
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Frost
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoekstra
Hoke
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hunter
Istook
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
LaFalce
Lantos
Largent
LaTourette
Laughlin
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mica
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nadler
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Pomeroy
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanford
Sawyer
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shays
Shuster
Skaggs
Skeen
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Upton
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Collins (MI)
Dicks
Jefferson
Moakley
Reynolds
Weldon (PA)

□ 1722

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia and Mr. TEJEDA changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 71 OFFERED BY MR. SANDERS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 70, noes 357, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 541]

AYES—70

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Brown (OH)
Collins (IL)
Conyers
Coyne
DeFazio
Dellums
Doyle
Duncan
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Fattah
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Frelinghuysen
Furse
Gutierrez
Hinchey
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kleczka
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Maloney
Manton
Markey
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Mfume
Mink
Moran
Nadler
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rivers
Roybal-Allard
Sabo
Sanders
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shays
Stupak
Torkildsen
Torricelli
Tucker
Velazquez
Vento
Woolsey
Wyden

NOES—357

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Manzullo
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
Meek
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Rush
Salmon
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Seastrand
Shadegg
Shaw
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz

Walker	Weldon (FL)	Wise
Walsh	Weldon (PA)	Wolf
Wamp	Weller	Wynn
Ward	White	Yates
Waters	Whitfield	Young (AK)
Watt (NC)	Wicker	Young (FL)
Watts (OK)	Williams	Zeliff
Waxman	Wilson	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—7

Ballenger	Jefferson	Reynolds
Calvert	Moakley	
Collins (MI)	Owens	

☐ 1731

Mr. FOLEY, Mr. RADANOVICH, and Ms. MCKINNEY changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. OLVER changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall vote No. 541, I was detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

☐ 1730

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage the distinguished chairman of the House Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee in a colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the bill, H.R. 1976, provides funding for the treatment and reduction of atrazine in three lakes in Illinois.

Mr. Chairman, knowing of your commitment and the commitment of the distinguished ranking member, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], to the environment and your concern for human safety, I want to let you know that Lake Springfield, which is in my district and also in the district of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], is experiencing the same problems as the other three Illinois lakes. Lake Springfield is the drinking water source for the city of Springfield, the capital city of Illinois. Lake Springfield has experienced the floodwaters and constant rain that fell throughout the Midwest this year. Consequently, this forced the city to spend an additional $200,000 for water treatment.

For instance, the atrazine levels in Lake Springfield reached a high of 25 parts per million during the high water levels in the spring.

Mr. Chairman, I have some articles that I am including in the RECORD detailing the severity of the problem in Lake Springfield.

The atrazine level in Springfield was a subject of a comical parody of the top 10 good things about having atrazine in our water, to name a few, makes Lipton iced tea more brisk, restaurants will now ask, ''Atrazine or no atrazine?'' And finally, smoke detector, carbon monoxide detector or, now I get an atrazine detector.

Mr. Chairman, I commend you and the committee for proactively assisting central Illinois in dealing with this problem.

I would ask, with the chairman's indulgence, to include Lake Springfield to share equally in any final conference report that appropriates funds to reduce atrazine in the State of Illinois.

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

Mr. LAHOOD. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct, and I would be happy to work with the gentleman from Illinois when we get to conference on this bill to ensure that his request is addressed.

Mr. LAHOOD. I would also like to acknowledge my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], the ranking member, who fully supports this effort and has lent his support to it. I thank him. I know the residents of Springfield, both the 20th and the 18th districts, appreciate our mutual efforts.

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

Mr. LAHOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Let me add my voice in support of the effort of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LAHOOD] here. He represents the watershed which serves Lake Springfield, which is in my district, and we have a common concern, because we both represent that city and many residents who rely on that water supply. I think his suggestion is a very valid one. I will do my best in conference to work with the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] to implement it.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DE LA GARZA

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DE LA GARZA:

AMENDMENT NO. 50: On page 41, line 3, strike out ''$390,211,000, of which $377,074,000'' and insert ''$385,889,000, of which $372,897,506''; and

On page 46 after line 7 insert the following paragraph:

''RURAL DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

''For the cost of direct loans as authorized by the rural development loan fund (42 U.S.C. 9812(a)) for empowerment zones and enterprise communities, as authorized by title XIII of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993, $4,322,000, to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans, $7,246,000.''.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will restore $4,332,000 in budget authority for the rural development loan fund program to continue direct loans to rural empowerment zones and 30 rural enterprise communities established last year.

We know, and we sympathize with the problems of the appropriators, but I think that we have found a way to restore these funds, Mr. Chairman, by reducing the amount given to the administrative function of the rural housing, because the loans on rural housing have all been reduced by substantial amounts, and it is our intention that the reduction that would accrue from not having to do that work be taken from the administrative side and provided for the technical assistance to the empowerment zone.

Mr. Chairman, the empowerment zones and enterprise community are the poorest of the poor. The nominated areas have to be less than 30,000, must have an unemployment below the poverty line, over 35 percent. They must have pervasive poverty and unemployment. And with all of the good intentions that these programs were dedicated to last year, I think that it would be in our own best interests to establish them, establish confidence in the community, get them to working together, matching funds and all of the work that has been done basically by the poor themselves, and I think it would be appropriate.

I do not think that we do any damage to the area where we are transferring from, and it is not our intention to do any damage, but I think, and hopefully, that novel and innovative ways could be found between now and final passage. We will leave that to the distinguished Members, the chairman, and ranking member and their staff.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to explain my amendment. It would restore $4,322,000 in budget authority for the Rural Development Loan Fund Program account to continue direct loans to the three Rural Empowerment Zones and 30 Rural Enterprise Communities established last year. This will support a loan amount of $7.2 million, the same level as was contained in the version of H.R. 1976 reported out by the Appropriations Committee.

The Empowerment Initiative involving these areas will help them to help themselves by providing Federal loans and grants that will be matched with State assistance and other nonmonetary assistance such as targeted tax credits and technical assistance from a variety of Federal, State, and local agencies.

Mr. Chairman, the localities involved in this initiative are some of the most impoverished rural areas in the United States. Each zone or community selected to participate in this effort put together a long-range detailed plan for utilizing the funds and technical assistance that will be provided to them. The loans that go out under the Rural Development Loan Fund are among the most effective in creating jobs in rural America. The lending history of the RDLF program shows an average job creation of 25–30 jobs for every $110,000 loaned out. This combination provides the potential for a tremendous return on the Federal Government's investment in areas in desperate need of economic activity.

My amendment as drafted would pay for the restoration of the Empowerment Zones/Enterprise Communities funding through a decrease in

the appropriation available for the administrative expenses of the Rural Housing and Community Development Service. I will work with my colleague, Mr. SKEEN, and the Department to find alternative sources should they indicate that a cut in this agency would hinder its ability to effectively deliver the programs under its jurisdiction.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the support of my colleagues for the amendment.

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

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. I want to say to my very good friend from the great State of Texas and distinguished ranking member and former chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, and, by the way, my chairman when I was a member on the Committee on Agriculture. I will never forget your advice, ''Don't overtalk an issue, and if you see me run that gavel handle across my throat, it means sit down.'' Well, you do not have the gavel, so I can go on.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] has offered an amendment to restore $4.3 million for empowerment zones and enterprise communities under the Rural Development Loan Fund program account. Funds for this program were eliminated as part of the en bloc amendment, because in order to make the necessary additional savings from discretionary spending, we eliminated all funding for this account.

The gentleman's amendment appears to be budget neutral because it takes a like amount from the administrative expenses of the Rural Housing and Community Development Service. I say to my good friend from Texas, the committee knows about the importance of the empowerment zones and enterprise communities and has funds for them in three other accounts in this title.

However, each of these accounts has different objectives, and so I will be happy to accept the gentleman's amendment and thank him for his interest and strong support for rural America.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I thank the distinguished chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CALLAHAN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CALLAHAN: Page 40, line 10, strike ''$2,200,000,000: and insert ''$2,250,000,000''.

Page 40, line 20, strike ''$107,840,000'' and insert ''$118,335,000''.

Page 39, line 24, strike ''$53,315,000'' and insert ''$42,820,000''.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, this afternoon and last night and all through this debate and all through the debate in the Committee on Agriculture as well as the Committee on Appropriations, we focused an awful lot on the 502 housing program, and I think that has been most healthy because a lot of people know about this in the House that did not know about this wonderful program that exists here in our country for people who need financing capabilities who cannot get it because of low income.

We have such a program here in this great country of ours, this 502 program. Firemen and policemen and other hard-working people for the first time in their lives have an opportunity to have the financing capability of a nice home at a reasonable cost, and let me tell you, it is a working program, one of the finest programs that this country knows, and I think that all of us now, through all of this debate, finally recognize how important it is.

We do have a dilemma, though, in this appropriation process, and let me tell you, both the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] and our colleague, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], have helped us tremendously as have their staffs, trying to find an opportunity to insert some more money, but there is just no capability here.

But we are optimistic that there will be a capability, as we flow through the process and get into conference committee with the Senate, and they have pledged to me that they are going to do even more to make certain that this program receives the necessary money that it needs.

We have 130,000 people whose applications have been approved who are waiting in the fiscal year starting October 1, hoping to get their first home. We are not going to be able to provide this service of all of them, but this is going to be a good start, and with the cooperation of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], we have come up with opportunities to add another $10 million as displayed in my amendment, which will create a capability of another $50 million in lending capability.

So I appreciate the staff of the committee working with me to find this resource. I am hopeful that we will finds more moneys, more resources, but I appreciate the spirit of working cooperation that I have received from the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], as well as the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON], who has worked hard at this on her own.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I join my colleague in support of this amendment. I tell you, I do it reluctantly, but I do it very proudly because I know he is moving in the right direction.

Obviously, I would have my amendment that would have restored it up to the level, or at least yesterday I wanted it restored up to the level we had it originally. Today I tried to restore it up to $1 billion and found I could not sustain a point of order.

I think the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] has done us a service of finding a way where we can begin the process.

Let me speak to the need of it. I think we need not underestimate because we have this compromise working. There is need to push for more, as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] said, in terms of the numbers. Already in my State there are 2½ years' worth of applications at the level at which we were funded last time, $1.4 billion. So now that we are moving back, can you understand where we moved to $500 million, and now we are raising this to $50 million, that we are cutting back essentially all of the opportunity for 3 and 4 years.

My plea to you is to recognize what we are doing in destabilizing these communities. Having an investment in your first home not only is an investment for the families and their children but it is an investment in the community. It is a tax base. It is really having a piece of the American pie.

I would urge both sides of the House, if, as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] has indicated, if in the conference we could find more money, we would encourage you to do that because this is just such a small opportunity. But I do urge that we support this because it means that at least this Congress recognizes that 502 has been a very effective program. It is a program that not only serves families well but also serves our communities well.

□ 1745

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

Mr. Chairman, I stand in strong support of the Callahan-Clayton amendment. This 502 program is critically important to lower-income working families and smalltown America. The gentleman from Alabama is right. There are people waiting in line for a piece of the American dream. We have got to not only add the money that was suggested, but keep looking for more. I will be working with the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] to accomplish that, and I thank my colleague for his leadership as well as the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment, I think, demonstrates very clearly the difficulty that we were in and we have been in. To make additional cuts in the discretionary program, an increase of $50 million in the loan level for section 502 direct loans, requires more than $10 million of subsidy, and this amendment would take that money from the salaries and expense accounts of the Rural Housing and Community Development Service. In 1996 that account will be used for, among other things, the closing and restructuring of USDA field offices, and that reorganization plan will save many millions of dollars in the long run. I know how important the 502 housing program is to many Members,

and it is important, as well, to me, and I will agree to this amendment. If we can do better for the 502 in the conference, we will certainly be trying to do exactly that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WATT OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WATT of North Carolina:

Amentment No. 46: Page 40, line 16, before the period insert the following:

''*: Provided,* That notwithstanding section 520 of the Housing Act of 1949, the Secretary of Agriculture may make loans under section 502 of such Act of properties in the Pine View West Subdivision, located in Gibsonville, North Carolina, in the same manner as provided under such section for properties in rural areas''.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, this provision would permit the subdivision in my congressional district, known as Pineview West subdivision, to be eligible once again for financing for the 502 program which was just discussed in the prior amendment. This was an eligible rural area as of the 1980 census. As a result of the 1990 census this still-rural area became a part of the standard metropolitan statistical area, and so it lost its designation as a rural area that would qualify under the 502 program.

Last year in the 103d Congress I offered this amendment which was adopted by the House Banking Committee in the housing reauthorization bill, and the housing reauthorization bill of course passed the House last time but was not acted on by the Senate.

This would not add any additional money. It would simply allow this one subdivision to compete along with other rural areas for 502 funds, and I ask the support of my colleagues.

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

Mr. Chairman, I stand in support of this amendment. I think it is a reasonable request by the gentleman, I think it has been reviewed by the majority as well, and I hope that we can pass this with a voice vote very quickly.

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

Mr. Chairman, we were reluctant to accept it, but we know of no real objection to it, so we accept it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word for the purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, a number of fruit producers in my central Washington district have expressed concern about the report language pertaining to the United States importation of Mexican avocados. They fear that it could continue current restrictions on United States imports of Mexican avocados, and we will have the unintended consequences of diminished access to Mexico for our products.

In Washington State the apple industry expects to suffer a 50-percent reduction in exports to Mexico this year due to a costly onsite inspection program mandated by Mexico. Washington cherry exports to Mexico were also halted 4 years ago in response to alleged pest concerns. Representatives of the tree fruit industry have told me that these actions were in response to United States restrictions on Mexican avocados.

The language in the report states that in order to modify the current restrictions on Mexican avocados this product must be scientifically viewed, adequately safeguarded with enough time provided for public comment.

Mr. Chairman, does this mean that, if adequate pest risk assessment is concluded, if APHIS, the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, has certified that adequate safeguards have been taken and that industry has been afforded adequate comment period as spelled out in the proposed APHIS rule announced earlier this month, that the United States importation of fresh avocado fruit grown in Mexico will go forward?

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, my response is ''yes.''

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I know that our fruit industry producers in central Washington will be very relieved to know that they will not be the target of inappropriate retaliation by the Mexican Government due to the overly stringent United States restrictions on avocados.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. CLAYTON

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. CLAYTON:

Amendment No. 34: Page 40, line 10, insert ''(less $70,000,000) before ''for loans''.

Page 40, line 11, insert ''(less $70,000,000) before ''shall''.

Page 40 line 14, strike ''$150,000,000'' and insert ''$220,000,000''.

Page 40, line 20, insert ''(less $119,000)'' before '', of which''.

Page 40, line 20, insert ''(less $119,000)'' before ''shall be for''.

Page 40, line 23, strike ''$82,035,000'' and insert ''$92,973,000''.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would increase the level of 515 by an amount of $70 million raising it back to the $220 million which is currently. I understand I am going to have a point of order, so it may not indeed be allowed, but let me share this with my colleagues.

This is a program that 2 years ago had $540 million, and it was cut last year to $220 million, and it was several of us who worked on that to retain the $220 million for 515.

Why is this important? Mr. Chairman, this is the only housing available to rural America at very low rates. Rental housing is very scarce to find. In fact, adequate housing period is very scarce to find in rural areas, and to conceive of not having this little resource to advocate for the poorest of the poor seems to me is unfounded, and it has moved in the wrong direction, and the $70 million would only bring it up to the $220 million which is the current area.

I would like to think that we could perfect this, that we would not have to have a point of order. I ask the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] if he could help us out on that, help me understand. Is there a possibility that we can perfect this without having a point of order?

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. CLAYTON. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. I understand the gentlewoman, and I have gained a great deal of respect and fondness for her, but I have to tell my colleagues this. I must make a point of order against it, the amendment, because it is in violation of section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, and the Committee on Appropriations filed a subcommittee allocation for fiscal year 1996 on July 20, 1995, House Report 104–197.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would provide new budget authority in excess of the subcommittee allocation. It is not permitted under section 302(f) of the act. However, Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be ruled out of order, but I want to tell the gentlewoman I want to work with her on her problem.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Could we get a commitment that we try to find money if it is possible during the conference?

Mr. SKEEN. The gentlewoman has that commitment from me, and I appreciate her forbearance. This breaches our 602(b) allocation by $10,819,000 by the way.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BEREUTER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 31: Page 40, after line 25, insert the following:

In addition, for the cost (as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974) of guaranteed loans under a demonstration program of loan guarantees for multifamily rental housing in rural areas, $1,000,000, to be derived from the amount made available under this heading for the cost of low-income section 515 loans and to become available for obligation only upon the enactment of authorizing legislation.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that this Member is offering is virtually identical to a provision included in last year's Agriculture appropriations measure.

This Member has taken a strong interest in rural housing programs, and has been successful in efforts in the Banking Committee to authorize new, more cost-effective approaches to rural housing development. One such initiative, which the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. SKEEN, and the distinguished ranking Member, Mr. DURBIN, have helped to make a reality, was the highly successful Section 502 Middle Income Loan Guarantee Program. This Member is pleased that this measure contains $1.5 billion in guarantee authority for that program. Now, this Member is seeking support to help make a new multifamily loan guarantee program a reality.

In the 103d Congress this Member introduced legislation to create a new multifamily loan guarantee program. That legislation would create a demonstration for a new Federal loan guarantee program for the construction of multifamily rental housing units. That legislation passed the House in the 103d Congress as part of H.R. 3838, the Housing and Community Development Act of 1994, passed July 22, 1994. Because H.R. 3838 died when the Senate failed to act on it in the last hours of the 103d Congress, this Member reintroduced the legislation, which was passed by the Housing Subcommittee as part of H.R. 1691, and is now awaiting further action by the full House.

Also, with bipartisan support on the Appropriations Committee, we were successful in including $1 million funding for this program in the Department of Agriculture appropriation for fiscal 1995, making it possible to finance approximately $25 million in guarantees, contingent upon the authorization of the demonstration program. Unfortunately, because the Senate never passed an authorization bill, that $1 million was never used. As this Member fully expects that the demonstration program will gain an authorization this year, this Member is offering this amendment to H.R. 1976 to allow $1 million of the credit subsidy allocation to be used to fund the new multifamily loan guarantee program, contingent upon that authorization. This amendment is similar to the final language adopted in the 103d Congress. This Member's staff has discussed this amendment with the distinguished Chairman's, Mr. SKEEN's, staff, and this Member understands that he is supportive. This Member greatly appreciates that support, and asks that the amendment be accepted.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEREUTER. I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman to help me understand how this would work with the current 515 program. This is at a slightly higher income level, and it is a guaranteed loan.

Mr. BEREUTER. It is a supplementary program to the 515 program which is a direct loan program, and it would be for those people whose income is 80 percent to 115 percent median area income, just as the 502 loan guarantee program, which is now 2 years old, serves this category, economic category, above the 80 percent by meeting income level.

Mrs. CLAYTON. So it is identical to the 502 unsubsidized guarantee for the same income level.

Mr. BEREUTER. It is almost identical, but that is of course a single-family program, and this would be for five units or more multifamily unit construction.

Mrs. CLAYTON. I support strongly 515. Obviously I support 515 for reasons that it serves the very poor, but I also supported 502 because it serves both the very poor as well as those not so poor who do not qualify for loans that are not guaranteed. So I want to join the gentleman in support.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the distinguished gentlewoman from North Carolina's support, and I know how important her interest is, and successful, in housing.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I think this is a great idea, and we hope the gentleman can get his authorization through. We will accept the amendment.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois who has been so crucial in helping me with the 502 loan guarantee program.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] has really shown us some leadership. This is an innovative approach to providing housing with limited exposure for Federal taxpayers and maximum investment in good housing for people living in rural areas. We were glad to support him last year. I am sorry the authorization did not go through, and I am happy to support him again this year.

Mr. LAZIO of New York. I rise in support of this amendment, offered by Mr. Bereuter, that will appropriate one million dollars for a rural rental multifamily loan guarantee demonstration program. This type of loan guarantee will leverage private-sector resources in order to provide and expand affordable rental housing opportunities. This provision is not new; during the 103d Congress, the House passed a similar provision in the housing authorization bill—H.R. 3838, The Housing and Community Development Act of 1994, which was not enacted into law. During this Congress, the Housing and Community Opportunity Subcommittee, of which I serve as chairman, has reported out legislation in H.R. 1691 that will authorize a sec. 515 multifamily loan guarantee program to be operated by the Rural Housing and Community Development Service. During this period of severe budget constraints, this type of demonstration provides Government an opportunity to form partnerships with the private and nonprofit sector to provide and expand affordable housing in rural areas. I urge support of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. OWENS

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments which were printed in the RECORD as amendment No. 22, and I ask unanimous consent that these amendments be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendments.

The text of the amendments is as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. OWENS:

Page 49, line 20, strike ''RURAL TELEPHONE BANK PROGRAM ACCOUNT'' and all that follows through line 12 on page 50.

Page 70, strike lines 12 through 14.

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

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. OWENS. The gentleman objects to what; the amendment being offered en bloc?

Mr. SKEEN. To the amendment being offered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OWENS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OWENS: Page 49, line 20, strike ''RURAL TELEPHONE BANK PROGRAM ACCOUNT'' and all that follows through line 12 on page 50.

□ 1800

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a continuation of the effort to get truth in budget balancing and to have it be made clear to the American people, have it on the record, that we are continuing to rob the cities and the people of the cities in order to take care of the programs and the institutions that support rural America.

I have nothing against giving all the possible support to farmers and institutions that serve farmers and rural America, but why are we robbing the cities? Why are we taking away a program for summer employment for youth? 600 young people will not be employed because the Committee on Appropriations is going to strike that

program, cut it to zero. We are cutting away job training programs for youth, job training programs for adults. We are drastically cutting title I programs, almost $1 billion for poor youth.

When it comes to this bill, we continue old institutions that have been draining the taxpayers for some time, even though they promised they would have a limited life and go out of existence.

Here is an example of one of those situations. Suddenly silence has descended on the House in terms of challenging some of these programs, but I think it is very important to get on the record exactly what is going on with respect to the robbing of the cities in order to take care of defunct and obsolete rural institutions.

This amendment would strike legislative language in H.R. 1976 which blocks the pending privatization of the Rural Telephone Bank and would delete the more than $3.5 million in appropriations provided for the operation of the bank. The Rural Telephone Bank was created in 1971 to provide an additional source of credit for rural telephone companies which did not qualify for subsidized direct loans and loan guarantees available from the Department of Agriculture.

At the time, taxpayers were promised that the RTB would be a time limited venture, comparable to the Federal land banks. We were assured that the initial Federal capital outlay would be repaid by eventual privatization of the bank. Privatization. The other side is fond of privatization when it comes to programs that are serving people in the cities. Why don't we have privatization here for this program?

The bank's enabling legislation directed that this privatization would begin on September 30, 1995, this year. The Clinton administration has been preparing to carry out the bank's privatization and has not requested any additional funding to support the bank, but H.R. 1976 derails those plans. It blocks privatization and it provides a new infusion of tax dollars to keep it running as a Federal entity. We are going to continue a government program which is slated to be a private program.

Yes, I want to remind my colleagues that this is in addition to the loan subsidies that were provided already by the USDA's rural utility service. In doing this, the Committee on Appropriations insists it supports privatization. It just wants more time to study the issue. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I think 25 years is long enough to study the issue.

This privatization of the Rural Telephone Bank is not coming out of the blue. It was mandated 25 years ago. This was a promise that Congress made to the taxpayers in 1971. If we tell people on welfare two years is enough, you have to get off, five years is enough, you have to get off, tell people in public housing, two years is enough, you have to get out, why don't we set some limits on the other subsidized programs across the country? We have farm subsidy programs not being discussed here, $20,000, $30,000 going to a family. It has been happening for the last 30 years, but nobody is talking about ending it.

This amendment will strike the legislative language and move on to have the privatization take place. I think it is very important that we support this amendment, which is consistent with all we have been preaching. It would assure this promise is kept and the privatization proceeds on course.

It should also be noted that this is one of those rare issues on which President Reagan and President Clinton agree. President Reagan tried to privatize the Rural Bank in 1981 and was rebuffed. He was told it was too soon and we should wait until 1995 to privatize. 1995 is now here, and President Clinton wants to follow the lead of President Reagan.

No more studying, stalling, no more excuses. Let us keep the promise and scrape this barnacle off the hull of the Federal Government. We do not want the taxpayers to be burdened with this any longer than they have to. Let us privatize the Rural Telephone Bank. I urge a yes vote on this amendment.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Rural Telephone Bank was created by Congress in 1971 as a supplemental source of financing for the rural telephone program, and nothing is more essential to rural America than good telecommunications systems. I ought to know. I am probably the last Member of Congress to ever have a phone after I became a Member of Congress, and I appreciate the effort of this particular program, and appreciate it very much, because it allows families to live where they work, and particularly in rural country.

Nothing is more essential than good telecommunications systems for basic telephone services for individuals, communication systems that can attract manufacturing and service companies to create jobs. You do not have to have a headquarters company in the United States now because we have the kind of telecommunications that allows you to locate your headquarters anywhere you want it and put your warehouses somewhere else and your printing somewhere else, and that is a boon to rural communities, to educational and medical programs that give rural schools, and health care centers access to data bases in urban areas.

The Rural Telephone Bank is an important part of this particular picture, Mr. Chairman. Almost every State in the union has districts which need rural communications service. I have already pointed out that we have had to freeze or cut many of the accounts that provide services to rural areas, and this account is among them.

The loan level remains at the same loan level as fiscal year 1995, at $175 million. The cost of the loan subsidy is very modest, $770,000, which is also the same as 1995. Administrative expenses are $3.5 million, which is $5.2 million less than fiscal year 1995.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, there is simply no need for this amendment. By law, the Rural Telephone Bank must privatize, and our bill provides for that process to begin in fiscal year 1996.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose this amendment, and ask my colleagues to oppose it as well.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take exception to my friend from New York, who suggested that somehow there is a war on cities and the rural areas have been exempted. This bill is a perfect example of a bill which is balanced in what it tries to do for the entire Nation.

It is true it serves rural areas and agriculture, which is important to all of us, regardless of where we live. But it is also a fact that a major portion of the spending in this bill literally goes into the gentleman's home city, as it does in mine, and all across the Nation, for programs like the food stamp program, child nutrition program, special milk program, the WIC Program, feeding for the elderly, and so many others that are important.

In the area of nutrition, this bill literally serves the Nation. It is not a bill directed to rural areas. There are specific programs that are directed to rural areas, and the gentleman addresses one, the Rural Telephone Bank.

I think we all concede and the committee report language says explicitly we are moving toward privatization of this bank, and I think it should be done. But we have to do it in an orderly way. What is at stake here is telephone service in areas of very sparse population, where in fact many of the large telephone companies have decided they do not want to build their subsidiaries. We have over the years created telephone cooperatives and others to deal with that service, much as we did in delivering electricity to those areas.

None of us want to jeopardize that. These are good, hard working people. We want to modernize it, we want to privatize it. I think the gentleman from New York is on the right track, but I think to do it precipitously with this amendment eliminating it may cause unintended consequences.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman tell me what date will be an acceptable date for the final privatization? We are past the deadline.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the administration has made the proposal to privatize, and we are still waiting for their suggestions. The authorizing and appropriating committees are waiting for specific

language. I wish I could tell you when that would be forthcoming.

Mr. OWENS. Would you estimate September 1996 instead of 1995? Can you make an estimate of how long it is going to take? It has been 25 years.

Mr. DURBIN. President Clinton does not take all my calls directly, but I would be happy to join the gentleman in perhaps a party line call that the two of us could make on maybe even a rural telephone program and get in touch with him to find out.

Mr. OWENS. Could the gentleman tell us what percentage the food stamp program has been cut?

Mr. DURBIN. The cuts for the food stamp program? I would have to look at it to be sure here, but it looks like in the fiscal year that we are presently in it was $25.1 billion, and that in the next fiscal year it will be $25.9 billion. So there is an increase, if I am not mistaken, in the food stamp program expenses.

Mr. OWENS. You are saying it has not been cut at all?

Mr. DURBIN. No, there are no cuts.

Mr. OWENS. With inflation as a factor, there are no cuts?

Mr. DURBIN. It looks like it is an increase of about $770 million over last year.

Mr. OWENS. The proposal to block-grant the food stamp program has been dropped?

Mr. DURBIN. Let me tell the gentleman, it is not part of this bill. It is my understanding we do not have any proposal in here relative to block grant. The gentleman and I share an opinion on block granting. The bill addresses the program as it currently exists.

Mr. OWENS. The food stamp program is now an entitlement. It will no longer be an entitlement once it is block granted, and there are proposals to block grant it, so areas like mine will have to take a huge cut if they depend on the States to continue after it reaches the levels it is funded at the Federal level.

Mr. DURBIN. The gentleman and I share the same view on this. I hope what you just described does not occur. This bill does not do that. This bill does not fund the program anticipating that will happen.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I share the concern in reference to the food stamp program. This appropriations bill actually increases that. It was this gentleman on the Committee on Agriculture that made a very determined effort simply not to block grant the food stamp program.

I would say what has already been said by my colleague from New Mexico and the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, this bill allows us to privatize. We are going to do that. The OMB wanted to do it immediately. We would end up here with a situation where many rural telephone companies would not have access to the money to borrow from. It would cause utter chaos in the communications system out in our rural areas. It is really not commensurate with the food stamp program.

We will privatize. We will get there from here. I would just urge the gentleman to allow us to do this work under the bill that we would like to do, and I will be happy to work with the gentleman in regard to food stamps.

Mr. OWENS. If the gentleman will yield further, I am happy to hear that the Committee on Appropriations is committed to the privatization of the program with all deliberate speed. I hope that speed is not too deliberate.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just want to briefly talk about this particular amendment. As I look at this amendment, what this amendment will do is eliminate $4.3 million in appropriations for the Rural Telephone Bank Program, and, second, it strikes a provision barring any of the bill's funds from being used to retire more than 5 percent of the Bank's Class A stock.

I am really concerned about the impact of this amendment on areas in our country where we have small independent telephone companies, States like Wisconsin. I cannot think of a State that is not impacted by this amendment.

Now, in this Congress we have been told a lot and talked a lot, we hear a lot about competition in the communications industry. In fact, we are in a major bill here this fall on this particular issue. But this program has fostered competition. This program has fostered competition by providing a source of capital to these small companies. The effect of the gentleman's amendment would be to terminate this program, which will lead to less competition. Let me say that again, less competition, and poorer service.

So I am asking and request that Members, especially from rural districts, look at this amendment, because it is going to hurt service. But it is going to do more than that, because if you do not have a good telephone service you are never going to have industry that produces jobs in those areas, and we need jobs in these rural areas. So this is not only going to harm our telephone and associated services, but it is going to harm the economies in these rural areas.

So I ask my colleagues to oppose the amendment for those reasons.

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

Mr. ROTH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OWENS. Is the gentleman saying he is opposed to privatization of the Telephone Bank? He never wants to privatize it? He wants it to remain as it is forever, so the Federal Government will subsidize it for anything?

