

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore. (Mr. KLUG), having assumed the chair, Mr. LAHOOD, 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. 2002) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLUG). 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 further consideration of the bill H.R. 1976.

□ 1305

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

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 the legislative day of Thursday, July 20, 1995, the bill was considered as read.

After disposition of any questions earlier postponed under the authority granted by the order of the House of July 19, 1995, and pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 20, 1995, no further amendments shall be in order except the following: The amendment by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER], 60 minutes; the amendment by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], 10 minutes; the amendment by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], 20 minutes; and the amendment by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH], 20 minutes.

Each amendment may be offered only in the order specified, by the specified proponent or a designee, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

When proceedings resume on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE], that amendment shall again be debatable for 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent of the amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOKE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 20, 1995, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] and a Member opposed will each be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE].

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

The purpose of the Hoke-Meehan amendment is very simple. What it does is reduces the appropriation for title I of Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade Development Assistance Act of 1954, by \$113 million to the level that was requested by the President and approved in the fiscal year 1996 budget resolution that we passed in this House.

What exactly is this title I program all about? Does it develop new markets for America's farm exporters, as its proponents would have you believe? Not according to a very long series of investigations by the Congressional Research Service and the General Accounting Office. In fact, there is not one single shred of nonanecdotal evidence that it develops long-term foreign customers.

Does it provide humanitarian food aid to save starving populations in desperately poor and hungry nations? No; in fact, that is not even the purpose of title I. That is the purpose of the \$875 million that has been appropriated in titles II and III for emergency humanitarian food aid relief.

However, there is substantial evidence that Public Law 480, title I, does exactly the opposite. It undermines the ability of foreign farmers to compete with much cheaper, dumped, subsidized American agricultural products. This has literally resulted in the destruction of local foreign farm economies around the world.

In Egypt, an AID study found that the volume of United States food aid has become a disincentive to Egyptian farmers to produce grain. South Korea is frequently cited by Public Law 480 proponents as the best example of a success story where a recipient has become a customer. But according to a 1995 GAO study, there is no evidence to support the existence of a direct tie between title I aid and the development of commercial markets for United States farm goods in South Korea.

In fact, because of the disruptive impact that this program has had on local farm economies, the nations of Bulgaria, Latvia, Poland, and Slovakia, among others, are no longer participating in it.

Well, if it is not about developing new markets for American farm exporters and it is not about providing humanitarian food aid for poor nations, then what is it about?

Mr. Chairman, I think that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], the distinguished majority leader, got it right and said it best when he called this, the politics of greed wrapped up in the language of love.

What this is about is clear-cut, straightforward Government subsidies to big-farm and big-shipping interests. This is a program that makes it possible for the U.S. Government to dump our products at below-market prices on foreign countries at the expense of small foreign farmers, all for the benefit of the very largest, giant agri-conglomerates in the United States; companies like Archer Daniels Midland, Bunge, Cargill, Continental Grain, and others.

Well, good for them, but not good for foreign policy, not good for the American taxpayer, and not good for building long-term relationships. This is precisely the kind of corporate welfare that our constituents want us to get rid of. Here is our opportunity to bring it down to the level requested by the President and approved by the 1996 budget resolution that we have already voted for.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to inform my colleagues that this amendment has been endorsed by Americans for Tax Reform, Citizens Against Government Waste, Citizens for a Sound Economy, and the National Taxpayers Union.

Vote "yes" on the Hoke-Meehan amendment.

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

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, after last night's debate, I think what is needed is some clarity on the issue. What many of the opponents of this amendment suggested is that this amendment is adopted, and Public Law 480, title I funding is cut, that starving people around the world would not receive food assistance.

If that were the case, I certainly would have never cosponsored this amendment. An action such as this would be mean-spirited at the very least.

Title I is a market development program, not an emergency humanitarian food program. Other titles of the Public Law 480 act are responsible for these activities. Title II authorizes donations for agricultural commodities for emergency feeding programs and to carry out activities to alleviate the causes of hunger and disease and death. Title III authorizes grants of agricultural commodities to be used for food distribution programs and development of food reserves.

The distinction between these differing objectives was made clear by the Committee on Agriculture itself. The 1990 Agricultural Development and Trade Act distributed the responsibility for these programs to two different agencies with distinct missions. The management of title I activities was kept in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that Members vote for the Hoke-Meehan amendment. The administration is in favor of cutting back this appropriation.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, title I, about which we are talking, is directed toward countries that exhibit potential to become customers of U.S. agricultural commodities. It is a program that serves as a vital link between the assistance we give to severely impoverished nations and business we receive from cash-paying customers of U.S. agricultural commodities.

So, Mr. Chairman, I stand today in strong opposition to this ill-advised amendment and must refute some of the arguments that have been presented.

First of all, it was stated last evening that several countries have dropped out of the title I program. They have. They have graduated from the concessional program to become hard-cash customers of U.S. commodities. In fact, 43 of the 50 largest buyers of American farm goods are countries that used to receive food aid.

□ 1315

Examples of this include Egypt, which now purchases a half billion dollars in United States bulk grains annually, and Pakistan, which has become 1 of the top 10 importers of United States wheat.

Furthermore, both of these countries have allowed privatization of their government-managed food importing agencies, a reform which has been furthered by participation in this program.

Some have said that this program has outdated objectives. I disagree. Market development and privatization are still very much in style today. Development of our export markets is as important today, if not more so, than it has ever been.

This amendment affects specifically title I, the portion directed toward economically stronger food-deficit countries that have the potential of becoming commercial importers, but it is an important part of the entire Public Law 480 picture because it allows a transition between the assistance that we give to severely impoverished nations and business we receive from cash-paying customers of U.S. agricultural commodities.

I also want to respond briefly to the argument the title I program was deemed inadequate by the GAO and USDA. That is not true. Both agencies have offered suggestions for refining the program, and these concerns will be addressed in the farm bill.

However, using the appropriations process to limit the role of our food assistance and foreign market development efforts is neither a timely nor an appropriate manner to effect needed operational refinements. This program is a win-win situation. We provide jobs for U.S. workers both now and in the

future, and we assist struggling countries to meet their food needs.

I urge my colleagues, I plead with my colleagues, to vote against this ill-advised amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding to me. He has been a true leader in having U.S. agriculture address the nutritional needs of countries that are in desperate shape from a food need standpoint.

This amendment comes right at the heart of a very important program we have long maintained, using our agricultural prowess to help shaky countries with serious food need shortages for their citizenry.

What have we gained from that? The benefit of world leadership, the benefit of stabilizing very unstable situations and, finally and best of all, new customers for our agricultural products.

Following the GATT Treaty, we are in a critical period of shakeout in terms of developing international markets. We must maintain the funding for Public Law 480. Please, do not succumb to the very shallow attractiveness of this amendment. Please, support the Committee on Appropriations and reject this amendment.

Mr. EMERSON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

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

Mr. EMERSON. I yield back to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this terribly insensitive amendment and attack on our Public Law 480 program.

Mr. EMERSON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution also. He is a distinguished leader on the Agriculture Appropriations Committee.

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

Mr. EMERSON. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico, the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. SKEEN. I, too, think it is about time we quit talking about corporate welfare when we do not even know what the program is all about. I tell the gentleman that I admire him for taking this on, his support for this program. It is one of the things that helps agriculture in this country. That is exactly what we need.

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

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The CLERK. The text of the amendment is 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.

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 Chairman announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on each amendment on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings, and this first vote will be a 15-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 83, noes 338, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 547]

AYES—83

Andrews	Gordon	Neumann
Archer	Goss	Owens
Armey	Green	Payne (NJ)
Bachus	Hancock	Petri
Baker (CA)	Hayworth	Portman
Ballenger	Hefley	Ramstad
Barrett (WI)	Hilleary	Rohrabacher
Bartlett	Hobson	Royce
Bass	Hoekstra	Salmon
Bilbray	Hoke	Sanford
Bilirakis	Horn	Scarborough
Blute	Hostettler	Schumer
Chabot	Inglis	Sensenbrenner
Coburn	Jacobs	Shadegg
Davis	Johnson (CT)	Shays
DeLay	Kasich	Smith (WA)
Dornan	Klug	Souder
Duncan	Kolbe	Stearns
English	Largent	Stockman
Ensign	LoBiondo	Stump
Eshoo	Longley	Talent
Fawell	Luther	Tate
Fowler	Manzullo	Torkildsen
Fox	Meehan	Wamp
Franks (CT)	Metcalf	White
Franks (NJ)	Miller (FL)	Zeliff
Frelinghuysen	Molinari	Zimmer
Gilchrest	Myrick	

NOES—338

Abercrombie	Callahan	Deutsch
Ackerman	Calvert	Diaz-Balart
Allard	Camp	Dickey
Baessler	Canady	Dicks
Baker (LA)	Cardin	Dingell
Baldacci	Castle	Dixon
Barcia	Chambliss	Doggett
Barr	Chapman	Dooley
Barrett (NE)	Chenoweth	Doolittle
Barton	Christensen	Doyle
Becerra	Chryslers	Dunn
Beilenson	Clay	Durbin
Bentsen	Clayton	Edwards
Bereuter	Clement	Ehlers
Berman	Clinger	Ehrlich
Bevill	Clyburn	Emerson
Bishop	Coble	Engel
Bliley	Coleman	Evans
Boehlert	Collins (GA)	Everett
Boehner	Collins (IL)	Ewing
Bonilla	Combest	Farr
Bonior	Condit	Fattah
Bono	Conyers	Fazio
Borski	Cooley	Fields (LA)
Boucher	Costello	Fields (TX)
Brewster	Coyne	Filner
Browder	Cramer	Flake
Brown (FL)	Crapo	Flanagan
Brown (OH)	Creameans	Foglietta
Brownback	Cubin	Foley
Bryant (TN)	Cunningham	Forbes
Bryant (TX)	Danner	Frank (MA)
Bunn	de la Garza	Frisa
Bunning	Deal	Frost
Burr	DeFazio	Funderburk
Burton	DeLauro	Furse
Buyer	Dellums	Ganske

Gejdenson	Manton	Roth
Gekas	Markey	Roukema
Gephardt	Martinez	Roybal-Allard
Geren	Martini	Rush
Gibbons	Mascara	Sabo
Gillmor	Matsui	Sanders
Gilman	McCarthy	Sawyer
Gonzalez	McCollum	Saxton
Goodlatte	McCrery	Schaefer
Graham	McDade	Schiff
Greenwood	McDermott	Schroeder
Gunderson	McHale	Scott
Gutierrez	McHugh	Seastrand
Gutknecht	McInnis	Serrano
Hall (OH)	McIntosh	Shaw
Hall (TX)	McKeon	Shuster
Hamilton	McKinney	Sisisky
Hansen	McNulty	Skaggs
Harman	Meek	Skeen
Hastert	Menendez	Skelton
Hastings (FL)	Meyers	Slaughter
Hastings (WA)	Mfume	Smith (MI)
Hayes	Mica	Smith (NJ)
Hefner	Miller (CA)	Smith (TX)
Heineman	Mineta	Solomon
Herger	Minge	Spence
Hilliard	Mink	Spratt
Hinchey	Mollohan	Stark
Holden	Montgomery	Stenholm
Houghton	Moorhead	Stokes
Hoyer	Moran	Studds
Hunter	Morella	Stupak
Hutchinson	Murtha	Tanner
Hyde	Myers	Tauzin
Istook	Nadler	Taylor (MS)
Jackson-Lee	Neal	Taylor (NC)
Jefferson	Nethercutt	Tejeda
Johnson (SD)	Ney	Thomas
Johnson, E. B.	Norwood	Thompson
Johnson, Sam	Nussle	Thornberry
Johnston	Oberstar	Thornton
Jones	Obey	Thurman
Kanjorski	Olver	Tiahrt
Kaptur	Ortiz	Torres
Kelly	Orton	Torricelli
Kennedy (MA)	Oxley	Towns
Kennedy (RI)	Packard	Trafficant
Kennelly	Pallone	Tucker
Kildee	Parker	Upton
Kim	Pastor	Velázquez
King	Paxon	Vento
Kingston	Payne (VA)	Visclosky
Kleczka	Pelosi	Vucanovich
Klink	Peterson (FL)	Waldholtz
Knollenberg	Peterson (MN)	Walker
LaFalce	Pickett	Walsh
LaHood	Pombo	Ward
Lantos	Pomeroy	Waters
Latham	Porter	Watt (NC)
LaTourette	Poshard	Waxman
Laughlin	Pryce	Weldon (FL)
Lazio	Quillen	Weldon (PA)
Leach	Quinn	Weller
Levin	Radanovich	Whitfield
Lewis (CA)	Rahall	Wicker
Lewis (GA)	Rangel	Williams
Lewis (KY)	Reed	Wilson
Lightfoot	Regula	Wise
Lincoln	Richardson	Wolf
Linder	Riggs	Woolsey
Lipinski	Rivers	Wyden
Livingston	Roberts	Wynn
Lofgren	Roemer	Yates
Lowe	Rogers	Young (AK)
Lucas	Ros-Lehtinen	Young (FL)
Maloney	Rose	

NOT VOTING—13

Bateman	Dreier	Reynolds
Brown (CA)	Ford	Volkmer
Collins (MI)	Gallegly	Watts (OK)
Cox	Goodling	
Crane	Moakley	

□ 1340

The Clerk announced the following pair: On this vote:

Mr. Dreier for, with Mr. Moakley against. Messrs. ALLARD, RUSH, BOEHLERT, and Ms. FURSE changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. DAVIS, SHADEGG, HOEKSTRA, SCHUMER, GORDON, and GILCHREST changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, I do not know if any of my colleagues were as thrilled as I was when I was driving around my district, I think on Monday, and had my radio on, and heard that one of our colleagues, a colleague from this House, was the one that had the courage and the guts to have two of our fellow Americans released by Saddam Hussein. It was not somebody from the administration; it was not somebody from the Senate. It was somebody from our House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to say I have been waiting all week to bring a little civility to the House, and what better way to do it than to recognize the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON]? We are in his debt for what he has done for two Americans and for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, we are in his debt, and now we are asking him to free us from this institution today.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDSON. First of all, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LAHOOD] for the very generous words.

Second, I want to thank all of my colleagues for their expressions of support.

I want my colleagues to know that this was not a solitary effort. I got support from the administration and many on both sides of the aisle like the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] and many others that worked with me to secure the release of the two Americans.

I also want my colleagues to know that Saddam Hussein did reject part of the deal, that being that I stay in Baghdad for a few days.

□ 1345

But seriously, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois for the nice words.

I think that there is a role for those of us, many here, with abilities in foreign policy that can serve as mediators when our executive branch perhaps does not have the flexibility to do that. There are many here in this body like the FRANK WOLFS and JOHN PORTERS and NANCY PELOSIS and TOM LANTOS and SAM GEJDENSONS and JIM MORANS and JIM OBERSTARS, all who have talents in foreign policy, care about

human rights, and could very easily have undertaken the efforts that I just did.

I think it is important that as we move ahead in relationships with countries that previously have been antagonists, like with North Korea, that eventually we utilize the talents of some of our own, like JAY KIM and many others that have direct experiences on many of these issues.

To my colleagues, I thank them for their warm words. I am thankful for the support and friendship and the jokes, the Free Willy jokes, the many others that they have undertaken, but mostly to the gentleman from Illinois and to the American people and to the families of these two good men and these two good Americans, family values, two regular guys that innocently got caught and did not get a response from their government until it was a coordinated effort between the executive branch and the Congress. I thank you.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SANFORD

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The text of the amendment is 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."

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 221, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 548]

AYES—199

Archer	Chambliss	Fox
Armey	Christensen	Franks (CT)
Bachus	Chrysler	Franks (NJ)
Baker (CA)	Coble	Frelinghuysen
Baker (LA)	Coburn	Frisa
Ballenger	Collins (GA)	Furse
Barr	Cooley	Ganske
Barrett (NE)	Cubin	Geren
Barrett (WI)	Cunningham	Goodlatte
Bass	Deal	Graham
Bentsen	Doggett	Green
Bereuter	Dornan	Greenwood
Bilbray	Doyle	Gutknecht
Bilirakis	Duncan	Hall (OH)
Bliley	Dunn	Hall (TX)
Blute	Ehlers	Hancock
Bono	English	Hansen
Brownback	Ensign	Harman
Bryant (TN)	Eshoo	Hastert
Bunning	Everett	Hastings (WA)
Burr	Fawell	Hayworth
Burton	Fields (TX)	Hefley
Buyer	Flanagan	Heineman
Camp	Foley	Herger
Castle	Forbes	Hilleary
Chabot	Fowler	Hobson

Hoekstra  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Inglis  
Istook  
Jacobs  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Kanjorski  
Kasich  
Kelly  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kildee  
Kim  
King  
Klecza  
Klink  
Klug  
Kolbe  
LaHood  
Largent  
Latham  
Laughlin  
Lazio  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren  
Longley  
Luther  
Manzullo  
Martini  
Mascara  
McCarthy  
McCollum  
McHale

NOES—221

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Allard  
Andrews  
Baesler  
Baldacci  
Barcia  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Becerra  
Beilenson  
Berman  
Bevill  
Bishop  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonior  
Borski  
Boucher  
Brewster  
Browder  
Brown (FL)  
Brown (OH)  
Bryant (TX)  
Bunn  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Canady  
Cardin  
Chapman  
Chenoweth  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clinger  
Clyburn  
Coleman  
Collins (IL)  
Combest  
Condit  
Conyers  
Costello  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Crapo  
Cremeans  
Danner  
Davis  
de la Garza  
DeFazio  
DeLauro  
DeLay  
Dellums  
Deutsch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dickey

McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntosh  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Metcalf  
Meyers  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Minge  
Molinari  
Mollohan  
Montgomery  
Moorhead  
Murtha  
Myrick  
Neumann  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Orton  
Owens  
Parker  
Paxon  
Petri  
Pombo  
Porter  
Portman  
Quinn  
Ramstad  
Reed  
Regula  
Rivers  
Roemer  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roth  
Roukema  
Royce  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Saxton

Scarborough  
Schaefer  
Schumer  
Seastrand  
Sensenbrenner  
Shadegg  
Shays  
Shuster  
Sisisky  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (WA)  
Solomon  
Soudier  
Spence  
Stearns  
Stockman  
Stump  
Talent  
Tanner  
Tate  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Torkildsen  
Torrice  
Upton  
Waldholtz  
Wamp  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
White  
Wicker  
Williams  
Wyden  
Young (FL)  
Zeliff  
Zimmer

Leach  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lightfoot  
Lincoln  
Lipinski  
Livingston  
Lowe  
Lucas  
Maloney  
Manton  
Markey  
Martinez  
Matsui  
McCreary  
McDade  
McDermott  
McKeon  
McKinney  
Meek  
Menendez  
Mfume  
Miller (CA)  
Mineta  
Mink  
Moran  
Morella  
Myers  
Nadler  
Neal  
Nethercutt  
Ney  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Oxley  
Packard  
Pallone  
Pastor  
Payne (NJ)  
Payne (VA)  
Pelosi  
Peterson (FL)  
Peterson (MN)  
Pickett  
Pomeroy  
Poshard  
Pryce  
Quillen  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Richardson  
Riggs

Roberts  
Rogers  
Rose  
Roybal-Allard  
Rush  
Sabo  
Sanders  
Sawyer  
Schiff  
Schroeder  
Scott  
Serrano  
Shaw  
Skaggs  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (NJ)

Bateman  
Bonilla  
Brown (CA)  
Collins (MI)  
Cox

Smith (TX)  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stenholm  
Stokes  
Studds  
Stupak  
Tauzin  
Tejeda  
Thomas  
Thompson  
Thornton  
Thurman  
Torres  
Towns  
Traficant  
Tucker  
Velázquez

NOT VOTING—14

Crane  
Dreier  
Gallo  
Gooling  
Hoke

□ 1355

The Clerk announced the following pair: On this vote:

Mr. Dreier for, with Mr. Moakley against.

Mr. STUPAK changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. CAMP and Mr. WICKER changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OLVER

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER] 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 text of the amendments is 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.

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 169, noes 248, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 549]

AYES—169

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Andrews  
Army  
Barrett (WI)  
Bass

Becerra  
Beilenson  
Bereuter  
Berman  
Bevill  
Bilirakis

Blute  
Boehlert  
Bonior  
Borski  
Boucher  
Brown (FL)

Brown (OH)  
Cardin  
Castle  
Clayton  
Clyburn  
Coleman  
Collins (IL)  
Conyers  
Costello  
Coyne  
Davis  
DeFazio  
DeLauro  
Dellums  
Deutsch  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Durbin  
Ehlers  
Engel  
Ensign  
Eshoo  
Evans  
Fattah  
Fields (LA)  
Filner  
Foglietta  
Ford  
Fox  
Frank (MA)  
Frelinghuysen  
Frisa  
Furse  
Gejdenson  
Gordon  
Green  
Gutierrez  
Hall (OH)  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Hilliard  
Hinchey  
Horn  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Jackson-Lee  
Jacobs  
Jefferson

Moakley  
Reynolds  
Volkmer  
Watts (OK)

Johnson (CT)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnston  
Kanjorski  
Kennedy (MA)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
Klink  
LaFalce  
Lantos  
Lazio  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lincoln  
Lipinski  
Lofgren  
Lowe  
Luther  
Maloney  
Manton  
Markey  
Martini  
Mascara  
McCarthy  
McDermott  
McHale  
McKinney  
Meehan  
Meek  
Menendez  
Mfume  
Miller (CA)  
Mineta  
Mink  
Moran  
Morella  
Murtha  
Nadler  
Neal  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pastor  
Payne (NJ)  
Payne (VA)  
Pelosi  
Pickett  
Poshard

NOES—248

Condit  
Cooley  
Cramer  
Crapo  
Cremeans  
Cubin  
Cunningham  
Danner  
de la Garza  
DeLay  
Diaz-Balart  
Dickey  
Dooley  
Doolittle  
Dornan  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Edwards  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
English  
Everett  
Ewing  
Farr  
Hyde  
Fawell  
Fazio  
Fields (TX)  
Flake  
Flanagan  
Foley  
Forbes  
Fowler  
Franks (CT)  
Franks (NJ)  
Frost  
Funderburk  
Ganske  
Gekas  
Gephardt  
Geren  
Gilchrist  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Gonzalez  
Goodlatte

Quillen  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reed  
Rivers  
Roemer  
Rohrabacher  
Roukema  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Rush  
Sabo  
Sanders  
Sawyer  
Schroeder  
Schumer  
Scott  
Serrano  
Shaw  
Shays  
Skaggs  
Slaughter  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stokes  
Studds  
Stupak  
Tanner  
Thompson  
Torkildsen  
Torres  
Torrice  
Towns  
Traficant  
Tucker  
Velázquez  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Waters  
Watt (NC)  
Waxman  
Wilson  
Woolsey  
Wyden  
Yates  
Young (FL)  
Zeliff  
Zimmer

Goss  
Graham  
Gunderson  
Gutknecht  
Hall (TX)  
Hamilton  
Hancock  
Hansen  
Hastert  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Hefner  
Heineman  
Herger  
Hilleary  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Hoke  
Holden  
Hostettler  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Inglis  
Istook  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Kaptur  
Kasich  
Kelly  
Kim  
King  
Kingston  
Klecza  
Klug  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
LaHood  
Largent  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Laughlin  
Leach

Lewis (CA)	Oxley	Smith (NJ)
Lewis (KY)	Packard	Smith (TX)
Lightfoot	Parker	Smith (WA)
Linder	Paxon	Solomon
Livingston	Peterson (FL)	Souder
LoBiondo	Peterson (MN)	Spence
Longley	Pombo	Petri
Lucas	Pomeroy	Stenholm
Manzullo	Porter	Stockman
Martinez	Portman	Stump
Matsui	Pryce	Talent
McCollum	Quinn	Tate
McCrary	Radanovich	Tauzin
McDade	Ramstad	Taylor (MS)
McHugh	Regula	Taylor (NC)
McInnis	Richardson	Tejeda
McIntosh	Riggs	Thomas
McKeon	Roberts	Thornberry
McNulty	Rogers	Thornton
Metcalf	Ros-Lehtinen	Thurman
Meyers	Rose	Tiahrt
Mica	Roth	Upton
Miller (FL)	Roth	Vucanovich
Minge	Salmon	Waldholtz
Molinari	Sanford	Walker
Mollohan	Saxton	Walsh
Montgomery	Scarborough	Wamp
Moorhead	Schaefer	Ward
Myers	Schiff	Weldon (FL)
Myrick	Seastrand	Weller
Nethercutt	Sensenbrenner	White
Neumann	Shadegg	Whitfield
Ney	Shuster	Wicker
Norwood	Sisisky	Williams
Nussle	Skeen	Wolf
Ortiz	Skelton	Wynn
Orton	Smith (MI)	Young (AK)

## NOT VOTING—17

Bateman	Dreier	Reynolds
Brown (CA)	Gallely	Volkmer
Clay	Gibbons	Watts (OK)
Collins (MI)	Goodling	Weldon (PA)
Cox	Greenwood	Wise
Crane	Moakley	

□ 1403

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Moakley for, with Mr. Dreier against.

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

Mr. WYNN changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. DEUTSCH changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER].

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ZIMMER

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, amendment No. 29.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ZIMMER:

Amendment No. 29: Page 71, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. 726. (a) LIMITATIONS 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.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 20, 1995, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] will be recognized for

30 minutes, and a Member opposed, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER].

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield 15 minutes of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] and that he be permitted to control the time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield 15 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] and that he be permitted to control the time.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. To make things clear to my colleagues in the House, the proponents of the amendment control 30 minutes of the time, 15 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] and 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER]. The opponents control 30 minutes, 15 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] and 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER].

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would eliminate funding for the market promotion program, the program that epitomizes corporate welfare and congressional pork at its worst. Since 1986, one and a quarter billion taxpayer dollars have been used by MPP to underwrite the overseas advertising budgets of some of America's largest and most profitable businesses like Gallo, Blue Diamond, McDonald's, Burger King, Jim Beam, Hershey's.

I am proud of what this Congress has done to get the poor off welfare. I think it is time we showed the same commitment to getting the rich off welfare. At a time when we are eliminating hundreds of Federal programs for the sake of Federal budget reduction, we can no longer afford this program.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] plans to offer an alternative amendment he says can preserve the MPP and still get rid of corporate pork. Do not be fooled by the Obey amendment. It is just pork lite. Mr. OBEY proposes to eliminate from eligibility any organization that sells more than \$20 million. You heard that right, that is \$20 million, not \$20,000, not \$200,000, not even \$2 million, but \$20 million.