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I never said anything about privatizing. I am in favor of privatizing. I am interpreting this amendment as to how it would affect our rural areas, not only my own State but every State of the Union. It is going to hurt not only telephone service, but hurt those areas in expanding their economy for jobs, because if you do not have good telephone service, good communication service, especially in the high-technology world we are moving into, you are never going to have industry locate in those rural areas. That is precisely what we are trying to do, so as to entice industry to those areas.

□ 1815

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman be offering the same agreement next year? The logic will still be there. You are saying we should never privatize again?

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, I am just saying what this amendment is going to do to your rural areas.

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

I would ask the gentleman a question, if I might. I appreciate his concern.

Would the gentleman take the word of this chairman and the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture that we will get something done in this area and give it every consideration? Would the gentleman withdraw his amendment?

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

Mr. SKEEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman repeat that? Do I have the chairman's word?

Mr. SKEEN. The Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, myself, the gentleman from Kansas, [Mr. ROBERTS] of the full House Committee on Agriculture, that we will work with the gentleman on this particular issue. We would appreciate very much the gentleman withdrawing his amendment at this time. Because I do not think it gets the gentleman where he wants to go. But we want to help the gentleman if he is interested in privatization. We would like to work with the gentleman.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, can I interpret that the gentleman will be willing to set a date for privatization?

Mr. SKEEN. Absolutely, set a date any time.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's pledge.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title III?

If not, the Clerk will designate title IV.

The text of title IV is as follows:

TITLE IV

DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FOOD NUTRITION AND CONSUMER SERVICES

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services to administer the laws enacted by the Congress for the Food and Consumer Service, $440,000.

FOOD AND CONSUMER SERVICE

CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751–1769b), and the applicable provisions other than section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1772–1785, and 1789); $7,952,424,000, to remain available through September 30, 1997, of which $2,354,566,000 is hereby appropriated and $5,597,858,000 shall be derived by transfer from funds available under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c): *Provided,* That up to $3,964,000 shall be available for independent verification of school food service claims: *Provided further,* That $1,900,000 shall be available to provide financial and other assistance to operate the Food Service Management Institute.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds other than provided in this Act may be available for nutrition education and training and the Food Service Management Institute.

SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION PROGRAM FOR WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN (WIC)

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the special supplemental nutrition program as authorized by section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786), $3,729,807,000, to remain available through September 30, 1997: *Provided,* That for fiscal year 1996, $20,000,000 that would otherwise be available to States for nutrition services and administration shall be made available for food benefits: *Provided further,* That $4,000,000 from unobligated balances for supervisory and technical assistance grants may be transferred to and merged with this account: *Provided further,* That the participation level on September 30, 1996, shall not exceed 7.3 million: *Provided further,* That up to $6,750,000 may be used to carry out the farmers' market nutrition program from any funds not needed to maintain current caseload levels: *Provided further,* That none of the funds in this Act shall be available to pay administrative expenses of WIC clinics except those that have an announced policy of prohibiting smoking within the space used to carry out the program.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out the Food Stamp Act (7 U.S.C. 2011–2029), $27,097,828,000: *Provided,* That funds provided herein shall remain available through September 30, 1996, in accordance with section 18(a) of the Food Stamp Act: *Provided further,* That funds provided herein shall be expended in accordance with section 16 of the Food Stamp Act: *Provided further,* That this appropriation shall be subject to any work registration or workfare requirements as may be required by law: *Provided further,* That $1,143,000,000 of the foregoing amount shall be available for nutrition assistance for Puerto Rico as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 2028.

COMMODITY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out the commodity supplemental food program as authorized by section 4(a) of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (7 U.S.C. 612c(note)), section 204(a) of the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983, as amended, and section 110 of the Hunger Prevention Act of 1988, $168,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 1977: *Provided,* That none of these funds shall be available to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for commodities donated to the program: *Provided further,* That none of the funds in this Act or any other Act may be used for demonstration projects in the emergency food assistance program.

FOOD DONATIONS PROGRAMS FOR SELECTED GROUPS

For necessary expenses to carry out section 4(a) of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (7 U.S.C. 612c (note)), section 4(b) of the Food Stamp Act (7 U.S.C. 2013(b)), and section 311 of the Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended (42 U.S.C. 3030a), $215,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 1997.

FOOD PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

For necessary administrative expenses of the domestic food programs funded under this Act, $108,323,000, of which $5,000,000 shall be available only for simplifying procedures, reducing overhead costs, tightening regulations, improving food stamp coupon handling, and assistance in the prevention, identification, and prosecution of fraud and other violations of law: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $150,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HALL OF OHIO

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALL of Ohio: Page 53, line 24, strike the colon and all that follows through ''7.3 million'' on line 26.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, the time to be equally divided.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] will be recognized for 5 minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am very glad to introduce the bipartisan amendment with the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA]. Our amendment will simply remove the cap on the number of people who can participate in the WIC program.

As many of my colleagues know, WIC is a very effective program at reducing infant mortality. This legislation, if passed, would be the first time ever that a cap is placed on the number of people who may participate in WIC.

While we have always funded WIC in our annual appropriation bills at a specific level, we have never capped the number of people who may qualify. By striking the cap, our amendment allows for greater flexibility at the local level. It encourages the WIC directors to find the most cost-efficient ways to run the program in order to serve the most people.

The Hall-Roukema amendment has been scored by the Congressional Budget Office and is budget neutral. It will not change the level of WIC funding in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, of all of the domestic hunger programs in America, few are as efficient, effective and respected as the WIC program. By promoting breast feeding and providing nutrition supplements and food prescriptions to qualified participants, WIC serves a critical need for America's most vulnerable people, low-income mothers, infants and children.

WIC also provides access to maternal, prenatal, pediatric health care services for this targeted high-risk population. It is a short-term intervention program designed to influence lifetime nutrition and health behaviors.

Five Wall Street CEOs called WIC in written testimony the health care equivalent of a AAA-rated investment. The WIC program reduces infant mortality and low birth weight. The GAO says that for every dollar spent on WIC, America realizes a $3.50 saving in health care cost.

WIC fights hunger among our poor, but it is also a good investment. It will prevent spending money down the road.

Mr. Chairman, I am also concerned that the cap on participation will create an unnecessary layer of bureaucracy. It will create an administrative nightmare for USDA and the States as they attempt to determine an appropriate cap formula to ensure that States do not add too many participants to their rolls.

Mr. Chairman, the cap could hold up the distribution of funds until appropriate administrative procedures are in place at the Federal, State and local levels. Since a set amount is appropriated for WIC, there really is no need to cap the number of people who may participate.

A cap would force local WIC directors to turn participants away from the program, even if they have the money to serve them through efficient program management.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge you to vote for the Hall-Roukema amendment. It is budget neutral. It provides for more flexibility to the local WIC directors. It would allow cost savings to help poor people.

Please support this amendment and remove the cap on participation in the WIC program.

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

PERFECTING AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOODLING

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Perfecting amendment offered by Mr. GOODLING: Page 53, line 25 insert after ''1996,'' the following: ''with Federal (and not State) funding''.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I am offering would retain the $7.3 million cap for participation on the WIC program. However, it would limit the effect of participants served with Federal program dollars.

I have been a strong supporter of WIC over the years and have worked to make sure that WIC works and is a good program. This said, I also believe there is a strong need for us to balance the Federal budget. However, we cannot reduce the cost of Federal programs contained in this appropriation bill solely through reductions in programs which support our Nation's farmers.

I understand concerns have been raised about the participation cap and the need to continue to increase WIC participation. My solution to the problem is to restrict the cap to Federal dollars. This is important because if you will look at the dollars that some States have spent beyond what is spent on the Federal level, you will discover my State, for instance, spends $6 million additional money. New York spends $21 million additional money. Other States spend additional money. And, therefore, the cap would not affect what the State puts in.

However, I think it is very, very important to understand that in doing this I in no way believe that next year we should count what the State puts in as far as numbers we are to serve with Federal dollars. We serve numbers with Federal dollars that we put in. The State dollars then would provide for the additional that they want to spend.

So my amendment merely says that the cap does not include dollars that are spent by State and local governments on the program.

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

I will try to address both of these interests.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] strikes the provision capping WIC participation at 7.3 million. That cap is only a 1-year cap in 1996. It is not to be a cap in future years.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment, and let me tell you why.

First, let me say that this committee has always been a great supporter of the WIC Program, and with the track record of the program over the years, I do not think anyone on the committee or in Congress can be accused of being against poor pregnant women, infants and children. And this year is no exception.

Mr. Chairman, let me tell you what the committee has done this year for WIC and why. Because of inflation and food cost increases, it costs the Federal Government more every year just to maintain the existing participation level for certain programs such as WIC and school lunch. What the committee has done is provide enough money to cover inflation and food cost increases to maintain the same number of participants in fiscal year 1996 that will be in the program at the end of fiscal year 1995.

Mr. Chairman, to do this, the committee had to find $290 million from an allocation that was $424 million less in outlays than the previous year. To find this kind of money, we had to make severe reductions in rural development, conservation, and research programs that are vital to keeping this country prosperous.

Capping participation at the end of fiscal year 1996 at 7.3 million allows the program to continue at the same level as 1995 while the Congress decides what to do with the program in the welfare reform bill.

Mr. Chairman, without an adjustment in the committee's allocation to account for inflation costs, we cannot afford $300 million increases every year to maintain existing caseloads at the expense of other programs in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I would request that the gentleman from Ohio withdraw his amendment and allow the program to continue in fiscal year 1996 while Congress works its will on the welfare reform.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will attempt to clarify the situation for Members who are confused. The amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] is a perfecting amendment to the original text.

Pending the decision on that amendment, then the Hall amendment will attempt to strike that entire section which may or may not include the Goodling amendment.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, we agreed to a time limitation at the outset of 20 minutes to the Hall amendment and all amendments thereto. If I understand the Chair's explanation, the Goodling amendment does not amend the Hall amendment so it is not subject to that time limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct. The Chair is certainly willing to entertain an agreement to include that time consideration for the Goodling amendment.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time limitation include the Goodling amendment.

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

Mr. GUNDERSON. Reserving the right to object, I think we need to get a handle on how much time has been consumed on both sides regarding the Hall amendment so we have some idea out of that 20-minute allocation what is left to understand the difference between the Hall and Goodling amendments before we agree to a time limit.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will attempt to clarify the time situation as best as he can.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] has only used 3 minutes of his 10 minutes, which means he still has 7 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] still controls 5 minutes.

The time of the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] since it was directed at the Goodling amendment, does not count against the original cap, so the gentleman has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield under his reservation, I say to my friend and colleague from New Mexico, the difference here is that the Hall amendment has been printed in the RECORD and has been subject to review.

The Goodling amendment, I am sure offered in good faith, was first brought to us just a few minutes ago, and we have not had a chance and really need an opportunity to discuss it, I think, on the floor so that we understand it and its impact on the proposal by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL].

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the Goodling amendment be limited to 10 minutes, the time to be equally controlled.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] will be recognized for 10 minutes and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] will be recognized for 10 minutes. After that debate is completed, the Committee will then return to the Hall amendment.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE].

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage in a colloquy with my good friend and my chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

Mr. HALL and the gentlewoman from New Jersey, Mrs. ROUKEMA, have worked very hard and researched their amendment. I know exactly what it will do. It will give some flexibility to WIC directors if the food inflation rate is down. It will serve more people, and food inflation may very well be down this year. It looks like it will be down.

If they save some money on infant formula bidding, competitive bidding, which is going to be restored, I am sure, in the Senate, we know then that it would not cost the taxpayers any more money, that they will have more flexibility to serve more people.

For example, just on the question of the competitive bidding for infant formula, that saves about $1 billion a

year, enabling us to serve well over 1 million extra people a month.

□ 1830

I would ask the gentleman, what will the effect of his amendment be that will be different from the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] which will leave this flexibility and not cost the taxpayers any more, because this is not an entitlement, not even a cap entitlement?

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

Mr. KILDEE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GOODLING. My amendment does not need any research. My amendment is very, very simple. It says: ''Insert after 1996 the following: 'with Federal, not State, funding.'''

What I am saying is the cap does not apply to money that is spent by States. For instance, the $6 million that my State spends, I do not have Michigan on here, so I do not know how much more the gentleman spends, but the $15 million that Massachusetts spends and the $21 million that New York spends is not part of that cap. In other words, if they put on, if my State puts on another 10,000 people, using the State money that they got from saving on their competitive bidding and all of these kinds of things, or money from their own funds, that is not part of the cap.

Mr. KILDEE. The money they rebate?

Mr. GOODLING. If the gentleman will continue to yield, that would be State money.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [MR. HALL].

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I am very concerned about this amendment because it appears to be a gutting amendment, and I believe it is. The reason I say that is that I have known all day that in fact the amendment was going to be offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING]. We had asked his office several times if we could see it, it was never produced. We just saw it about 2 minutes ago.

In fact, what he is trying to do is in fact produce a vote on his first, which confuses the issue and which we have before us. The issue is we are not trying to increase the money for the WIC program. I wish personally it could be increased, but we have to live with that fact. What we are trying to say is that we want to take the cap off the number of people. We want to give the flexibility, the creativity, the innovation to the WIC directors around the country to add more people, still using the same amount of money.

I took the chance and I bothered a number of WIC directors around the country and called them by phone, and said, ''What is going to happen here with this whole process if we put a cap on people?'' And all the WIC directors said: ''We are going to be very conservative, we are not going to be aggressive, we are not going to be innovative. There is going to be a lot more money in the program that there will be penalties on, probably. What will happen is that more people that could participate in the WIC program will probably drop off the program, because as the publicity comes out that we are really restricting the program, less people will apply, and in the long run, you will have less people. What will happen is next year you will say, 'See, there are less people participating,' more money probably will be sent back to the Government, and you will say, 'You did not even spend the money in the first place, because what you are doing is you are stopping the WIC directors from doing their job. You are wasting money.'''

For that reason I certainly oppose the Goodling amendment. It is a gutting amendment.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes. I just want to take issue with the gentleman from Ohio. I do not take second seat anyplace to him in my effort to make sure that WIC is effective and WIC works. I have worked just as hard as he has, and maybe longer. If he wants to make a statement that I am trying to gut something, he had better have some facts and figures. The reason we have not had anything to present before is because we were clearing with the Parliamentarian exactly what the language would have to be. That is why it took as long as it took.

Let me point out, Mr. Chairman, we are talking as if somehow or other we are restricting people from participating in WIC. In 1993 $97 million was returned. In 1994, $100 million was returned. In 1995, $125 million of that will be returned. We will need $70 million of that when the late vouchers come in; however, there will still be $55 million additional money. Why has it been returned? Primarily because we pumped so much money in so rapidly that there was not an infrastructure out there in order to do the job and do it with quality. Therefore, I do not want to take a back seat to anyone in relationship to my efforts on the part of WIC over the years.

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

Mr. GOODLING. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, there is no one over here who questions the gentleman's intentions at all, we are just worried about the language. We know that. We are worried about the language, what the effect will be, not the gentleman's intentions at all, because his record is very good in that.

What I worry about is one thing. It appears that food inflation costs will be down this year, less than in previous years, so that food inflation being down, it would appear, then, that we could feed more people. If we cap the number of people, we cannot take advantage of that low inflation for food costs. That is one of the problems I see with the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. GOODLING. The gentleman served 6.3 back in March, he will probably serve about 7.2 by the end of the year. They are allowing him to go to 7.3. I can understand what they are doing. The only way they can slow down the growth, and that is what we are talking about on every issue that comes to the Congress of the United States, the only way they can do that is to cap the numbers. Otherwise, every time we say ''the numbers are,'' then the Agriculture Department will say, ''This is how much money you need to feed that many people in WIC.''

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON].

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

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Obviously, I rise in support of the Goodling amendment, Mr. Chairman. I think it is important to understand with the Goodling amendment, along with what the committee has done, it is to try to put together the means by which we can manage this program in an intelligent way.

The gentleman is probably right, that food inflation will be down this year, but I do not think just because food inflation is down that we ought to send a signal that in the year of welfare reform being developed in this country, that we want to go around and stack the rolls, build up the baseline, and then if something happens in welfare reform, all of a sudden we are back here next year and we go, ''What do we do?'' We have falsely created this hope that all these people are going to get covered, we do not have the money to cover them. Then we have a real problem.

I think what we are trying to do here is recognize that in order to fully serve that baseline that exists, the committee has increased WIC by $260 million this year, and we are saying there is no indication that in order to serve that baseline we have to increase the caseload above that, because inflation is not going to cause that.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I just merely want to say that what I am trying to do is make sure that those extra participants that the State can add to the program have that opportunity; that this cap does not affect what the State does with State money.

Mr. KILDEE. If the gentleman will yield to me further, I want to make it clear to all the body here that the WIC program is not an entitlement program. It requires an appropriation each year. It is not even a capped entitlement, which I tried to get it to be, but

it is not. Each year we have to appropriate for this, so it is not an entitlement program, it is not something that we are going to be obligated to. We have to appropriate each year.

Mr. GOODLING. I am not involved in this entitlement fight, or how much you increase, or anything else. I am involved in the State, that those the State put on are not part of that cap. It is just as simple as that. I think the amendment is about as clear as any amendment could ever be.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say at the outset that I believe the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] is attempting to improve the appropriations bill, but I think there is a flaw in the approach that he is using. If I am not mistaken, I believe the gentleman from Pennsylvania stated during the course of the debate that if a State should save money in the WIC program by competitive bidding for infant formula, and getting a lower cost per can, saving money, that the money that they saved he believes would be State funds that could be used to increase participation. The gentleman is nodding his head in agreement, and I believe that is what he said.

Unfortunately, we have received information that suggests that that is not the case. What we have been told is that the rebates that the States receive under WIC cost containment contracts are legally Federal funds and not State funds. As a result, what the gentleman from Pennsylvania has done is to create disincentives for the States to make this a more cost-efficient program.

That is not what we want to do here. I think what we want to do is to say to each one of the States: ''Feed as many pregnant women and new mothers and their children as possible at the lowest possible cost, and if you can do that more cost-effectively and save money in the process, we want you to expand your program and bring in more eligible people.'' That is the intent of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], it is my philosophy, and I think it is one we ought to share.

I think the difficulty here is that the money saved on cost containment is going to be considered Federal, and as a result, with the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], that money cannot be used to expand participation, so I would like to urge that we defeat the Goodling amendment and adopt the Hall amendment. By defeating the Goodling amendment, we will overcome this problem I have just described. By adopting the Hall amendment, we will say to the States, ''Be more cost-efficient, do the best you can for the mothers and their children, and if you can save money and expand the program to help more mothers and kids have a healthy pregnancy and healthy kids, that is a goal that we all share.''

I would urge the defeat of the Goodling amendment and the adoption of the Hall amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the perfecting amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. GOODLING].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The debate is now on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA].

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I think in view of that last debate, I would hope that this is more direct and straightforward, if not less controversial. However, I have to rise in strong support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL]; I like to call it the Hall-Roukema amendment, and I want to express appreciation to the author of the amendment because of his untiring commitment to hunger and family issues.

Mr. Chairman, I want to explain again what this amendment is. It is very direct. It eliminates the cap on the number of people who participate in the WIC program. It has nothing to do with the amount of money. We are talking about the numbers of people, not the volume of money.

Currently approximately 6.9 million families are enrolled in WIC, and under the bill the enrollment would rise to 7.3 million. That is not the end of the story. It has been amply outlined by both the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] that the Department of Agriculture will have to divide these slots up, and really create another bureaucracy in and of itself among the several States.

However, there are other reasons why I am in favor of this and opposed to the committee approach, because what we need is smaller government and more efficient government, and it should go back to the States, as we did in H.R. 4, the original bill, of which I am a member of the committee that wrote that bill. The participation cap in this bill does very little to make government smaller. The cap will substantially increase the WIC bureaucracy, and undermine the program, in my opinion.

More to the point, however, the fact is that there will be no reason without the Hall amendment to pursue strong cost containment measures at the State level, since any savings could not be used to bring more needy women and children into the program, but the money would be turned over to the USDA as unspent funds. That is the most important thing, because it is completely contradictory to what we did in H.R. 4, the family nutrition program, which was a Republican-initiated program to direct back to the States the opportunity for less bureaucracy, streamlining of the program.

Really, in many ways, and in a direct way, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] is completely consistent with eliminating bureaucracy and giving the WIC directors at the State level the complete flexibility they need for more efficiency within their State. I think that it must again be remembered that this amendment does not change the amount of money. We are simply saying, ''WIC directors, you improve your program, you increase the opportunities for women and children, and you will not have a cap on the number of people.'' I think it is clear that it is the kind of efficiency that we sought to have, it is the kind of efficiency that Republicans talk about, about being smarter and better, and I think it will bring benefits for all of the people that are under this program. It is not a welfare program, but it is a nutrition program that has proven itself as a cost-saver from beginning to end, not only in terms of better health, but in terms of efficiency of delivery at the State level.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Hall/Roukema amendment and urge its adoption. I would like to particularly thank my good friend from Ohio for his tremendous work on hunger issues for so many years. In an institution that is built on words, there is no one in this House who has displayed such an untiring commitment through his actions. He has been a champion of the children and families.

Having had the privilege of serving as the first ranking minority member of the former Select Committee on Hunger, I know something about this subject. I had the honor of working closely with then-Chairman Mickey Leland and his successor, Mr. HALL, on a range of hunger issues—both domestic and international.

Mr. Chairman, our amendment is simple. It eliminates the cap on the number of people who can participate in the WIC program. Currently, approximately 6.9 million families are enrolled in the WIC program nationwide. Under this bill, enrollment is allowed to rise to 7.3 million and no higher.

But that is it. End of story. No matter the economic conditions. No matter the need.

Without the Hall amendment and with the participation cap in place, however, there is absolutely no reason to pursue strong cost-containment measures, since any savings could not be used to bring more needy women and children into the program, but

would be turned over the USDA as unspent funds.

Finally, allow me to address specifically my Republican colleagues—my colleagues who joined me in voting in March to move the WIC program into the family nutrition block grant of H.R. 4.

And why did we do that? To give the Governor's and the States flexibility to operate their programs as effectively and efficiently as possible.

Now you can make the case that the participation cap defeats the purpose of the block grant by removing the incentive to streamline your State's program. Why should they go through the motions of reforming their programs when the USDA will be the bureaucracy that benefits—and not the children?

Let me be clear: our amendment does not say that we will increase funding for WIC next year. It simply says that WIC offices around the country should have the ability to help those who need assistance.

Let me spell out for you just what that means.

It means that the Department of Agriculture will have to divide 7.3 million slots among the various States. In effect, bureaucrats in Washington will be establishing a state-by-state WIC quota system. That alone should cause everyone in this chamber to think twice about opposing the Hall amendment.

But there are other reasons.

While I am the first to say that we need to make government smaller and more efficient, this bill presents the wrong approach.

The participation cap in this bill does very little to make government smaller. In fact, the cap will substantially increase WIC bureaucracy, undermining a program that is nothing short of an American success story.

I want to point out to my colleagues that one of the most important elements of WIC, and perhaps the element that distinguishes the WIC program from others, is the incentive to save money through cost-containment.

WIC is not welfare. It is an effective, efficient and respected health-based nutrition program. At a time when only 66 percent of eligible participants are enrolled, we would be derelict in our duty if we refused to educate more eligible women about this life-saving program.

While it is easy to get lost in a debate about mandatory and discretionary spending, about how much money to spend and where to do it, we must not lose sight of the human element here.

When the health and well-being of expectant and postpartum mothers and their children hang in the balance, we cannot afford to be wrong.

Support the Hall-Roukema amendment. Eliminate the cap place on WIC participation, and support a program that protects the women and children who need our help.

□ 1845

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my support for the Hall-Roukema amendment to the Agriculture appropriations bill that would lift the WIC participation cap.

How would the participation cap be enforced? Would each State be assigned a participation cap? How would the USDA come up with an appropriate and fair formula that would prevent States from adding more participants to their rolls?

This cap would create an administrative nightmare for the USDA and would most likely ensure a decline in WIC participation. In an effort to comply with the law, most States would probably come in below the participation cap. Moreover, States with a surplus at the end of the year would be forced to turn away eligible participants.

WIC is an effective prevention program that saves on future health care costs. WIC provides food, education, and child care to poor women, infants, and children. It is estimated that one in five children in our country is living in poverty, and five million children under the age of 12 go hungry each month. No child in our country should go to bed hungry. Only well-nourished children reach their full potential and become productive, contributing members of society.

Hunger is caused by poverty. Poverty and hunger are a violence against humanity, whether they occur in the streets where we live or in a far-off Bosnian village.

I urge my colleagues to allow WIC directors the flexibility to manage their State WIC programs. Allow the States the flexibility to include as many WIC participants as their budgets will allow. Vote for the Hall-Roukema amendment.

Mr. MARTINI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Hall-Roukema amendment to remove the cap on WIC participation.

Considering the cost-effectiveness of WIC, and by now we are all familiar with the statistics on Medicaid savings that this program can provide, we should try our best to expand WIC's rolls, not limit them.

The WIC program in my area serves only about 60 percent of the eligible population.

Nationally, the number is closer to 65 percent.

I understand that we will never be able to serve 100 percent of the eligible WIC population.

Some people we will never be able to reach, and realistically speaking, we simply do not have the Federal resources to cover everyone right now.

So the status quo already forces us to place limits on WIC each fiscal year when we determine a funding level in an appropriations bill.

This is unfortunate, but merely a recognition of the actual situation.

That said, why are we now implementing a numerical cap?

As we reformed the welfare system last March, and as this new majority has taken various and new approaches to making the Federal Government work better, one overriding theme has been consistently stated.

How many times in the 104th Congress have we heard the phrase: "We must get government to do more with less"?

Well, we have not given WIC less money this time around.

In fact, we have increased its funding.

But this cap in effect tells WIC administrators across the country: Don't bother trying to implement new policies to be more efficient. Don't bother trying to stretch your budgets to reach more people with the same amount of funds.

You can't expand the rolls of your clients beyond what they have already reached, despite your best efforts to the contrary.

This is big-government, top-down management at its worst, and it should be eliminated. Without a cap, we can send a signal to WIC administrators that we want them to expand their clientele. We will reward their innovative and expansive outreach efforts, not discourage them.

Support flexibility and decentralization in the delivery of our social services by voting in favor of the Hall-Roukema amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Hall amendment. Let me tell what has happened in my home State. The State of Illinois put out for competitive bid infant formula, and it turns out that the WIC Program in the United States, which I understand serves 40 percent of the infants in America, obviously is one of the major purchasers of infant formula.

So when a State like mine, as large as it is, decides to ask the companies that make the formula to enter a competitive bid, they had quite a bit of competition and quite a bit of savings.

They ended up with a rebate of $2.06 on every can of infant formula purchased under the WIC Program in Illinois and because they were so successful in competitive bidding, turned around and took this money and expanded the program, just what we want them to do, to be cost efficient, save money and expand the program.

We do not want to create an incentive, or disincentive I should say, for States to enter into competitive bidding. Just the opposite. Let us have them spend their tax dollars as effectively as possible, save the money and help as many families as possible. That is why the Hall amendment should be agreed to.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, this is a very good program and I still must oppose the amendment because if we do take the cap off and if you do have the efficiencies in the State operations, that is wonderful except we will put more people on the rolls and that is going to cause us to raise more money next year.

Mr. Chairman, we do not have the money. It is not here, and if we raise

that capital, take the lid off of the 7.3 million, it puts us in jeopardy because it does allow the States to put more people on, which is wonderful from the States' perspective, but from the national level, it is very precarious because we just do not have any sources to raise the money. That is the problem.

I still, Mr. Chairman, have to oppose the Hall amendment, and reluctantly so because it is a good program. It has been one of the best feeding programs we have got, of the 26 nutrition programs that we are funding today in the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the gentleman is trying to do and admire the work that he has done, but it puts us in an untenable position, and we maintain our opposition to this proposal to remove the cap because, once again, we did overfund it last year.

States could not pick up the slack, they could not get the organization work done to put more people on, so we had to take money out in the rescission package. It has been kind of an ungodly nightmare, but I think that I understand where you are going and I hope the gentleman understands our position and I have to oppose it.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I would say that what we are doing here is we are removing the cap of 7.3 million people who can participate in this program in 1996. This does not change the level of funding which is appropriated in this bill. This is budget neutral according to CBO. We are not trying to increase the money.

It provides more flexibility to the WIC directors to manage their State programs. Just ask them. They want the flexibility. They want the ability to be innovative.

It is bipartisan. The administration is strongly in support of this amendment. The National Association of WIC Directors, strongly in support of it. Bread for the World, strongly in support of it. Center on Budget Priorities, strongly in support of this amendment.

Vote against the Goodling amendment. Vote for the Hall-Roukema amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title IV?

If not, the Clerk will designate title V.

The text of title V is as follows:

TITLE V—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Foreign Agricultural Service, including carrying out title VI of the Agricultural Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1761–1768), market development activities abroad, and for enabling the Secretary to coordinate and integrate activities of the Department in connection with foreign agricultural work, including not to exceed $128,000 for representation allowances and for expenses pursuant to section 8 of the Act approved August 3, 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1766), $123,520,000, of which $5,176,000 may be transferred from Commodity Credit Corporation funds, $2,792,000 may be transferred from the Commodity Credit Corporation program account in this Act, and $1,005,000 may be transferred from the Public Law 480 program account in this Act: *Provided*, That the Service may utilize advances of funds, or reimburse this appropriation for expenditures made on behalf of Federal agencies, public and private organizations and institutions under agreements executed pursuant to the agricultural food production assistance programs (7 U.S.C. 1736) and the foreign assistance programs of the International Development Cooperation Administration (22 U.S.C. 2392).

None of the funds in the foregoing paragraph shall be available to promote the sale or export of tobacco or tobacco products.

PUBLIC LAW 480 PROGRAM AND GRANT ACCOUNTS

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For expenses during the current fiscal year, not otherwise recoverable, and unrecovered prior years' costs, including interest thereon, under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1691, 1701–1715, 1721–1726, 1727–1727f, 1731–1736g), as follows: (1) $291,342,000 for Public Law 480 title I credit, including Food for Progress programs; (2) $25,000,000 is hereby appropriated for ocean freight differential costs for the shipment of agricultural commodities pursuant to title I of said Act and the Food for Progress Act of 1985, as amended; (3) $821,100,000 is hereby appropriated for commodities supplied in connection with dispositions abroad pursuant to title II of said Act; and (4) $50,000,000 is hereby appropriated for commodities supplied in connection with dispositions abroad pursuant to title III of said Act: *Provided*, That not to exceed 15 percent of the funds made available to carry out any title of said Act may be used to carry out any other title of said Act: *Provided further*, That such sums shall remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b).