Let me put that \$20 million in perspective for you. The average American farm household income in 1993 was less than \$43,000. It would take that average American farm household 466 years to earn \$20 million. Most American farm

producers are lucky if they gross \$100,000, let alone \$20 million. In fact, only 6 percent of all American farms gross more than \$250,000 annually.

So who is the Obey amendment going to help? Who is he thinking of? The average farmer who earns \$43,000, or the 94 percent of all American farms whose total gross annual sales are less than \$250,000? I think not. Under the Obey amendment, you will be asking American taxpayers to subsidize the advertising budgets of those who do up to \$20 million in business, and as high as it is, even the \$20 million cap would be incredibly easy to evade.

In yesterday's debate on this bill, we heard how the current \$50,000 per farm subsidy cap is a joke. The Obey amendment \$20 million cap can be breached by any competent lawyer through the use of multiple bogus partnerships and dummy corporations. The Obey amendment \$20 million will not get Ronald McDonald off welfare. Instead of one application for MPP money for Ronald McDonald, you get 500 from Ronald's franchises.

If you do not believe that this is welfare for the rich, then support the Obey amendment. If you really want to help small American farm producers break into overseas markets, then vote for the Zimmer amendment and scrap this program altogether. The Obey amendment, no matter where it places its cap, does not address the fundamental bias that this program has toward big business.

MPP requires a 50 percent match, and Obey will not change that. So if you are a California producer with less than \$250,000 in sales and you can spare \$2,000 for ads, MPP will give you \$2,000. But if you are big business with \$20 million in sales, and you can spare \$200,000, you can get \$200,000 from MPP. If you want to get rid of corporate pork and if you want to help the small producers, support the Zimmer amendment, vote to end this fatally flawed MPP program and ask the authorizing committee to create a brand-new program for you, one that has not been tainted by 10 long years of controversy and pork. You do not need to do this in this year of 1995. When the farm authorization bill comes to the floor, seize that opportunity. Vote for the Zimmer amendment, and do not settle for pork lite.

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

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

Once again, we hear the stories of 6 or 7 years ago and most of them were wrong then, and to dredge them up over and over does a disservice to this debate.

Through the efforts of this committee, we have forced the Department to redo the way it manages the Market Promotion Program, the idol of all of the great pork busters when they cannot find a pig. It now targets the small, nonbranded trade groups. The success of this program is well-known, and we

will hear story after story today to show how this program benefits American farmers and industry.

This program means jobs in the United States, and to pass this amendment means jobs in other countries. Vote "no," save American jobs.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to join with my colleagues, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARRETT], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LOBIONDO], and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LUTHER], to end once and for all and never return to one of the most ill-conceived and wasteful programs in the annals of congressional spending, the market promotion program.

Joining us in spirit, if not in person as a cosponsor and one of the originators, is no other than the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], who has worked with me for many years to kill the MPP Program. For 10 years this program has shoveled over \$1.3 billion to pay mostly, not exclusively, but mostly, huge agribusinesses to advertise their products overseas.

The program was changed so badly, three times in separate reports by the GAO, for example, that Congress borrowed a tactic from the FBI's witness protection program and changed its name from TEA to MPP to give it a new lease on life.

Well, you can run but you cannot hide. MPP still brazenly gives cash grants to the biggest corporations in the world: \$70 million to Sunkist, \$40 million to Blue Diamond, \$20 million to SunSweet, Gallo, \$16 million, Pillsbury, \$10 million, and a little hamburger company called McDonald's got over \$1 million.

I have nothing against McDonald's or any of the other blue chip companies that receive these grants. They are what makes America tick. They are good. But it is simply wrong for corporations that grace the pages of Fortune magazine to receive taxpayer handouts.

Some companies never even sought the grants, there is so much money in this program that is unneeded, but took the money because USDA offered it free of charge.

□ 1415

USDA called Paul Newman's salad dressing company, for example, and asked if they wanted a grant. Now, is this a government program, or is this a Publishers Clearing House contest?

My favorite story, of course, is the one about the California Raisin Advisory Board. They received \$3 million to introduce raisins to Japan. After this MPP fiasco, it will be centuries before the Japanese eat a single raisin. The Raisin Board used the same singing

and dancing, "I heard it through the grapevine" claymation raisin campaign that proved so successful in the United States, but not so in Japan. First, it turns out that these claymation raisins were not bilingual, so they only sang in their native English. The Japanese could not understand.

Second, Marvin Gaye and his hit song, "I Heard It Through the Grapevine," are virtually unknown in Japan, so the Japanese target audience did not get the pun.

Third, since the Japanese were not familiar with regular raisins, they were baffled by these gargantuan vaudevilian dancing raisins. They thought they were dancing potatoes or dancing chocolates.

Finally, and worst of all, the raisin figures that they had dancing had four fingers. In Japan, this is a very bad omen. It would be similar to the Japanese marketing the Nissan as satan. Therefore, this is not the only MPP-inspired fiasco.

A California walnut ad in Israel has puzzled Israelis scratching their heads. Only 1 in 20 Israelis could figure out what the ad was about. The rest thought the walnut was, you guessed it, a potato.

As bad as this program is, as tight as our budget is, as draconian as the cuts in this bill are for child nutrition, MPP, can Members believe this, received a \$25 million increase.

Our MPP amendment funds this program at the level it deserves: zero. I urge Members to support a bipartisan amendment. Look who is supporting it: Heritage Foundation, the Citizens for a Sound Economy, the National Taxpayers Union, all the way over to the Center for the Public Interest, the Teamsters, and no group less than the Doris Day League for the Protection of Animals.

With all due respect to my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one final argument. I hope those of the Members, and their staffs watching on the television, please tell your Member this. If we pass this amendment and end the program, we skip the next three votes. We will be out of here much earlier this afternoon than we would otherwise. This final argument is one that even the gentleman from New Mexico, BILL RICHARDSON, could not negotiate such a good settlement. Therefore, I say to my colleagues in conclusion, do not be fooled by any substitutes. Vote against the MPP program.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. THURMAN].

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Chairman, in response to my good friend, the gentleman from New York, I realize he comes from an urban area, but those companies he is talking about are selling food. Just so he will be reminded, food does not come from the grocery store, it comes from the farmer.

Beyond that, I want Members to know I strongly oppose this amend-

ment. Just a few weeks ago this floor rejected an amendment to abolish OPIC, and the vote was 90 to 329. I know that OPIC is not structured like MPP, but they have the same purpose: to increase American exports; OPIC for manufactured jobs, MPP for agriculture. Last month's debate showed that exports not only create jobs but also create a positive balance of payments. OPIC creates American jobs. So does MPP.

Mr. Chairman, GATT allows us to support agriculture exports for a few years. Our economic competitors are using every legal means available, and so should we. I did not support GATT because I believe in fair trade. It is not fair trade if our competitors use tools that we deny our own farmers. Just look at this chart, and it shows what we spend as compared to others.

Mr. Chairman, the agriculture-related segment of the economy upstream and downstream from the farm constitutes about 17 percent of our gross domestic product. Agriculture exports have outpaced imports by about \$20 billion in recent years.

Mr. Chairman, I just would like to remind this House that 43 State delegations supported OPIC last month, and we ought to be supporting MPP.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SALMON].

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, the Market Promotion Program is the ultimate corporate welfare—giving millions of taxpayer dollars away to many of our largest corporations. It is good business to advertise overseas, and corporations would, and do, do it on their own. Our Nation's businesses are the best in the world. They know how to advertise effectively both at home and abroad.

This amendment will not put people in the unemployment lines as its opponents say, but it will help to get people off of welfare. People like Ronald McDonald, the Keebler Elves, the Dancing Raisins, and the Pillsbury Doughboy, to name a few. In fact, in 1993, the GAO reported that they could find no correlation between the amount spent on the MPP, and the levels of U.S. agricultural exports.

We are taking great steps forward toward shrinking the Federal Government and balancing our budget. Continuing the MPP flies in the face of all that we are trying to do. We are making tough choices and setting tough priorities so that we will not burden our children with a debt that they had no part in creating. Providing seed money for multibillion-dollar corporations to advertise beer, nuts, fruit, or any other product overseas is not one of these important priorities.

In tight budgetary times, this program should not have even survived—but it was increased by 30 percent. The MPP has already cost taxpayers \$1.2 billion. Let us end this corporate welfare program.

Without the MPP, the raisins will still dance, the doughboy will still giggle, and Ronald McDonald will still smile. The difference is that Mr. and Mrs. America will not be picking up the tab. Vote "yes" on the Zimmer-Schumer amendment.

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose this amendment.

Corporate welfare, they say? The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] spoke of several of America's larger corporations. How about Bekins Skiff Orchards, how about McCluskey Farms, or western New York State apple growers? This program impacts on our farmers positively.

The MPP program, just this year, opened up a great new market for New York State apples in Israel. Trade sources in Israel report the market potential is 50,000 metric tons per year. This year we sold thousands of pounds of apples from New York State, upstate New York, to Israel. This means jobs. It means real income to our farmers all over the country, not just in New York. Stop this big city assault on our family farms. Vote "no".

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LUTHER], cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today as a cosponsor of this amendment to end funding for the Market Promotion Program [MPP].

The Market Promotion Program, as other speakers have mentioned, reimburses companies for advertising and promotion incurred in overseas markets. While I fully appreciate the merits of export promotion, and I respect the motives of those who support this program, I must ask why we are even considering funding a program like this when our Federal budget is completely out of balance and we are nearly \$5 trillion in debt.

The MPP is a clear example of a taxpayer-provided subsidy for dozens of American's successful businesses. In fact, over the past decade, the MPP has cost American taxpayers over \$1.2 billion to subsidize foreign advertising.

Like with other programs, a case can be made that this advertising is helpful in selling our products overseas, but if the program is so successful, then the private sector should—and hopefully will—continue the practice without help from American taxpayers.

In fact, to their credit, some of the companies, including at least one in my home State of Minnesota, has been candid and honest enough to say that while they benefit from this program, they understand the need to cut this subsidy along with other areas of Federal spending.

This amendment is supported by groups across the spectrum including the Concord Coalition, Citizens for a Sound Economy, and the National Taxpayers Union.

Mr. Chairman, let me conclude by saying I am surprised that we are even having to deal with an issue like this in today's environment. I thought the people of this country made it clear in last fall's election that they want change, discipline, and fiscal responsibility here in Washington. Why then does spending like this still appear in a bill on the floor of this House?

Today, after years of overspending, we have no extra money to spend and we must discipline ourselves the way the rest of the world does. We must ask ourselves, not whether there is some value in this program, but rather is it more important to provide this foreign advertisement subsidy or make future investments in our children's education, Head Start, job training, and health care for the people of this country.

And what credibility will we have in trying to hold the line in those areas if we fund this program?

I ask you to bring some discipline and common sense to our work and support this amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLEY].

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Chairman, this week all of us were greeted when we read our morning newspaper, regardless of where we were in the country, that the United States was experiencing the largest trade deficit in history, that we had an \$11.5 billion trade deficit. It is ironic that today on the floor of this House, we are considering passing an amendment that would increase that trade deficit.

Our agricultural exports are one of the few sectors of our economy to have a positive balance of trade. We are exporting over \$51 billion worth of agricultural goods, creating a \$20 billion surplus of trade in that sector. When we look at this, we are doing this in light of the fact that we are being grossly overspent by our competitors in the international marketplace.

If we look what the EC is spending, they are spending 10 times as much as the United States is. On wine exports alone, the EC has their subsidies of \$90 billion. That is more than we spend on the entire market promotion program.

We talk about the arguments about the major corporations and cooperatives in this country, but the only way a cotton farmer in California or an apple grower in Pennsylvania or a dairy farmer in New York can market their products overseas is through some type of cooperative or some type of corporation. The MPP gives the tools to the farmers, to the cooperatives, so they can compete against the unfair international competition.

Mr. Chairman, this program is a program that works. This chart clearly demonstrates that since MPP was instituted, our trade balance has gone up with our agricultural products. It is a success. Do not listen to some of the arguments of our urban neighbors and urban colleagues. Vote for MPP.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LOBIONDO].

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Zimmer amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we say it over and over—if we are going to balance the budget in 7 years, we must make some tough decisions. Cutting the market promotion program is not one of them. This is easy. There is no way that this program can be justified.

We must ask ourselves if it is an essential task of the Federal Government to advertise McDonald's Chicken McNuggets, Gallo Wine and Sunkist Oranges in foreign countries. The answer is no. Yet that is exactly what the market promotion program does.

The supporters of this program are going to talk about how the market promotion program is justified because it increases economic activity here in the United States.

Which means one of two things:

If the program is effective, we should eliminate funding because these multi-million-dollar corporations don't need it.

If, on the other hand, the market promotion program is not effective enough for private corporations to justify spending their money on it—then how do we justify spending more taxpayers' dollars on it?

Either way, we should eliminate funding for the market promotion program.

Since the program began in 1986, Congress has spent \$1.25 billion to supplement the advertising budgets of some of the biggest corporations in the United States.

In this bill, spending on the market promotion program will increase from \$85 million this year to \$110 million in fiscal year 1996. This is a spending increase that we cannot tolerate.

Mr. Chairman, the American people sent us here to do what is right for the Nation. They want us to cut spending. They want us to stop putting them deeper and deeper in debt. And they want us to build a better economic future for them and their children. They want us to shrink the size of the Federal Government—to preserve those things that only government can accomplish, and get government out of those areas that should be left to the private sector.

We must make difficult decisions on spending in order to balance the budget in 7 years. The Zimmer amendment is an easy one. Vote "yes" on Zimmer-Schumer.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS].

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose any of these amendments pending on the floor

today to the 1996 agricultural appropriations bill which would either eliminate or reduce funding for the market promotion program.

□ 1430

Such an action would cripple American agriculture's ability to remain competitive in the post-GATT global marketplace.

Let me be clear about one thing. The world marketplace is still characterized by unfair competition. The European Union, for example, over the past 5 years has outspent the United States by 6 to 1 in terms of export promotion, and will be able to maintain this historical advantage even under GATT. The European Union now spends \$89 million just promoting wine exports, which is more than we spend promoting all of our agricultural exports abroad.

The people that would be hurt by this amendment, which again comes from Northeasterners and I think is sort of a continuation of the overall war on the West emanating from Washington, DC, would be farmers and ranchers and the 1 million Americans whose jobs depend on U.S. agricultural exports. The fact of the matter is the MPP works.

Let me tell why. Arizona State University as part of a recent study completed analysis of the impact of MPP expenditures on 7 fruit and vegetable crops. The analysis showed that for every dollar of MPP funds spent overseas promoting American table grapes, there was an increase in value of \$5.04. Even more dramatic was the return from a value-added product such as American wine. In addition, the study found that the return from the MPP to apple production was \$18.19. The Market Promotion Program based on this study pays for itself and then some. The funds invested in the MPP translate into increased income for farmers, more jobs in the packaging and processing industries, and more jobs on the shipping lines.

Do not be deceived by these stories about so-called corporate abuse.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN].

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, earlier this year I put together my own plan to balance the budget. I had to make some difficult decisions, but I learned a valuable lesson: If we're serious about balancing the budget, Congress has to stop allocating scarce resources to pork-barrel projects.

The Market Promotion Program is a flagrant example of misallocated funds. Last year alone the Department of Agriculture spent \$110 million helping market American food products abroad: \$2.9 million went to Pillsbury to sell pies and muffins; \$465,000 went to McDonalds to market Chicken McNuggets; \$10 million went to Sunkist to sell oranges; and \$1.2 million went to the American Legend to market mink coats.

Ronald McDonald and the Pillsbury doughboy shouldn't take priority over

feeding young children when it comes to Government spending. Congress should end the special interest handouts before cutting programs that people rely on—like WIC, and other nutrition programs.

Let's put an end to the Market Promotion Program. Vote for the Schumer-Zimmer amendment, and start cutting corporate welfare now.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BALDACCI].

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Chairman, we have been hearing a lot of talk about the large companies and how they benefit, but there are a couple of small Maine companies that benefit, and there are companies in the Northeast in the family farms that do benefit.

There is a family in Yarmouth, ME, Chick Orchards, which has been run by the Chick family since 1933. They have 500 acres of apple trees and about two-thirds is planted as McIntoch. Last year along they shipped 36,000 boxes of apples to supermarkets in the United Kingdom. Norman Chick chatted with me a while Wednesday and he told me how important the MPP program is to his success. Each time there is a promotion in the United Kingdom, he sees an increase in demand, an increase in sales. The Chick family has been on the orchard since 1933. That is a program that works.

This year for the first time ever funds from the Market Promotion Program are going to be used by the lobster industry in Maine, in my State. With the help of the MPP funds, a good deal of their money is going to be promoting the Sprucehead Lobster Company and the Seaview Lobster Company in Kittery, and they are going to be part of a delegation that travels to Japan and Korea.

The MPP program does work. Trade is the future. We are not going to have subsidies and price supports into the future. We have got to be able to give the small family farms the opportunities to be overseas.

It does work, it does work in the Northeast, and it works all over.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE].

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

You are sitting in a beautiful restaurant, a little overpriced, kind of snooty, you are handed a list. See if any of these names sound familiar to you: Gundlach Bundaschu, Iron Horse, Trefethen, Chalone, Robert Mondavi, Far Hierte, Sutter Home, Fetzer, Dry Creek, Domaine Chendon, Firestone, Sebastiani, Simi, Korbel, Pine Ridge Parducci, Kendall-Jackson.

Wonderful list. Wonderful list. Why on Earth, please? Why on Earth are we subsidizing these vineyards for advertisement abroad? It is crazy.

The thing that I really do not understand about the people that are supporting this is that we have the same

folks who are the most avid free traders, pro-GATT, pro-NAFTA, antitariff, anti any kind of barrier to trade. Yet they are saying, "Well, we've got to have the MPP Program because we've got to subsidize them from within." It is just another way of having unfree trade. That is what it is all about.

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

Mr. HOKE. Did I miss one of them? Who did I miss?

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. RIGGS. What I would like to point out to the gentleman, he did tick off a rather impressive list of wineries, most of which are small family-owned wineries. I just want to point out to him, of the 101 wineries participating in the MPP, 89 are small wineries.

Mr. HOKE. And probably 100 of them are from California.

Reclaiming my time, what I would like to point out, also, is that it is an extraordinarily regional kind of subsidy and welfare scheme. It goes 10 times to California what it goes once to Ohio. Ten times. It is unfair. It is crazy. It is antifree trade.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. NETHERCUTT].

Mr. NETHERCUTT. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, it is fascinating that the proponents of this amendment, all from the northeast part of the United States, do not understand what we in the West do to help them sit in that restaurant and eat the food that is produced in this country and we do it because we export it overseas. A lot of our farmers in the West are potato growers, are apple growers, pea and lentil growers, and wheat growers.

The proponents of this amendment ought to come out to Washington State and see what we export overseas because Washington exports over 1 billion dollars' worth of agriculture products and those exports generate about \$3 billion in economic activity and about 30,000 jobs in this country.

We benefit New Jersey and New York by the fact that we are able to export our goods overseas. We have to compete with the European Union who subsidizes their wine growers in this country to the tune of \$89 million. We have to have this kind of assistance to be fair to the jobs and the economy of the Northwest. Vote "no" on this amendment.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARRETT], a cosponsor of the amendment.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, imagine that you are a chairman or a president of a major corporation in this country, and Uncle Sam walks into your office and tells you, "I've got a deal for you. Here's the deal. I subsidize your foreign advertising budget, while in exchange you do nothing. You just get the money." That is how the program works.

Also, think of every single company in your State. Not just your Congressional District. Every company in your State. Unless you are from New Jersey or unless you are from California, Gallo Wine last year received more money than every single company in your State under this program. Sunkist received more money than every single company in your State under this program. That is simply wrong. We should not have two corporations receiving more than every single company in my State or your State or anybody else's State. That is not a good distribution of resources.

The people who support this program say, well, the return on the dollar is very good. There was one person who was attacking the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] who said, "Wait a minute, there is a 5-for-1 return on my investment here." If there is a 5-for-1 on your investment, you would be a knucklehead if you did not invest yourself. If you are making that much money on the program, well, then invest. You don't need Uncle Sam to do it.

We hear in Congress that the private sector can do a lot of things better than Government. One thing is for sure. Private sector can do the private sector a lot better than Government can.

There is no reason for the Government to come in and subsidize these corporations. If there is a problem and if we want to encourage exports, we should do it in another way. But we should not be doing it by giving it to corporations who make millions of dollars in this country.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, the first 20 years of my life I lived in New Jersey and New York and Massachusetts. Then the last 30 I have lived in the valleys of California. I have learned a little bit in that last 30-year time frame, but I have not forgotten how politically attractive a cutting amendment could be for the people who think they do not benefit from these programs.

Let me simply ask the gentleman who works for the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] if he would leave the well.

I think this is a very important piece of information. The Europeans are spending a tremendous amount on export promotion. They understand where it is at in agriculture. Now with the GATT round completed, those subsidies for agriculture that are off the table are going to shift even more money over to the promotion of agricultural exports in competition with our growers.

Let me tell who these people are. They are people who grow 10 acres of almonds or 50 acres of prunes or 30 acres of wine grapes. These people are the heart of agriculture. Whether they sell through a small entity or a co-op

or whether they sell through a large corporation, they have to find outlets for their products. They have to find income for their families. This program works. We ask for a 50/50 cost share. Nobody gets into these programs free. They have to think long and hard before they put the money on the table. But they have proven time and time again, as the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLEY] showed, to increase export sales and increase farm income.

Let's face it, folks. Mistakes can be made. This program can be and has been reformed. But it works. If we turn our back on the international markets, we are killing our small farmers.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment which would eliminate the Market Promotion Program.

Every year, we see these short-sighted attempts to reduce or eliminate the Market Promotion Program. Fortunately, this House has kept this important program alive in the face of such opposition, and I hope we will be smart enough to do so again this year.

American agriculture leads the world in productivity and in total production. Agriculture accounts for our greatest export dollar. Agriculture and related food and fiber industries employ more Americans by far than any other industry.

However, one area in which we are falling short—and this has been analyzed by agricultural experts, the GAO and others—is promotion for our agricultural products overseas.

In particular, we need promotion for so-called value-added agricultural products. This is an area where our competitors in the European Union and Asia are making enormous promotion investments and reaping enormous returns. It is an area where we should be doing much more.

The Market Promotion Program is the program that fills this need.

Agriculture exports, projected to exceed \$50 billion this year—up from \$43.5 billion for fiscal year 1994—are vital to the United States.

Agriculture exports strengthen farm income. Agriculture exports provide jobs for nearly a million Americans.

Agriculture exports generate nearly \$100 billion in related economic activity.

Agriculture exports produce a positive trade balance of nearly \$20 billion.

If U.S. agriculture is to remain competitive under GATT, we must have policies and programs that remain competitive with those of our competitors abroad.

GATT did not eliminate export subsidies, it only reduced them.

The European Union spent, over the last 5 years, an average of \$10.6 billion in annual export subsidies—the United States spent less than \$2 billion.

The EU spends more on wine exports—\$89 million—than the United States currently spends for all commodities under the market promotion program.

MPP is critical to U.S. agriculture's ability to develop, maintain and expand export markets in the new post-GATT environment, and MPP is a proven success.

Our success with the MPP in California is very instructive.

MPP has been tremendously successful in helping promote exports of California citrus,

raisins, walnuts, almonds, peaches and other specialty crops.

For example,

In Japan, MPP funds helped educate consumers regarding the high quality of United States cheeses. The result: a 15-fold increase in exports.

In Eastern Europe, MPP funds were used to provide technical and educational assistance to textile spinners. The result: U.S. cotton exports to this area rose to 1,100 metric tons with a value exceeding \$1.4 million.

MPP permits small producers to pool the promotion efforts for particular commodity groups.

It may allow them to pursue new markets—markets they could not have pursued otherwise.

It may leverage their promotion efforts in a particular market that are already underway.

We have to remember that an increase in agriculture exports means jobs: a 10-percent increase in agricultural exports creates over 13,000 new jobs in agriculture and related industries like manufacturing, processing, marketing, and distribution.

The measure of any government program has got to be performance.

The Market Promotion Program performs.

For every \$1 we invest in MPP, we reap a \$16 return in additional agriculture exports. And as I said before, more exports means more jobs for Americans.

MPP has come under some criticism in recent years, and the program has been adjusted to take these recommendations into account.

In allocating funds, MPP gives small businesses the priority—we've stopped the subsidies for big companies that don't need the help.

MPP limits participation to 5 years—that means commodity groups will not grow dependent on MPP, but will use those funds wisely to put in place long-term, industry-wide promotion efforts.

MPP requires a cost-share—participants, including farmers and ranchers, must contribute as much as 50 percent of their own resources and cannot substitute MPP funds for investments they intended to make in the first place.

MPP is accountable—independent audits and on-going reviews ensure that the program remains effective and remains true to the intent of Congress.

In short, MPP is an effective program. If anything, we should be bolstering our commitment to value-added market promotion overseas instead of constantly whittling back our efforts in the face of significant investments by our competitors.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support American agriculture, support smart marketing efforts to promote American exports, support American farmers and producers, and oppose this amendment.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute and 20 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER].

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Zimmer amendment to eliminate funding to the Market Promotion Program. We in the 104th Congress have been struggling to get pork out of the budget so we can balance the budget. We have talked about the evils of corporate welfare.

Believe it or not, this Market Promotion Program, I believe, is worse than pork and it is worse than corporate welfare, because at least Federal pork and corporate welfare dollars are spent in the United States. The Market Promotion Program on the other hand takes precious and scarce Federal dollars and spends them overseas to pay for advertising for very wealthy, rich American companies, like Sunkist, Gallo Wine in my State, and McDonald's.

Supporters of this foreign handout use the argument that scarce tax dollars are being spent to convince people to buy American products. Well, I do not care what American products you are talking about, it is not the job of the Federal Government to promote American products.

□ 1445

The last thing we need is for hard-working taxpayers to be actually footing the bill for paying for wealthy companies' advertising. We do not want to use scarce tax dollars to convince the French to buy "Le Mac." We do not need that.

What we need is open markets and let those companies handle their own advertising and produce superior products and we will win and we will prosper.

I support the Zimmer amendment, which will allow us to balance the budget by eliminating this unnecessary spending.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT], a gentleman who knows the difference between a cop and a corporation.

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

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed, of course, to the elimination of the MPP program.

In the first place, to kill this program with an amendment to the agriculture appropriations bill is simply not the way to go.