For the cost, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, of direct credit agreements as authorized by the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, and the Food for Progress Act of 1985, as amended, including the cost of modifying credit agreements under said Act, $236,162,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the Public Law 480 title I credit program, and the Food for Progress Act of 1985, as amended, to the extent funds appropriated for Public Law 480 are utilized, $1,750,000.

SHORT-TERM EXPORT CREDIT

The Commodity Credit Corporation shall make available not less than $5,200,000,000 in credit guarantees under its export credit guarantee program for short-term credit extended to finance the export sales of United States agricultural commodities and the products thereof as authorized by section 202(a) of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5641).

INTERMEDIATE-TERM EXPORT CREDIT

The Commodity Credit Corporation shall make available not less than $500,000,000 in credit guarantees under its export credit guarantee program for intermediate-term credit extended to finance the export sales of United States agricultural commodities and the products thereof as authorized by section 202(b) of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5641).

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION EXPORT LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For administrative expenses to carry out the Commodity Credit Corporation's export guarantee program, GSM–102 and GSM–103, $3,381,000; to cover common overhead expenses as permitted by section 11 of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act and in conformity with the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, of which not to exceed $2,792,000 may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for the salaries and expenses of the Foreign Agricultural Service, and of which not to exceed $589,000 may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for the salaries and expenses of the Consolidated Farm Service Agency.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title V?

If not, the Clerk will designate title VI.

The text of title VI is as follows:

TITLE VI—RELATED AGENCIES AND FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Food and Drug Administration, including hire and purchase of passenger motor vehicles; for rental of special purpose space in the District of Columbia or elsewhere; and for miscellaneous and emergency expenses of enforcement activities, authorized and approved by the Secretary and to be accounted for solely on the Secretary's certificate, not to exceed $25,000; $904,694,000, of which not to exceed $84,723,000 in fees pursuant to section 736 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act may be credited to this appropriation and remain available until expended: *Provided*, That fees derived from applications received during fiscal year 1996 shall be subject to the fiscal year 1996 limitation: *Provided further*, That none of these funds shall be used to develop, establish, or operate any program of user fees authorized by 31 U.S.C. 9701.

In addition, fees pursuant to section 354 of the Public Health Service Act may be credited to this account, to remain available until expended.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For plans, construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities of or used by the Food and Drug Administration, where not otherwise provide, $15,350,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b).

RENTAL PAYMENTS (FDA)

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For payment of space rental and related costs pursuant to Public Law 92–313 for programs and activities of the Food and Drug Administration which are included in this Act, $46,294,000: *Provided*, That in the event the Food and Drug Administration should require modification of space needs, a share of

the salaries and expenses appropriation may be transferred to this appropriation, or a share of this appropriation may be transferred to the salaries and expenses appropriation, but such transfers shall not exceed 5 percent of funds made available for rental payments (FDA) to or from this account.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SERVICE

PAYMENTS TO THE FARM CREDIT SYSTEM FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE CORPORATION

For necessary payments to the Farm Credit System Financial Assistance Corporation by the Secretary of the Treasury, as authorized by section 6.28(c) of the Farm Credit Act of 1971, as amended, for reimbursement of interest expenses incurred by the Financial Assistance Corporation on obligation issued through 1994, as authorized, $15,453,000.

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), including the purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; the rental of space (to include multiple year leases) in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; and not to exceed $25,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109; $49,144,000, including not to exceed $1,000 for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided,* That the Commission is authorized to charge reasonable fees to attendees of Commission sponsored educational events and symposia to cover the Commission's costs of providing those events and symposia, and notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, said fees shall be credit to this account, to be available without further appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title VI?

If not, the Clerk will designate title VII.

The text of title VII is as follows:

TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. Within the unit limit of cost fixed by law, appropriations and authorizations made for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1996 under this Act shall be available for the purchase, in addition to those specifically provided for, of not to exceed 665 passenger motor vehicles, of which 642 shall be for replacement only, and for the hire of such vehicles.

SEC. 702. Funds in this Act available to the Department of Agriculture shall be available for uniforms or allowances therefor as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901–5902).

SEC. 703. Not less than $1,500,000 of the appropriations of the Department of Agriculture in this Act for research and service work authorized by the Acts of August 14, 1946, and July 28, 1954 (7 U.S.C. 427, 1621–1629), and by chapter 63 of title 31, United States Code, shall be available for contracting in accordance with said Acts and chapter.

SEC. 704. The cumulative total of transfers to the Working Capital Fund for the purpose of accumulating growth capital for data services and National Finance Center operations shall not exceed $2,000,000: *Provided,* That no funds in this Act appropriated to an agency of the Department shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund without the approval of the agency administrator.

SEC. 705. New obligational authority provided for the following appropriation items in this Act shall remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b): Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, the contingency fund to meet emergency conditions, and integrated systems acquisition project; and Foreign Agricultural Service, middle-income country training program.

New obligational authority for the boll weevil program; up to 10 percent of the screwworm program of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service; Food Safety and Inspection Service, field automation and information management project; funds appropriated for rental payments; funds for the Native American institutions endowment fund in the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service, and funds for the competitive research grants (7 U.S.C. 450i(b)) shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 706. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 707. Not to exceed $50,000 of the appropriations available to the Department of Agriculture in this Act shall be available to provide appropriate orientation and language training pursuant to Public Law 94–449.

SEC. 708. No funds appropriated by this Act may be used to pay negotiated indirect cost rates on cooperative agreements or similar arrangements between the United States Department of Agriculture and nonprofit institutions in excess of 10 percent of the total direct cost of the agreement when the purpose of such cooperative arrangements is to carry out programs of mutual interest between the two parties. This does not preclude appropriate payment of indirect costs on grants and contracts with such institutions when such indirect costs are computed on a similar basis for all agencies for which appropriations are provided in this Act.

SEC. 709. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, commodities acquired by the Department in connection with Commodity Credit Corporation and section 32 price support operations may be used, as authorized by law (15 U.S.C. 714c and 7 U.S.C. 612c), to provide commodities to individuals in cases of hardship as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 710. None of the funds in this Act shall be available to reimburse the General Services Administration for payment of space rental and related costs in excess of the amounts specified in this Act; nor shall this or any other provision of law require a reduction in the level of rental space or services below that of fiscal year 1994 or prohibit an expansion of rental space or services with the use of funds otherwise appropriated in this Act. Further, no agency of the Department of Agriculture, from funds otherwise available, shall reimburse the General Services Administration for payment of space rental and related costs provided to such agency at a percentage rate which is greater than is available in the case of funds appropriated in this Act.

SEC. 711. None of the funds in this Act shall be available to restrict the authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation to lease space for its own use or to lease space on behalf of other agencies of the Department of Agriculture when such space will be jointly occupied.

SEC. 712. None of the funds in this Act shall be available to pay indirect costs on research grants awarded competitively by the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service that exceed 14 percent of total Federal funds provided under each award.

SEC. 713. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, all loan levels provided in this Act shall be considered estimates, not limitations.

SEC. 714. Appropriations to the Department of Agriculture for the cost of direct and guaranteed loans made available in fiscal year 1996 shall remain available until expended to cover obligations made in fiscal year 1996 for the following accounts: the rural development loan fund program account; the Rural Telephone Bank program account; the rural electrification and telecommunications loans program account; and the rural economic development loans program account.

SEC. 715. Such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1996 pay raises for programs funded by this Act shall be absorbed within the levels appropriated in this Act.

SEC. 716. (a) COMPLIANCE WITH BUY AMERICAN ACT.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the funds the entity will comply with sections 2 through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a–10c; popularly known as the ''Buy American Act'').

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS; REQUIREMENT REGARDING NOTICE.—

(1) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—In the case of any equipment or product that may be authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided using funds made available in this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving the assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

(2) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In providing financial assistance using funds made available in this Act, the head of each Federal agency shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in paragraph (1) by the Congress.

(c) PROHIBITION OF CONTRACTS WITH PERSONS FALSELY LABELING PRODUCTS AS MADE IN AMERICA.—If it has been finally determined by a court or Federal agency that any person intentionally affixed a label bearing a ''Made in America'' inscription, or any inscription with the same meaning, to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in the United States, the person shall be ineligible to receive any contract or subcontract made with funds made available in this Act, pursuant to the debarment, suspension, and ineligibility procedures described in sections 9.400 through 9.409 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 717. Notwithstanding the Federal Grant and Cooperative Agreement Act, marketing services of the Agricultural Marketing Service may use cooperative agreements to reflect a relationship between Agricultural Marketing Service and a State or Cooperator to carry out agricultural marketing programs.

SEC. 718. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR HONEY PAYMENTS OR LOAN FORFEITURES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall be used by the Secretary of Agriculture to provide for a total amount of payments and/or total amount of loan forfeitures to a person to support the price of honey under section 207 of the Agriculture Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1446h) and section 405A of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1425a) in excess of zero dollars in the 1994, 1995, and 1996 crop years.

SEC. 719. None of the funds in this Act may be used to retire more than 5% of the Class A stock of the Rural Telephone Bank.

SEC. 720. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to provide benefits to households whose benefits are calculated using a standard deduction greater than the standard deduction in effect for fiscal year 1995.

SEC. 721. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for any program, project, or activity when it is made known to the Federal entity or official to which the funds are made available that the program, project, or activity is not in compliance with any applicable Federal law relating to risk assessment, the protection of private property rights, or unfunded mandates.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title VII?

If not, the Clerk will read the last 3 lines of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the ''Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996''.

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Chairman, I support the Hall-Roukema amendment, and I commend my colleagues for bringing this important issue to the floor. It will maximize the potential of a time-tested and needed program, while remaining completely budget neutral.

The program's motto is ''WIC Works Wonders'' and indeed it does:

In over 70 evaluation studies, WIC has demonstrated improved pregnancy and reduced anemia in children;

Medicaid beneficiaries have experienced a lower infant mortality rate;

Four- to five-year-old children have increased immunization rates and improved vocabularies.

WIC serves 6.5 million women and children monthly, saving the Government over $700 million every year in health and education expenditures. With such a significant return on our investment, I regret that this Congress is unable to provide for additional cases in the coming year. However, this amendment will at least give cost-conscious States the opportunity to expand their own caseloads if additional funds become available. A participation cap is counterproductive and potentially harmful to a program that deserves our full support.

I urge my colleagues to support WIC by voting for the Hall-Roukema amendment.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 19, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order: The amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING]; the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL].

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

PERFECTING AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOODLING

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 19, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on each amendment on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 230, noes 193, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 542]

AYES—230

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martinez
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—193

Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Tauzin
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Ward
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—11

Abercrombie
Collins (MI)
Gallegly
Goodling
Jefferson
Moakley
Pallone
Reynolds
Saxton
Volkmer
Waters

☐ 1916

Messrs. VENTO, BARCIA, TAUZIN, and JACOBS changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. PRYCE, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. FLANAGAN, and Mr. TORKILDSEN changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the perfecting amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, during rollcall vote No. 542 on H.R. 1976 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted ''nay''. I ask unanimous consent that my statement appear in the RECORD immediately following rollcall vote No. 542.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HALL OF OHIO

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 278, noes 145, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 543]

AYES—278

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blute
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Buyer
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cremeans
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foglietta
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefner
Heineman
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoekstra
Holden
Horn
Hoyer
Inglis
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Ney
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pomeroy
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waldholtz
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (FL)
Zimmer

NOES—145

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bliley
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Duncan
Dunn
Ehrlich
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fields (TX)
Foley
Frisa
Funderburk
Ganske
Gekas
Goodlatte
Goss
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hoke
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Istook
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Largent
Latham
Laughlin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Lucas
Manzullo
McCrery
McIntosh
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Pombo
Porter
Radanovich
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Royce
Salmon
Scarborough
Schaefer
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Solomon
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Watts (OK)
Whitfield
Wicker
Young (AK)
Zeliff

NOT VOTING—11

Cardin
Collins (MI)
Dreier
Gallegly
Goodling
Jefferson
Moakley
Reynolds
Saxton
Smith (WA)
Volkmer

□ 1925

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Moakley for, with Mr. Dreier against.

Messrs. WELLER, WAMP, GRAHAM, FORBES, and LONGLEY changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend this remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to comment on title V of the bill. I strongly support title II funding to feed starving people, and I urge the committee to preserve and enhance funding for the P.L. 480, title II, program.

Mr. Chairman, with the budget constraints we are under, we need to make cuts in foreign assistance. My committee's bill, the American Overseas Interests Act passed the House on June 8 by reducing spending over $3 billion in fiscal year 1996 and fiscal year 1997. We did this while increasing funding for programs that actually saved lives—disaster assistance, refugee relief and food aid. Simply put, the Public Law 480 title II program saves lives by feeding starving people.

Through the title II food aid program, the American people feed 2.7 million displaced and war-affected people within Bosnia and another 2 million in Angola. Thirteen million mothers and children on the Indian subcontinent depend on this program for daily nutrition. Closer to home, over 1 million Haitians depend on this program for nutrition, helping to ensure the survival of the democracy there. The title II program is designed to work with the leading American relief agencies such as Care, Catholic Relief Services, Save the Children and World Vision. These organizations, which raise most of their funds through private donations, represent the best in America and our mission to the poor.

This year, the Appropriations Committee wisely chose not to make budget savings for the title II program by recommending last year's level of $821 million. Unfortunately, this will still represent a cut for the program. Under a little known provision—section 416(b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949—the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to provide commodities acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation [CCC] to the title II program. In fiscal year 1993, over 2 million metric tons of foods were donated under 416. Because CCC stocks have dwindled, in fiscal year 1994 only 160,000 metric tons were delivered and this year no ''416'' food will be available.

Mr. Chairman, for all the work we have done, hunger is still a problem in the developing world. Even under the optimistic estimates of the administration, we will fall over 400,000 metric tons of food short of the needs of starving people around the world. Recognizing this need, the International Relations Committee included a 2-year authorization for a minimum of 2.025 million metric tons of food to be delivered under the title II program. Cost estimates show this would be equal an authorized funding level of $863 million for this program in fiscal year 1996 and fiscal year 1997.

Mr. Chairman, the Title III Government-to-Government Program is a new one, created in 1990. While it has worthy goals, it clearly does not have the priority that the title II program has in saving lives. The administration recognized this when it proposed cutting the title III program by $100 million, down to $50 million. The Budget Committee recommended ending the title III program altogether. Working with Representative BEREUTER on the House floor, we saved the program in the American Overseas Interests Act at the $25 million level. Given the needs of starving people, I believe that the Appropriations Committee should reflect the authorizing committee levels and

emphasize the life-saving mission of the title II program.

I want to thank Chairman SKEEN and Representative DURBIN for their work on this issue. They have done good work on this bill and I will strongly support it on final passage.

I ask that since I will be unable to offer my amendment to title V to transfer $25 million from the public law 480 Title III, Government-to-Government Program; to the public law 480 Title II program. I strongly support funding for the title II program.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DURBIN

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DURBIN: Page 71, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. 726. None of the funds made available in this Act to the Department of Agriculture may be used (1) to carry out, or pay the salaries of personnel who carry out, any extension service program for tobacco; or (2) to provide, or to pay the salaries of personnel who provide, crop insurance for tobacco for the 1996 or later crop years.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk, and I would like to inquire of the chairman of the committee if he would like to enter into a unanimous consent as to the time for the debate on this amendment relative to the tobacco program, and I would like to suggest to the chairman that we limit the debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto to 1 hour, 30 minutes on each side.

Mr. SKEEN. If the gentleman will yield, would the gentleman accept 40 minutes, 20 minutes on each side?

Mr. DURBIN. I would like to think that could happen. But honestly I have 20 requests for time to speak. I think 30 minutes is realistic on each side.

Mr. SKEEN. The gentleman is bound and determined to extend this thing. Thirty minutes each side?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 1 hour, 30 minutes, equally divided by myself and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN].

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield my time on this side to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time limitation on this amendment will be 1 hour, equally divided, 30 minutes by proponents and opponents, and all amendments thereto. Time for the proponents will be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], and the opposition by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS].

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the Durbin amendment and ask that he explain the amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, may I correctly assume this time will not be taken from the debate time on the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will make that concession.

Mr. DURBIN. Soon?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. DURBIN. I might respond to the inquiry from the gentleman from Illinois that this amendment has been changed and does two things. It says that none of the funds made available in this act, this appropriation to the Department of Agriculture, may be used, No. 1, to carry out or pay the salaries of personnel who carry out any extension service program for tobacco or, No. 2, to provide or to pay the salaries of personnel and provide crop insurance for tobacco for the 1996 or later crop years.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, would the Chair clarify the status of time on this inquiry and this point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The inquiry does not come out of debate time.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, rule XXI, clause 2(c) provides that no amendment to a general appropriation bill shall be in order if changing existing law.

□ 1930

The burden is also on the proponent of an amendment to a general appropriation bill to prove the language offered under the guise of a limitation does not in fact change existing law (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp 18666–7, June 16, 1976), or impose additional duties on Federal officials, not required by law (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 28, 1968, p 15350), or implicitly requires Federal officials to make judgments and determinations not otherwise required of them by law (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 31, 1969, pp 21653, 21675). It is submitted that even an implicit restriction on authority to incur obligations otherwise included in an existing contract is legislative in nature and not a limitation on funds (July 13, 1987, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p 19507).

Section 508(b)(1) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act requires the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation to offer a catastrophic risk protection plan to indemnify producers for crop loss due to loss of yield or prevented planting and such coverage is provided for tobacco.

Section 508(b)(5) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act provides that producers shall pay a fee for such catastrophic coverage and section 508(b)(7) provides that to be eligible for price support and a number of other benefits from USDA the ''producers must obtain at least the catastrophic level of insurance for each crop'' grown on the farm (with certain exceptions for minor crops not applicable here).

What is mandated in the Federal Crop Insurance Act, that is, catastrophic insurance coverage, whether obtained from a Federal Agency in the field (a county office of USDA) or a private insurer under an agreement for sale from the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation is not only limited by this amendment, but is effectively denied to producers. The provisions of Public Law 103–354 (the Federal Crop Insurance Reform Act of 1994) would be suspended by the Amendment, at least for the period of the 1996 fiscal year, for catastrophic as well as ''buy-up'' coverage of insurance.

Moreover, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Board of Directors and the manager of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation [FCIC] would have added duties of changing their regulations, changing their contracts with their insured producers many of whom are automatically renewed through a continuing contract and whose contracts would have to be cancelled by the Secretary, an additional duty. They must also change their reinsurance agreements with private insurance companies who serve as agents for the Government in offering catastrophic and buy up insurance coverage under existing agreements that would have to be amended. The reason for the latter is that, the agreements between the FCIC and the private insurers are normally multiyear, but for fiscal year 1996 because there is an element of Government funds, over and above the premium, involved in the catastrophic and buyup coverage in crop insurance, some action would have to be taken by the Secretary or the manager of the FCIC to change the insurance company agreement. There would also be costs involving advertising notices to producers, banks, and other lending institutions about the proposed change to cancel coverage. Other ''wind-down'' costs involving cancelled coverage in 1996, as well as the duties and costs involved in reinstituting notices and regulations concerning coverage availability in fiscal year 1997. Heretofore, because tobacco was covered by general notices on major crop coverage there would be a need for notices to banks and institutions offering credit and to tobacco producers when the coverage would be terminated in 1996 and the reinstituted for 1997 tobacco crops.

Finally, it is submitted that if the Amendment were adopted that it could have the effect of denying conventional crop insurance coverage for tobacco, but make tobacco producers eligible for the Noninsured Crop Disaster Assistance Program (NAP) of section 519 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1519). This program provides disaster assistance, without insurance premiums being paid, mainly where catastrophic coverage is not available. I note that crops specifically included

are Christmas trees, turf grass and industrial crops. However because there could be added cost to the Government of $17 million in FY 1996 according to USDA if such coverage was given for tobacco crops if this Amendment were to be adopted, that possibility should be considered in the ruling on this Amendment as a violation of section 602 of the Budget Act.

Also, Mr. Chairman I point to the colloquy last night between Chairman ROBERTS of the Agriculture Committee and other members when he urged them to take up matters such as this in the farm bill and not try to change the appropriations bill into a farm bill. He stated he would work with them in such an undertaking.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there further discussion on the point of order?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have offered neither changes the law nor imposes any new duties on any Federal employee. Under the rules of the House, the House is free to specify what is not to be funded in a bill. The House may decline to fund specific activities under rule XXI. This is a strict limitation and totally within the four corners of the existing rules and limitation amendments which have been allowed time and again.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, I believe that I have answered those remarks by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] and I would insist on my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman does insist on his point of order, and the Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING] makes the point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois violates clause 2 of rule XXI by legislating on a general appropriation bill.

The amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] is in the form of a limitation. It prohibits funds in the bill from being used to carry out, or pay the salaries of personnel who carry out, certain tobacco programs, including crop insurance for tobacco.

The precedent cited by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING] (July 13, 1987, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at p. 19507) is distinguishable. The language ruled out on that occasion was a proviso in a paragraph of a general appropriation bill proscribing the incurring of obligations for certain facilities that was not in the form of a proper limitation on funds in the bill.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] however, is in the form of a straight limitation. It is a negative restriction on the availability of funds in a general appropriation bill that merely restricts the availability of funds and refrains from prescribing duties or requiring determinations of governmental officials. A straight limitation on funds is not considered as changing existing law but as merely constricting the range of objects to which the accompanying appropriation may be put.

Accordingly, the Chair overrules the point of order under clause 2 of rule XXI.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to salute my colleagues who have joined me in offering this amendment. The gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] and the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH] have been kind enough to join me in this bipartisan effort. This is an important and perhaps historic debate on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives. We will decide tonight in no small measure whether Uncle Sam is going to get out of the tobacco business.

Let me tell my colleagues what ever Member of Congress in this Chamber has faced and what I have faced many times throughout my career in town meetings where ordinary Americans asked a very difficult question. ''Congressman,'' they say, ''if the Federal Government tells us that tobacco kills you and is dangerous for you, why in God's name do the Federal taxpayers have to subsidize the growth of this tobacco?''

And time and again my colleagues on the floor here will answer, ''Well, perhaps it is not such a good idea; we ought to do something about it.'' Tonight my colleagues have a chance to do something about it because tonight this amendment addresses two specific areas of spending on the Federal tobacco program, mainly the Extension Service and the crop insurance program.

Mr. Chairman, I wish it were within my legislative power to completely abolish the tobacco programs at the Federal level tonight with this amendment, but, because of budgetary constraints, I cannot. What I will attempt to do with this amendment is to address two large parts and very serious parts of our Federal tobacco program, and I hope in so doing to not only demonstrate why this is good philosophically, but good from a budgetary viewpoint.

First and foremost, the tobacco growers and their supporters on the floor will tell us time and again until they are blue in the face that the tobacco program does not cost the taxpayers anything. My colleagues will hear that tonight at least a dozen times and believe each time they have heard it that it is not true. The tobacco program costs American taxpayers each year $42 million, $42 million of Federal tax money going to support an industry that generates $40 billion a year in sales, 40 billion. These are not mom-and-pop pauper operations. These are huge tobacco companies working in many instances with huge tobacco growers, and we still subsidize their effort.

The amendment which I have introduced addresses the Extension Service. We have men and women in the Extension Service traveling across the country giving advice to growers and farmers as to the best way to grow their crop. What we are saying is get them out of the tobacco business. They can advise people who are growing crops that are good for us how to grow those crops more efficiently, but tobacco, tobacco is the only subsidized crop by the Federal Government which, when used according to manufacturers' directions, will kill us. It is not an ordinary agricultural crop. It is a killer, and each year it is the No. 1 preventable cause of death in America. We cannot say that about cotton, or corn, or wheat, sugar beets, or any other commodity that the Department of Agriculture deals with.

The second area is crop insurance. Those who grow tobacco buy insurance in the likelihood or in the circumstance where their crop might be endangered because of floods or drought, whatever it happens to be. They pay a premium, but the premium does not cover the cost of the program. In other words, when they get paid back, they receive more back from the Government than they paid in premium. The difference is paid for by America's taxpayers, and that unfortunately adds again to the cost that we pay each year to the tune of about $23 million.

Today's debate is not about whether small tobacco farmers will survive. One acre of tobacco can generate 2,000 pounds of product a year, currently selling, I understand, for about $1.80 a pound; in other words, $3,600 gross. Now it is much more labor-intensive than most other crops, but a person with 1 acre of tobacco under cultivation can expect to make several thousand dollars from that 1 acre. In my part of the world where we grow corn, if someone can net $200 an acre from growing corn, they are lucky. If someone is a tobacco grower under the program, we are talking in terms of several thousand dollars.

The program continues, the tobacco allotment program will continue, those profits will continue for those families. They can afford to buy their own crop insurance.

The issue here is should the Federal Government use taxpayers' dollars to subsidize this crop. I will tell my colleagues I would like to have every Member of Congress tonight to have an opportunity the next time that a town meeting comes up to say, ''Yes, I cast a ''yes'' vote for the Durbin-Hansen-Smith amendment to make it clear that Uncle Sam ought to get out of the tobacco business. We have no business subsidizing the growth, production, and processing of a product which kills hundreds of thousands of Americans each year.''

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

□ 1945

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak against the amendment. Let us be clear what

the Durbin amendment does. This amendment does not reduce spending in this appropriations bill. Read it for yourself. We will not cut a penny in this bill. What the amendment does do though is discriminate against the small farmers in the tobacco growing regions of this country in favor of large corporate growers.

Let us be sure what we are doing here. You are giving the big advantage to the big corporate growers, and you are cutting out the very small one acre plot growers. That is who you are hurting, I would say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN]. That is who this amendment hits. Whether the gentleman is aiming there or not, that is where it hits. They will be denied basic assistance available to any other farmer, particularly the big farmers.

The corn farmer in the gentleman's district is welcome to get help from the extension agent, thank you very much. But my farmer is told, ''No, we don't like what you grow, we are going to refuse to help you.'' It says to my farmers, ''Even though Federal law requires you to participate in the crop insurance program, we are prohibiting you from doing so,'' forcing that small family farmer to break the law that this Congress wrote.

The intent of this amendment, as the gentleman said, is to get people to quit smoking. Well, let me explain to Members how this thing works. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] does not understand that the tobacco allotment program holds down production of tobacco. If you lift that program, the big, huge corporate growers are going to grow tobacco like it is going out of style. They will import tobacco from all over the world. People are going to smoke cigarettes, it will be foreign tobacco or big producer tobacco, and the cigarette prices will plummet, and you will see a rash of smoking increases. The tobacco control growth program holds down the production of tobacco, propping up the price of cigarettes. You remove that, and cigarettes go dirt cheap.

Mr. Chairman, I ask you, is that what you really want? While you promote smoking, you are killing off the small growers in the country in favor of the large corporate growers. I urge Members, reject Durbin.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN], a cosponsor of the amendment.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, let me point out to Members that this amendment we are working on does not hurt the family farmer. They still have access to tobacco price support programs and their crops will still be in demand. Furthermore, tobacco is a very lucrative business and I am sure they can afford to stay in this business.

Let me tell you about a man who is my neighbor, Dr. Chuck Edwards. Chuck Edwards is the foremost expert in the West in taking care of people who have cancer of the jaw and the larynx. You ought to see that. I wish Dr. Edwards was here and everybody in this House was forced to look at this, and everybody in America, because what he does is he shows these films. He takes their face off and puts it up over their head, and then he goes into that area and he cuts off their jaw, and then he puts a hole in their trachea, and that is how they breathe.

He talks about all these young people who take this little round can they keep in their back pocket, and take it like this and stuff it down in their mouth. He says, ''There is 100 percent chance, if they live to the age of 60, we will take their jaw.''

Who in their right mind can tell me, what doctor will stand up and say that this is not one of the greatest killers there is in America today? And we subsidize it. This is a Kevorkian budget subsidy if I have ever seen one.

We find ourselves in the position where we talk about 350,000 people that went up in smoke in a mushroom cloud in the days of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Now we kill 400,000 of them, and this group, this Congress, supports it. It is unbelievable to me that Congress will take it upon themselves to support this kind of thing.

I do not worry about my friends here that smoke. That is fine. Go ahead. We are old guys. We are going to die anyway. I am worried about that kid, that teenager. Do not tell me the Marlboro man and Joe Camel is there to try to get him to change from one to another. That is there for one reason and one reason only, and that is to get youngsters to smoke. There is a 31 percent increase in 2 years of 8th graders, 31 percent increase, that are now smoking.

I would suggest that Members read this month's issue of Reader's Digest. It talks about a tobacco lobbyist. It talks about all the money he received to walk around here and convince you and convince me that we are supposed to do everything in our power to keep this subsidy on.

This is the time that America can make a difference. This is a time to do something for the American people. I urge Members to support the Durbin-Hansen-Smith amendment.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

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

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, that is a kind of tough act to follow. This the first time you have heard there is no subsidy for tobacco, and if this amendment passes, not one person, not one person is going to stop smoking. It has nothing to do with people stopping smoking, and it is not going to affect the argument that the gentleman made.

Let me tell you who it is going to hurt. It is this small farmer who averages about three acres. People in North Carolina are already telling me they are losing two-thirds of their crops this year, and if they do not have insurance, they are broke. They cannot go diversify. They cannot go and become some other kind of farmer. They cannot go to Illinois and rent some land and grow corn on three acres. You cannot make enough money growing corn on three acres.

This is not going to stop one individual in this country of ours from beginning to smoke, or quit if they already smoke. But what it is going to do, it is going to hurt that small farmer, that is trying to send his kids to school, to get them through school and get them through one of our universities where they can go out, get some training, and get a better job. They are trying to raise their families. They made commitments. They cannot diversify.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a health amendment, this is an economic amendment. You are not going to stop one individual in the United States of America from smoking because of the Durbin amendment. What you are going to do is you are going to penalize this small farmer that is up to his ears in debt, he has obligated his farm, and he is trying to make it from year to year. That is who you are going to devastate, and that is who we are not here to devastate, is the small farmer.

I would urge Members, when you consider your vote, consider that small farmer and his family that is trying to make a living. He and the wife both work and the children work, and it is a legal product, and it was $5.8 billion that came into the economy of this country last year because of tobacco. It is legal. Vote against the Durbin amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the cosponsor of the amendment, the gentlewoman from the State of Washington [Mrs. SMITH].

(Mrs. SMITH of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I first want to thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] for having the courage. I found out over the last couple of days it takes courage to go up against the tobacco industry. You not only get a lot of calls to your office, you get a lot of pressure.

This amendment will not just save $23 million, but it is the right thing to do. On my desk each day I read in front of me, it is a quote from Abraham Lincoln, and it says ''I am not bound to win, but I am bound to be true. I am not bound to succeed, but I am bound to live up to what light I have. I must stand with anybody that stands right and part with him when he goes wrong. Abraham Lincoln.''

I am parting with you who are supporting the tobacco industry because I think you are wrong. I have to tell you that when I go into my home area one

of the top issues that they ask me is, Linda, in downsizing government, have you got rid of that tobacco subsidy yet? And I said no, but I am going to do it. I just did not realize how bad it would be.