In my opinion it is clearly an attempt to set policy on an appropriations bill and it is a decision that we should want to debate when we talk about the farm bill, not now.

Mr. Chairman, this is not to say that I do not have some concerns with the Ag Department's administration of the program, because I do. In fact, I believe that the only congressional hearings that have taken place on this issue, on trade matters, with very few exceptions, have been my subcommittee. Those hearings were conducted by the General Farm Commodities subcommittee, the point committee on the new farm bill.

I wish Members who were offering this particular amendment, and perhaps others who support it, might have come to the committee of jurisdiction before taking an end run to the floor.

Even some strong advocates for MPP realize the political problems with the

branded promotion part of the program where Federal dollars actually help benefit large private companies. However, the brand promotion increases the highest value and the fastest growing U.S. agricultural exports.

But I believe the changes can be made and I believe they will be made with respect to branded promotion. My subcommittee will address these matters at the appropriate time when we start marking up the farm bill after the August recess.

The MPP is just one of the few tools that we have that have been instrumental in assisting the United States in increasing and enhancing agricultural exports.

According to the testimony by the administrator of the foreign ag service, "market promotion is really working the best." He added, "To eliminate the MPP now, I think, would be not helping to keep America competitive in the coming years."

The bottom line, Mr. Chairman, is the market promotion has been a success. It is a good example of Federal, State, and private partnership which has worked well. It may need some reform, but this is not the time nor is this the legislation to do it.

I urge a no vote. Let us do it the right way.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the elimination of all funding for the Market Promotion Program for a number of reasons.

First, to kill this program with an amendment to the agriculture appropriations bill, is clearly an attempt to set policy on an appropriation bill. A decision we should want to debate in the farm bill.

This is not to say that I don't have some concerns with the Agriculture Department's administration of the MPP program. In fact, I believe the only congressional hearing in this Congress, relating to MPP and most of the other agricultural trade programs, was conducted by the Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities, which I chair.

I wish the Members who are offering this amendment, and others who support the abolishing of MPP, would come to the committee on jurisdiction before taking an end-run to the floor.

Even some strong advocates for MPP, recognize the political problem with the branded promotion part of the program, where Federal dollars help benefit large private companies.

However, the brand promotion increases the highest value and the fastest growing U.S. agricultural exports. But I believe changes can and should be made to MPP with respect to branded promotion, and my subcommittee will address this when we mark up the farm bill after the August recess.

Despite some problems, there is little doubt of the overall success and efficiency of this program. Unfortunately, like many government programs, the Market Promotion Program has been much more effective than it has been given credit.

The world markets are very competitive. In 1994, world farm subsidies amounted to \$175 billion. That's correct, virtually all countries support their agricultural industry, and in 1994 those subsidies totaled \$175 billion.

This year the European Union alone, will be spending \$9 billion on export subsidies. The

EU's overall farm expenditures is \$54 billion. By comparison, this is roughly 10 times what the U.S. is expected to spend on agricultural trade programs.

The MPP is just one of the few tools we have, that have been instrumental in assisting the United States in increasing and enhancing agricultural exports.

According to testimony by the Administrator of the Foreign Agriculture Service, "market promotion is really working the best."

He added, and I quote, "to eliminate the MPP now, I think, would be not helping to keep America competitive in the coming years."

The bottom line is, the Market Promotion Program has been a success. It is a good example of a Federal-State and private partnership which has worked well. It may need some reform, but this is not the time, and certainly not the legislation, with which to kill the program.

I urge a "no" vote. Let's do it the right way.

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

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Chairman, I have to move through this quickly, so I am going to stand and state my opposition to the Zimmer amendment, the Obey amendment, and the Kennedy amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I come from California, a district which is dependent heavily on agriculture and we are also dependent on agricultural trade. Trade is the driving force for our economy in the Central Valley.

Today what we are trying to do is to penalize what we believe to be large ag companies. Let me assure my colleagues, we are not penalizing large ag companies with these amendments today. What we are doing is penalizing thousands of small farmers.

Let me give my colleagues an example. In my district, the largest wineries, the five largest wineries that participate in the Market Promotion Program, purchase 90 percent of the grapes. That is hundreds and thousands of independent grape growers.

Second, this Congress has already addressed the issue of small business during the 1993 Budget Reconciliation Act by requiring small business be given the first priority for funding of MPP.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I do not have more time, but I ask my colleagues to vote against all these amendments as they come up today.

I rise today in strong support of the Market Promotion Program [MPP].

Contrary to popular belief by some Members of this body, MPP is one of the most effective trade programs at the Department of Agriculture.

By eliminating the Market Promotion Program, Congress will be sending a message to Americans and American business that we can do without \$1.4 billion in exports generated by this important program.

The Market Promotion Program is designed to assist in the promotion of U.S. agricultural products.

This program promotes American food and American farm products, not individual company names.

U.S. producers often find themselves competing not with their foreign agriculture counterparts but with foreign governments.

The European Community for example, subsidizes their wine industry \$89 million annually, the government of France spends \$229 million on the promotion of agriculture products and the Australian Government contributes \$226 million to promote agriculture products such as dairy, wine, brandy, and processed meats.

By eliminating funding for the Market Promotion Program you will be sending a message to the American farmers that what is appropriate in another country may not be appropriate in this country.

Congress will be saying that you can go out on your own and compete in a world market against foreign governments and fend for yourselves.

If the United States is serious about establishing fair trade and has the political resolve to establish its position in world trade, the Market Promotion Program is the right vehicle to use.

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

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to that high-spurring, hard-riding gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Opponents of the Market Promotion Program have portrayed this program as "corporate welfare." Nothing could be further from the truth.

U.S. Agriculture continues to face rigid competition in the global marketplace against heavily subsidized countries all over the world.

By helping U.S. Agriculture compete more effectively, the Market Promotion Program contributes to economic growth, job creation, and increased tax revenue.

Even Secretary Glickman has said, and I quote—"We cannot eliminate unilaterally our export assistance efforts at a time when the competition is increasing its investments in these areas."

In Oregon, agricultural exports total over \$500 million. Such exports alone generate over \$1.4 billion in economic activity and provide over 15,000 export-related jobs.

Increasing exports not only helps boost economic activity, but adds to my State's and the Nation's job base.

I urge my colleagues to protect American jobs and reject this amendment.

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the Members, "Wake up. Look what is going on around here." We passed GATT last year. We passed NAFTA. We told the world we want to be competitive and now my colleagues want to cut the underpinnings that allow us to be competitive?

All you urban legislators that get up and talk about cutting this program turn around and say it is all right to use taxpayers moneys to promote New

York, promote Massachusetts, and promote Atlantic City. "Bring the tourists here. We will use the taxpayers' money to do that promotion."

But when it gets to agriculture, "No, we don't want to use any of that money. We don't want to promote." You walk into a restaurant and you talk about the fact that there are all these big wine companies. There are also Chilean wines, European wines.

Do my colleagues know that the Europeans spend more money promoting European wine than is in this entire program? I represent small farmers who try to sell their strawberries. We grow more strawberries than California and the United States can consume. We have to sell them some place else. We have to have some help doing that.

They have to put their own money into it. They have to be in small business and can only be in the program for 5 years. This is a program that works. If we are going to be competitive in the world, we have to sell our product abroad. Do not undercut the small farmers in the United States. Vote no against this amendment and all the other ones that attack this program.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LUTHER], as the designee for the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], is recognized.

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

(Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, let us be straight about what is going on here. This program is nothing more than a corporate grab of the worst order.

We are here on the floor of the Congress of the United States cutting the most important programs about the future of this country. Whether it is student loans or whether or not it is funds to assist our senior citizens.

But what we are saying is we do not have money for things like the fuel assistance program to heat or cool our homes, but there is plenty enough to buy a shot of Jim Beam whiskey to keep people warm at night.

We say there is no money to pay for summer jobs or paying for student loans, but the Pillsbury Dough Boy is going to go to the head of the class.

We say there is no money for public housing, but we are going to give wine to the homeless. And we have cut services for the needy and the frail elderly, but they will be able to go out and buy a cup of warm Campbell's soup.

We say there is no money to pay for the senior citizen's health care in this country. We cannot buy their pills, but we can buy them a pack of M&M's.

Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues let us stop what is going on here in this country with a corporate grab to grab the few dollars that are available to invest in the future of this country. These corporations are not the Ma-and-Pa kinds of operations that are being

described. These are the biggest corporate 500 companies in America.

Ten percent is all they have to put up. The smallest vineyards in the country put up a very small amount of money and get a very small amount of money. The biggest companies, Ernest and Julio, the brothers themselves, stand up and get \$22 million over 5 years to promote their wines overseas.

Let us be realistic about who wins and who loses in this country and who wins and who loses in this bill.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, the Market Production Program is very important to the people of my district in Marin and Sonoma County, CA. The wine and wine grapes from my district, many of them that were listed by the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. HOKE] are famous worldwide. But these vintners have to fight to enter and compete in the world market.

The Market Promotion Protection Program, on the other hand, Mr. Chairman, helps these small wine producers. It helps them in my district compete with heavily subsidized foreign producers, producers who dominate the global marketplace.

The U.S. wine industry is at a disadvantage from the start because it receives no production subsidies from the Government. I repeat, no production subsidies from the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me today in an effort to level the playing field of the global market by opposing the Schumer-Zimmer amendment. Let us help export California products, not California jobs.

Mr. SKEEN. 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 rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the MPP has been a tremendous success in helping U.S. agriculture, including farmers and ranchers in my district and in my State, compete more effectively in the international marketplace. It has opened up markets in Eastern Europe for the sale of more United States cotton, opened markets in Japan for the sale of United States structured wood panels and beams, and opened up markets in Mexico for additional apples to be sold. We need this program.

Mr. Chairman, I say to my friends who are world and free market traders, this ought to be right down their alley. This is their opportunity to support free trade by U.S. agricultural product.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to my colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WICKER].

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, I think it is easy to get up here and toss around the words "pork" and "boon-doggle." This is a program that is working. It is working to create jobs in the global marketplace; 24,000 alone in my home State of Mississippi, over 1 million jobs nationwide.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote on the Schumer amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE].

Mr. WISE. Mr. Chairman, it seems like all the supporters of MPP are from the West, and I am, too, West Virginia. It is about 1 hour and 15 minutes from here. We have pockets of high unemployment, but yet the county that has the lowest unemployment is an agricultural county.

When my colleagues talk about pork, I would rather talk about poultry, because the MPP is helping move poultry into the Asian market. Take Hester Industries of Hardy County. Hester Industries, with \$3,500 of MPP, of which they matched half of it, began a promotional campaign in Japan. In the last 6 months they have moved 100,000 pounds of drumsticks into the Japanese market.

Or Wampler-Longacre, a bigger company, yes, but using a little amount of MPP, which they had to match, I might add, they have been able to put hundreds of people to work, both in the poultry houses as well as the poultry processing industry as they promote their products in the Far East.

A very small amount of MPP leverages a large amount of jobs for West Virginians and, yes, in revenues for this Government as well as a healthy economy.

Mr. Chairman, I urge you to support the Market Promotion Program.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I have a letter from our Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Dan Glickman. You know who is into market promotion big time under GATT, under free trade? Not the United States, not McDonald's, not Gallo. It is the European Union. As has been stated, they are spending more for wine export promotion than we invest in all of our products.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER], the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] should introduce their bills in the British Parliament and the French Assembly and the German Bundestag.

It is easy to say the check goes to McDonald's. It does not. It goes to the United States Poultry, Egg and Potato Council, and McDonald's matches that contribution so that that customer in McDonald's in Bangkok will eat American French fries and American Egg McMuffins, representing 2,000 jobs in New Jersey, 10,000 jobs in New York, and I would tell the gentleman from

Ohio [Mr. HOKE], 30,000 jobs in Ohio, not Chinese products.

□ 1500

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER].

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding me this time.

Since 1985, we have reduced subsidies, direct subsidies, to farmers from \$35 billion in 1985 and \$9 billion last year, and as we have brought subsidies to farmers down, what we have done is we have moved money into export programs so that our farmers have fair access around the world.

There are a number of programs that they gain access for our farmers. The market promotion program is just one of these programs, and the special part about market promotion is that this is value-added products. It is commodities that are produced here in America, they are processed here in America with American labor, creating American jobs that we can use this program to move these products around the world. As we continue to bring down subsidies to farmers, as most every Member of this Congress wants to do, we have to ensure that our farmers are not being unfairly blocked from entry into other markets around the world, because the European Economic Union is trying to steal those markets from our small farmers. It is not fair. This is a good program. Defeat their amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, would the Chair give us an accounting of the time at this moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would be delighted to give a time summary.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] controls 4 minutes, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] 5, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], the designee, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LUTHER], 3 minutes, and yourself, 4 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Does the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] have the right to close? Is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Mexico as the chairman of the committee, has the right to close debate.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LATHAM].

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

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the subcommittee chairman for yielding me this time.

One thing that really concerns me in this whole discussion that is forgotten is that agriculture and the small farmers are going to take their hit as far as reducing the budget and getting to a balanced budget. In the next 7 years, we have passed a budget resolution that takes away \$13.4 billion from the American farmer, and it is not just that, folks.

We are talking about real jobs in this program, and I think when you look at the proportion, if you are from California, we are talking about 137,000 jobs in California directly related to agricultural exports, and you talk about what the base closings did to California.

If you are in Iowa, Iowa is the second largest State as far as export jobs with 96,000 jobs; if you are in Illinois, there are 68,000 jobs.

I see the gentleman from Minnesota up here. You go back to Minneapolis and tell them you voted to take away 50,000 jobs in Minnesota and see what they say.

Defeat this amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, we are conducting this debate at a time when our trade deficits are running at a historic high. Our trading partners must be looking at us in absolute amazement.

Agriculture is one facet of our economy where we actually sell more than we buy, and the old "hurt America first" crowd now comes after agriculture. When will you be satisfied? When we import more agriculture, too?

In fact, in the post-GATT world, we are in a vicious competition for new markets, and the Europeans know exactly what that is all about. They have committed many times the amount of support for their export products than the United States of America.

The MPP program is a buy America program. It benefits farmers, ranchers, American workers that process and handle the product, and shippers. In fact, there are 20,000 American jobs that flow from \$1 billion worth of agriculture exports.

The MPP program is a critical link. Do not pull the pin on our export program.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING].

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, I for the life of me cannot understand why we attack programs that increase ag exports and decrease our trade deficit.

We continue to cut agricultural programs domestically, and we need to protect and preserve our foreign trade and our foreign markets.

We need to do more, not less.

You know, this program, if it needs reform, let us reform it. Do not kill the goose that lays the golden egg of \$100 million in economic activity, thousands and thousands of jobs and billions of dollars in tax revenues. Vote against these amendments.

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZKA].

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment.

I was trying to find one of the proponents of this waste-of-moneys chart, but I cannot seem to locate it right, now, so I will not use it.

Mr. Chairman and Members, if we had an extra \$110 million lying around

collecting dust, maybe we could justify giving it to corporations like Ralston Purina, Pillsbury, Snapple, name brand, very profitable companies.

But, my friends, we do not have an extra \$110 million laying around. So at this point in time I think it is time to say we do not have the money. We have to abolish the program.

Why? What are we doing to the citizens of this country who provide those tax revenues? For the senior citizens of this country, we are going to cut Medicare by \$270 billion. Do you know where the bulk of those funds are going to come from, my friends? From your pocket. It is going to come as out-of-pocket expenses to pay for the hospital bills and the doctors you are going to need.

So, as we give \$110 million to E.J. Gallo and Pillsbury, you are going to pay more. For the students, \$10 billion cut in student loans, they are not going to be able to afford college.

We do not have the \$110 million.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH].

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I think the thing that is important for me today is I came here to balance the budget, and we have \$200 billion in excess spending.

When I went home for my townhalls, I was asked to get rid of corporate welfare, and corporate welfare being those things that American people could do for themselves.

When I look at this program, even though for a time we needed help in the marketing, I have to say now it is time we let industry do this for themselves, we let the farmers, we let the companies that market it, we let you and I, we let the big corporations. At some point we have to say no to some of this stuff. We cannot continue to say yes to everything.

It is nice, But it comes in the nonnecessary.

And yes, I have farming in my State, but everybody is going to have to sacrifice just a little bit if we are ever going to get there.

Our grandchildren have to see us do this now, or we will never get rid of the debt, and we are giving this cost to our grandchildren and our children and they just plain old should not have this charged to their account.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON].

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, it amazes me here in the House of Representatives. We are very often trying to fix things that are not broken.

Certainly, the program that we are talking about here is not broken. What we must remember is that people just do not buy soybeans and corn and wheat and cotton. They buy cooking oil and cereals and clothing products that are all processed by foreign companies also, and our competitors, our competitor nations, are certainly helping them.

The goal of branded promotion is to persuade foreign consumers to choose and develop a loyalty to brand names by U.S. companies that utilize U.S. commodities. It is also important to remember that products promoted in this program provide jobs here in the United States.

This program, which helps us assist the really very positive factor in our trade problems, agriculture, is one of the great things we have got going for us. This is the thing we want to whack.

I do not understand how this House could come to the conclusion that we want to hurt something that is helping us so very much.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment which would devastate the Market Promotion Program.

Through the Market Promotion Program, funds are available to conduct promotional and educational activities including trade servicing, technical assistance, and generic and branded advertising of U.S. grown agricultural commodities and products in foreign markets. A majority of the MPP efforts are focused on consumer-oriented, high-value products—the products that are found in supermarkets.

The MPP also provides that assistance may be made to private organizations for branded advertising when it is determined that such organization would significantly contribute to United States export market development. This is the aspect of the program that has generated controversy, because some view it as unfair that individual corporations receive funds.

What we must remember is that people don't buy soybeans, wheat, corn, and cotton. They buy cooking oil, cereals, and clothing—products that are also processed by foreign companies. The goal of branded promotions is to persuade consumers to choose and develop a loyalty to brands made by U.S. companies and that utilize U.S. commodities.

It is also important to remember that the products promoted in this program provide jobs in the United States. Selling value-added products overseas not only supports agricultural producers, but also creates jobs in the processing, merchandising, advertising, and transportation industries. For every \$1 billion in agricultural exports, 20,000 jobs are created in the United States. Expansion assistance, the value added portion of total agricultural exports has more than tripled, reaching a record high of almost \$17 billion in 1994. That growth translates to over 220,000 jobs throughout the country.

Furthermore, the cost-share requirements of the MPP require private companies selling branded products, with few exceptions, must contribute at least 50 percent of the promotional costs.

In short, the Market Promotion Program has helped boost U.S. exports, promoted economic growth, contributed to agriculture's trade positive trade balance, created additional employment opportunities, and enlarged the tax base. It has been a cost-effective method for leveraging the growth potential of the food industry.

While there is room for improving MPP, it is appropriate to make operational refinements in the farm bill rather than to dismantle now what has been a fundamentally successful program. Using the appropriations process to limit the

role of our foreign market developments is neither a timely nor appropriate matter to effect needed modifications.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment and allow true reform to take place in the pending farm bill debate.

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

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

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose this amendment. Mr. Chairman, in this time of burgeoning U.S. Trade deficits, why would we even consider eliminating one of our most successful export programs?

Consider, for example, what this program has done for the walnut and raisin industries in California. In 1986 the United States market share of walnuts in Japan was 30 percent. As a result of a highly successful MPP promotional program, 9 years later the California industry controls 71 percent of the market and exports nearly 12,000 metric tons of walnuts to Japan.

The raisin industry has enjoyed similar success in the United Kingdom where agricultural exports encounter stiff competition from heavily subsidized European commodities. Over the last 9 years, with the help of the MPP, California raisin shipments to the United Kingdom have increased sixfold, capturing 45 percent of the entire market. Today California raisins are known and preferred by over 54 percent of the households in England.

Mr. Chairman, let's not penalize ourselves for succeeding. I urge no vote on the Zimmer amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute 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 think we need to be reminded here in this body of some of the facts of what we are talking about today.

We are talking about reducing this appropriation bill. The \$110 million is not in the bill we are considering today. It is in the farm bill, and that is why many of us are suggesting that we ought to take a look at the farm bill for this purpose, not this amendment today.

When we talk about this, I do not take a back seat to anyone on balancing the budget. Since 1981, the Committee on Agriculture has cut \$50 billion from our function of the budget. Under the budget reconciliation bill, we will have to cut another 23 percent, and not from an inflated baseline but from a real baseline.

This discretionary bill is down 3.1 percent from last year, but it is completely overlooking we cut 14 percent.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] presided over that last year when there was a different chairman and minority member.

So let us keep our facts straight when we are talking about budget cuts.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Zimmer amendment calling for the elimination of funding in general or that would limit funding for salaries and expenses associated with the MPP program.

The United States must compete for world export markets. The new GATT trading rules are opening markets throughout the world, and U.S. agricultural producers must compete for shares of these newly opened markets. The European Union is expected in 1995 to spend over \$54 billion—\$6 billion more than last year—under its common agricultural policy to support its farmers, including over \$9 billion for export subsidies alone.

The MPP is a value enhancing program that gives U.S. agribusinesses the added edge to be aggressive in markets that they otherwise would not. A new national food and agriculture policy project study has shown a \$5 return on each \$1 spent in MPP funds for certain horticultural products and products derived from them. According to USDA, every dollar spent through MPP results in an additional \$16 in U.S. agricultural exports.

Currently, the United States spends less—\$85.5 million—on MPP for all commodities than the European Union spends on wine exports—\$89 million. The European Union, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and other major foreign competitors are aggressively working with their agricultural producers and exporters in support of market development and promotion efforts. Such expenditures total nearly \$500 million more than similar efforts by the United States.

MPP is vital to U.S. agriculture's ability to develop, maintain, and expand export markets in the new post-GATT environment, especially to some 20,000 family farms, that are members of agricultural cooperatives. As members of cooperatives that benefit from MPP, these families are able to engage in international markets that would otherwise be unavailable to them.

Our agricultural industry is the most competitive in the world, but it cannot compete against foreign governments alone.

Therefore, we need to keep the Market Promotion Program as it is, and allow the authorizing committee to address the concerns and criticisms of MPP in the farm bill. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against any amendments reducing funding for the MPP.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute, the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, the Zimmer-Schumer amendment is nothing short of unilateral disarmament in the world trade war. They have replaced the peace-at-any-price crowd with the Zimmer-Schumer unemployment-at-any-price, because the Zimmer-Schumer amendment is a job killer. One million Americans work in businesses which have a direct interest in ag exports, and these are generally good-paying jobs. What the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] want to do is to cut out those jobs, reduce them, make it more difficult for us to sell overseas, while every major exporting nation in the world is pumping up its export efforts.

ZIMMER and SCHUMER and all of their friends would have the United States throw in the towel. ZIMMER and SCHUMER just do not get it. They should sit down in Tokyo and Seoul and learn the realities of world trade competition.

American products can win the trade war overseas if we are willing to fight.

The Market Promotion Program is a proven success. For \$110 million we leverage \$50 billion in ag exports, creating jobs and farm income across America, and that is a great investment.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH].

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

When you sit here and listen to the debate, it boils down to ideology over reality. Stop and take a look at what is taking place with this amendment.

Some of my colleagues talk about big companies. You should be so lucky to have big companies involved. First, do you know what it takes for a big company to be involved in this program? You must cite unfair trade practice in the targeted country. Second, you want MacDonald's involved, because if MacDonald's is involved, every piece of beef has to be American, every piece of bread has to be American, every piece of cheese has to be American. Everything under this program has to be American. You should be so lucky to have the big companies involved in this program.

This program is for all the small companies, like the one in Door County up in Great Lakes, where 30 people have jobs because we are selling cherries overseas in Australia and opening the market in China. This is not an on-going program. This is a beachhead program. Exporters get a few dollars to go over to these other countries to get them to understand what good products we have here in America.

□ 1515

I do not want anyone who votes for this amendment ever to tell me they are concerned about a trade deficit or jobs here in America. This is for good-paying jobs here in America.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, agriculture is an essential industry in this country. Agricultural jobs are very important to us, as are jobs in food production.

But there is absolutely no proven connection between the MPP and act exports or agricultural jobs, and do not take it from me. This is what the GAO, this is what the Office of Technology Assessment, has concluded.

In all the years of the MPP program, Mr. Chairman, not one disinterested group has looked at the program and come to its defense. They all conclude there is no evidence that these large corporations would not have spent their own money, McDonald's money, on this advertising if MPP were not available, and MPP has been under fire for all these years because the lion's

share of its money has gone to the biggest corporations, and change it as they might try, this is still the case.

And so, as a result, in 1994, the last available year for data, while Berry Station Confectioners in New York, a small company, got \$2,000 in MPP funds, Hershey's got \$265,000, Tootsie Roll got \$161,000, and M&M-Mars, which by the way, Mr. FARR, is in my State, got more than \$300,000. In California, Ernest and Julio Gallo last year got a whopping \$2½ million. Other vintners did get some money: \$2,500 for Mountain View Vintner, \$4,000 went to Sunny Dune Vineyards. Now we know why Gallo sells no wine before its time. It is waiting for its subsidy check.

This is not a regional issue, my colleagues. This is an issue that involves every State and every taxpayer. My State, as I said, is the home of M&M-Mars, of Ocean Spray, of Campbell Soup. My friend, the secretary of agriculture of New Jersey, and, yes, New Jersey does have a secretary of agriculture, is very upset with me for this, but I believe that we have to have frugality begin at home because this is a program that cannot be justified. It has been changed in its features; even the proponents of the program have said in passing that it still is not a program that does not need changes.

This reminds me of a story about the great baseball player, Leo Durocher, when he was a playing coach. He had a player who was committing error after error out on the field. Leo Durocher took that player out of the game, put himself in the game instead. The first play that happened thereafter was an easy fly ball. Leo Durocher dropped it. At the end of the inning Leo Durocher stormed into the dugout, told the player he had taken out of the game, "You screwed up that position so bad nobody can play it."

What we have got to do is terminate this program, pull it up by its roots, and allow the authorizing committee, the Committee on Agriculture, and the 1995 farm bill to come up with a program that will help exports in a way that does not benefit the biggest, and wealthiest, and least needy corporations.

In the past years the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], has led the fight against this program, and I will close by quoting him:

The market promotion program is a corporate handout, nothing more. I wonder about our commitment to deficit reduction if we cannot take Betty Crocker, Ronald McDonald, and the Pillsbury Doughboy off the dole.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] is recognized for 1 minute.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, 10 years ago I thought it was important to have a cooperative effort between the Government and the private sector, not through subsidies, but through a cooperative effort. That is what this program is.