I want to tell you clearly this is a subsidy. Some say when the government pays for your insurance it is not a subsidy. Some say when they pay for the extension agents to help you grow a better crop to market to our children, it is not a subsidy. But when I tell you the bottom line is $23 million spent from your taxes, folks, you in this room and the other folks out there in America, I have to tell you, it is $23 million, and they should be giving us money.

My mother died younger than I am of cancer. I had a friend die over the weekend of cancer, a young man, a pack-a-day smoker. There is no justification for subsidizing tobacco. Teach them to grow another crop. It is a lucrative crop, but they can grow another crop. I am not saying right now they cannot grow the crop. I am just saying, do not spend the taxpayers' money. Please folks, do what is right. Do not do what the tobacco industry wants.

They were prowling the halls here yesterday and the day before. Ignore them and do what is right and vote against the tobacco subsidy and for this amendment.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from western Kentucky [Mr. WHITEFIELD] to explain that there is no tobacco subsidy anymore.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of discussion this evening about the tobacco industry, and when you talk about the tobacco industry, what you are talking about is 126,000 small farmers around this country who have grown tobacco legally in America since really the founding of this country in Jamestown.

Really what this amendment is about, this administration has made a conscious effort to try to destroy the tobacco industry. It is a legal crop and there are many things in our society that we do not like. We do not like to see bad things happen to children or women or anybody else.

My mother-in-law, for example, smoked until she was 94 years old, and we know that smoking does cause cancer in some instances, and other times it does not cause cancer. But it is an individual decision. It is not something that the Government should be dictating.

This amendment, this Durbin amendment, is a discriminatory amendment against small tobacco farmers who have the right to grow a legal crop, and I think it would be a serious mistake to adopt the amendment, and I urge its defeat.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BISHOP].

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Durbin amendment. It would devastate the economy of key Southern States like Georgia. Tobacco growers would be only farmers who will be punished. This is a punitive effort.

Since the Depression, we have been denied access to government research, to education, and to extension services for a legal crop. We are not talking about growing marijuana here. We are talking about a legal crop. And it is an administrative nightmare that is about to be created here. It is misguided.

What the amendment says with regard to extension agents' salaries is that the salaries will not be paid if they provide any services to help tobacco growers. But what about the people in those counties that do not grow tobacco? Their salaries would be cut, so they cannot even help the ones who grow corn.

That does not make any sense. This amendment is misguided, it is punitive, it is a slap in the face to southern States. It is a slap in the face of farmers, small family farmers, who work hard. Why shouldn't they have crop insurance if they grow a legal product? Why should they not be able to help support their families and the economy of this Nation?

Nine thousand farmers in my State of Georgia make their living growing tobacco. Twenty-eight thousand warehouses, other in the retail industry. Overall, the tobacco industry contributes to the economy of Georgia thousands and thousands and thousands of dollars for a legal product.

I submit to you that the amendment is misguided, it is an administrative nightmare, it will punish the growers of crops that are non-tobacco crops in counties where they do grow tobacco. It just makes absolutely no sense. It is a case that reminds me of the years of prohibition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] has 23 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] has 20 minutes remaining.

□ 2000

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN].

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

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, this is the kind of debate that mystifies the American people. The Federal Government and every medical expert in this country has told us that cigarette smoking is the leading cause of preventable death. On tonight's news, we heard that young people are starting to smoke again in large numbers. That is a public health menace.

So on the one hand, we are telling people not to smoke, and on the other hand, we are subsidizing the tobacco industry. What kind of signal is this to the American people? What kind of signal is it to our children? How are we going to explain to people that we are going to cut back on school lunches, we are going to cut back on programs for poor people and the elderly, but we are going to continue subsidizing the tobacco farmers?

We do not dictate whether a person smokes or not. That is an individual decision. But it ought not to be sudsidized by the American people in any way, shape or form.

This amendment is a small step. There are other subsidizations that we have through the tax deductions that the tobacco companies take in order to promote their product, and there is no product for which more money is spent to promote than tobacco itself, something like $3-, $4-, $5-billion a year.

They are making an enormous amount of profit from the disease and death of people who are their customers. I believe they are enlisting kids to become smokers to replace those that are dying off.

Do not subsidize it with taxpayers' funds. I urge adoption of the Durbin amendment.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BURR].

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

Mr. BURR. Mr. Chairman, in fact, we are here tonight and I rise in opposition to an amendment that does need exploring. The truth is that we are here to talk about an amendment that will, in fact, eliminate crop insurance to one small segment of our agricultural industry, tobacco, while corn, wheat and everything else continues to receive that special privilege.

We say to an extension agent, you can go to a farm and you can talk about other agricultural products. You can even discuss the grass in that farmer's front yard. But if he asks you about tobacco, by law, Congress says you cannot talk to him about it. It does seem a little strange, and it does not make a lot of sense.

The authors of this amendment are not trying to balance the budget. They are not even trying to streamline the Department of Agriculture. They want to kill a crop. They want to kill tobacco.

Will they kill the family farm? Absolutely. Do they care? Absolutely not. Farmers are trying daily to survive, to pay their mortgage, to educate their children, to contribute to their community. But they do not care.

I would say one thing to the authors of this bill. If you want to kill tobacco, then introduce a bill. Be brave enough to ask for what you want. Do not hide behind something that kills people who do not have a voice in it, the small farmers in this country.

This is exactly the type of legislation, Mr. Chairman, that in fact the American people are sick of and I as a Member of Congress am sick of it. Do what is right. Defeat the Durbin amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ].

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Chairman, the discussion tonight is not about whether this is a legal crop. It is. This is not about trying to drive farmers out of business. We are not trying to take anyone's livelihood away from them.

The question tonight is about whether the Government of the United States is going to encourage behavior that we know kills people.

Mr. Chairman, we are talking in this Congress about how to preserve and protect Medicare. We are tearing our hair out to figure out how we can preserve those benefits for people for the coming generations. Yet, it has been estimated that over the next 20 years we will spend $800 billion on Medicare patients who need treatment for smoking-related illnesses, $800 billion.

It is not just impacting seniors. It is impacting children. Pregnant women who smoke have a 50 percent greater chance of a miscarriage or a low birth weight child. So we are impacting our children. We are impacting our seniors.

The question we have to ask ourselves tonight is why the government of the United States should encourage and subsidize that behavior by paying for people to find out how to grow more tobacco, by paying for crop insurance for tobacco.

Yes, it is a legal activity, but pay for it on your own. The government of the United States should no longer encourage a behavior that harms our children, that harms our seniors, by continuing to pay for this activity.

Those who want to continue to smoke, to use tobacco, to grow tobacco, let them do it on their own. But let us stop paying for it.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, let me first recognize the sincerity of the proponents of this amendment, but let me also say very clearly I rise in opposition to this amendment, and I want to clarify what this amendment is not about.

This amendment is not about smoking, whether juvenile or adult smoking. It has nothing to do with smoking. This amendment is not about deficit reduction. It has nothing to do with deficit reduction.

Every small family farmer pays an assessment on every pound of tobacco that they grow. This amounts to over $30 million a year that goes to the Treasury, so it has nothing to do in any way with deficit reduction.

What it does have something to do with is whether or not small, rural counties and communities in the South can exist. Tobacco is the only crop they can grow in these communities, unlike in Illinois and other communities where they have farms with hundreds of acres, long rows where you get on that tractor, and you drive a half mile and your turn around and you drive back.

You cannot do that in these little communities. These are hilly country, rocky country. About the only thing they can grow is tobacco, and that is why the average tobacco patch is only 3.3 acres. It takes a family. It is squat labor. It is the whole family that gets out and works together to get this crop in and then get it in the barn.

Without the tobacco, it means that there are no grocery stores, because there is no one to buy groceries. There is no filling stations, because there is nobody to buy gas. There is no pharmacies, because there is no one to go to the drugstore.

So make no mistake about it. This amendment is not about deficit reduction. This amendment is not about smoking. It is about allowing small communities in the South to continue to be able to exist and allowing farmers to raise their family and see that they are able to improve their life, just like everyone here wants to see their family's life improved.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING], chairman of the Subcommittee on Risk Management and Speciality Crops.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for allowing me to speak out on this.

I wish that my colleague from Illinois would have introduced a bill, if he really wanted to get smoking, to make it illegal. I am a reformed smoker, and I understand that. I do not encourage it.

But what you are doing here, you are not affecting the program at all. You are just twiddling with it around the edge. You are doing things to a program that provides income to the American Treasury, that provides export and helps us with our balance of trade.

My colleagues, go to Kentucky, go to Georgia, go to North Carolina and see how these people live and see if the Durbin amendment is not affecting the lives of small people. It is.

If you want to make tobacco illegal, do it. Try and do it up front. But do not twick around the edge. That is not fair to the people you are messing with, and it certainly is not fair to this Congress.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKY].

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Durbin-Hansen-Smith amendment.

I would like to address three sets of people here: children, farmers, and tobacco companies.

The gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] in his remarks earlier said that smoking among eighth graders has increased 30 percent in the last 3 years. As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] asked rhetorically several years ago, would any of you be happy if your eighth grader came home tomorrow and said, dad, mom, I started smoking today? Would you be happy if that happened?

We talked about a lot of farmers here today. We ought to talk about a lot of kids and the $6 billion that the tobacco companies spend every year on promotion and advertising to get these kids addicted.

Second, I represent a district that lost 38,000 jobs, count them, between 1977 and 1987, and I am very sympathetic with the problem that the tobacco farmers are having. But I find it very interesting that the tobacco companies do not care. If they care, we, 2 years ago, would not have had to enact a limitation on imported tobacco coming into this country because so much of the tobacco that the companies use was from other countries, not from those poor farmers who are losing their jobs who they trot out in front of them to take that first volley of fire, because they have no place to hide.

Finally, the issue of saving $23 million, that is still a lot of money from where I come from, and if you want to protect those farmers, if you want to give them insurance, let the tobacco companies take some of their $6 billion in profits and spend $23 billion to help those farmers insure their tobacco so they can continue to grow it in safety.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BAESLER], the only tobacco farmer in the House of Representatives.

Mr. BAESLER. Mr. Chairman, I think we have had a lot of discussion about what this amendment is not.

Being a tobacco farmer, this year in June we are all in Kentucky putting out tobacco and working with it. What this amendment tells me as a tobacco farmer and all of the other farmers in Kentucky and North Carolina, if I have a disease in my crop this summer, if I have something going wrong in my field, I cannot go ask the county extension agent what the problem is.

It also tells me later on when that disease, blue mole or black shag, takes all of my crop, that I am not entitled to Federal crop insurance to help pay for that disaster. If the Ohio River floods, on one side we might be in Illinois, those farmers can acquire Federal crop insurance to take care of them. A tobacco farmer from Kentucky cannot.

This is not about health. This is about fairness. We are going to tell one group of farmers in the United States who pay their taxes, tobacco generates $12 billion a year to the United States, States and local governments. We are going to tell one group of farmers, you are not deserving to go to the extension service to get help. Every other farmer in the United States is, but you cannot.

We are going to tell that same group of farmers, if the Durbin amendment passes, you cannot have Federal crop insurance to protect your investment.

You folks do not know the first thing about the profitability of tobacco. I

have heard three people here talk about the profitability who are basically ignorant about the profitability of tobacco.

So it is a question of fairness. It is not a question of health. It is a question of fairness. Tell these farmers they are not as deserving as all of the other farmers, and continue [Mr. DURBIN], continue, the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH], continue to take the money from these farmers and what they generate throughout this country, but do not let them participate like the other farmers.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE].

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, we have heard numerous times, maybe 50 times in the course of all of these amendments, that we want to send somebody a message. It is stated in a variety of ways, generally dealing with small amounts of money in some way or another. I think we send the most confused message possible with respect to our tobacco policies in the United States of America.

We indeed have support systems for crop insurance, for extension and for various other aspects, but it would indicate in that way that we bless the growing and the selling of tobacco and the Federal Government is a part of it.

☐ 2015

On the other hand, we condemn it. The Surgeon General condemns it, we have studies which have condemned it, we have proclamations which do so. We do know a few things. We know tobacco is very deadly, that it can create great mischief in our society, but we know there are huge costs attached to this well beyond the $23 million we are talking about here tonight.

We have other costs. When we look at Medicare, Medicaid, we look at lost productive time in our economy, there are all manner of ways in which we can measure the cost in terms of what has happened with tobacco.

We know our children suffer because of tobacco. I did not even know what Joe Camel was. I thought it was sort of a joke when I heard about it. Then somebody pointed out to me that it was appealing to children, and was a very serious problem in terms of tobacco is concerned.

I believe even if the Federal Government removes itself from the ring, the big tobacco companies will probably move in and help out with the small farmers. I do not think there will be any loss there. I think at that point the Federal Government will be sending one clear message to everybody in the United States of America, and that is that we are not going to be involved in tobacco; that if you are going to smoke, smoke with great caution; that we can sell the programs of trying to make sure we go out and point out the problems to the people of the United States of America.

It is for this reason that I support the Durbin-Hansen-Smith amendment. I hope that all of us would, and all of us would realize the problems caused by tobacco. Tonight we can start to make the changes in this country that will be in the best interests of all of us.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I rise tonight in opposition to the Durbin amendment. The denial of extension services and Federal crop insurance will destroy the family farmer and the economy of rural America. In my State of North Carolina alone, the production of tobacco employs approximately 260,000 people; more specifically, one in 12 people have a tobacco-related job.

Every year the Federal Government counts on $25.9 billion in tobacco-related revenues, compared to the approximately $16 million in costs to USDA to administer the program, quite a return for the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask my fellow Members, who will shoulder the revenue loss? The taxpayer? I think not. In this time of budget cuts, we need to think twice before attacking the very heart of an industry that gives back so much to this country. Mr. Chairman, I ask Members to vote no on the Durbin amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Durbin-Hansen-Smith Amendment. This amendment would save $23 million by eliminating Federal funding for tobacco extension services, and crop insurance.

Under the Durbin proposal, debate on the future of the tobacco price support program is deferred to the Farm Bill. However, there are other tobacco-related activities that are costing the taxpayers money. Administrative costs to run the price support program and related crop insurance, as well as marketing costs to promote the auction sales and production of tobacco are subsidies that keep the red ink flowing.

The tobacco industry makes large profits on their products. As a matter of fact, 68 cents of each dollar that is spent by consumers on tobacco products goes to manufacturers and distributors. Only 3 cents goes to the growers. Manufacturers are turning their sights overseas, while the number of tobacco farms and manufacturing jobs have dropped. Ironically, the policies set forth by Congress to help the small family tobacco farmer are actually benefiting the tobacco industry. I believe that we will be able to address the plight of the small family farmer when the House debates the 1995 farm bill.

The amendment before us is merely an extension of legislative actions taken by past Congresses. In 1994, the Agriculture appropriations bill extended the prohibition on tobacco assistance to the Agriculture Department's research programs. This amendment extends the prohibition to crop insurance and extension services.

It is time for the Federal Government to get out of the tobacco business. I urge my colleagues to seize the opportunity to move one more step toward accomplishing that goal by supporting the Durbin-Hansen-Smith amendment.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Durbin-Hansen-Smith amendment. This misguided amendment will not allow small tobacco farmers to call upon the guidance of their USDA agent about some important environmental concerns, such as how to distribute fertilizer without causing damage to soil or water, or how to apply insecticide safely and properly, or how to combat agricultural plagues, such as blue mold and target spot. These are matters important to our environment. It would also strip away from the tobacco farmer his ability to purchase crop insurance, like all other farmers can do.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a direct assault on the hardworking men and women, farmers who grow tobacco in my district and in the southern part of the United States. Even worse, some would have us believe that this amendment eliminates the Federal Government subsidy to tobacco-related programs.

Let me set the record straight. There is no direct government subsidy for tobacco. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] has already spoken to that. Furthermore, and I think importantly, tobacco's importance to our Federal, State, and local government can be summed up in one figure. That figure is $62,300. Sixty-two thousand dollars is the amount of money per acre that tobacco generates for the public sector. This is money that flows into the general revenue of the U.S. Treasury and that of many of our States, to be used for discretionary spending on such things as agricultural programs.

I believe these numbers in fact speak for themselves. The Federal Government does not subsidize the tobacco program. Tobacco does contribute very positively to the U.S. Treasury. However, this amendment would allow any farmer in the Nation to utilize USDA services, except our tobacco growers. This amendment would allow any farmer in the United States to participate in Federal crop insurance, except tobacco growers. Do not be fooled by this amendment. It is not about smoking, it is blatant discrimination against small tobacco farmers. Vote against this amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN].

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of Durbin-Hansen-Smith

amendment, to finally end the $23 million giveaway to the tobacco industry. Each year 420,000 people die from tobacco-related illnesses, which makes it the leading cause of preventable death in the United States today. Each day 3,000 kids pick up their first tobacco product. According to the FDA's diagnosis, they become inflicted with a pediatric disease. This epidemic costs our Nation's economy over $100 billion in health care and lost productivity. How can we give one cent of taxpayer money to support this industry?

The tobacco industry spends billions, not $23 million, Mr. Chairman, but billions of dollars in advertising and marketing to entice children. An industry that snares 3,000 new customers a day into a lifelong addiction does not need our help. Already Joe Camel is more recognizable to 5-year-olds than Ronald McDonald. We should be debating how to regulate and restrict this industry, not how to support it.

Not only does the tobacco industry target children, it has the distinction of not being truthful to the Congress, to numerous Federal agencies, and to the American people. How many times have we heard that the tobacco industry does not market to children, that nicotine is not addictive, or that the level of nicotine is not manipulated by tobacco companies?

Mr. Chairman, the tobacco industry has not been telling the truth. The American Medical Association knows that they are lying. The FDA knows that they are lying. The American people know that they are lying. According to their own internal documents, the tobacco industry knows that they have consistently misrepresented the truth. When are we, my colleagues, going to learn?

Usually when I rise in favor of eliminating programs, I like to point out that in order to balance the budget, difficult choices need to be made, and that as conscientious legislators, we have to balance the good programs and what they achieve with their cost to the American taxpayers. Not today, not with tobacco, not with this amendment. The Durbin-Hansen-Smith amendment is an easy choice. We must pass this amendment tonight.

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

Mr. MEEHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman, does he realize that the amendment that is being offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] is being directed at the small tobacco growers, not Phillip Morris? They would benefit. They would be allowed to grow tobacco by the tons of acres. It is the small farmers that are being hurt by this amendment, does the gentleman realize that?

Mr. MEEHAN. I am well aware of it. That is a $23 million giveaway long, long overdue. I think it is time we turn around and give the American taxpayer a break and give the American public a break.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CHAMBLISS].

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

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose what I call ''the harass the tobacco farmer'' amendment to the agriculture appropriations bill. Having lived in Georgia's farm belt all my adult life, I understand farm programs. I live in the most diversified agricultural county east of the Mississippi River. I have had the privilege of working with farmers on a daily basis for the last 26 years. I understand how farm programs work. I understand that there is a big difference in improving farm programs and harassing farm families.

Let me tell the Members what the difference is, why we are talking about corporate farmers versus small farmers. A corporate farmer does not depend on crop insurance to pay his bills. He does not depend on crop insurance to educate his children or pay his operating loan. The small farmer does.

The corporate farmer does not depend on the extension service agent. The corporate farmer can afford to go to Athens or Tifton or Lexington and hire a specialist to come in and check his field. The small farmer depends on that extension agents who comes to his field and work tireless hours, day and night. If Members do not want to throw a blindsided knockout punch to the family farmer of this country and to the rural district of America, I urge Members to vote ''no'' on the Durbin amendment.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING].

Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Durbin amendment. This is a mean-spirited attack on the small farmer throughout the South. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] does not like smoking, but this amendment will not stop one person from smoking. It will only hurt the small tobacco grower in my district and throughout the South.

The opponents of tobacco always imply that we should not pay farmers to grow tobacco. We do not. Let me repeat that, the Federal Government does not pay subsidies to farmers to grow tobacco. The government only pays for the administrative cost of the tobacco program, which the farmers pay back to the government. Over $20 billion in Federal, State and local taxes are paid by the tobacco companies annually into the Treasury of Kentucky and the United States of America.

Sure, our government also offers some of the same programs, like crop insurance and extension service, to tobacco farmers, but we should offer them the same services that the other farmers receive. We need that help with out small tobacco farmer. We have to have the same help that the farmers of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] have in Illinois from our extension service, so we know how to do it better in Kentucky. Remember, it is a legal commodity. They are not outlaws, our small farmers.

This bill will do not one thing, I say to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH] and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN], to prevent smoking. It will not only hurt the big tobacco companies, it will not decrease the deficit, it will only treat the small farmers of America like criminals.

☐ 2030

It is bad policy. It is unfair. It is wrong to do it, and I urge the defeat of the Durbin amendment.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, this debate is neither about the morality of smoking nor the mortality of tobacco. This amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] who I respect, does not either address the value or disvalue of smoking, although I respect his position. In fact, I am one who does not advocate smoking; in fact, fear that smoking is a health problem.

Mr. Chairman, this is misdirected. This is misdirected to achieve a noble goal, a noble goal to say to people they should not smoke because smoking is bad for your health. It is an adult election. Certainly we do not want to encourage tobacco companies, to make sure they advocate smoking for children, at least this Member does not.

The Durbin amendment does neither of these issues, address health value, nor does it raise the opportunity for people to cease smoking. It actually will hurt our Nation's farmers. You have heard that over again.

Mr. Chairman, in my district, I have more flue-cured tobacco grown in my district than any other part of this country, and I expect you naturally to say that, EVA CLAYTON, because you are from North Carolina. Yes, I am from North Carolina and I know that my farmers are not the villains. They are, indeed, the victims.

They are people who often tell their boys and girls, ''I teach you to grow it but I teach you not to smoke it.'' They are trying desperately to make a living, a decent living for their life. In fact, many of them wish they did not grow tobacco, but that is their fate in life.

Mr. Chairman, why should we discriminate against those who happen to be growing a legal crop that they will receive no extension service, and when they need crop insurance, they will not receive any crop insurance? This is misguided. It is discriminatory in its application, whether worthy or not.

Mr. Chairman, I urge defeat of the Durbin amendment.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr.Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Durbin amendment. I understand the gentleman's objectives, but I think he misses the mark. What happens here is we are not going to reduce the consumption of tobacco. We are going to reduce perhaps production.What does that do? It ruins the economy of many southern States and communities, and it ruins millions of small farmers.

Mr. Chairman, it is wrong to hold our tobacco farmers responsible for the consumption of tobacco products, just as it would be irresponsible to hold grain farmers responsible for the local drunk.

Ladies and gentlemen, we have the wrong target. We are hurting the wrong people. We are going at this in the wrong way. This is the wrong place with the wrong amendment.

Mr.Chairman, I urge strong opposition to this amendment and ask you to vote against it tonight.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute, Mr. Chairman, to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON].

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment and I do so because there are really two issues here. One is economic and one is philosophical. Economically the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Durbin] is telling us that this is going to save $23 million, then $10.6 million, when, in fact, the USDA estimates that this will cost $5.4 million.

Let us not fool ourselves. This is not saving money. It is not directed to save money. What it really is is philosophical. And philosophically, the gentleman from Illinois feels passionately against tobacco and I understand that, but I would say to him that this is authorizing; it is not appropriating.

I do not understand why we do not have legislation introduced. We are seven months into Congress. I do not think any of the three authors of this amendment have authored legislation so that we could have the great tobacco debate in the committees of Congress, and I think that is what we need to do.

Mr. Chairman, we should get this thing over with. There are vehicles to get probably where we want to go, but as it is, when Members take noble aim at the tobacco industry, they only hit the tobacco farmer.

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

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

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, about 8 years ago to the day I stood in this well and offered an amendment. It was an amendment to ban smoking on airplanes. When I offered that amendment, it was opposed by every leader on the House of Representatives floor, Democrat and Republican alike.

I had been around here for 5 years. My staff and my closest friends told me I was crazy to take on the tobacco lobby; they were too big and too powerful and I was not only going to lose, but I was going to be embarrassed in the way that I lost. Eight years ago on this floor, by a margin of five votes, we passed the ban on smoking on airplanes.

The people who spoke that day represented the diversity of the U.S. House of Representatives as those who have spoken this evening in support of this amendment. The gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN], the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH], so many others, represent political points of view far different than my own on most issues. But we have come together on this issue because we find common ground and agreement in a basic understanding and a basic premise.

Mr. Chairman, the premise is the one I began this debate with. Why on God's green Earth, if we tell every American that this crop will kill you, do we, as taxpayers, go on year in and year out subsidizing the growth, production and processing of this product?

I want to commend my colleagues for their fortitude in standing up this evening and speaking on behalf of this amendment. For those who are watching, it may seem like an easy thing to do. Believe me, it is not. They have risked, I am sure, some evil glances from colleagues and perhaps more. Some of them have decided not to come to the floor this evening and I can understand why they did not. This is not an easy issue to deal with.

The tobacco lobby in this town is one of the most powerful and pervasive. They are everywhere. They are undoubtedly watching this and writing down every word to use it against all of us. I thank my colleagues for coming up and supporting this amendment.

Let me tell you about this amendment.

Yes, it is only $23 million out of a $1.5 trillion budget. It could be a lot more money we could be talking about, but it is a significant change that we are talking about here.

If this amendment passes this evening, it will clearly send a signal to the Committee on Agriculture when they write their tobacco program that Members of Congress, Democrats and Republicans alike, have had it with the Federal subsidy of tobacco. When we passed the ban on smoking on airplanes 8 years ago, people said, ''So what? Two-hour flight, so what?'' It ended up triggering a debate across America on secondhand smoke that reached every restaurant and every public building in the last 8 years. You see it when you even walk into this building.

Right behind me, if you want to know what the tradition is in this Chamber, carved on that little podium up there are tobacco leaves. That is right. We have been into tobacco in this place for a long time. Tonight is our chance to break it, for Uncle Sam to finally get off the tobacco habit.

There is a lot at stake here. This is not another farm crop. This is the only crop subsidized by American taxpayers which, when used according to manufacturers' directions, will kill you. It is the only one.

My colleagues who come up here and say treat it like any other farm crop would like to ignore the death and destruction caused to American families every year by this insidious crop. It is time for us once and for all to break the tobacco habit at the Federal level, to put an end to this subsidy. This measure tonight, the Durbin-Hansen-Smith amendment, is a step in that direction.

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my colleague the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is unrealistic, unnecessary and unfair.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment prevents people who grow tobacco from taking part in the Federal Crop Insurance Program.

But just last year congress passed a bill making the crop insurance program mandatory. Sounds like a catch-22 to me.

The Durbin amendment will hurt small farmers the most. It's the family farmer who depends most on the advice and help of extension services.

It is simply unfair to single out one crop and one type of farmer.

Mr. Chairman, maybe some people think the tobacco farmer has an easy, lucrative life. I'd say those people have never watched folks work in a tobacco patch.

I'll be happy to show them around Kentucky's second district.

First the Clinton health plan, then the FDA, now the Durbin amendment.

All for a crop using a few million dollars worth of assistance that brings in nearly 20 billion in taxes and trade surplus. 20 billion!

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the Durbin amendment, and call an end to the war on tobacco.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FUNDERBURK].

Mr. FUNDERBURK. Mr. Chairman, yesterday morning I addressed the opening of the Smithfield, North Carolina tobacco market. I spoke to hundreds of farmers who made their way across my district to sell their crop in rural Johnston County.

These farmers are not the giant tobacco corporations the Clinton administration, the FDA and some in Congress attack. These are small farmers who struggle from year to year just to make ends meet. These are the people who provide the jobs, pay the taxes, and fight our wars.

If you have been on a tobacco farm, you know it is the most backbreaking work in agriculture. This year the small farmers of North Carolina have been hit by twin disasters, bad weather

and President Clinton. Too much rain weakened the crop, too much Clinton and Kessler threaten the industry's survival.

If that were not enough, here comes the Durbin amendment with another kick in the teeth to the 200,000 men, women and children in my State who depend on tobacco for survival. This amendment is bad legislation. It does nothing the authors claim. It punishes no one they want to punish. Vote ''no'' on Durbin.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WARD].

Mr. WARD. Mr. Chairman, we have heard from the opposition. We have heard from the proponents. What we have heard from the proponents is that only 3 cents of a dollar that is spent on cigarettes goes to the farmer.

But, listen, tonight we are going after that very farmer who gets only 3 cents on the dollar. We are punishing families who grow on average 3 acres of tobacco. To make ends meet, members of that family work day and night on that farm. Tobacco is a very laborious job. But also to make ends meet, they work in factories in my district in Louisville.

Not one bit of tobacco is grown in my congressional district, or just a tiny bit. It is grown around the Commonwealth of Kentucky by people who rely on its income to keep their family farm. Let us not attack the lease of the people who benefit from tobacco in this country. Vote against the Durbin amendment.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ROSE].

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Chairman, I knew the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] had been too nice all night and all day, that he had a sword in his pocket somewhere, and here it came.

But listen to me carefully, my friends. I have spent 24 years working on this particular crop and this particular problem. If you want to put American farmers out of the tobacco business, support the Durbin amendment.

And if you then want the companies that buy tobacco to smile all the way to the bank, and go to Brazil and buy tobacco for 30 and 40 cents a pound, support the Durbin amendment. If you want the cigarette companies to make more money than they are making tonight and be able to sell cigarettes cheaper to the young people of this country, support the Durbin amendment.

The gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] said it very well. If you want to take a family, rural, poor, black and white, that has 5 acres of tobacco that can make 2,000 pounds an acre, 5 acres times 2,000 is 10,000 pounds of tobacco.

□ 2045

A poor rural family can supplement their income with $10,000 to $12,000. That is the difference between them staying on the farm or moving into your city and getting on your welfare program. If that is what you want, some more poor people in your cities, vote for the Durbin amendment.

This is incredible, to offer an amendment to deny price support and pesticide advice to farmers and then piously walking around here saying, we are saving the people of this country from the dangers of smoking. You all can do better than that.

Make cigarettes illegal. Go after outlawing cigarettes. I will join you in banning unattended cigarette machines.

Please, vote against the Durbin amendment. Ye know not what you do if ye vote for it.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will remind our guests in the gallery, please, that public demonstrations of either support or opposition are not permitted.

The Chair thanks them very much for their courtesy.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, to close the debate on our side, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER], the chairman of the Republican Conference.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague for yielding time to me.

Ladies and gentlemen, we know this amendment that is before us tonight has nothing to do with smoking. It is not even about public policy. It does not even have anything to do with the tobacco program.

What this is tonight, ladies and gentlemen, is about politics, not about policy. This is about big government telling the American people what they can and they cannot do. It is nothing more than harassing small farmers in 23 States in America that have grown tobacco for 300 years. It is another step down the path toward political correctness that some on the left want to continue to advance in this Chamber.

My colleague, tonight let us say no to more, bigger and better government here in Washington. Let us say no to political correctness, and let us say no to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Durbin-Hansen-Smith amendment. I have often spoken of the need for our Government to have the right priorities as we move to balance the budget. Funding tobacco-related programs is more than a bad priority; it is wrong for our Government to directly or indirectly encourage the use of tobacco.

Tobacco use kills over 400,000 people every year in America. What makes these deaths even more tragic is that they are wholly preventable. Uncle Sam must stop simultaneously spending taxpayers' dollars to encourage tobacco use through these Agriculture programs, then discourage tobacco use through public health campaigns, and then pay for medical treatment when smoking gets people seriously ill. This policy just doesn't make sense. Let's stop it today.

In Congress, we should be in the business of preventing deaths, not encouraging them. I urge all my colleagues to support the Durbin-Hansen-Smith amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BUNNING

Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky:

Page 71, after line 2, insert the following new section:

''SEC. . Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, none of the funds in this Act shall be made available to or for the Food and Drug Administration.''.

Mr. BUNNING (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes and that the time be equally divided.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this is a simple amendment. It strikes all funding for the food and drug administration from the bill.

The amendment is meant to send a shot across the bow of the FDA. It's a rogue agency that's out of control and Congress needs to slap it down.

At a time when we are cutting the size of Government and slashing red tape, the FDA is heading in the opposite direction. It wants broader regulation and bigger bureaucracies.

Dr. David Kessler, the FDA Commissioner, summed up his philosophy pretty well a couple of years ago when he proudly noted that the FDA was ''Getting new regulations out faster than ever before.''

When you stop to consider that the FDA is probably the most powerful government agency in the world with direct regulatory authority over a trillion dollars worth of our economy, Dr. Kessler's regulatory glee is more than a little frightening.

But, still, what have all of these new regulations got us?

Back in the 1970's it took 5 to 7 years to develop a new drug and get it approved. Now it takes 12.

As recently as 1992 the median approval time for medical devices was 102 days. Last year it climbed to 182 days.

It took 3½ years for the FDA to approve the kidney treatment drug interlukin–2, even though nine other countries had already approved it. During this time, an estimated 25,000 Americans died of kidney cancer.

Because of a 7-year delay in the approval of a heart medicine commonly known as beta blockers, the director of Tufts University Center for the study of drug development estimates that 119,000 Americans died who might have been helped by this drug.

All of this has happened in spite of the fact that the FDA has continued to expand. Since 1990, the FDA's budget has grown 27 percent. The number of employees who work for the agency has climbed 14 percent.

Mr. Chairman, we might have more regulations than ever before. But I believe that in their zeal to safeguard the American public from every possible evil, Dr. Kessler and the FDA have actually been slowly regulating America to death.

Mr. Chairman, last November the voters told us they don't want more Government and more regulation. They want less.

They want less Government interference in their day-to-day lives. They want less micromanaging by Federal bureaucrats.

And the American people certainly don't want Federal agencies pumping out rules and regulations faster than ever before.

But, in case the FDA hasn't noticed, the age of the welfare state is ending. The time when the Federal Government acted as a nanny for the public is passing.

In a recent op-ed piece, former Delaware Governor Pete Dupont even went so far as to dub Dr. Kessler the ''National Nanny''. This is one nanny who has been slowly suffocating the children.

Mr. Chairman, I'm a realist. I don't hold out much hope that my amendment will pass the House. But I want to send a message.

We have to let Dr. Kessler and the FDA know that some of us in Congress are watching. Some of us recognize that the Commissioner is out of control, and the FDA is out of control.

And more importantly, I think that we need to continue sending the signal that the time of Government passing more and more regulations in the name of compassion for its citizens is passing. FDA regulations are raising health costs. FDA regulations are killing people.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to see the gentleman from Kentucky offer this amendment, and I congratulate him for it. This makes the issue very clear.

This is the kind of amendment that we Democrats love to see Republicans offer. It is the kind of amendment that will lead the voters of America and the consumers of America to vote the offeror out and all who vote for it. I urge my colleagues to join in supporting the gentleman from Kentucky.

What does the Food and Drug Administration do? It protects against bad and dangerous blood and dangerous blood products. It protects against filthy, dirty, adulterated, contaminated food manufactured and imported into this country. It protects the American public against unsafe biological products.

It protects the American people against unsafe products which are medical devices. It protects the American people against contaminated, dangerous, and unsafe commodities such as cosmetics. It protects the American people against the distribution of materials which affect the health of the American people and which are, in fact, not safe. It assures that products which are sold in commerce are, in fact, efficacious.

It has come into being because the Congress needed a body which would protect the American people against things like sulfanilamide elixer, which killed millions of Americans in the 1930's or against milk which was made safe and preserved by the addition of formaldehyde. It protects Americans against the kind of situation which we saw created generations of European babies who were born with flippers and without hands and legs, because of thalidomide.

I have been more critical than anybody else in this body about the Food and Drug Administration and about their failures, and I have seen to it that one administrator of the Food and Drug Administration has left public service and that a number of them have gone to jail.

I have seen to it that the entirety of the generic drug portion of the Food and Drug Administration has left that service, and we have cleaned it up.

Drugs are safe in this country, and they are safer here than anywhere in the world. Foods are safer in this country than anywhere in the world because of Food and Drug, and American women can buy cosmetics in the knowledge that they are safe, and the American mother can buy food for her baby in the knowledge that that food is going to be safe and not risk the health and the welfare of that child.

America can look to its food, America can look to its cosmetics, America can look to its appliances, to its blood and every other commodity that affects health and that sustains life and know that it is safe because of the Food and Drug Administration.

No other country until the world can have that comfort and satisfaction, and I would urge my colleagues, as they vote on this piece of legislation and on this particular amendment, to understand it is easy to criticize, but it is very, very hard to make the situation better.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] and ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control that time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN].

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues in the strongest possible way to oppose this amendment.

The FDA needs reform, and I have introduced the first comprehensive bill in this session to get that reform. But make no mistake about it, the Bunning amendment would cripple the safety mission of the Food and Drug Administration.

My colleagues, let me say I know of no major industry group in our country that wants to go as far as the Bunning amendment. The biotechnology industry, which we have so much hope for in the 21st century, is certainly not going to want to cut all of this funding. The device industry, which also shows such great promise, does not want to go this far. The pharmaceutical industry does not want to go this far. They all believe that the Food and Drug Administration needs reform.

□ 2100

We can do that on a bipartisan basis, but let us not turn back the clock, let us not play Russian roulette, with the safety of the America public. Vote no on the Bunning amendment.

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

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] for yielding this time to me.

Colleagues, make no mistake about it. This is a very, very unwise amendment, and I guess in a sense it is appropriate that it follows on the heels of the Durbin amendment, which was in my view of very modest amendment. This is a shot across the bow of the FDA all right, but it comes from the cannons of the American tobacco industry, and the reason for this amendment is one reason and one reason only, and that is that the FDA in the face of overwhelming medical and scientific evidence is on the verge of classifying nicotine as an addictive substance. So we need to be clear on, frankly, the motives behind this amendment.

Again, Mr. Chairman, it is very unwise. The FDA is making improvement, and working with industry, and expediting the rulemaking process, and I strongly urge the defeat of this amendment.

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

I response to the gentleman from Michigan I would like to just give him some information he might not have, that on July 14 of this year the FDA agents swooped into the headquarters of Synthetic Systems of Seattle, WA, to seize a device that poses a serious threat to the American people. What was the device? It was a chair that had a massage machine attached to it. They came in, and it was a relaxation machine, and the FDA, without warning, came in and removed it, stopped the sale of a relaxing chair machine that had a massage motor attached to it. If that is not an agency out of control, I have never seen one.

I would like to respond to my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS]. I understand that the timber industry in his area needs help, and we understand that this Congress took steps to take care of that. I really personally resent the implication that the only reason that we are offering this amendment is that the FDA might, might, consider classifying tobacco as an addictive drug. There is no proof of that, and he knows it.

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield a minute and a half to the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN].

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am just shocked at the debate that we are hearing this evening. The story the gentleman just told, as far as I know, is an anecdote that is not correct. It did not happen. I have heard these stories over and over again, and they turn out, when we investigate them, to be untrue. This is not the basis for ending an agency that protects the safety of the American people by approving drugs to be effective and protecting us from a food supply that may poison us.

I think this an irresponsible amendment. If this amendment were to be adopted, it would keep the FDA from getting drugs and devices on the market. Our industry in this country for drugs and devices are the marvel and leader of the world because they work with FDA, and, when FDA approves them, everyone recognizes that the FDA approval means that those products do what they are intended to do. They are safe, they are effective, and our industry has been profitable and saves lives.

Let us preserve the FDA and defeat this amendment. I think it is thoroughly irresponsible to want an appropriations bill to do away with the Food and Drug Administration. I wonder what the authorizing committees are all about, what the policy committees are supposed to be doing, if we are going to have amendments dropped out here on the floor without any debate, without any hearings, without any real thought being given to whether the FDA ought to be preserved, in some ways reformed, but made to work as it has done and can continue to do in the future.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] has expired.

Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, in yielding such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] for the purposes of a colloquy, does the gentleman believe the things written in CRS are factual?

Mr. WAXMAN. I would.

Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky. The gentleman called me a liar.

Mr. WAXMAN. I did not call the gentleman a liar, but let me tell my colleague, if he would yield to me, I will explain to him my point, and I have heard the story over and over again about the FDA sneaking into offices, and when I investigated it, it just was not true, it just was not accurate.

Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky. So the fact of the matter is the FDA did swoop down on this company in Seattle and do exactly what I said, and that is right here, in case the gentleman is interested, on page 28 of the Congressional Service. Let me get the date for the gentleman.

Mr. WAXMAN. If the gentleman will continue to yield, perhaps they were enforcing the law. I think the gentleman is overreacting to something that is not accurate.

Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky. I say to the gentleman, ''If you call me a liar, I react to it.''

Mr. WAXMAN. This is about the anecdote he is relating to the House.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I urge a ''no'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Bunning amendment. I understand that there are some very volatile, negative opinions surrounding the FDA, but it would be irresponsible to simply eliminate all of the programs the Agency oversees.

Reforms at FDA may be necessary, but there are effective and far less draconian methods of accomplishing that than by obliterating the Agency.

Last year I worked with a broad, bipartisan group of Congressmen to pass the Dietary Supplements bill, which brought common sense to the treatment of dietary supplements.

In that effort, we addressed what some considered to be regulatory excess and unreasonable restrictions on the part of FDA. However, even those in the nutrient and supplement industry who objected to FDA's tactics would not suggest that the entire Agency be abolished.

FDA governs the safety of all drug products, is working towards an AIDS vaccine and AIDS diagnostic tests, researches veterinary medicine products and devices, and ensures that food labeling is truthful. Surely we will not say to our constituents that these functions are no longer necessary.

Committees of jurisdiction in this body are free to use their oversight authority to curb overzealous FDA activity, and the appropriations process is always available to shift an Agency's priorities. But to destroy these health research and enforcement programs without a full and open debate would be careless and unproductive.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the Bunning amendment.

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

Think about this amendment for just a second. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING] will close down the Food and Drug Administration. It will close it down, no funding, and then tomorrow what will happen? The Food and Drug Administration, which is responsible for monitoring the Nation's blood supply so that when someone is in an accident and goes to the emergency room they do not have to worry about that transfusion passing the HIV virus to them? Out of business. The Food and Drug Administration which inspects mammography clinics where our wives and loved ones who go in for breasts examinations can be assured the instruments are accurate and the people working there are professional; the FDA inspects those. Out of business. The Food and Drug Administration which review drugs on the market to try to protect us from disease and help live our lives a little longer, live a little longer, out of business. I ask if this is the Republican revolution that was voted for last year. Is this what they were looking for to get Government off our back, to take the Food and Drug Administration out of business of making sure that the foods, and drugs, and medical devices coming into our homes are safe and effective? I do not think so. I think what Americans are looking for are smart people here in this Chamber pushing for legislation to make more effective Government, not closing down the Food and Drug Administration.

Mr. Chairman, this is a kind of extreme position which I hope all Members of Congress would understand is unwise for America's future. Democrats and Republicans alike should defeat this amendment and perhaps join the gentleman from Kentucky in reforming this agency. There are things we can do to reform it, but turning out the lights is hardly reform. It really closes down an agency that is vitally important to every American family. I hope we will all join in defeating this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 19, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from

Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING] will be postponed.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Chair to proceed now to have the votes at this time, and I ask unanimous consent that we do this.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I rescind that request, and we will let the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] proceed, and I think then we will have the votes immediately after, and that will take 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] withdraws his request to proceed with votes that had been rolled over from earlier this evening.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY: Page 71, after line 5, insert the following new section:

Sec. 726. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall be used to pay the salaries of personnel who carry out a market promotion program pursuant to section 203 (7 U.S.C. 5623) of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 that provides assistance to recipients other than those identified at 7 Code of Federal Regulations 1485.13(a)(1)(i)(J), 1485.12 (a)(2)(ii), and 1485.15(c) or that provides assistance to organizations with annual gross sales of $20,000,000 or more unless it has been made known to the official responsible for such expenditures that the organization is a cooperative owned by and operated for small organizations that are members of the cooperative.

Mr. SKEEN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. ZIMMER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I have proposed an amendment that has a considerable amount of support that deals with the same general program that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is addressing, the market promotion program.

I intend to offer my amendment as a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], and the agreement that had been reached with the leadership and with the chairman of the subcommittee was that the discussion of the market promotion program would be 1 hour, 30 minutes, divided between the two sides.

Continuing under my reservation, Mr. Chairman, if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin is passed, it will in effect preempt the amendment that I have offered in a timely manner, and so I must object to this unanimous-consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is willing to entertain suggestions from the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman if we will have a 10-minute debate, we will accept his amendments, and no votes on that tonight?

Mr. ZIMMER. I reluctantly reject that proposal. The understanding that I reached with the gentleman was that my amendment would be entitled to 1 hour of debate. There are many Members who feel very strongly about this on both sides of the issue, and in effect that debate will be preempted, it will be truncated, by the debate on the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. OBEY's amendment. Mr. OBEY is trying to deal with the problem in a good-faith manner, but in a much more limited way than our striking amendment and elimination of the program.

I believe it is entirely appropriate for us to debate the elimination of the program and the limitation and the reduction of the program in the same general debate, and so I must reluctantly object to any unanimous-consent request that does not give proponents and opponents of Mr. OBEY's amendment and my substitute an aggregate of 60 minutes.

□ 2115

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield under his reservation, I simply ask a question.

Mr. Chairman, the situation, as I understand it, is simply that we are trying to work out a mechanical problem. We are trying to facilitate the completion of all of these appropriation bills this week.

The difficulty we have is that I cannot be on the floor at the same time I am supposed to be in the committee helping to move forward the Labor-HEW appropriations bill.

I do not believe that the gentleman's amendment is in any way inconsistent with mine. Frankly, I had expected that there would be a very truncated discussion on mine, vote up or down, and then we would proceed to the gentleman's, which I think has probably much more interest than mine. But I think the gentleman misunderstands if he thinks that our amendment in any way precludes his amendment. It does not. The gentleman's amendment is simply much more restrictive than ours and can be offered, even though ours is offered, even in the unlikely event that mine is adopted.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, with all respect, I understand that the gentleman has proposed the same amendment in years past, and it is not designed intentionally as a way to inoculate against the complete elimination of the MPP, but that will be its effect, and that is why I am insisting that we be able to debate them both in the same hour.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, there is a dissimiliarity in the two amendments. One is a limiting amendment; the other one is an omission, a complete omittance of a program. The Zimmer amendment is freestanding and will get its own time, and I will assure the gentleman that he will have a full hour of time, regardless.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, you have been very fair and very understanding. We have had a number of conversations about this. But with all respect, it is not a question of time, it is a question of timing.

If the Obey amendment is to succeed, it will, for all practical purposes, forestall any reasonable debate on my amendment.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, we will not have any votes on the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] this evening.

The CHAIRMAN. With all due respect to my colleagues on the floor, this has gotten a little bit out of the bounds of normal operating procedure. We have already heard objections to the suggestion of a time limitation by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY]. The Chair is inclined to proceed with the Obey amendment and recognize for 5 minutes on each side, unless the chairman of the committee has a suggestion on how else we proceed, very quickly.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, all I am trying to do is to offer an amendment which I expect will be opposed by both sides for opposite reasons. I am simply rising today to offer an amendment that is trying to put some rationality in the export marketing program, which is going to be debated a good deal tomorrow or later this evening as well.

I simply am offering an amendment which suggests that it does not cut any money out of the marketing program. All it suggests is that support under this marketing program should not be allowed for any corporation that has sales of $20 million or more unless it is essentially a co-op. That is all the amendment does.

I have 10 reasons for proposing this amendment. They are the Ernest and Julio Co., the Dole Co., Pillsbury Co., Tyson's Foods, M&M Mars, Campbell Soups, Seagrams, Hershey, Jim Beam Whiskey, Ralston Purina.

I enjoy virtually all of those products. I just do not want to have to subsidize all of them.

At the same time, I think there is room for an export marketing program provided that it is not gobbled up by the big boys.

Now I recognize that those who want the program to stay as is are going to oppose my amendment because they think they have a better chance of killing an amendment to cut off the program. I also recognize that some Members think they have a good chance to

cut off the entire program, and they do not want to vote for my amendment because they think it gets in the way. I apologize for that inconvenience. But I do think that once in a while around here there is room for a middle way. That is all I am trying to do.

With that, in an effort to simply try to move this forward so that Members can go home and the committee can continue to debate the rest of the amendments and roll the votes until tomorrow, I thank the chairman.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ZIMMER AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ZIMMER as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. OBEY: Strike the text of the amendment and insert the following:

''SEC. 726. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to pay the salaries of personnel who carry out a market promotion program pursuant to section 203 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5623).

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION IN FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided in this Act for ''Commodity Credit Corporation Fund—Reimbursement for Net Realized Losses'' is hereby reduced by $110,000,000''.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, during the course of the evening, we have had suggested time limitations on debate. Does the chairman want to make a time limitation request on the Zimmer amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will consider a time limitation request.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour and that the time be equally divided.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman refer to debate of both the substitute and the underlying Obey amendment or only to the Zimmer substitute?

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, yes, both.

The CHAIRMAN. Does it refer to both the Zimmer amendment and the Obey amendment or only the Zimmer amendment?

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, that is my understanding.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, just a clarification. I presume the one hour, I do not care what kind of limit is on the Obey amendment, which we did not know about and came as a surprise, but we were promised one hour on the Zimmer amendment last night for foregoing doing it last night, and I would ask that it be one hour on the Zimmer amendment and then whatever time the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is willing to accept on his substitute amendment be added to that.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Reserving the right to object, I would ask the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] to modify his proposal for 1 hour on the Zimmer amendment and whatever he wants to add, 10 minutes or whatever, to the Obey amendment.

Mr. Chairman, continuing my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to point out that if we are going to start cross-walking these things, I have an amendment to the gentleman's amendment, and that also ought to be included in the discussion. I would simply prefer to have a five-minute debate on my amendment on the other side. I do not care if the vote is taken tonight or tomorrow, and as far as I am concerned, I do not care how long we stay here tonight debating the gentleman's amendment. I would suspect that they could all be rolled until tomorrow.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, continuing my reservation of objection, does the gentleman care which order they are debated and voted upon?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I have already debated mine. I do not need any more time on mine. I would offer another substitute.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, the proposal I would make is that we spend 1 hour on the Zimmer amendment, no more debate on the Obey amendment, and then move to vote on the Zimmer substitute and then the Obey amendment.

Mr. Chairman, continuing my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN].

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I have a counter for the gentleman, and I would say this, let us do two votes now and get them out of the way, and then we will give you all the time necessary for the Obey and Durbin and Bunning.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, just a point of clarification from the gentleman, those two votes are not either the Zimmer or the Obey amendment?

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, neither one of those.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to that.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have no objection to rolling over votes while we are all here listening to the debate, but if we are going to vote and then have debate while all of the Members are gone and then vote tomorrow, I find that a highly offensive procedure. There will be no one to hear the debate on either side. So if the proposal is to have our votes and have the debate on that one amendment only and roll it over to have the vote thereafter or roll it over until tomorrow and not have all of the other amendments brought up tonight, I will not object, but I do not think it is proper to have a lot of amendments debated when members are not even here to hear the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will enforce regular order. There is no pending question.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The amendment is not withdrawn.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, everybody is a little offended about everybody's other little offenses tonight, and I am sure it is becoming a very prickly situation. I would once again offer, let us do the two votes that we have pending now that we have rolled over and do them now. We will also discuss this amongst the interested parties during the vote, and we will then come up with some resolution on what time to afford the two interested parties during the vote, and we will then come up with some resolution on what time to afford the two interested parties on the issue that we have got that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] are interested in.

□ 2130

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, the inquiry is very similar to what the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] just mentioned. Is it the intention of the chairman of the subcommittee to have debate tonight and then no votes tonight after those next two amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry. A parliamentary inquiry must be directed to the Chair.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, I am asking the Chair to ask the chairman. I think a lot of us are concerned that we are going to have debate this evening on a lot of significant matters.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has a number of responsibilities, one of which, however, is not to announce the program for the evening.

There is a pending proposal by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] to proceed to the two votes that were postponed from earlier in the evening. That would be possible if the pending amendment to the bill were withdrawn. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, are those two votes first on the Durbin-Hansen-Smith amendment on the tobacco program, and second on the Bunning

amendment, on the Food and Drug Administration?

Mr. SKEEN. That is correct.

Mr. DURBIN. Those are the two votes we would have now, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DURBIN. In that case, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. There is still a pending amendment by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY]. He cannot withdraw his amendment because of the objection of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING]. We must dispose of the pending business involving the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] before we can move to the other one.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY]?

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series. The first vote is 15 minutes.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY THE MR. DURBIN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 199, noes 223, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No 544]

AYES—199

Ackerman
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baldacci
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bass
Becerra
Beilenson
Bereuter
Berman
Bilbray
Blute
Borski
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Coburn
Collins (IL)
Conyers
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Crapo
Cunningham
Davis
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Doggett
Dornan
Dunn
Durbin
Ehlers
Engel
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fields (LA)
Foglietta
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Furse
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Goss
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hansen
Harman
Hayworth
Hefley
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hyde
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kim
King
Kleczka
Klug
Kolbe
LaFalce
Lantos
Largent
Lazio
Leach
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Martini
McCarthy
McCollum
McDermott
McHale
McInnis
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Molinari
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Neumann
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Orton
Owens
Packard
Pallone
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Petri
Porter
Poshard
Pryce
Quinn
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Salmon
Sanders
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Stokes
Studds
Talent
Tate
Torkildsen
Torricelli
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waldholtz
Walsh
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
White
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—223

Abercrombie
Allard
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barton
Bateman
Bentsen
Bevill
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (FL)
Bryant (TN)
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Cramer
Crane
Cremeans
Cubin
Danner
de la Garza
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Duncan
Edwards
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Franks (CT)
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Graham
Green
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Holden
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Kennelly
Kingston
Klink
Knollenberg
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Livingston
Longley
Lucas
Manton
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McIntosh
McKinney
Meek
Mica
Mink
Mollohan
Montgomery
Murtha
Myers
Nethercutt
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Oxley
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Quillen
Radanovich
Rahall
Regula
Roberts
Rogers
Rose
Sabo
Sanford
Schaefer
Scott
Serrano
Shadegg
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Stupak
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torres
Towns
Tucker
Vucanovich
Walker
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wise
Wynn
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—12

Collins (MI)
Dreier
Gallegly
Goodling
Jefferson
Lewis (GA)
Moakley
Reynolds
Stark
Volkmer
Wilson
Yates

□ 2153

Messrs. WAMP, CHRISTENSEN, and MASCARA changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. COSTELLO, MFUME, HYDE, SAWYER, SAXTON, ENGEL, and KIM changed their vote form ''no'' to aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BUNNING

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my demand for a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The demand for a recorded vote is withdrawn.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MRS. LOWEY

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 8 offered by Mrs. LOWEY: At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to provide deficiency payments and land diversion payments described in paragraph (1), or other payments described in paragraph (2)(B), of section 1001 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1308) to any person when it is made known to the Federal entity or official to which the funds are made available that the person has an annual adjusted gross income of $100,000 or more from off-farm sources.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on

this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

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

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, everyone else objected this evening, I just thought it was my turn. Under my reservation, I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico what the arrangement is in regard to the many amendments we have pending, and of course the very important amendment by the two gentlemen who are not on the Authorizing Committee and not on the Appropriations Committee, but must have 1 hour of debate and an immediate vote as opposed to the 10 or 15 or 20 other votes that affect policy, but we are going to debate them tonight, not have votes, roll them over into the next day so nobody will know what they are voting on.

Mr. Chairman, is that the business of the committee?

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I tell this wonderful gentleman that he is exactly right and to not have a fit until we get this thing reduced to some kind of a settlement. I appreciate everybody's patience. This has been a very difficult situation.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, I would tell my dear friend and all the sheep that he has and the one he rode in on with a saddle. With a saddle.

Mr. SKEEN. I thank the gentleman. The beauty is in the eyes of the beholder.

Mr. ROBERTS. In the saddle. My concern is this.

□ 2200

My concern is that the agreement has been reached between two of our colleagues, and I was a tad sarcastic when I said neither were members of the authorizing committee and the appropriating committee, reserving 1 hour of debate, which is essential to the market promotion program, which is a very important program not only for the farm program but for American export and all of that.

However, we have at least 8, 10, 15 other amendments on means testing, the farm program, on the Export Enhancement Program, on the Food for Peace Program and on and on. Now, we are not going to have an hour of debate in that regard. We are going to announce that we are going to roll the votes until tomorrow.

I doubt if there are more than six people on the floor when we announce that, and so the debate will not be heard, but we will come in very quickly as of tomorrow, and we will vote, and we will roll those votes, and I have a little problem with that because it is so late at night.

I think each issue deserves this kind of a policy debate, and I will tell you that if some of these key amendments are passed which I consider to be very counterproductive I will urge every member of the Committee on Agriculture to vote no, and this bill will go down.

Now I am not for that. I am not for that. But I think we are getting a little far afield here in terms of reasoned debate on the very key amendments that affect our Nation's policy.

If that is what we are going to do I guess we will just have to go and do it. I do not want to be obstreperous, well, I do want to be obstreperous; I do not want to really pose an obstacle, but the gentlewoman is going to offer an amendment here on means testing. It should have a 30 to 45 minutes at least an hour debate. It will gut the current farm program.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection. If that is how we are going to do this, why, fine, but I am just telling you this is a hell of a way to run a railroad.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I do not want to threaten or anything else. I just do not know what we are doing. What is it that has been requested? What is the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. SKEEN. Once again, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes, and that is the business before this committee on the Lowey amendment.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, does that include a vote on that amendment?

Mr. SKEEN. No.

Mr. THOMAS. Does the gentleman from New Mexico intend to have a vote tonight following debate on this amendment?

Mr. SKEEN. No; at this present time, no.

Mr. THOMAS. Then I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike the last word.

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

There is no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Pending the recognition of the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY], the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, let me first express my appreciation to the managers of the bill, both on the Republican and the Democratic side, and to those Members who have exercised their right to bring forward amendments for their willingness to work together and try to negotiate time limits on this bill, even though they are free under the rule to hold each amendment to the 5-minute rule. They have worked very hard together trying to work out time limits for the convenience of the body, and I want to express my appreciation for everyone who has worked with the floor managers toward that end.

This is a rough schedule, I know. I have heard about it quite a bit.

Let me just tell you, 2 weeks ago, or was it a week ago, the leadership team on both sides of the aisle as well as that from the Senate went to the White House and we talked to the President about how seriously important it is for us to move these appropriations bills as quickly as possible. The President of the United States, in his concern for this process, knowing how much we must get done before this year is over, encouraged both the House and the Senate to work through the August recess, and the President was most sincere in his encouragement out of a desire to have this work done, knowing what we must do later.

We made a decision that we would prefer to preserve the August recess out of consideration for the fact that each and every Member of this body already has a scheduled recess period that should not be disrupted.

We further hope to make it possible for each and every Member of this body to avoid working on weekends between now and that August recess, and yet we share the President's conviction we must complete these bills before we adjourn for the August recess.

In that interest, we are, in fact, keeping a rigorous schedule. We prefer not to deny any Member their right to have an amendment. Irrespective of whether or not they are on the authorizing committee or the Committee on Appropriations, the Member has a right to offer this amendment.

We prefer not to write rules where the Committee on Rules would dictate the terms of debate in terms of the time. We prefer instead to place our confidence in the bill managers working in conjunction with the people who have the amendment to make reasonable time limit agreements freely and voluntarily among themselves out of consideration for their colleagues. And that is working reasonably well.

How badly must it work before we write rules that diminish the right of another Member to participate in the process in the interests of time? I do not think it is working that badly, and I again applaud those folks.

Now it is an innovation for us to roll votes while we are in the Committee of the Whole, and we understand it is an innovation that probably does not have a lengthy tradition, but it's something that we thought we could do out of consideration for the Members, and I think to some extent it has worked fairly well.

I must say that some Members with amendments like the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] are able to feel confident working with the bill managers that a 20-minute time limit will suffice for the purpose of the debate. Others feel very strongly that maybe an hour might be required. But

I should ask you, is that Member who says, ''I really feel like I need an hour'' being more unreasonable than that Member that says, ''I insist on operating under the 5-minute rule''? It does not take that many Members to talk for more than an hour under the 5-minute rule.

So I think even that Member that might have said, ''I would like to have an hour working with the bill managers'' should be appreciated for the effort they made.

Now, again, let me just say I am sorry that the objection has been made. I think it is unfortunate with respect to the good effort that was made by the people involved in negotiating this time. But still, nevertheless, we still have our hopes to complete our desire and that of the President with respect to the completion of these bills before we adjourn on recess on the fourth of August. We still have our hope and our desire that we can do so without working weekends between now and then. We still have our hope and our desire we can do so without diminishing the rights of the Members to participate, and we will continue to work toward that.

But I must tell you, for us to maintain that schedule, we will have to finish this bill tonight. Now, we can, in fact, make a decision to not finish tonight, if you would prefer to not have your adjournment for the weekend at 3 o'clock tomorrow.

These are tough tradeoff decisions we have to make, and again let me thank the bill managers and those with amendments for their willingness to participate freely and voluntarily in negotiating limits on this time so that we can accommodate these tough configurations of choices.

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

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman that we have worn out this body with night after night meetings until 9 and 10 o'clock, and if your announcement means that without being able to get this unanimous-consent request we are going to sit here and grind through both amendments and vote through the night in order to get done, we are going to leave the Members totally exhausted and unable to come back here tomorrow and get the rest of the work done.

We understand what you are trying to do, and we are trying to be helpful. Our Members on both sides, as you have said, have worked hard together to try to reach unanimous-consent agreements, and they have had a good deal of success.