My colleagues have heard this is about trade. We are at war. It is post-GATT. My colleagues heard a lot of jokes earlier about raisins and about the Japanese. I ask my colleagues, Do you know the Japanese are our third largest raisin market? My colleagues heard talk about corporations. Sun-Maid is not a corporation; it is 5,000 farmers and 50,000 workers.

What we are talking about is something that we have got to do more of. We have got to be competitive in the world marketplace. The single largest positive balance-of-trade category is horticulture-agriculture. That is what we are talking about in the MPP program. We need market share, we need a cooperative effort between our Government and our American workers, farmers, and processors.

This program is \$100 million. It brings back enormous benefits. It should be \$1 billion. Let us knock this ill-conceived amendment where it belongs.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, this Member rises in strong opposition to this misguided amendment which would eliminate the Market Promotion Program. If the other agricultural producing nations of the world did not grossly and unfairly subsidize the production and sale of agricultural and food products, this member would be more than willing to support this amendment. Unfortunately, free and fair trade does not exist in world agricultural trade. Even with the Market Promotion Program, U.S. producers are being out-subsidized by their competitors, including the very aggressive member countries of the European Union. The United States Department of Agriculture has determined that the United States would have to increase its current funding of the MPP by approximately 500 to 600 percent in order to catch-up with the European Union in consumer food exports by the year 2000.

The USDA recently concluded an exhaustive cost-benefit analysis of the MPP and the results are absolutely clear that a modest MPP Program greatly enables American agriculture to compete for high-value agricultural export markets.

Mr. Chairman, competition for agricultural markets in bulk commodities, intermediate, and high-value products is a high-stakes battle for good paying jobs here in the United States. Because of agricultural export programs like MPP, the U.S. agricultural industry currently enjoys a \$19 billion trade surplus. With the help of the MPP, U.S. high-value agricultural exports have expanded by 75 percent over 7 years.

However, statistics and studies about the MPP do not reveal its total value. As the chairman of the Asia and the Pacific Subcommittee, this Member witnesses daily the proliferation of nontariff barriers specifically designed to keep U.S. high value agricultural products out of developing markets. In Taiwan and Korea for example, MPP circumvents a host of trade barriers by creating consumer demand

for United States products. This demand in turn leads to relaxation and reform of the tariff and nontariff barriers which deny consumers in those countries access to U.S. exports.

Mr. Chairman, MPP is an important export tool and a good lesson for other export-related industries; MPP enables our agricultural industry to sell directly to the consumers of some of the world's most protected markets.

This Member acknowledges that MPP is not perfect and agrees that certain reform of the MPP is necessary to ensure that it does not allow Federal dollars to replace rather than augment private sector market development efforts. Nevertheless, as the General Accounting Office has suggested, while reform of the program may be necessary, elimination of the program could substantially affect our ability to compete for lucrative and emerging markets throughout the world.

Mr. Chairman, this Member urges his colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, here is the latest example of the bizarre sense of priorities prevailing in the House these days: Some of the same folks who have been arguing that this Government does not have enough money for school lunches are claiming that Ralston Purina and Fruit of the Loom should get more corporate welfare than ever before.

It seems we do not have money to clean up toxic waste sites, or to provide Medicare to elderly people, or to help students with college loans. But we apparently have plenty of cash lying around to give McDonalds to advertise Chicken McNuggets in Europe.

The truth is that in any year, the Market Promotion Program would be difficult to defend. But in this year when hundreds of efforts to help hard-working, middle-class families are being slashed or totally eliminated, it is simply astounding to see the Republican leadership actually increase this corporate giveaway program by \$25 million taxpayer dollars.

We could be spending this \$110 million to pay the salaries of 5,817 new police officers. Or we could pay for 56.1 million school lunches. Instead, we are going to engage in more business as usual: When it comes to tax breaks for the wealthy or corporate welfare for industry, there is no blank check the Republican leadership will not sign.

The Market Promotion Program is an insult to taxpayers and working Americans, and I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 154, noes 261, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 550]

AYES—154

Andrews  
Archer  
Armey  
Bachus  
Baker (CA)  
Barrett (WI)  
Bass

Bilbray  
Blute  
Borski  
Brown (OH)  
Brownback  
Burton  
Cardin

Castle  
Chabot  
Christensen  
Chrysler  
Coburn  
Collins (IL)  
Conyers

Coyne  
Cremeans  
Davis  
DeLauro  
DeLay  
Dellums  
Deutsch  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Duncan  
Engel  
English  
Ensign  
Fawell  
Foglietta  
Fowler  
Fox  
Franks (CT)  
Franks (NJ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Frisa  
Gejdenson  
Gibbons  
Goss  
Graham  
Green  
Greenwood  
Gutierrez  
Gutknecht  
Hancock  
Haworth  
Hilleary  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Hoke  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Inglis  
Istook  
Jacobs  
Johnson, Sam  
Kanjorski  
Kasich

Kelly  
Kennedy (MA)  
Kennedy (RI)  
King  
Kleczka  
Klink  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
LaFalce  
Largent  
Lazio  
Lewis (GA)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Longley  
Lowe  
Luther  
Maloney  
Manzullo  
Martini  
McHale  
McInnis  
McNulty  
Menendez  
Mfume  
Miller (CA)  
Miller (FL)  
Molinar  
Moran  
Morella  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Neal  
Neumann  
Owens  
Pallone  
Payne (NJ)  
Porter  
Portman  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Reed  
Regula  
Rivers

Roemer  
Rohrabacher  
Roukema  
Royce  
Salmon  
Sanders  
Sanford  
Saxton  
Scarborough  
Schumer  
Sensenbrenner  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Shuster  
Skaggs  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (WA)  
Solomon  
Souder  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stockman  
Talent  
Tate  
Taylor (MS)  
Tiahrt  
Torkildsen  
Torricelli  
Towns  
Velazquez  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Waldholtz  
Walker  
Wamp  
Waxman  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Wolf  
Yates  
Zeliff  
Zimmer

NOES—261

Ackerman  
Allard  
Baesler  
Baker (LA)  
Baldacci  
Ballenger  
Barcia  
Barr  
Barrett (NE)  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Becerra  
Beilenson  
Bentsen  
Bereuter  
Berman  
Bevill  
Bilirakis  
Bishop  
Bliley  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bonior  
Bono  
Boucher  
Brewster  
Browder  
Brown (FL)  
Bryant (TN)  
Bryant (TX)  
Bunn  
Bunning  
Burr  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Canady  
Chambliss  
Chapman  
Chenoweth  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clinger  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Coleman  
Collins (GA)  
Combest  
Condit  
Cooley

Costello  
Cramer  
Crapo  
Cubin  
Cunningham  
Danner  
de la Garza  
Deal  
DeFazio  
Diaz-Balart  
Dickey  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Dooley  
Doolittle  
Dornan  
Dunn  
Durbin  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
Eshoo  
Evans  
Everett  
Ewing  
Farr  
Fattah  
Fazio  
Fields (LA)  
Fields (TX)  
Filner  
Flake  
Flanagan  
Foley  
Forbes  
Ford  
Frank (MA)  
Frost  
Funderburk  
Furse  
Ganske  
Gekas  
Gephardt  
Geren  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Gonzalez  
Goodlatte  
Gordon

Gunderson  
Hall (OH)  
Hall (TX)  
Hamilton  
Hansen  
Harman  
Hastert  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hefley  
Hefner  
Heineman  
Herger  
Hilliard  
Hinchen  
Holden  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Hunter  
Johnson-Lee  
Jefferson  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnson, E.B.  
Johnston  
Jones  
Kaptur  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
Kim  
Kingston  
Klug  
LaHood  
Lantos  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Laughlin  
Leach  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Lightfoot  
Lincoln  
Livingston  
Lofgren  
Lucas  
Manton  
Martinez  
Mascara  
Matsui  
McCarthy

McCollum	Pelosi	Spratt
McCrary	Peterson (FL)	Stenholm
McDade	Peterson (MN)	Stokes
McDermott	Petri	Studds
McHugh	Pickett	Stump
McIntosh	Pombo	Tanner
McKeon	Pomeroy	Tauzin
McKinney	Poshard	Taylor (NC)
Meek	Pryce	Tejeda
Metcalf	Radanovich	Thomas
Meyers	Rahall	Thompson
Mica	Richardson	Thornberry
Mineta	Riggs	Thornton
Minge	Roberts	Thurman
Mink	Rogers	Torres
Mollohan	Ros-Lehtinen	Traficant
Montgomery	Rose	Tucker
Moorhead	Roth	Upton
Murtha	Roybal-Allard	Volkmer
Myers	Rush	Vucanovich
Nethercutt	Sabo	Walsh
Ney	Sawyer	Ward
Norwood	Schaefer	Waters
Nussle	Schiff	Watt (NC)
Oberstar	Schroeder	Weller
Obey	Scott	White
Olver	Seastrand	Whitfield
Ortiz	Serrano	Wicker
Orton	Sisisky	Williams
Oxley	Skeen	Wilson
Packard	Skelton	Wise
Parker	Slaughter	Woolsey
Pastor	Smith (MI)	Wyden
Paxon	Smith (TX)	Wynn
Payne (VA)	Spence	Young (AK)

## NOT VOTING—19

Abercrombie	Dreier	Quinn
Bateman	Gallegly	Reynolds
Brown (CA)	Goodling	Stupak
Clay	Markey	Watts (OK)
Collins (MI)	Meehan	Young (FL)
Cox	Moakley	
Crane	Quillen	

□ 1542

The clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Dreier for, with Mr. Quillen against.

Messrs. FLAKE, BEILENSON, FLANAGAN, and Ms. LOFGREN changed their vote from "aye" to "no." Messrs. TIAHRT, DAVIS, YATES, GEJDENSEN, WELDON of Florida, LAZIO of New York, GUTIERREZ, DELLUMS, STARK, and BAKER of California, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider the amendment by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. 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. 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 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 (a) is a cooperative owned by and operated for smaller organizations that are members of the cooperative or (b) would satisfy the Small Business Administration standards for a small business.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 20, 1995, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is recognized for 5 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] will be recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

□ 1545

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

The market promotion program is a program that is supposed to help provide funding for the promotion of U.S. agricultural products in foreign countries. Its original intent was to help the American farmer, I emphasize farmer, compete against heavily subsidized producers in Japan, Europe, and elsewhere.

This amendment is very simple. This amendment does not cut any money from the program. It simply says that you qualify for this program only if you are considered a small business under SBA definition, if you are a company with less than 20 million in annual sales, or if you are a cooperative representing a large number of small producers or companies and would under qualify the Small Business Administration standards for small business.

I have 10 top reasons for wanting to pass this amendment. They are as follows: Ernest & Julio Gallo received \$6.9 million out of this program the last 2 years; Dole Corp., 2.4 million; Pillsbury, 1.75; Tyson Foods, 1.7; M&M Mars 1.5, Campbell Soups, 1.1; Seagrams, 793,000; Hershey's 738,000; Jim Beam Whiskey, 713; Ralston Purina, 434.

As I said last night, I have nothing against any of those products. I enjoy every last one of those products, every last one of them. But I would simply, while I like them, I would simply like to know that I am not subsidizing them with my tax dollars. I am happy to purchase them, but I do not want to subsidize them.

This amendment is not perfect, and I am sure opponents of it will find some reason to attack it for being imperfect, but I simply want to say to folks on both sides of this issue, to those like the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] who attacked this amendment during the discussion on the earlier bill, I would simply say this: Your amendment clearly overreached, but this is the only chance you have to send a signal to both the Committee on Agriculture and the Department that we want this program reformed.

To those of you who, like me, represent farm districts and would like to see no change in this program, I would simply say, sooner or later, if you do not reform it, you are going to lose it. With the kind of budget squeeze com-

ing at the American people, with the cuts we are making or being asked to make in Medicare, with the cuts that are being imposed on us for education, for health, for job training, we have no business giving corporations on this list money to subsidize the exports of their own products.

I urge Members to support this amendment as a reasonable compromise.

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

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the now famous, powerful committee.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Mexico for yielding time to me. It is also good to see the gentleman from New Mexico. It is also good to hear from the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] in his attempt here with this amendment to separate the wheat from the chaff and then try to export the chaff.

I rise in opposition to his amendment. Look, here is what this is all about. This is not going to take very long.

We must export high-value-added products. That is the future of agriculture program policy. The highest value ag products are branded products. These products are sold by brand loyalty.

The European Union has that all figured out. They will not let some branded products in. Here we have a Member of Congress that does not want to let the branded products out.

This amendment should be introduced in the Assembly of France or the Bundestag of Germany or the Parliament of maybe Great Britain. I have a better idea. What this is, basically, is just a revote on the previous amendment. You kill the branded products, you kill the program.

If that is what you want to do, go ahead and we can have a revote. But if you are really excited about a generic product as opposed to the laundry list of big companies who do such a great job on behalf of our farmers and ranchers and every consumer here with exports, let us just put it in a brown paper bag.

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

I would simply say, I am amused at the fact that some of the same Members in this House who will vote for a farm policy which will throw hundreds of thousands of small farmers over the cliff will bleed all over this floor for some of the largest corporations in this country.

I urge a "yes" vote on the amendment.

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

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON].

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The

able and brilliant author of this amendment has called it imperfect. I agree with him. It is imperfect. It has got two problems.