It is late. One of the reasons we are having trouble keeping the agreements coming is because people are getting short of temper. They are wearing out. With the greatest of respect, I suggest that we leave tonight and we come back tomorrow, maybe with a fresher attitude, and we try to go back to getting unanimous-consent requests and vote on the amendments as they come.

You have every right in the world to say that we are going to meet on Friday, maybe to a later time. Maybe the Friday and Monday of next week that you asked for us to be off has to be taken away. But I think people would rather work in the daylight hours and into the early evening. Nine o'clock might be a time beyond which we should not go. And if you will do that I think you will finish your schedule.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, the distinguished minority leader for that recommendation, and again I would like you to know we try to take as many innovations as we feel are feasible under consideration.

At this point, I think all of our work would be more facilitated, Mr. Chairman, if I would surrender my time and let the floor managers get back to work on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from New York controls the time. No other Member may be recognized unless she yields time.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent, given the statements of the distinguished majority leader and minority leader, to renew the request that was previously made by the distinguished floor manager of this bill, that is that the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] be entitled to, as I recall, a half an hour, and that the votes would then be rolled until tomorrow.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California reserves the right to object.

First, does the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] yield for that request?

Mrs. LOWEY. I certainly accept that Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from New York yields for that request.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, the original request, I believe, was for 20 minutes, if I am correct, 30 minutes, which could have been already completed. We would have started to vote, and we would have gone home.

To say that we are going to roll the vote over until tomorrow on an issue which is absolutely critical to my district when somebody else decides they have an amendment, it is going to be a half an hour debate, but the vote will not occur until later.

I commend the majority leader for packaging votes on a rollover basis during the day. It has certainly been a time saver. But when you have a half an hour debate and say you are going to postpone the vote until tomorrow, that is an aberration of the concept of rolling votes. That amendment is critical.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry, who controls the time?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from New York controls the time. Will she yield to the majority leader?

Mrs. LOWEY. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ARMEY. Reserving the right to object for just a clarification, and I beg the gentlewoman's forgiveness. The gentleman from California did make an important point, and I am sorry I forgot to make this point, and I think the body should know it. There will be no more rolled votes this evening.

That is to say again, we will not roll votes over, collect votes. The votes will take place at the time they are called.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from New York controls time.

Mrs. LOWEY. I just want to be sure that at the end of yielding the time I still have the 30 minutes, 15 minutes on each side to debate.

The CHAIRMAN. There is objection to the unanimous consent request. There is not a time limitation, and at this time, the gentlewoman is recognized under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia will hold his request. There is no pending unanimous consent request. The gentleman from California has objected.

□ 2215

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I did not object on the last unanimous-consent request.

The majority leader has told me there will be no rolling of votes, and that the vote will be called when the amendment is ended, and I will serve notice, I will not object, but when the debate is ended, I will ask for a rollcall vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent request the amendment is debatable for 30 minutes, 15 minutes controlled by proponents, 15 minutes by opponents.

Mr. LINDER. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, is it in order for the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] to move for a motion to allow the debate to occur and the vote to occur also?

The CHAIRMAN. There is no objection. We can enter the order immediately, and we can begin debate.

Hearing no objection, there will be a 30-minute cap on this debate.

The CHAIRMAN. There was no objection. The gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] will control 15 minutes, and an opponent will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] for 15 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment until the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] has explained her amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] reserves a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] but asks first she have the opportunity to explain her amendment.

The point of order is reserved.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] for 15 minutes.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman will state her parliamentary inquiry.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman from Kansas proceeding with his point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas reserves his point of order.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, has the gentlewoman explained her amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] may proceed with explaining her amendment. She controls 15 minutes of time.

Is the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] opposed to the amendment?

Mr. SKEEN. Yes, I am, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] will control 15 minutes of time as well.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Chairman, the Lowey-Greenwood-Andrews-Schumer amendment would disqualify those earning more than $100,000 in off-farm income for receiving subsidy payments. That is off-farm income. The proposal would stop wealthy landowners who often do not live or work on their farms from receiving these subsidies.

Mr. Chairman, the farm subsidy program was originally intended to help family farmers stay on their land and produce a crop. Today, too many subsidies go to independently wealthy, non-resident farm owners who do not work their own land. This amendment affirms our commitment to those family farmers who struggle each year to keep their farms an grow a crop.

There are many people engaged in this debate who are saying we should eliminate all agricultural subsidies. I do not agree. But clearly we must make this program more accountable to the needs of America's farmers. This rational change in the program will ensure that those people receiving these subsidies truly deserve them.

In an era of tight budgets, how can we justify giving these subsidies to millionaires like Sam Donaldson? It just does not make sense.

According to USDA, this proposal will only affect 2 percent of farm owners. The proposal is supported by the Clinton administration, and groups as diverse as Citizens Against Government Waste, Citizens for a Sound Economy, the Environmental Working Group, the National Taxpayers Union, and USPIRG. It is in the CBO's Spending and Revenue Options, and even the Heritage Foundation supports the concept.

CBO estimates that this amendment will save $41 million in fiscal year 1996 alone, and USDA estimates a 5-year savings of $450 million.

Mr. Chairman, this proposal makes fiscal sense, and it makes policy sense. I urge my colleagues to support the Lowey-Greenwood-Andrews-Schumer amendment.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS].

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas insist on his point of order?

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve my point of order and ask the gentlewoman for several clarifications, if I might.

Would the gentlewoman advise me as to how people would make known to the Secretary of Agriculture that a person has an annual adjusted gross off-farm income in excess of $100,000 and what the Secretary would do to obtain such information?

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I received assurance that the Department of Agriculture would understand the intent of this amendment and would put in place appropriate steps to carry out the intent of this amendment.

Mr. ROBERTS. That the Secretary would put into place appropriate steps to carry out the amendment?

Mrs. LOWEY. I am saying that I understand that the Department of Agriculture would understand the intent of the amendment and the appropriate process would follow.

Mr. ROBERTS. Well, let me keep on with my questioning if I might.

Would the gentlewoman advise me whether the Secretary would verify the information received on off-farm income and what the Secretary would do with that information?

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, as I believe this body is aware on appropriations bills, we have the right to offer a limitation amendment, but we do not have the right to dictate the policy. The intent of the amendment is clear.

Mr. ROBERTS. Would the gentlewoman please clarify for me and the membership what calendar year does her amendment apply to—1995? 1996?—and what duties it would impose on the Secretary or other Federal agencies?

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, may I have clarification on the gentleman's questions? Are they all part of the point of order?

Mr. ROBERTS. I am just reserving the point of order under the 5 minutes. If I could, I will reclaim my time for clarification to determine if this gentleman would raise a point of order.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is extremely important to know how the gentlewoman's amendment would be administered if, in fact, it even would be administered.

Mrs. LOWEY. Would the gentleman clarify the point of order?

Mr. ROBERTS. I would like to know if the gentlewoman's amendment, if the restriction that somehow the Secretary of Agriculture would administer without the gentlewoman telling the Secretary how to administer it, would that be applicable to 1995, or 1996, or what year?

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I believe, as the gentleman is aware, the amendment is printed in the RECORD, and the gentleman will have to state his point or order.

Mr. ROBERTS. In other words the gentlewoman cannot tell me whether this is applicable to crop year 1996 or 1995. I am just asking the gentlewoman a simple question.

Mr. Chairman, I can understand the concern of the gentlewoman because she does not know.

In order to implement her amendment, and this is the final question, and we will get to the end of this, would the Secretary obtain income tax returns from the IRS, or require producers to bring in a tax return, or require producers to certify their off-farm income in order to verify any off-farm income?

Mrs. LOWEY. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment speaks for itself. The intent is clear, and, if the gentleman does not have a point of order, I believe we should proceed.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I will raise the point of order once I get the clarification if, in fact, the gentlewoman can tell me. I am not trying to be argumentative. I am trying to find under clarification whether a point of order should lie against the gentlewoman's amendment. I have discussed this with the gentlewoman prior to discussion as of this late hour. What I am trying to determine is will her amendment in any way require anybody to come in and ask for information of our Nation's farmers. Will her amendment require anybody to go and obtain information? If the information does come in, will anybody verify it?

□ 2230

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, is there any additional duties required of the secretary under the gentlewoman's amendment?

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, it is not the responsibility of myself to develop the point of order.

Mr. ROBERTS. So the answer is no.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, the intent of the amendment is clear.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, so the answer is no.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, I do not have the obligation to develop the point of order.

Mr. ROBERTS. So then would the gentlewoman agree that what we have

here is the equivalent of a strong intent, and I am not trying to put words in the gentlewoman's mouth, a strong intent, a sense of the House then in terms of intent, sort of a sense of the House resolution that this would be the intent of the gentlewoman? In terms of mandatory legislation, that that would not apply here; this is more of a sense of the House of Representatives that this would be the case?

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I think the intent of this amendment is clear. It was ruled in order by the parliamentarian, and as I understand it, we do not have an obligation to define it further. This amendment certainly expresses the intent.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to raise a point of order. I will not raise a point of order. I will simply, for discussion purposes, proceed.

I think the House can understand what is apparent here. We have no way of knowing how this is going to be enforced. It is a simple attempt here that the only option the secretary has in this regard, and I am talking about Secretary Glickman, a former friend and colleague of us all, is to somehow sit back and let the information in regard to all farm income simply come to him.

Now, maybe a farmer, in a fit of taxpayer-induced guilt, will walk into the secretary's office with a certified copy of his tax return and tell Secretary Glickman that he makes more than $100,000 off the farm and please request that the secretary now pay him. However, barring this kind of situation, this amendment will be, because the secretary cannot, I repeat, cannot, deny any farm program payments for which a producer is eligible under current law without making some kind of active determination that some producers off-farm income exceeds the $100,000.

In other words, passively waiting for off-farm income information to come floating into his office is not a basis for denying payments that the courts, the courts will find acceptable when the secretary begins denying payments to producers.

Let me also say that other than the point of order concern and that there are no marching orders whatsoever on how this is going to be implemented and that every farmer in America, the 98.3 percent who do not make anything close to $100,000, will have to fill out forms and paperwork if this is administered, and the gentlewoman is careful to say that she will not do that, think of the forms and the regulations that everybody is going to have to put up with.

Now, there are several other reasons why this is not a good idea.

Mr. Chairman, the real victims here are not the people that have been piloried simply because they have off-farm income, the doctors, the lawyers, the Sam Donaldsons. Lord knows, I do not care if Sam Donaldson gets a farm program payment. It is the tenant. The tenant will lose their lease. The tenant will be forced to go to cash rent because the landowner will not continue with crop share.

This amendment will hurt the very people that we are supposed to be helping. Every farmer in the country, if this is implemented, is going to have to deal with the IRS in some form; 1.7 of America's farmers are in this category.

I can tell you if they have off-farm income in excess of $100,000, this will be the lawyer and CPA full employment act of 1995. They will separate out that income, and it will not achieve what is intended. We will not have the savings.

Mr. Chairman, I will not raise a point of order. I thank the gentlewoman. I respect the gentlewoman. I urge a no vote on the gentlewoman's amendment.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD].

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the gentlewoman from New York for offering this fiscally conservative and well considered amendment. The Lowey amendment simply ensures that those who need subsidy payments receive them.

This not only benefits the American taxpayers but it greatly benefits those small-independent farmers who need subsidies to survive.

Too often, Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government gives subsidies to those who simply do not need them. We have seen this in too many of our Federal programs, however, this has been particularly true with agriculture subsidies.

Independently wealthy, non-resident farm owners have been collecting taxpayers dollars for farm subsidies, and in turn, taking resources away from those farmers who depend on these subsidies for their very existence.

This assistance was never meant to support someone's hobby, which happens to be farming. To the contrary: It was developed to help those farmers who truly depend on the land; those farmers who every year have the threat of the bank foreclosing on their only means of income; and, those farmers who live day-by-day with the threat of losing their land and their crop because of inclement weather.

Mr. Chairman, I need not remind any of my colleagues what the message was last November. The American Public wants real reform, no more giveaways, or out of control programs.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the Lowey amendment. We can no longer mortgage our children's future to subsidize those who do not need it.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS].

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I have no quarrel whatsoever with any of the statements that were made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. The problem is, none of that applies to this amendment. If someone is passively involved, if it is a hobby of farming, if they do not have labor or management involvement, the 1987 Budget Reconciliation Act said that they cannot participate.

Those people have already been taken care of. Please read this amendment. What it says is that you are going to deny the funds to these people when it is made known to the Federal entity. When it is made known? How? When it is made known, it is going to be denied. And it is adjusted gross income of $100,000, adjusted gross income.

Come with me to Shafter, California, to Wasco, California, to Pixley, California. Who runs the tractor equipment shop? Who runs the fertilizer shop? Who are the small businessmen in these agriculturally oriented towns? The folks who farm as well. You deny them $100,000 gross income, and they are not either going to be able to be the businessmen or they are not going to be able to farm, and those small towns need both to survive.

It is a poorly conceived amendment. You are going after the wrong target. I am with you if you want to get the Sam Donaldsons and the passive people who do not really put labor or management into farms. We have already gotten rid of those folks. You are creating a nightmare in terms of IRS forms, and you are going to destroy small towns by taking small businessmen who are also farmers who provide two good services. And you are saying, you cannot do both.

It is a bad amendment. Please vote no.

AMENDMENT OFFERED MY MR. MINGE TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. LOWEY

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MINGE to the amendment offered by Mrs. LOWEY: Line 8 is amended to insert the following language after the word ''person'': ''who resides in an incorporated municipality with a population that exceeds 50,000, as determined by the 1990 census, or the person''

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

Under the previously agreed to unanimous consent agreement, the amendment by the gentleman from Minnesota is not separately debatable and must be dealt with in the time parameters now controlled by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] and the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment being offered by the gentlewoman from New

York, and I would like to put this into a perspective that may not have been noted to this point in the debate.

Several years ago, the United States Congress passed a law which recognized that we have a limited amount of resources available to pay farmers in America. We came to the understanding that we cannot pay every farmer all of the eligible amounts that they might be entitled to under a program. So we said, there is a $50,000 payment limitation. No matter how large your farm might be, no matter how complicated your personal circumstances, that is it, $50,000.

Many farmers then raced off to meet with their accountants and attorneys to figure out how to get around it, how to put the farm in the brother's name or in the uncle's name, the son's and daughter's, wife and everybody so that they could split it up and everybody would get $50,000. But it did not work in some instances and some of the wealthy or bigger farmers in my part of the world basically got out of the program.

What the gentleman from New York is suggesting is that we recognize this reality again. It is not just a $50,000 payment limitation now. It is who will receive it. Who will receive it. Pick up your investment manuals, and you will find a lot of recommendations and advice on where to put your money. Stocks and bonds and mutual funds and investments and gold and silver and this and that, some will suggest, buy farmland. Good investment.

Well, the folks that make that decision, the investors who buy farmland are interesting people, but I do not think we should shed a lot of tears about those folks.

What we are dealing with here are people with off-farm income in excess of $100,000. How many farmers today receiving money under the program fall into that category? Off-farm income in excess of $100,000? A few Members of Congress, I might add. But 2 percent, overall 2 percent of the farmers have off-farm income in excess of $100,000. So are we going to decide now to sacrifice these programs and to cut back severely to benefit that 2 percent of investors? I hope not.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] have a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman form Minnesota to the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this well-intended but having an entirely different effect amendment than the gentlewoman proposes.

It is true, several years ago, in fact, 1981, this Congress decided to move farm policy in a market-oriented direction and away from subsidization. And we have proceeded steadily in that direction and we will continue so in this year, the 1995 farm bill.

Applying an income test fundamentally modifies the function of agricultural programs and breaks the link between the programs and the accomplishments of national objectives under the current law. Producers would be excluded on the basis of a randomly selected income test.

Listen again to the answers of the gentlewoman from New York as she attempted to answer the questions of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS]. She could not and would not for a very good reason. There are no good answers.

If she did answer them, there would in fact have been a point of order logically applied to this amendment, because we ought not to be dealing with these kind of matters on an appropriation bill. We ought to be debating them as we change the direction of farm policy.

If we want to go back to a fully subsidized, away from market-oriented direction, then let us do that in the 1995 farm bill. But to fundamentally change tonight by means testing, you simply will move away from market orientation.

The unintended consequences are many. Means testing could cause a decline in the number of producers who participate. We know what will happen with means testing. The 2 percent that we are talking about tonight will immediately cash rent their farms to their tenants. When you cash rent, that will have an obvious effect on that tenant farmer. The tenant farmer will have to go to the bank, will have to borrow the money to put it up. That is the rules of the FSA office today.

There are so many reasons to oppose this amendment tonight. I could go on, but time is limited.

□ 2245

Mr. Chairman, I urge opposition to the amendment, and would urge the gentlewoman to seriously consider withdrawing the amendment.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the Minge amendment and support the underlying Lowey amendment. Mr. Chairman, this has been a revolutionary year, or promises to be a revolutionary year with respect to the budget of the United States. This Congress has made decisions to give school districts less money to teach children how to read, for better or for worse, I think for worse. It has made decisions to dredge fewer rivers. It has made decisions to raise rates of interest for students for student loans. It has made decisions to reduce school lunch allocations.

Now we are being asked to do the following: we are being asked to say that people who own farms, who have gross adjusted income other than from farming of more than $100,000 a year, other than from farming, should no longer be given a Federal welfare check.

In the same year, my colleagues, in which we are saying that we can cut back on school lunches and student loans and environmental protection, are we not ready to say to those who own farms and have income other than from farming, other than from farming, in excess of $100,000 a year, that it is about time that they took a cut, too?

If this is to be a revolutionary year in the Federal budget, let the revolution continue with the Lowey amendment. Support it. It is the right thing to do.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, most in America understand the term ''learn from our mistakes.'' However, it seems Congress sometimes forgets this fundamental dogma of society.

Does the author of this amendment realize that over the years numerous changes have been made in the way Federal farm program payments have been made, limited and targeted to certain individuals? These changes have always been made by the Committee on Agriculture and have had a wide variety of results, sometimes intended, sometimes not so intended.

Who does this amendment really impact? Banning the so-called wealthy landowners with large off-farm incomes from participating in the programs will create collateral damage, surely unforeseen by the author of this amendment. This amendment will not hurt rich people, it will hurt the small tenant farmers who rent from someone, who inherited their property, or left agriculture for other opportunities. These amendments hinge on many factors, or agreements, I should say, including crop yields, weather, good management, and yes, Federal farm programs.

If a source of income was stripped out of this equation, the small tenant farmer is likely to be pushed off the land or forced to move to a cash rent agreement, which moves all the production risk to the producer and away from the landowner.

Mr. Chairman, let me make a personal observation about this issue. I am a career farmer and rancher from western Oklahoma. I have experienced the euphoria of a bountiful harvest, and the financial burdens of a short crop. I know what it is like to be a young farmer just starting out, being primarily a cattle rancher, a cow-calf operation. It has been about 10 years since I have participated in any Federal program, and I have no plans to start in the future.

Being a Member of Congress, and the compensation that comes along with this job, the author's amendment would prohibit me from participating in any of these programs. I do not quibble with that. I do argue the fact that should I decide to change the focus of my agribusiness, this amendment would place a young farmer-rancher from my home county who is just trying to start out in farming at a disadvantage. With this limitation, Mr. Chairman, we force them to cash rent, take them out of crop share, put the burden only on the small producer, and wipe him or her out.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. Let me just make a couple of points. First, I think every one of us knows that farming is very tough work. It is backbreaking. It depends on weather and other vicissitudes far away from what people do. I think that there is a great deal of sympathy, with justification, for the American farmer. However, we are not really talking about the American farmer here. We are talking about people who have large, large non-farm incomes who are not farmers. They may own land, but they are not farmers.

Everyone says that this will decimate the farm programs. Mr. Chairman, let me tell the Members who we are dealing with. We are dealing with a number of people who receive less than 2 percent of all the deficiency payments, not 2 percent of the farmers. It is far less than 2 percent of the farmers. It is probably less than half of 1 percent of the farmers. It is 2 percent of the entire farm income. What does the average family farmer make? Between $30,000 and $35,000 for getting up early in the morning, working late at night, working hard, worrying about the weather. We are not talking about those people. We are talking about the people who do not deserve this kind of price support from the Government, and who ruin it for the rest of the farmers.

Every time there is one of these TV things on, the whole program gets knocked. If Members want to reform the program before it goes away, this is a very, very logical amendment to support, and I urge my colleagues to do it.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Arkansas [Mrs. LINCOLN].

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

With all due respect to the gentlewoman from New York, we are not talking about windowbox gardens, we are talking about large farming operations that provide an abundant and affordable food supply on the grocery stores shelves of this Nation.

I would like to reiterate what the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Kansas, [Mr. ROBERTS] says; it is impractical to try to implement this amendment. To the gentleman from California, we have taken care of the extreme situations like Sam Donaldson, with active participation language in the 1987 budget reconciliation. We are talking about the difference here between crop rent and cash rent. We are not hitting the people that the gentlewoman from New York is fully trying to get at. We are going to be damaging the small farmers across this Nation that are providing an affordable and abundant food supply on the grocery store shelves.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to vote against this amendment. With all due respect to the gentlewoman, I do believe she does not quite understand. I come from a seventh-generation farm family. Most of the farmers in my district are hard-working farmers. They understand, too, that if they do not have that subsidy in order to be able to pay back that cash rent, there is absolutely no way they will be able to continue farming.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN].

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, entitlement spending is the fastest growing portion of the Federal budget. And if we don't do something to slow the rate of growth now, in 35 years the entire budget will be spent on mandatory programs.

Most people know that Medicare and Social Security are entitlement programs, but they don't realize that farm subsidies and business tax breaks are entitlements, too. If we want to be even-handed about making spending cuts to eliminate the deficit, every mandatory spending program will have to be on the table.

The Lowey-Schumer amendment is a reasonable and fair approach to curbing farm entitlements. Let's face it, a farmer with an annual non-farm adjusted income of more than $100,000 doesn't need any more government handouts.

If we're serious about balancing the budget, and getting a handle on the growing national debt, we need to stop giving money to people who clearly don't need it.

Vote for the Lowey-Schumer amendment, and put some reasonable limits on farmers' access to the Federal trough.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], the ranking minority member.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, since the gentleman from Minnesota offered his amendment under this restricted time, we will not have any time to debate it, but I would like to explain what he has done, or tries to do with his amendment. He wants to say it just is not a question of whether or not you happen to be a person with off-farm income over $100,000, he wants to limit it to only those people who live in incorporated municipalities with a population that exceeds 50,000. I guess that is the city folks he has gone after, but the fact is I live in a part of the world where rich people live out in the country, too. If we are going after folks with off-farm income in excess of $100,000, it really does not make any difference to me where they live.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I think he has misinterpreted the amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. I do not thing I have.

Mr. MINGE. Yes, he has turned it inside out.

Mr. DURBIN. What we have here is a restriction that only applies to those who reside in incorporated municipalities. I do not know what the gentleman is doing this for, but frankly, it goes beyond the intent of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York. I hope we will defeat the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE], and then adopted the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

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

Mr. Chairman, the intent of this amendment is very clear. We want to be sure that the farm subsidy programs are helping the farmers who are farming the land, keeping the farmers on their land. This amendment only pertains to those people, too often very wealthy investors with more than $100,000 in off-farm income.

We understand many of the questions which have been posed to us today. They are just not relevant. This amendment only pertains to those investors with off-farm income over $100,000. They should not be receiving a subsidy in these very difficult times. We were on a committee today that was cutting student loans and cutting all kinds of programs that help our people in all of our communities around this country. Why should somebody with an income over $100,000 get a farm subsidy paid for with taxpayer dollars? It is the right thing to do. I hope Members will support this amendment.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, 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. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, in the interests of time, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Lowey amendment, to limit farm program payments based on a producer's off-farm income.

You've already heard it said on the floor today, you've heard it from other members of the Agriculture Committee, and now I'm going

to say it again. This is not the time, nor the proper bill, to be reforming and tinkering with Federal farm programs.

In just 2 months, we will have a farm bill out here on the floor, and I will welcome debate on this issue. Save your amendment for that time.

Agriculture will do its share and more, toward deficit reduction and a balanced budget. We're going to report out a farm bill that saves $13.4 billion in mandatory farm program spending over the next 7 years, just as was proposed in our final budget resolution. That's a chunk of money out of the pockets of the people who put the food on your table, but we are going to do it.

Finding that $13.4 billion in savings may mean that we may have to abandon totally the whole price-support, supply-management farm program we've had around since the 1930's. I can assure you as chairman of the subcommittee that will start to draft the farm bill, that we are looking at all alternatives.

We may bring out a bill that has an expanded payment limitation, tied to off-farm income as proposed in this amendment; or the issue may be moot under some new agriculture support system. The amendment proposes a cut-off of $100,000—how do we know if that is the correct cut-off, without knowing the context of the program for the next 5 or 7 years?

Let's wait and debate payment limitations in the proper context, that being the 1995 farm bill. Oppose this amendment.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the final 1 minute to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO].

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Chairman, we have had lots of folks here from large metropolitan areas telling us how we should micromanage our farm program. However, once again, those who would like to micromanage this program have created a rule that is going to hurt the very people that they say they are trying to help. What will this program, which affects at most only 1.7 percent of the participants in agriculture, do? It is going to do just as other speakers have said. It is going to cause those landowners who then will not be able to participate in this program to shift from their rent programs to cash rent programs. Then the risk is all going to be shifted to the tenants.

This will allow the landlord to protect against his loss, and the tenants will then not be able to share with the landlord some of the benefits of this program. The tenant will then have his ability to secure bank financing risked and put at jeopardy, and the net result will be no loss of income to those who are being attacked in this proposal, and instead, an economic harm to the farmer-tenant.

Why should we take a step now in this House to try to micromanage the farm plan when the Committee on Agriculture, which is served by those who understand these programs, is going to be getting a full review of it in the next few months? Let us let those who know what is going to be done by these programs do the managing.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my good friend, Congresswoman NITA LOWEY, which would prohibit commodity payments to producers with off-farm income exceeding $100,000.

This amendment is short-sighted because it severely undervalues the critical importance of the off-farm contribution to agriculture.

But I also think it conveys a basic lack of understanding of what is happened on the farm in the U.S. today.

First, let's realize how small a target the gentlelady is shooting at—the Department of Agriculture tells us that the households targeted by the this amendment represent less than 2 percent of all farm operator households and receive just 2.3 percent of all deficiency payments.

Second, let's examine the American firm today so we can put this amendment in a little context.

Today, only 57 percent of the 945 million acres of U.S. farmland is actually owned by those who farm it. The rest is cash-rented or crop-shared.

Excluding this rented land from payments would undermine the conservation and supply control objectives of Federal farm policy.

It is important to remind my colleagues that these are not income distribution programs.

We are talking about price stabilization programs for important crops which, in turn, permit American consumers to pay less of their incomes for food than any other country in the world.

We are talking about conservation programs for important cropland to protect our farmlands from erosion and to protect our waterways from excessive runoff.

Without the incentive of farm payments, these owners would be longer be bound by strict conservation and land management rules.

As a result, we would jeopardize vast amounts of environmentally sensitive land, and we would impair the ability of the program to stabilize markets for important crops.

We must also remember that these owners share the financial risks of crop production with farm operators. These off-farm investors infuse significant capital into the agricultural sector, generating many of the jobs, and much of the economic activity in rural America.

Without this capital, farmland values could decrease, creating equity problems for farmers and creditors alike.

This investment is a critical source of funding for those who would not be able to farm otherwise.

This amendment would deny the right to farm to thousands of young farmers who are starting off with limited resources, and who lack the large amounts of cash that would be needed to buy their own land in order to farm.

These owners are, in many cases, retired farmers, or sons and daughters of farmers, who are only trying to keep the farm in the family. Often, they make it possible for their siblings or offspring to remain on the farm.

In short, farm programs are not welfare programs. income tests like this amendment help to discourage productivity and efficiency, and in the long run, undermine the competitiveness of U.S. agriculture in world markets.

I strongly oppose the gentlelady's amendment, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Lowey amendment.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, imagine this scenario: A so-called farmer who lives in a fancy Los Angeles home, drives a luxury car, and enjoys a salary of well over $100,000 from a downtown Los Angeles business may receive a check every year from the U.S. Department of Agriculture as a deficiency payment for the wheat on his Kansas farmland. He may never even visit this land, yet checks are delivered, without fail, to his home in Los Angeles every year.

Unbelievably enough, checks for gentlemen farmers just like this are arriving in mailboxes in big cities across the country at taxpayer expense. There are 735 so-called farmers receiving subsidies in the city of Los Angeles alone, and I know they are not living on family farms. They may grow tomatoes in their backyards, but certainly not wheat, rice, feed-grain or cotton—the crops for which deficiency payments are made.

The U.S. Government has been paying so-called farmers who live in big cities and have an annual adjusted gross income of $100,000 or more from off-farm sources far too long. Over the past decade, taxpayers have paid more than $1.3 billion to city-dwelling farmers whose permanent full-time residence is in the heart of one of the 50 most populous urban areas in the United States.

I strongly support the Lowey amendment, and I encourage all of my deficit hawk colleagues to join me. During a time when reducing the deficit is of tantamount importance, this Government handout should be among the first to go. This amendment will save taxpayers $41 million in fiscal year 1996 alone.

As a supporter of the balanced budget, I believe that cutting payments like those to city-dwellers making over $100,000 is critical to achieving our goal. For this deficit hawk, there are many tough budget choices ahead, but this is not one of them. Cutting subsidies for those who don't need them is fiscally responsible, and it's the right thing to do.

This amendment will keep subsidies out of the hands of wealthy, nonresident farmowners who don't need or deserve them without curtailing subsidies to hardworking, family farmers. Please join me in supporting the Lowey amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE] to the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 158, noes 249, answered "present" 8, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 545]

AYES—158

Ackerman	Barrett (WI)	Berman
Andrews	Becerra	Bilbray
Barcia	Beilenson	Bilirakis

Blute
Borski
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Cardin
Clay
Collins (IL)
Conyers
Coyne
Davis
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan
Durbin
Engel
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Fattah
Fawell
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Ford
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Furse
Gejdenson
Gilman
Gonzalez
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Harman
Hinchey
Holden
Horn
Inglis
Istook
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Johnson (SD)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
King
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
LaFalce
Lantos
Largent
Lazio
Levin
Lewis (GA)
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Markey
Martini
Mascara
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Mfume
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Moran
Morella
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Petri
Porter
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Rivers
Rohrabacher
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Scarborough
Schroeder
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Stearns
Stockman
Stokes
Stupak
Talent
Tate
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Tucker
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (PA)
Woolsey
Wyden
Zimmer

NOES—249

Abercrombie
Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Bevill
Bishop
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Brewster
Browder
Brown (FL)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
de la Garza
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dingell
Doolittle
Dornan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Frost
Funderburk
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lucas
Manton
Manzullo
Matsui
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Meek
Metcalf
Mink
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Murtha
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Scott
Seastrand
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stenholm
Stump
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Traficant
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wise
Wolf
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—8

Dooley
Ewing
Ganske
Meyers
Myers
Sabo
Skeen
Smith (MI)

NOT VOTING—19

Boucher
Brown (CA)
Collins (MI)
Dreier
Foglietta
Gallegly
Gibbons
Goodling
Jefferson
Martinez
Moakley
Reynolds
Shuster
Solomon
Stark
Studds
Volkmer
Wilson
Yates

□ 2319

Mr. EWING changed his vote from ''no'' to ''present.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as I have a pecuniary interest in the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY], I am abstaining from rollcall vote No. 545.

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

I think my colleagues may be interested in hearing this.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to present this proposal to give us a road map, and I hope that we have got agreement. To begin with, no more votes tonight. We will finish the debate on everything on the bill, debate only, with the exception of MPP, which we will take up tomorrow morning under the following agreement: Zimmer, 60 minutes; Obey, 10 minutes; Kennedy, 20 minutes; Deutsch, 20 minutes.

Tomorrow we would proceed as follows: The House will meet at 10 a.m. We will do 10 1-minutes on a side, rule on the transportation bill, general debate on transportation, get into transportation for about an hour. Then we would rise after the first vote is ordered, take record votes on the agriculture bill rolled from this evening, 5-minutes to summarize Hoke, take debate plus the votes on MPP as I described, and the final passage on the agriculture bill and hope to go home by 3 p.m., not a.m.

□ 1120

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. LAHOOD] having assumed the chair, Mr. KLUG, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1976) making appropriations for Agriculture, rural development, Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LIMITING AMENDMENTS TO BE OFFERED DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1976, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION ACT, 1996

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent during further consideration of the bill H.R. 1976 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 188 on the legislative day of Friday, July 21, 1995, after disposition of any questions earlier postponed under the authority granted by the order of the House of July 19, 1995, no further amendment shall be in order except the following—

First, the amendment of Representative ZIMMER, to be debatable for 60 minutes;

Second, the amendment of Representative OBEY, to be debatable for 10 minutes;

Third, the amendment of Representative KENNEDY of Massachusetts, to be debatable for 20 minutes; and

Fourth, the amendment of Representative DEUTSCH, to be debatable for 20 minutes, and further—

That each amendment—

First, may be offered only in the order specified;

Second, may be offered only by the specified proponent or a designee;

Third, shall be considered as read;

Fourth, shall be debatable for the time specified, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent;

Fifth, shall not be subject to amendment, except as specified; and

Sixth, shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole, and further—

That when proceedings resume after postponement on the amendment offered by Representative HOKE, that amendment shall again be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

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

Mr. WAXMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I wish to inquire of the subcommittee chairman the time limits he indicated, are those for debates for this evening on those amendments?

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAXMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WAXMAN. Those are for debate for tomorrow?

Mr. SKEEN. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. And what will we debate this evening?

Mr. SKEEN. Tonight we do whatever anybody brings up tonight.

Mr. WAXMAN. So we will go on with other amendments?

Mr. SKEEN. And then roll the votes until tomorrow and do the MBP tomorrow.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION ACT, 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 188 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1976.

□ 2325

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1976) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, with Mr. SHAYS (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier tonight, the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] had been disposed of.

Are there further amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOKE

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOKE: Page 71, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. 726. The amounts otherwise provided in this Act for under the heading ''Public Law 480 Program Accounts'' are hereby reduced by the following amounts:

(1) The amount specified in paragraph (1) under such heading, $129,802,000.

(2) The amount specified in paragraph (2) under such heading, $8,583,000.

(3) The amount specified for the cost of direct credit agreements, $104,329,000.

Mr. HOKE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, is there a problem with 20 minutes? 25?

Mr. SKEEN. OK; 25 minutes.

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

Mr. POMEROY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, does the amendment go to the appropriate title? To which title does the amendment address?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman is adding a new section to the end of the bill.

Mr. POMEROY. To the end of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. HOKE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, just for clarification, the time will be controlled by me on our side and by someone that the chairman will designate in opposition.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] will be recognized for 12½ minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] will be recognized for 12½ minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE].

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, Congressman MEEHAN and I are offering an amendment that would reduce the funding level for title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 by $113 million to the level requested by the President and approved in the fiscal year 1996 budget resolution that we passed.

Our amendment does not reduce title II emergency humanitarian food aid, nor does it reduce title III food grants for the poorest countries. Indeed, the Hoke-Meehan amendment would not deny humanitarian food aid to Bosnia or any other war-torn or impoverished country.

Under title I, U.S. agriculture commodities are sold on long-term credit at below market interest rates. The original objective of title I was to move large amounts of surplus U.S. agricultural commodities. In the 1950's the program amounted to more than 80 percent of U.S. food foreign aid and fully 20 percent of the total value of U.S. agricultural exports.

Today we no longer possess huge agricultural surpluses. In 1994, title I represented only about 10 percent of U.S. food foreign aid and less than one-half of 1 percent of all U.S. agricultural exports.

Supporters of title I claim that it promotes economic development, but according to the GAO and the U.S. Department of Agriculture, title I's contribution to sustainable economic development is minimal.

In fact, title I sometimes results in a short-term increase in the food supply of some recipient countries, which in turn drives down the price of local farm products and distorts the agricultural markets of those countries. This has resulted in reduced domestic agricultural production, ultimately defeating our purpose of fostering long-term sustainable economic development.

In fact, it is for that very reason that Egypt and Pakistan, whose local farm economies were disrupted by title I assistance, have pulled out of the program completely.

Some supporters argue that title I develops foreign markets for U.S. agribusiness conglomerates that they might not otherwise have. But GAO has found that because title I subsidizes agricultural commodities at below market rates, whatever market shares may be gained by U.S. companies in the short term won't necessarily develop into long-term commercial relationships at prevailing market prices. In other words, once the subsidy is eliminated, the market no longer exists.

What title I does accomplish is it enriches a small number of giant agribusiness conglomerates, like Archer-Daniel-Midlands, Cargill, Bunge, and Continental Grain Co., all of whom maintain a well-funded stable of Washington lobbyists.

So we have to ask what possible justification is there for an 80-percent increase in the title I program above the administration's request and the budget resolution, especially when we are trying to balance the budget.

The Hoke-Meehan amendment does not affect humanitarian aid in any way whatsoever. It does not touch title II or title III. Rather, the Hoke-Meehan amendment is about ending corporate welfare in the form of Federal subsidies for a program that not only does not work, but which has actually harmed the very people we have intended to help.

This is a clear example of what happens when you give a person a fish, but refuse to teach them how to fish.

Thus, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote for the Hoke-Meehan amendment that will conform title I's funding level to that approved by the fiscal year 1996 budget resolution.

□ 2330

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

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, this well-intended amendment is what I would call the shoot-yourself-in-the-foot amendment. It is P.L. 480 funding which in fact over the years has been cut by 24 percent, just in the last 2 years. Total food aid tonnage has dropped from 8 million tons in 1993 to an expected 4 million tons in 1995, a 50 percent cut. The United States has retreated from giving food to the hungry. Other donor countries have not been able to fill the gap, and 750 million people in the world are hungry each and every day of their lives.

Half of these people are children. If the children survive, most will suffer from lifelong disabilities and disease due to poor health and nutrition. We can and have helped millions of people through our Food and Peace Program and our Food for Progress Programs. But we cannot if we cut this program.

Each dollar spent on food aid in this program has at least a double impact. First, the funds are spent here in the United States to grow, process, fortify, bag, can, rail, barge and ship agricultural commodities.

Second, the commodities are provided to poor countries that cannot afford to buy adequate amounts of food to meet basic needs.

In the marketing year 1992–93, 40 countries that had graduated from U.S. food assistance programs imported $13 billion of agricultural products from the United States, which was 31 percent of U.S. agricultural exports that year.

The proposed cuts in P.L. 480 will cause pain not only for the countries that are recipients of our largesse, but also for our own people. We will deny money to the people that are starving, the chronically hungry. The food that is not sent to them which is used in the program not only provides food for today for them but also is linked to their health care, to their education, to their work programs, which provide opportunities for people tomorrow.

Most importantly, in sum, Mr. Chairman, if we cut the money in this program, we will be denying jobs to Americans, American citizens, farmers, grocers, shippers, longshoremen, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. People are dependent on this program in this country and around the world, and if we cut this program as severely as the gentleman has suggested, we will indeed be shooting ourselves in both feet.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes and 30 seconds to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong opposition to the Hoke amendment to cut $113 million from the Food for Peace program. Mr. Chairman, the food assistance provided by P.L. 480 is not a favor we do for the world. For 40 years Congress has supported the Food for Peace program on a bipartisan basis because it serves our interests. P.L. 480 not only responds to the humanitarian needs of people suffering from food shortages; it enhances our national security by promoting economic development and political stability in less developed countries while cultivating markets for U.S. agricultural commodities.

The Food for Peace program is an important part of our Nation's foreign policy. In North Dakota we strongly believe an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure, and P.L. 480 is that ounce of prevention. By promoting economic development and political stability in less developed nations, P.L. 480 is a very cost-effective insurance policy against political unrest and even military conflict that could threaten our own national security.

P.L. 480 also benefits our economy by cultivating foreign markets for U.S. agriculture exports. In fact, 43 of our top 50 consumer nations of American agriculture exports were once U.S. foreign aid recipients. Between 1990 and 1993, U.S. exports to developing and transition nations increased. Exports increased $46 billion.

Finally, P.L. 480 is a vital tool in the post-GATT era. While the Uruguay round ratchets down export subsidies, other market development tools are no longer available. If history is our teacher, we know that the Europeans will redirect export subsidy reductions into GATT-legal market development programs. For us to cut programs like P.L. 480 is engaging in unilateral disarmament while other nations seek to develop their international markets.

□ 2340

Those who seek to destroy our export programs, like the amendment before us represents, will reap what they sow: lost jobs, a weaker economy, and little hope of regaining our share of the international market.

Mr. Chairman, P.L. 480 feeds the hungry, supports our foreign policy objectives, and provides vital support for U.S. agriculture exports. Therefore, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against the Hoke amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] has the time.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to go out of order and allow the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

Mr. SKELTON. I much appreciate the gentleman yielding time to me, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, as has been pointed out by two speakers tonight, the pole star of this whole debate is the fact that those countries that once were the recipients of this food for peace have graduated and are part of the export market of the United States of America. As we work on this amendment, as we think about it, we should think about the future, because our future is in exports, that is the balance of trade. That is where we make our money as a Nation.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds to say this is not humanitarian aid, this is not food grants for the poorest countries; these are grants to big agriconglomerates. This is corporate farm welfare.

Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN] cosponsor of the amendment.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will bring some reason back to the expenditure of taxpayer money for the Public Law 480, title I program. The present funding level in the bill is $120 million above the administration's request. That is an incredible 80 percent above the administration's request.

In a letter to the Committee on Appropriations, OMB Director Alice Rivlin expressed the administration's opposition to this increase in funding. As Director Rivlin stated, ''The subcommittee has funded P.L. 480 in excess of the President's request, title I has been shown to have limited effectiveness in advancing its goal of market development. The administration urges the committee to reduce this program so that higher priority programs can be funded.''

As with scores of other Federal programs, this initiative, when begun, had a valid policy purpose. In the 1950's, impediments such as the inconvertibility of foreign currencies, and the lack of foreign exchange held by potential customers, limited the commercial export of large domestic agricultural commodity surpluses. The situation that now exists is a far cry from the circumstances that existed in the 1950's. Even though this program has been redirected in recent years these reforms have not solved many of its inherent problems.

In a recent report, the GAO stated ''the importance of title I, domestically and internationally, has declined significantly since the program's inception. Increased food aid donations from other countries and the establishment of new USDA export assistance programs has reduced the importance of title I aid as a humanitarian, surplus disposal, and export assistance program.''

Programs such as the Commodity Credit Corporation's short and intermediate-term credits, and the Export Enhancement Program, are also designed to penetrate new markets. In light of these complementary programs the current funding level in the bill for title I is excessive.

I wish to assure my colleagues that this funding in no way diminishes the emergency and humanitarian food programs available through title II and III of P.L. 480. Nor is this amendment an attack on the ocean freight differential, otherwise known as cargo preference.

This amendment is about providing a responsible level of funding for a program that needs additional reform and focus in order for it to accomplish its stated goal.

The reduction provided for in this amendment will still enable the U.S. Department of Agriculture to continue this program, and to support the expansion of markets in developing countries.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON].

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

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in very strong opposition to this amendment, which would effectively cause very significant harm, and would undermine an important market-building tool for this Nation's agricultural industry. Forty-three out of 50 countries that used to be recipients of U.S. food aid have developed into cash-paying customers of U.S. agricultural commodities. Titles I, II and III of P.L. 480 each have a distinct purpose in helping recipients evolve from nations in chronic poverty to countries with stable economies, and to diminish these operations undermines the integrity of the program overall.

Public Law 480 is a very unique foreign aid program. I would appreciate Members' attention to this. Each dollar spent on food aid has an impact here in the United States, as well as the recipient Nation. First, the funds are spent in the U.S. to grow, process, fortify, bag, can, rail, barge, and ship agricultural commodities. Then the commodities are provided to poor countries that cannot afford to buy adequate amounts of food to meet very basic needs.

Title I, the portion of food aid that is committed to countries that exhibit long-term potential to become customers of U.S. agriculture, is a meaningful program that allows countries to make the transition between grant beneficiaries to commercial customers of U.S. commodities. As such, the authorizers and the appropriators have agreed that it is very important that we maintain funding for this program at the 1995 level, the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Agriculture, to meet the overall budget numbers. The plan presented in H.R. 1976 achieves this designated goal.

Title I is a particularly important aspect of the P.L. 480 program because it is targeted at developing commercial markets for U.S. commodities. Many examples exist of countries that have successfully made the transition from a concessional buyer to a hard cash purchaser, one of the most poignant being Egypt, which now buys nearly one-half billion dollars a year in U.S. wheat and feed grains.

How can we dispute the merits of investing in a program that has been so successful in cultivating a customer that now constitutes about 1 percent of our total agricultural exports through its bulk grain imports alone? Let us not forget that the half-billion that Egypt now spends on grains creates an estimated 10,000 jobs right here in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair will inform the Members that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] has 1½ minutes remaining, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] has 3¼ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] has 15 seconds remaining.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOKE. Is it correct that we had 12½ minutes to begin with, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman is correct. The gentleman is correct, our time is not correct. We will correct that. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HOKE. Could the Chair review all of the times, please?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair would be delighted to. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] has 5½ minutes remaining, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] has 3¼ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, who has the right to close the debate?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The committee position closes the debate.

Mr. HOKE. Therefore, the gentleman from New Mexico, with 15 seconds, gets to close debate.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. He may ask time from the gentleman from Illinois, but the committee position closes.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 90 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE].

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, which would reduce spending for Public Law 480 to the level requested by the administration, and to the level provided for in the budget resolution which we adopted in May. The level proposed in the bill for this program is approximately 80 percent more than the administration requested. It exceeds the adopted 1996 budget resolution assumptions by more than $100 million.

Proponents argue that the amount in the bill is the same as the current year level. However, those levels have been proposed for rescission, and a GAO study completed just three weeks ago at the request of the House and Senate authorizing committees concludes that, and I am going to quote from that GAO report, concludes that the program as currently instructed does not significantly advance either the economic development or the market objectives of the 1990 act.

□ 2350

That GAO report goes on to say that the program should either be seriously restructured or should be scrapped entirely. I believe we should take the time to study the GAO report findings before we dump $100 million more into this program than was requested.

I urge my colleagues here to vote ''aye.''

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, let me say in opposition to this amendment, I hope that the gentleman who is offering this amendment will be sensitive to the fact that we have cut Public Law 480 funding 24 percent over the past 2 years. The needs around the world have gotten much worse. Some 750 million people are hungry each and every day of their lives. This debate here turns on budgetary terms, dollar amounts, outlays and budget authority. But anyone who has traveled overseas and actually seen what the Public Law 480 program means to real living people I think can put it in a new perspective. The United States has a reputation of being a generous, charitable country, and we have come to the rescue of many people in distress in the past. Public Law 480 has been one of our best efforts. What the gentlemen from Ohio and Massachusetts seek to do with their amendment is to cut some 500,000 metric tons of food aid in the next year. They insist that this will not hurt starving people, but history tells us they are wrong.

Last year funds from Title I were shifted to Title II to cover some of the emergency food aid needs in the Rwandan crisis. This year additional emergency food aid is needed in Rwanda, Burundi, parts of the former Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union. Who knows where next year's crises will be? We do know that if the Hoke-Meehan amendment is adopted, fewer funds and no surplus commodities will be there to provide in response.

I know that it is not fashionable politically to be in support of food aid programs for starving people overseas.

There are not many people who will cheer you back in your district for that. But the bottom line is this program has been around for 30 years and has been a great source of pride to Americans as we have seen heart-wrenching pictures on television and in the news media which have called our attention to the fact that with all our challenges in the United States, there are other places in the world in far worse conditions.

This cut in Title I may seem very easy to us sitting here in the comfort of the United States of America. But for the people who are literally starving to death halfway around the world, this is a cut that should not take place. Our committee considered this Public Law 480 and actually made a reduction below last year's expenditure. What we are trying to do now is to appeal to the gentlemen offering this amendment and those who will vote on it and ask them to take into consideration that there still will be a role for the generosity and charity of the United States in helping those poor people overseas who literally are the least of our brethren.

I rise in opposition to this amendment, and I hope my colleagues will join me in voting against it.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER].

Mr. ZIMMER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois referred to humanitarian aid and aid for those in the throes of poverty and those who are afflicted by warfare. Those portions of Public Law 480 are not affected by this amendment. This amendment deals with title I which was designated as a way to get rid of America's huge agricultural surpluses back when we had huge surpluses. Today title I is a program that gives good intentions a bad name. It wrecks local farm economies in countries we are trying to help by driving down the cost of food so local farmers cannot compete and earn a decent price. It creates short-term opportunities for select shippers and a coterie of exporters and shipping companies. But this is an advantage that is temporary and fleeting. It is a hothouse situation, because it depends on the below-market financing that is provided.

One point that has not been mentioned is that this program provides a tremendous opportunity for corruption in the countries that are receiving the assistance, and some of the recipients of money under this program are amongst the most corrupt in the world.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that what we should do with this amendment is simply to reverse an astounding 80 percent increase that the committee adopted over the President's request and over our own budget resolution, keeping the essential and humanitarian aspects of this law and removing that part which is not justified.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS). The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, the opponents of this bill would like you to believe that what this bill is about is humanitarian aid and food aid and Food for Peace and all of these wonderful sounding things that none of us would ever want to oppose. But the fact is that that is not what this is about. What this is about is the baldest kind of corporate welfare, the very kind of corporate welfare that we are trying to eliminate, and in this case it is agri-corporate welfare. The money goes to the largest conglomerates of agriculture in the United States. It also goes to some shippers on a smaller basis. But this title does not in any way go to humanitarian or emergency aid. It is exactly the kind of subsidies that not only are wrong because they give disproportionate amounts of money to companies in the private sector that ought not get them but it is also wrong because what it does is it actually creates problems for the countries that receive the money themselves and it creates a kind of a welfare dependence that has been well-documented in other places with respect to the bad impacts that it has had on those local economies. It has happened in Africa, it has happened in El Salvador with respect to milk products, and we continue to do this.

This is not to help with humanitarian aid foreign countries that are truly poor and need the help. This is to help American agri-conglomerates that simply do not need it. I strongly urge my colleagues to look at this carefully and closely and to adopt this amendment. It is going to exactly what we already passed in this House and it goes to exactly what the President and the administration have called for.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I have 15 seconds in which to close this thing. I oppose this vehemently and strongly and urge a ''no'' vote on it. I thank the Chairman for the 15 seconds.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 19, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. MC INTOSH

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 41 offered by Mr. MCINTOSH: At page 71 of the bill, after line 2, insert after the last section the following new section:

SEC. 726. None of the funds made available in this Act shall be used to increase, from the fiscal year 1995 level, the level of Full Time Equivalency Positions (whether through new hires or by transferring full time equivalents from other offices) in any of the following Food & Drug Administration offices: Office of the Commissioner, Office of Policy, Office of External Affairs (Immediate Office, as well as Office of Health Affairs, Office of Legislative Affairs, Office of Consumer Affairs, and Office of Public Affairs), and the Office of Management & Systems (Immediate Office, as well as Office of Planning and Evaluation and Office of Management).

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is 10 minutes acceptable?

Mr. SKEEN. If the gentleman will yield, it certainly is acceptable to me, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I have about 6 or 7 minutes.

Mr. SKEEN. Shall we make it 12 minutes?

Mr. DURBIN. Twelve minutes is acceptable.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH] will be recognized for 6 minutes, and 6 minutes will be equally divided between the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH].

□ 0000

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment deals with the employment in the front office at FDA. The FTE levels at FDA's nonoperational managerial offices have increased by over 25 percent from fiscal year 1989 levels. This growth in overhead expenditures represents an inefficient use of resources that must be reversed.

The savings that will be achieved in overhead reductions can be used to redirect their efforts toward hiring additional employees to provide additional approval for much-needed drugs, devices and other medical products. Such a reinvestment will increase the ability of the agency to timely review product applications.

The amendment I am offering would prevent an increase from the fiscal year 1995 levels in the level of full-time employees in the following offices: the

Office of the Commissioner, the Office of Policy, the Office of External Affairs, and the Office of Management Systems.

Mr. Chairman, this is one of several amendments that I was planning to offer tonight. The other amendments I am not going to offer. I have spoken with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY], the chairman of the authorizing committee, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS], the chairman of the subcommittee. They share my concerns.

I wanted to address some of the issues and the problems that have been caused by the failure of FDA to have sufficient employees in some of the agencies that are operational, that do approve the drugs, the devices and the other medical products.

First of all, we have discovered that there is an increasing amount of surveillance and oversight that the agency does of the industry. This oversight effort has increasingly led them to slow down the approval of new drugs and new therapies and in many ways harass the manufacturers of products who may disagree with the FDA's chosen method of operation.

I hear time and time again from people who we have suggested could come and testify before my Subcommittee on National Economic Growth, Natural Resources and Regulatory Affairs that they are afraid to do so because the agency has such an overwhelming enforcement authority. My amendment would have simply directed them to limit expenditures on enforcement to 10 percent so that they can turn their efforts to seeking new product approvals.

I plan to work with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS] in making sure that that redirection of priorities occurs in their reauthorization bill later this fall.

Finally, another issue is off-label uses. I was going to offer an amendment that would have said the FDA had to discontinue efforts to prevent the distribution of medical literature and other means of promoting off-label uses in drugs.

Let me give the body a little background in this, and I have to tell you that working with FDA in this areas is a little bit like entering into Alice in Wonderland.

The FDA has an unwritten policy that prevents manufacturers from disseminating enduring materials such as medical journals, the Journal of the American Medical Association, and other highly reputable journals and textbooks if they contain information about nonapproved, that is, the FDA has not yet sanctioned, uses of a manufactured product, even through the agency has determined the product is safe for use for other purposes.

They do not allow this until the agency has either examined the journal article or the material or approved the product for the off-label use.

This is where Alice meets the Mad Hatter. It takes years and years to get that type of approval for additional uses and costs the companies millions of dollars. Meanwhile, patients suffers because they are not able to have their doctors learn about this treatment and be able to get the most recent medical information.

Let me tell you, off-label uses are critical for treating children and others such cancer. Virtually all of the new treatments developed in this country come about when doctors start using labeled existing drugs in new ways, off-label uses.

The FDA has also a draft policy that prohibits virtually all support, financial or otherwise, by drug and medical device manufacturers of any educational activities designed to disseminate truthful, accurate information and designed to provide training with respect to off-label uses.

This is just nuts. You have got big, powerful, wealthy drug companies and device manufacturers willing to spend their money to train doctors on how to use these newest techniques, and the FDA has a new draft policy saying they cannot do it. The Mad Hatter strikes again.

FDA's actions raise serious first amendment concerns. Are we to say that manufacturers of these devices cannot disseminate truthful and accurate information? FDA's policies already have and continue to significantly inhibit the free flow of peer reviewed, scientific information about drug uses.

Ironically, while the agency does not prevent physicians from prescribing uses of therapeutic products, in other words, the doctor can use the off-label use, the devices and the drugs have, even though they have not been approved by FDA for that use, the agency policies have significantly curtailed the ability of doctors to receive information about that, to receive the understanding in journals, such as the Journal of the American Medical Association, about what they think these off-label uses are.

Of course, in the world of Alice in Wonderland, as the Queen said, execute first, trial later. I urge the body to adopt my amendment and send a message to the agency that this is no longer going to be the practice.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, we on this side would be glad to accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT].

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support and I stayed up because I wanted to talk on this issue of the McIntosh amendment.

Earlier tonight we had a rather heated exchange here on the floor of the House talking about the FDA between the gentleman from Kentucky and the gentleman from California. I think the gentleman from Kentucky referred to the FDA as a rogue agency out of control. That may have been too strong, Members of this body. But I do believe that Mr. Kessler and his agency needs to have their horns trimmed and be put on a shorter leash.

Earlier today, the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] talked about a credibility question about a story that was shared on the floor of this House. I want to share a couple of stories tonight, several of them that I believe to be true, one that I absolutely know to be true.

I have in my district and in the State of Minnesota a number of medical device companies and an awful lot of physicians who work with them. Among other things, they have developed a number of new technologies which are being used in other countries, but they cannot or have not gotten approval here in the United States.

For example, there is a simple device which can prevent people from having a second heart attack called a stint. I have cardiologists in my area who literally have to go now over to Europe to do the research on those technologies because they cannot get the approval, and it takes so long, and it is so expensive in the United States.

In fact, when they go to Europe, sometimes they actually smuggle back into the United States liquid injectable aspirin because it is not available in the United States because it is too expensive to get FDA approval, and it takes too long, and it is not worth it. There are not enough people that need it.

In fact, one of my cardiologists was in this town a few months ago for an international exposition, and he went down to look at technologies which are available in virtually every other country in the world but they are not available in the United States because the FDA takes so long and it is so expensive to get them approved.

Let me just share this also. I believe this to be true. The last time the FDA approved a new food additive in the United States was 5 years ago.

We are going to have hearings I understand next week, and they are going to be talking about some of the raids that this agency has been conducting on medical device companies. I know that we are going to, hopefully, have some hearings in the McIntosh committee.

I do support this amendment, but I do believe what we really need is to rein in on this agency so that we can have the same devices here in the United States that they are enjoying in Europe and Japan.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN].

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Chairman, first, I wanted to say to the gentleman from Indiana that I appreciate the way he has addressed this issue. It seems to me that all Members should want to see more dollars devoted to the drug approval process and less to bureaucracy,

and I think we can agree on that on a bipartisan basis.

We do need comprehensive FDA reforms. I have introduced legislation towards this end. I know a number of our colleagues have as well.

We ought to be pushing for tighter time lines to get products out, save money, save time, and on this matter of off-label drug uses, I think we can come up with a policy that ends FDA's censorship over important medical journal articles and at the same time protects consumers.

For example, what I have proposed is we say that these journal articles would be made available, but the FDA, if they found questions in a journal article, would be in a position to add additional information so this would supplement what was out in a journal article.

This, I found, has been acceptable to industry. It has been acceptable to the cancer groups that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH] has correctly discussed. This is the kind of constructive work we can do on a bipartisan basis.

I want to tell the gentleman from Indiana, I am very pleased that he has kept his amendment on the question of freezing front-office dollars.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for the way he was offered his amendments and that he has not offered the others. I want to tell him I will be pleased and happy to work with him on his concern with regard to the Food and Drug Administration.

I do want to inform my colleagues that the food and drug law has been written in a very harsh fashion by the Congress of the United States because of the fact that it is susceptible to serious abuse, not by the honest people in the prescription pharmaceutical industry or in the device industry but rather by fly-by-nights who come in and go out and who will use pharmaceuticals and use other devices in an improper fashion.

The law requires that these devices and that these prescription pharmaceuticals and other things be, first, safe and, second, that they be effective, that they do not hurt and that they do what they are supposed to do.

It is FDA's difficult mission to see to it that products are used in the fashion for the purposes that they are used for. They can be tested.

I will tell my colleagues that the testing process is long, and it is so for a very good reason. Other countries have had massive scares over pharmaceuticals and other things which have caused huge health problems in the country, and I would just remind my colleagues about the thalidomide scare of some years ago where a whole generation of European children were born with flippers and without hands and arms and were otherwise deformed. That was something which created a massive scare in this country and resulted in a very major change. The result was a good piece of legislation which has been balanced.

It is possible, I think, that it shall and can be reviewed, and I would look forward to working with the gentleman toward that purpose.

Mr. SKEEN. May I inquire of the Chair how much time we have left?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS). The gentleman from New Mexico has 30 seconds remaining. He is the only gentleman who has time.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield that to my ranking member, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. I want to thank my colleague from New Mexico for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that I am glad that the gentleman from Indiana has offered this amendment this evening, and we look forward to working with him, and I hope we do not lose sight of the fact of the important mission that the Food and Drug Administration has.

They should be reformed, they should be improved, and we can work toward that end, but they certainly perform an invaluable function which no other Federal agency does. I hope that in our criticism of the present practices we do not overlook much of the good that is being done by a lot of hard-working professional people.

I support the amendment by the gentleman from Indiana.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SANFORD

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SANFORD: Page 71, after line 2, insert the following new section:

''SEC. 726. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act shall be used for the construction of a new office facility campus at the Beltsville Agricultural Research Center.''.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes and that the time be equally divided.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SANFORD] will be recognized for 5 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SANFORD].

□ 0015

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment prevents the construction of a new 350,000-square-foot office building in Maryland. With so many pressing demands on our Nation's budget and so many different ways to cut this budget, the logical budget is: Why here? Why now?

I think there are 4 good reasons that make a lot of sense as to why we ought to look at this. The first, GSA, Government Services Administration, controls 644 million square feet, let me say that again, 644 million square feet of office space. That is enough office space to fill the commercial cores in New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, and Houston combined. That says to me, with that kind of office space intact and this revolution that is supposedly taking place here in Washington, do not we have enough? Do we really need to go out and add another 350,000 square feet of space.

Second, even if we do, I think we would be putting the cart before the horse if we built this building now. The reason being, this fall the farm bill comes out, and that is going to have a lot to do with whether the Ag Department is growing, staying the same or shrinking. If it happens to be shrinking, which could well be the case given the fact we have got 114,000 folks on staff which roughly works out to about one for every six working farmers, if it were to actually be cut, we may not need this building, or if it were not to be cut, look at the number of different agencies ceilings and different departments that are talking about being closed here in Washington.