One is substantive. First, if you outlaw the brands because of certain corporate receipts levels, then what they are going to do is set up another entity that has lower receipts to channel the funds through there.

Also this, as the previous speaker said, should probably be handled by the World Trade Organization, the GATT language or whatever else. This is not the proper place to do it.

The second problem with this amendment, though, is an inherent problem, and that is that the big dog does have the tendency to eat first and, yet, in that process the little bitty puppies also get some of the bone. How can you promote American hamburgers without McDonald's getting their share of the market? How can you promote American wine products without Gallo being a recipient of it?

I think we have got these two problems in this amendment, Mr. Chairman. There is no need to rush it. This amendment does kill the MPP. Vote "no".

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, this amendment would preclude any corporation with more than \$20 million in annual gross sales from participating in the program. How long are we going to hear about rich versus poor, big versus little?

I would remind my colleagues, if you are looking for a job, do you turn it down because the company is too big? No. We are talking about jobs, good jobs. Larger companies often provide higher paying jobs with better benefits. Besides, these companies buy products from smaller companies.

This program contributes to our positive agricultural trade surplus. Let us not divide and be conquered. Stand up for all American agriculture. Vote "no" on Obey.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, about the only agriculture I have in my district is at the swap meet. So this is not real big.

And I know the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has good intentions in this thing. I grew up in Sheldon, MO, about 2,113 folks. I went back just a couple of months ago. Every single one of those farmers are having to work two and three jobs just to hang onto their farm. I think where you have a bigger organization that supports those organizations all the way down, I think we need to oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment as strenuously as I did the prior amendment.

We are talking competing country to country and small farmers in this country need large entities, in some cases, yes, corporations, to speak for them in the international marketplace.

There is no question that the Europeans are spending much of their taxpayers' dollars to compete with us, 10 times as much. And when you eliminate the entities that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] read off in the well, you eliminate thousands of small farmers whose ability to play a role in the international marketplace would be totally eliminated.

We have made it clear that small business has a priority in this program. These large entities will be using it less and less over time because promotions have a 5-year limit on them.

What is most important for people to understand can best be understood in the context of the wine industry in our State.

Yes, there are 101 wineries participating, 89 of them are small wineries. But when you look at it in detail, you will discover that the five largest harvest 90 percent of all the independently grown grapes in our State. They cannot succeed if this limitation is imposed.

Please defeat the Obey amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 176, noes 229, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No 551]

AYES—176

Ackerman	Fattah	King
Andrews	Fawell	Kleczka
Archer	Fields (LA)	Klink
Armey	Foglietta	Klug
Bachus	Ford	Lafalce
Barrett (WI)	Fox	Largent
Bass	Frank (MA)	Lazio
Becerra	Franks (CT)	Leach
Beilenson	Franks (NJ)	Levin
Berman	Frelinghuysen	Lewis (GA)
Blute	Frisa	Linder
Borski	Furse	Lipinski
Brown (OH)	Gejdenson	LoBiondo
Brownback	Gibbons	Lofgren
Bunn	Goss	Longley
Cardin	Green	Lowey
Castle	Greenwood	Luther
Chabot	Gutierrez	Maloney
Christensen	Gutknecht	Manzullo
Clinger	Hancock	Markey
Coburn	Harman	Martini
Coleman	Hayworth	Mascara
Collins (IL)	Hilleary	McHale
Coyne	Hinchey	McInnis
Creameans	Hoekstra	McNulty
Davis	Hoke	Menendez
DeFazio	Horn	Meyers
DeLauro	Hostettler	Mfume
DeLay	Inglis	Miller (CA)
Dellums	Istook	Miller (FL)
Deutsch	Jacobs	Minge
Doggett	Kanjorski	Molinari
Doyle	Kaptur	Moran
Duncan	Kasich	Morella
Dunn	Kelly	Myrick
Ehlers	Kennedy (MA)	Nadler
Engel	Kennedy (RI)	Neal
Ensign	Kennelly	Neumann

Ney	Sanders	Stockman
Oberstar	Sanford	Studds
Obey	Sawyer	Tate
Olver	Saxton	Taylor (MS)
Orton	Scarborough	Tiahrt
Owens	Schumer	Torkildsen
Pallone	Sensenbrenner	Upton
Payne (NJ)	Serrano	Velazquez
Petri	Shadegg	Vento
Porter	Shaw	Visclosky
Ramstad	Shays	Waldholtz
Rangel	Shuster	Wamp
Reed	Skaggs	Waters
Rivers	Slaughter	Watt (NC)
Rohrabacher	Smith (MI)	Waxman
Roukema	Smith (NJ)	Wolf
Roybal-Allard	Smith (WA)	Wynn
Royce	Solomon	Yates
Rush	Souder	Zeliff
Sabo	Stark	Zimmer
Salmon	Stearns	

NOES—229

Allard	Fields (TX)	Mink
Baesler	Filner	Mollohan
Baker (CA)	Flake	Montgomery
Baldacci	Flanagan	Moorhead
Ballenger	Foley	Murtha
Barcia	Forbes	Myers
Barr	Fowler	Nethercutt
Barrett (NE)	Frost	Norwood
Bartlett	Funderburk	Nussle
Barton	Ganske	Ortiz
Bentsen	Gekas	Oxley
Bereuter	Gephardt	Packard
Bevill	Geren	Parker
Bilbray	Gilchrest	Pastor
Bilirakis	Gillmor	Paxon
Bishop	Gilman	Payne (VA)
Bliley	Gonzalez	Pelosi
Boehlert	Goodlatte	Peterson (FL)
Boehner	Gordon	Peterson (MN)
Bonilla	Graham	Pickett
Bonior	Gunderson	Pombo
Bono	Hall (OH)	Pomeroy
Boucher	Hall (TX)	Portman
Brewster	Hamilton	Poshard
Browder	Hansen	Pryce
Brown (FL)	Hastert	Radanovich
Bryant (TN)	Hastings (FL)	Rahall
Bryant (TX)	Hastings (WA)	Regula
Bunning	Hayes	Richardson
Burr	Hefner	Riggs
Buyer	Heineman	Roberts
Callahan	Herger	Roemer
Calvert	Hobson	Rogers
Camp	Holden	Ros-Lehtinen
Canady	Hoyer	Rose
Chambliss	Hunter	Roth
Chapman	Hutchinson	Schaefer
Chenoweth	Hyde	Schiff
Chrysler	Jackson-Lee	Schroeder
Clayton	Jefferson	Scott
Clement	Johnson (CT)	Seastrand
Clyburn	Johnson (SD)	Sisisky
Coble	Johnson, E. B.	Skeen
Collins (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Skelton
Combust	Johnston	Smith (TX)
Condit	Jones	Spence
Conyers	Kildee	Spratt
Cooley	Kim	Stenholm
Costello	Kingston	Stump
Cramer	Knollenberg	Talent
Crapo	Kolbe	Tanner
Cubin	LaHood	Tauzin
Cunningham	Latham	Taylor (NC)
Danner	LaTourette	Tejeda
de la Garza	Laughlin	Thomas
Deal	Lewis (CA)	Thompson
Diaz-Balart	Lewis (KY)	Thornberry
Dickey	Lightfoot	Thornton
Dicks	Lincoln	Thurman
Dingell	Livingston	Torres
Dixon	Lucas	Towns
Dooley	Manton	Traficant
Doolittle	Martinez	Tucker
Dornan	Matsui	Volkmer
Durbin	McCarthy	Vucanovich
Edwards	McCollum	Walker
Ehrlich	McCrery	Walsh
Emerson	McDade	Ward
English	McHugh	Weldon (FL)
Eshoo	McIntosh	Weller
Evans	McKeon	White
Everett	McKinney	Whitfield
Ewing	Meek	Wicker
Farr	Mica	
Fazio	Mineta	

Williams	Wise	Wyden
Wilson	Woolsey	Young (AK)

## NOT VOTING—29

Abercrombie	Galleghy	Quillen
Baker (LA)	Goodling	Quinn
Bateman	Hefley	Reynolds
Brown (CA)	Hilliard	Stokes
Burton	Houghton	Stupak
Clay	Lantos	Torricelli
Collins (MI)	McDermott	Watts (OK)
Cox	Meehan	Weldon (PA)
Crane	Metcalf	Young (FL)
Dreier	Moakley	

□ 1613

The Clerk announced the following pairs: On this vote:

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

Mr. TIAHRT changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. 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. KENNEDY of Massachusetts: Page 71, after line 2, add the following new section:

SEC. 726. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act for the Market Promotion Program may be used to promote the sale or export of alcohol or alcoholic beverages.

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

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time be reduced to 5 and 5, 5 minutes on each side, and that the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] be allowed to control the remainder of the time on my side.

The CHAIRMAN. Under a previous ruling of the House and the agreement of the House, each side is given 10 minutes. We can, however, reach a consensus if both the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] will yield back 5 minutes each.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, do we do that at the end of the debate?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentleman, he can do it right now and preserve the other 5 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield back 5 minutes.

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN].

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

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express concern about the proposed language contained in the Appropriations Committee report regarding the importation of Mexican avocados. This language is unnecessary and improperly seeks to create special procedural hurdles which the Secretary of Agriculture must overcome before determining whether to modify the embargo on Mexican avocado imports.

Moreover, the proposed language seeks to preserve technical barriers to trade of the type that Washington apple growers have been fighting for decades in Japan, Mexico, and elsewhere. Only recently have consumers in these countries been able to enjoy our apples while our growers enjoy the economic benefits of free trade. The United States is the most competitive producer of agricultural products in the world. Accordingly, we should act to encourage our trading partners to dismantle their technical barriers to U.S. agricultural exports.

THE COMMITTEE'S SPECIAL PROCEDURES ARE UNNECESSARY

The Department of Agriculture has been regulating agricultural imports successfully for over eighty years to protect American crops from the risks of imported pests or diseases. After extensive research and consultations with the Mexican authorities, the Department of Agriculture has now proposed a detailed plan under which avocados could be imported from one part of Mexico to the Northeastern United States, without risk to U.S. crops in the South or West. The Department has already held two public hearings on this issue and has scheduled five more hearings in August. Anyone interested in this issue may speak at one of the hearings or submit their views in writing. The Department will only decide whether to publish a final rule after considering all the views and evidence submitted.

The proposed language would state that the House Appropriations Committee "expects" the Department of Agriculture to "ensure scientific credibility on pest risk assessment and risk management" and to "ensure that industry is provided with an opportunity to provide input on any proposed regulatory changes." This language is simply unnecessary. The Department has already published a detailed explanation of its "systems approach" to eliminate any risks posed by avocado imports. Moreover, the ordinary procedures for rulemaking under the Administrative Procedure Act already ensure that the industry will have ample opportunity to express its views in writing and at the five scheduled hearings. To the extent that the proposed language can be read to encourage the Secretary to apply a higher standard in this case than the scientifically-based standards ordinarily used by the Department, the use of this higher standard is unjustified and discriminatory.

The proposed language also suggests that the Secretary create an "independent peer review panel" before modifying the embargo on Mexican avocados. In other words, the proposed language seeks to create a special procedure applicable to only one product, from only one country. To adopt the proposed language would be to say: "For all other crops,

from all other countries, the Department's ordinary procedures and standards are good enough to protect American crops. But for some reason, the Appropriations Committee believe that the Department of Agriculture's well-established procedures and standards cannot be trusted with regard to one product: Mexican avocados."

The committee language does not explain why these special, one-time-only procedures and standards are necessary in this case. But the reasons are apparent: referring a well-studied matter to an "independent peer review panel" is nothing but an attempt to further delay the import of Mexican avocados into the United States. The committee would cater to a special interest group at the expense of the American consumer by imposing delays and restrictions on the Secretary of Agriculture's ability to determine that continuing the embargo is scientifically unjustified.

THE COMMITTEE'S APPROACH WOULD VIOLATE OUR TRADE COMMITMENTS AND HARM U.S. INTERESTS

Moreover, by encouraging the Department of Agriculture to delay the modification of an unjustified trade restriction, the proposed language would have the United States breach its obligations under two recent trade agreements: the North American Free Trade Agreement [NAFTA] and the World Trade Organization [WTO]. Both of these agreements were approved by the Congress to promote economic growth in America, the region, and the world, and a committee of this House—particularly a committee which lacks jurisdiction over trade policy—should not lightly advocate breaches of these vital agreements.

Both the NAFTA and the WTO contain provisions expressly addressing this type of trade restriction, which are known as "phytosanitary measures." In particular, these rules prohibit the application of phytosanitary measures in a manner which either discriminates against the produce of one country or operates as a "disguised restriction on trade." These rules were included at the insistence of the United States. The American negotiators pressed for international rules on phytosanitary measures to prevent other countries from using such measures as non-tariff barriers to agricultural products from the United States. As the world's largest exporter, the United States has the most to lose from trade barriers, including the overbroad use of phytosanitary measures. Japan and other countries have used excessively strict phytosanitary justifications to restrict U.S. agricultural exports that compete with their local products.

It is simply inconsistent with U.S. interests to encourage other countries to delay changes to their trade restrictions by adopting special new procedures of the sort suggested by the Committee. You can rest assured that protectionists in other countries will be studying the Committee's language as a model for delaying access to their markets for U.S. apples, rice, and other agricultural exports, to the detriment of the American economy.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, first I want to thank the gentleman from Utah, Mr. JIM HANSEN, who has cosponsored the amendment with me, and I appreciate all the hard work he has put into it.