Again, I think that has done to do with why the National Capital Planning Commission, which is the Federal agency in charge of watching out how different agencies control space, has disapproved this plan and disapproved this building. They, in fact, say the following: ''It appears that the opportunities may exist for meeting virtually all of USDA's fiscal year 2000 administrative space requirements within its existing inventory, without construction of the Beltsville office complex.'' I think they know more about this than most of us. I ask we heed their advice.

Third, the budget. KASICH and his budget crew came up with a plan that gets us to a balanced budget by the year 2002. This building was not included as part of that budget.

Finally, National Taxpayers Union and Citizens for a Sound Economy think this amendment would make a lot of sense.

I hope my colleagues will join.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

I wonder if the gentleman from South Carolina would take a microphone at his leisure. I would just like to ask him two or three questions.

First, I would like to ask the gentleman, has he ever be in the south building of the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. SANFORD. If the gentleman will yield, I have run by it practically every morning.

Mr. DURBIN. Ever been inside?

Mr. SANFORD. No.

Mr. DURBIN. I think it is important you go inside before you get deeply into this amendment. You know what you are going to find? A 60-year-old building that is a fire trap. The reason we got into this debate, because many of us are worried about the safety and security of the men and women who work in that building. When a fire alarm goes off anywhere inside that building, they literally have to evacuate every employee. It is not divided by corridors or sections so that in the event of a fire or emergency they can even protect the people inside.

The ventilation system is so antiquated that not only it does not heat and cool the building, in fact what it does is endanger the people working in there.

So we are talking about in the first instance a genuine fire trap which on any given day could cause a great embarrassment to the gentleman from California when a tragedy might strike.

Point number 2, does the gentleman know how much money we expect from the Federal taxpayers by building the new campus at Beltsville and replacing the leased space which we are currently using for U.S. Department of Agriculture across the city of Washington?

Mr. SANFORD. I have heard upwards, close to $1 billion.

Mr. DURBIN. The figure I have is not that high, $200 million over 10 years. Unfortunately, the Department of Agriculture, with reduced status, fewer functions, fewer employees, is spread all over the D.C. area. We are paying rent. Unfortunately, we are paying too much for that rent. We went through this battle last year and said there has got to be a better way.

It turns out if we build the building and occupy it and depreciate it, it is cheaper for taxpayers. It is not just a matter of building a building. It is a matter of getting out of expensive leased space to do it.

The reason I asked the gentleman these questions is my first reaction when I heard about a new building was the same as his, for goodness sakes, at this time, this is the wrong place and time to do it.

Yet I went down there and took a look at the south building.

Mr. SANFORD. On those two points, if the gentleman would yield, on the south building, as you might notice, my amendment does nothing to preclude reconstruction to the south building.

Mr. DURBIN. Reclaiming my time, here is the practical difficulty. In order to do the kind of work that is necessary on the south building, the GSA did extensive surveys and found that they had to take the employees out as the construction was taking place.

That is why this whole plan that we have developed involves moving out to Beltsville for temporary quarters and eventually moving back into a renovated south building, and then using what is constructed at Beltsville for permanent facilities so all the leased space can come together into something we own.

I am sure the gentleman's life experience, like my own, we rented for years, it was not worth much, finally bought a home, and now I take a lot more pride in it.

Mr. SANFORD. If the gentleman will yield, I would agree absolutely in a static environment, but the problem is we know right now we are not working in a static environment. I think that actually has a lot to do with why the National Capital Planning Commission, in fact, disapproved the plan and, in fact, said because things like the Department of Commerce may one day be an empty building and because a host of other agencies are looking at dropping numbers rather than increasing numbers, there may be more than enough space in Washington, DC.

Mr. DURBIN. Reclaiming my time, I will tell the gentleman there are many possibilities. There are many eventualities. There is one solid hard cold fact. The south building of the U.S. Department of Agriculture today is a fire trap. It is dangerous to tens of thousands of people who go there every day. It could not pass the most basic fire and safety inspection. And I do not think the gentleman from South Carolina, certainly the gentleman from Illinois, would not want it on his conscience that we are not doing everything we can to protect those employees.

That is why I got into this. I think what we have come up with is a reasonable approach that ultimately will save taxpayers $200 million and do it in a very professional way.

I would add that I am not an expert at this. We gave to the General Services Administration the responsibility to come up with a plan. They came up with one. We went back and forth and negotiated with the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

From the gentleman to come in now and say, well, we have got problems, let us get rid of that, you still are going to have a south building that is a fire trap. You are still going to have leased space that costs you dearly.

Mr. SANFORD. If the gentleman will yield again, I want to reemphasize my amendment in no way precludes renovation to the south building. The whole idea is putting the cart before the horse. All I am suggesting by this amendment is, given all that may be happening in terms of downsizing the Federal Government, maybe, just maybe since it is federally owned land, this building would be going on out in Maryland since that space is not going anywhere.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SANFORD].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. (Mr. SHAYS). Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 19, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SANFORD] will be postponed.

Are there further amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OLVER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OLVER: Page 71, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. .(a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds made available in this Act shall be used to pay the salaries of personnel to provide assistance to livestock producers under provisions of title VI of the Agricultural Act of 1949 if crop insurance protection or nonuninsured crop disaster assistance for the loss of feed produced on the farm is available to the producer under the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended.

(b) CORRESPONDING INCREASE IN FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided in this Act for ''Rural Development Performance Partnerships'' is hereby increased by $60,000,000.

Mr. OLVER (during the reading), Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, the time to be equally divided, I will claim 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER].

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

The language of my amendment prohibits benefits under the livestock feed program for losses which could be covered under the crop insurance program.

The subcommittee had provided $80 million for the livestock feed assistance program, and by the language that I offer, by limiting that livestock feed assistance program to those who could not use the Federal Crop Insurance Program, we can reduce the needs for the livestock feed assistance

amount from $80 to $20 million, and in that process we are able to free up $60 million which then can be used for the rural development performance partnerships, which is essentially the moneys that hundreds of communities all over this country use in districts all over the country in rural areas of the country, use to develop drinking water systems, waste water treatment systems, by either grants or loans, or a combination of grants and loans in most instances, and for solid waste management systems.

The communities that get this money are small communities, the most stressed communities probably in this country outside of the very core urban areas. They are communities without a strong tax base, without a strong commercial base. They are continually under stress, and they are of a severely limited capacity to deal with what are extremely capital-intensive programs and where the per capita costs of those capital-intensive programs happen to be exceedingly high, therefore, because of the low population of rural communities.

All that is required here is that if crop insurance is available, it is to be used rather than using the livestock feed assistance, and that gives us the $60 million available for the program.

Now, this is a program which in the present fiscal year was counted at almost $700 million. Under the program as it now stands in the bill, it would be down to $430 million, and so the addition of 60 would bring that up a little bit and change a 40-percent cut in this program for so many communities all over the country, in infrastructure grants and loans, it would allow that cut to be only a 30-percent cut.

So I would hope that we would adopt this amendment and help these hundreds of communities all over the country that this money can be used for.

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

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose the amendment.

I yield the remainder of my 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank my good friend and colleague from New Mexico for yielding me the time.

I rise in strong opposition to the gentleman's amendment. The amendment, while I am sure really redirects funds into an important program, and the gentleman and I have discussed this at length, for example, the cuts in the water and sewer programs which we all hope can be restructured, and we all hope that we can find additional funds for these very important programs, but the gentleman's amendment also restructures, or throws a monkey wrench is a better word, into an important reform of the crop insurance and disaster program that was just implemented by the Committee on Agriculture just this past year.

This major new reform that was designed to save the taxpayers billions of dollars and move our farmers away from dependence on the Government disaster programs really has not had a chance to work, and already the gentleman has simply brought an amendment that has not been considered by the authorizing committee. We have had no hearings, and it would fundamentally change the protections designed for the livestock industry.

We left the livestock disaster program in place because there was no other way to cover them. As I have indicated, it is entirely possible that some changes in the newly reformed crop insurance disaster protection program will be needed. As a matter of fact, we are going to have a major overhaul of the crop insurance program. It is underfunded, and it is mandatory, and we have several proposals that I think would be very, very salutory.

But these proposed changes should receive the same careful consideration as the original reform provisions. For example, this amendment does not make it clear how we are to treat a livestock producer who grows 25 percent of his feed and then purchases the rest. Is this producer to lose all of his disaster protection because he is prudent enough to provide a fraction of his own feed?

□ 0030

Mr. Chairman, these are exactly the kind of problems that caused us, after long thought, to design the program in its present state. Certainly a more careful consideration should be given before the program is changed or simply used for a bank for vitally needed sewer and water programs. We should reject this amendment.

I would only add that this amendment also abridges the agreement that the authorizers and the appropriators have reached, at least on our side of the aisle, after many, many meetings, and the $60 million that would be used by the gentleman would be into a situation where we would either double-score it and it would not count in regards to our scoring responsibilities or the Ag Committee is going to have to go find another $60 million to cut in regards to our budget responsibilities.

We have an agreement with the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] and the chairman of the committee, and the chairman of the Committee on the Budget that the appropriators will make the appropriate cuts in regards to their budget responsibilities and the authorizers in our pasture will make our cuts.

I know the gentleman is extremely concerned about the water and sewer programs. This is the wrong way to go about it. I will be more than happy to work with the gentleman to find some money in the appropriate discretionary account.

And one last thing: In the last several weeks we have had a real disaster in farm country more especially with our cowboys in reference to the terrible weather, 100 degrees, 105 degrees, 110 degrees. In feedlots all across the country and on ranches all across the country we have had heavy livestock losses, and all prices in the livestock sector are very depressed. This is exactly the wrong time to take the emergency program for livestock producers that we hope we will not use during a time when they are experiencing very heavy losses due to weather-induced conditions.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would urge the gentleman to perhaps work with us, perhaps maybe withdraw his amendment, but if he insists on going on ahead, we will have to oppose it very, very strongly.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 45 seconds, and then I will yield the remainder of my time to the ranking member of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out that, if there is a livestock loss which would not now be covered, not now be coverable, under the crop insurance program, that the livestock loss is still covered under the livestock feed program. That is the provision, that is the language of the legislation, that I have provided. So there is no problem, at least as I understand it, there.

Secondly, if what we are doing is banking $60 million so that it will be easier there for the dealings on the problem of mandatory expenditure, then I think this will be much more valuable to put this where it can be used where 40 percent cuts were being made and use only 30 percent cuts in the infrastructure accounts which all of our communities do.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, everyone seems to agree that we should put more money into water and sewer programs. We all know there are a lot of communities that need them. Otherwise they cannot improve their systems for public health reasons. The obvious question here is whether or not this provision, when it comes to livestock feed programs, should be allowed to continue.

I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts it should not. So many of these farmers, and cowboys and ranchers want to be rugged individualists and say, ''No, I'm not going to buy crop insurance, I'm on my own, buddy, leave me alone,'' and then things get tough, and guess what?

They come and knock on Uncle Sam's door and say, ''Well, now I need some help.''

What this amendment says is, ''Grow up.'' If you got crop insurance available, buy it, and, if you don't, you're going to pay. If you have a disaster, you're not going to get as much money from the Federal Government.''

Is that a radical suggestion? I think that ought to be the policy across the land, to tell producers and business people that, if there is insurance available, use it, and, if they do not use it,

they are going to suffer as a result of it.

Now, to say we are going to hold them harmless regardless I think creates bad conduct on their part. The gentleman from Missouri and I were co-chairs of a disaster task force. We now spend or compensate for about 95 percent of the disasters and losses in the United States. We cannot afford to continue to do it. Individuals have to accept more personal responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS). The gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I would really hope it would not come to this, to get back into this whole argument on the disaster program and crop insurance. The mandatory crop insurance program is underfunded. It is not working well in high-risk agriculture country mainly because of the efforts of the gentleman from Illinois.

Now we will adhere to our responsibilities in regards to crop insurance, and we are trying to move away from the disaster program. But to try to rewrite an unworkable crop insurance bill right in the middle of an appropriation bill when we are trying to do it in the farm bill is just not the way to do business. I want water and sewer programs, but that was a very untoward remark by the gentleman from Illinois, and I resent it.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit for the record a copy of a letter from Agriculture Secretary Glickman expressing the administration's support and commitment to agricultural export programs such as the Market Promotion Program and the Export Enhancement Program.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC, July 19, 1995.

Hon. BILL BARRETT,
Chairman, Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities, Committee on Agriculture, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR BILL: As the United States House of Representatives considers the fiscal year 1996 appropriations bill for the Department of Agriculture (USDA), I would like to express my commitment to USDA's export programs.

With the help of the Market Promotion Program (MPP), the Export Enhancement Program, and USDA's other export programs, U.S. agricultural exports are expected to reach a record level of $51.5 billion in 1995. These programs have proven that they work, achieving export growth nearly every year since they were first enacted in 1985. MPP, in particular, has proven its worth, helping the high value exports that it targets to quadruple over the last decade. Our farmers and ranchers depend upon foreign markets—23 percent of cash farm receipts is now earned from exports.

In the current world trade environment, I view these programs as critical tools. The Uruguay Round Implementation Act was enacted last year largely because of the support it received from American agriculture. The agricultural sector will benefit greatly from that agreement, but funding for export promotion and the so-called ''green box'' programs is critical. The Uruguay Round agreement permits countries to continue to subsidize and promote agricultural exports. Our competitors are doing just that.

The fact is, the competition is well on its way towards seizing new market opportunities. The European Union (EU) will spend $54 billion under the Common Agricultural Policy to support its agricultural sector in 1996, including $9 billion for export subsidies. The EU will spend $7 million more for wine export promotion this year ($93 million) than USDA will invest in promotion for all products under MPP. Competitors are also increasing GATT-legal spending for export promotion and credit guarantees. Last year, competitors spent $500 million on export promotion. This year, Canada announced a new credit guarantee program for about $713 million.

I know there is an urgent need to control spending and to reduce the federal deficit, but I urge you to resist efforts to balance the budget on the backs of America's farmers and ranchers. I appreciate your support of our joint efforts to promote U.S. agricultural exports.

Sincerely,

DAN GLICKMAN,
Secretary.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, the committee report accompany H.R. 1976, the fiscal year 1996 Agriculture appropriations bill, contains a provision that will seriously affect the availability of food on Indian reservations. In the report, the Appropriations Committee directs the Secretary of Agriculture to begin the termination of the Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations, commonly known as the commodities program. Indians who benefit from the commodities program are to be transferred to the Food Stamp Program. Given the current levels of poverty and hunger on Indian reservations, the phase out of the commodities program is an unwise and uninformed maneuver that is nothing short of another clear breach of this Nation's trust responsibility to native Americans.

The administration requested $78.6 million for reservation commodities in fiscal year 1996. The committee's bill provides for $65 million, a decrease of $13.6 million—17 percent. The President's request reflects the fact that the commodities program must operate with a $0 carry-in for fiscal year 1996 as opposed to carry-ins of $13.4 million in fiscal year 1994 and $27.3 million in fiscal year 1995, as well as the fact that food costs have risen steadily, from $45.6 million in fiscal year 1994 to $47.7 million in fiscal year 1995 to an estimated $49.2 million in fiscal year 1996.

The commodities program serves more than 110,000 native Americans each month who reside on or near reservations in 24 States. The reservation commodities program was the only commodities program maintained by the Nixon administration following the institution of the national Food Stamps Program in 1974. Both Congress and the Nixon administration carefully examined food needs and determined that the Food Stamps Program would not adequately meet the needs of native Americans living on or near reservations.

The main reason that the Food Stamps Program is unsuited for Indian reservations is that the program requires individuals to trade food coupons for food at grocery stores. In many reservation areas there are simply no or few grocery stores, round trips of up to 100 miles to buy groceries are not uncommon, and transportation is often unavailable. In addition, the prices for foods at existing on-reservation stores are generally much higher than those at off-reservation stores. In other words, food stamps will buy less at reservation stores than off-reservation stores. Thus, this bill not only makes it harder for Indians to get food, but it also makes it likely that they will end up with less food.

In addition, while tribes operate the distribution of commodities, States operate the Food Stamps Program. Conversion to the Food Stamps Program will require native Americans to travel vast distances to the nearest State food stamp office. Other problems with the food stamps program include a differing set of eligibility rules, and the likelihood that nonperishable foods, which make up the bulk of the commodities programs, will be less available under the food stamps program because stores are less likely to stock them.

Finally, it appears that conversion to the Food Stamp Program will result in increased costs to the Federal Government. In fiscal year 1994, the average per month cost of food stamp benefits was $69.01 compared to $33.51 for commodities. Thus, conversion to food stamps would more than double the per-person food cost of service to Indian beneficiaries.

In sum, the Appropriation Committee's plan to phase out the commodities program will not only increase hunger and hardship on Indian reservations but will also increase costs to the Federal Government. This policy is clearly anti-Indian and, without any hint of hesitancy or remorse, literally takes food out the mouths of the poorest of the poor. Mr. Chairman, the Indian population which is dependent upon the commodities program needs our protection and not our spite. As trustees and fiduciaries to the more than 550 native American tribes, we should treat them better.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the fiscal year 1996 Agriculture appropriations bill, which carries through on the directives of the House Republicans' welfare reform plan by cutting food stamps and other nutrition programs.

As we saw with their welfare reform measure, the new majority in the House wants to launch an extreme and broad-based attack on poor children and families. As part of this attack, they are cutting the Food Stamp Program, one of the most essential programs for people in need, and capping the number of participants which may receive assistance from the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children [WIC]. WIC is a program with such proven benefits as fewer premature births, fewer fetal deaths, and better cognitive performance in children, one family would have to leave the WIC program for another to be served.

Under this appropriations bill, inflation will no longer be considered as a factor when determining a family's eligibility for food stamps. This means that families will either become ineligible for benefits or see their benefits reduced as inflation impacts their income and ability to meet their basic needs. The bill also cuts overall funding for food stamps in 1996 by $1.7 billion compared to this year 1995. States predictably will tighten eligibility requirements in order to try to keep down costs and the result will mean that fewer poor families will be able to receive food assistance. Furthermore, this bill completely eliminates the food stamp contingency reserve which is used to shore up the program when the need for food stamps becomes greater than optimistically low limits estimated. Republicans claim that cutting funding for food stamps and other public assistance programs will move people off of welfare. The question is: where are the children, women and the elderly going? Not only is the GOP cutting food stamps, but they are intent on cutting the social safety net of education, training, child care, shelter, and medical care in numerous proposals and measure being advanced in this Congress.

The WIC program is among the most successful and cost-effective of our Federal nutrition programs and promotes the health and well-being of our country's children. Currently, the WIC program can not even provide benefits for all eligible women and children due to lack of funds. I have supported full funding of this program, which should be a high priority if we value our future enough to care for our children. However, Republicans want to further limit the number of children who may benefit from the program by capping the number of participants at current levels. This will decrease the effectiveness of this program by ruling out any opportunity for a response from the Government when there is an increase in the number of children and families in need of services.

Nutrition programs provide an extremely valuable way to promote good health and prevent disease for some of our most vulnerable citizens. When we fund nutrition programs, we invest in children and families and create economic and social benefits for all. When the Republicans cut back on nutrition programs, we will see a rise in malnutrition and a resulting rise in health care costs. The Republican approach to nutrition programs is to cut off benefits with the notion that you can forcefeed change and reduce poverty through such harsh action. I do not support this approach and I believe that the Federal Government has a role in helping people. I oppose this bill because of the shortfall in funding and the policy changes that are being superimposed through this ill considered appropriation process.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Last night my colleagues from New York, Ms. LOWEY withdrew her amendment to the Agriculture appropriations bill which pertains to the peanut program. I commend the gentlelady for withdrawing her amendment and would state that I appreciate the fact that the gentlelady now agrees that the farm bill needs to be written in the Agriculture Committee as opposed to the appropriations process.

We members of the Agriculture Committee have been working very diligently to reform all agriculture programs. I have been particularly involved in working on a reform of the peanut program that will be a more market oriented program and will still provide a safety net for peanut growers.

That bill will address the concerns of the gentlelady and I think will satisfy the vast majority of those that have objections to agriculture programs.

Again, I thank the gentlelady for allowing the authorizing committee to do its job.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, as a former member of the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, I recognize the difficulties faced by the chairman and ranking member and I commend them for their efforts on this bill. H.R. 1976 provides $15.9 billion in agricultural programs but still saves $5.2 billion, compared to spending last year. However, with tough challenges come tough decisions, and I am faced with one today. I am concerned about an amendment to be offered later during this debate and the effect this will have on low-income housing for people in my State of Nevada and throughout the Nation. Specifically, 502 direct housing loans help those low- and very-low-income families who are unable to obtain financing elsewhere. Without these funds, it will be difficult or impossible for people to achieve the American Dream of owning their own home. In addition, I am concerned about other reductions to rural programs including rural waste disposal projects and rural development.

Although reluctant, I will support this amendment because it does have some good provisions in it regarding the Conservation Reserve Program and the Wetlands Reserve Program. However, I urge the chairman to continue to fight to restore funding for the 502 housing program and some of the other rural programs in conference.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I cannot begin to express how pleased I am that a compromise was reached yesterday between Agriculture Secretary Glickman and Representative WALSH regarding the implementation of meat and poultry safety rules.

Representative WALSH's withdrawal of his amendment to the fiscal year 1996 Agriculture appropriations bill is a clear sign of his commitment to enact change into the current food handling process. The new agreement will allow for additional public hearings to be held to consider the views of all interested parties throughout the rule-making process. I am relieved that there will not be a delay of the USDA's implementation of safeguards and standards to improve meat inspection.

Unfortunately, the issue of safe food and the devastating effect of foodborne illness are not new to me. I have closely followed this issue since the 1993 E.coli outbreak on the West Coast. I have had the pleasure of working with members of STOP [Safe Tables Our Priority], an organization founded by victims' families who are dedicated to the prevention of foodborne illness.

Until the tragedies were highlighted a few years ago, I do not believe that people were aware of the inherent dangers associated with the consumption of raw meat products. It is unfortunate that a number of deaths occurred before significant changes were made to the current food handling processes.

I think that we would all agree that our Nation's meat inspection policy must be improved. Obviously, a system that was created in 1906, and has changed very little since that time, is in need of repair. A new inspection system based on HACCP or hazard analysis and critical control points, is needed to prevent problems from occurring throughout the production process.

Once again, I commend my colleague, Representative WALSH, for his willingness to compromise with the administration regarding the procedural problems in an effort to improve the current system. I also want to applaud the efforts of the ranking minority member of the Agriculture Subcommittee, Representative DURBIN, in bringing this matter to the House's attention. I believe that the risks are too high to wait any longer to implement change into the current food handling process. We cannot rest until everything is being done to protect the safety of our food, and provide for the well-being of our loved ones.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. SHAYS, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1976) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Scot M. Faulkner, Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives:

CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington DC, July 20, 1995.

RE: State of Illinois v. Melvin Reynolds

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to rule L (50) of the Rule of the House that my Office has been served with a subpoena issued by the Circuit Court of Cook Country, Illinois.

After consultation with the General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

Sincerely,

SCOT M. FAULKNER,
Chief Administrative Officer.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. VOLKMER (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, after 6 p.m., on account of illness of spouse.

By Mr. BACHUS (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) until 4:30 p.m. today, on account of attending a funeral.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. ZIMMER) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HORN, for 5 minutes, on July 21.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DURBIN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
Ms. DELAURO.
Mr. LANTOS.
Mr. ACKERMAN.
Mrs. MALONEY.
Mr. PALLONE in two instances.
Mr. SERRANO.
Mr. FRAZER.
Mr. MILLER of California.
Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts.
Mrs. MEEK of Florida.
Mr. COYNE.
Mr. RAHALL.
Ms. HARMAN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ZIMMER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. SMITH of Washington.
Mr. ROGERS.
Mr. PACKARD.
Mr. SCHIFF.
Mr. MARTINI in two instances.
Mr. HASTERT.
Mr. ZIMMER.
Mr. HORN.
Mr. GUNDERSON.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 40 minutes a.m.), the House adjourned until today, Friday, July 21, 1995, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1233. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11–95, ''Vending Site Lottery and Assignment Amendment Temporary Act of 1995,'' pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1234. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting proposed regulations repealing three obsolete provisions of its rules (11 C.F.R. sections 104.17, 110.1(g), and 114.12(d)), pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 438(d); to the Committee on House Oversight.

1235. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting an informational copy of the lease prospectus for the Patent and Trademark Office, northern Virginia, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 606(a); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1236. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, ''Vaccine Excise Tax Amendments of 1995''; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1237. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, ''The Accelerated Direct Loan Program Implementation and Student Loan Marketing Association Transition Act of 1995''; jointly, to the Committees on Economic and Educational Opportunities and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LIVINGSTON: Committee on Appropriations. Report on the Revised Subdivision of Budget Totals for fiscal year 1996 (Rept. 104–197). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LONGLEY:

H.R. 2077. A bill to designate the U.S. Post Office building located at 33 College Avenue in Waterville, ME, as the ''George J. Mitchell Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. HOUGHTON, and Mr. DOOLEY):

H.R. 2078. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the excise tax treatment of draft cider; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRISA:

H.R. 2079. A bill to provide amnesty from criminal and civil tax penalties for individuals who, within the 6-month amnesty period, notify the Internal Revenue Service of previous nonpayments or underpayments of Federal income tax and pay such underpayments in full; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GEJDENSON:

H.R. 2080. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide priority health care by the Department of Veterans Affairs for veterans who received nasopharyngeal irradiation treatments while serving in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HANSEN (for himself, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. SHADEGG):

H.R. 2081. A bill to recognize the validity of rights-of-way granted under section 2477 of the Revised Statutes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself, Mr. DAVIS, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 2082. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the establishment of priority placement programs for Federal employees affected by a reduction in force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. OBEY (for himself, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BRYANT of Texas, and Ms. PELOSI):

H.R. 2083. A bill to provide for a tax reduction in the case of low economic growth; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. OWENS, Mr. STARK, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. EVANS, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. MORAN, Mr. YATES, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DELLUMS, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. OBEY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. REYNOLDS, and Mr. MARKEY):

H.R. 2084. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to impose labeling requirements for milk and milk products produced from cows which have been treated with synthetic bovine growth hormone, to amend the Agriculture Act of 1949 to require the Secretary of Agriculture to reduce the price received by producers for milk that is produced by cows injected with synthetic bovine growth hormone, to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop a synthetic BGH residue test, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 2085. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require labeling for milk and milk products produced from cows which have been treated with synthetic bovine growth hormone, to direct the development of a synthetic bovine growth hormone residue test, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SHAYS (for himself, and Mr. CLINGER):

H.R. 2086. A bill to increase the overall economy and efficiency of Government operations and enable more efficient use of Federal funding, by enabling local governments and private, nonprofit organizations to use amounts available under certain Federal assistance programs in accordance with approved local flexibility plans; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 2087. A bill to provide that human life shall be deemed to exist from conception; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 2088. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, relating to the sale of alcoholic beverages to persons who are less than 21 years of age; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. TATE:

H.R. 2089. A bill to provide for a change in the exemption from the child labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 for minors between 16 and 18 years of age who engage in the operation of automobiles and trucks; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself, and Mr. GILMAN)

H. Con. Res. 84. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress concerning freedom of the press in Russia; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. QUINN (for himself, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. CREMEANS, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. HOKE, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. CHRYSLER, Mr. EVANS,

Mr. MASCARA, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. THURMAN, AND Mr. WISE):

H. Con. Res. 85. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for an event sponsored by the American Iron and Steel Institute to demonstrate the use of steel building materials in the construction of residential homes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

138. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Alabama, relative to expressing opposition to the Congress of the United States with respect to pending bills to reduce benefits for coal miners; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

139. By the SPEAKER: Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Nevada, relative to urging the Congress of the United States to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow States to make payments for certain services provided to, and to provide certain services to, recipients of Medicaid who have disabilities; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Commerce.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 104: Mr. SKEEN.
H.R. 328: Mr. CRANE.
H.R. 436: Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HUTCHINSON, and Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas.
H.R. 500: Mr. PARKER.
H.R. 580: Mr. LUTHER and Mr. BAKER of California.
H.R. 616: Mr. REYNOLDS.
H.R. 739: Mr. BARTON of Texas.
H.R. 743: Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Mr. CHAMBLISS.
H.R. 752: Mr. KLINK, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. FRISA, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. WARD and Mr. ARMEY.
H.R. 783: Mr. COOLEY.
H.R. 835: Ms. JACKSON-LEE and Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 883: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 942: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Mr. HOKE.
H.R. 969: Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 995: Mr. CANADY.
H.R. 997: Mr. EMERSON, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. MANTON, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. WILSON.
H.R. 1018: Mr. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 1046: Mr. REYNOLDS.
H.R. 1050: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 1073: Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. BEILENSON, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. HEINEMAN.
H.R. 1074: Mr. FROST, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. BEILENSON, and Mrs. MORELLA.
H.R. 1114: Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. HALL of Texas.
H.R. 1127: Mr. ARCHER, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. EHLERS, and Mr. ROTH.
H.R. 1161: Mr. WARD.
H.R. 1162: Mr. ROYCE and Mr. HUTCHINSON.
H.R. 1184: Mr. HUTCHINSON.
H.R. 1280: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.
H.R. 1299: Mr. HORN.
H.R. 1328: Mr. SKEEN.
H.R. 1381: Mr. FRAZER.
H.R. 1384: Ms. RIVERS.
H.R. 1386: Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. GOSS, Mr. GILLMOR, and Mrs. SEASTRAND.
H.R. 1458: Mr. BEVILL.
H.R. 1514: Mr. KLINK, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Ms. FURSE, Mr. LINDER, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Mr. HAYWORTH.
H.R. 1594: Mr. HORN.
H.R. 1619: Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. MANTON.
H.R. 1660: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HORN, and Mr. DELLUMS.
H.R. 1699: Mr. SCARBOROUGH.
H.R. 1754: Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 1769: Mr. DREIER.
H.R. 1799: Mr. FLANAGAN.
H.R. 1802: Mr. HOLDEN.
H.R. 1818: Ms. PRYCE, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. GOSS, Mr. WAMP, Mr. TATE, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. STUMP, Mr. METCALF, Mrs. SEASTRAND, and Mr. ROGERS.
H.R. 1834: Mr. CLINGER, Mr. EWING, and Mrs. FOWLER.
H.R. 1885: Mr. PARKER.
H.R. 1960: Mr. SAXTON and Mr. STEARNS.
H.R. 2003: Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 2058: Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. ACKERMAN.
H.R. 2064: Mr. BACHUS.
H. Con. Res. 60: Mr. PALLONE.
H. Con. Res. 79: Mr. WILLIAMS.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2002

OFFERED BY: MR. HEFLEY

AMENDMENT NO. 16: Page 53, line 15, strike ''$8,421,000'' and insert $5,421,000''.

H.R. 2002

OFFERED BY: MR. NADLER

AMENDMENT NO. 17: Page 46, lines 3 through 7.

Redesignate subsequent sections of title III of the bill accordingly.

H.R. 2076

OFFERED BY: MR. HEFLEY

AMENDMENT NO. 1: Strike page 36, line 21, through page 38, line 4.