

pear industry needs greater flexibility than the act currently allows in order to respond to international markets. This bill will help the pear industry achieve increased exports and essential goods for all farmers in the U.S.

Mr. Speaker, this 65 year old law was originally intended to protect the reputation of U.S. apples and pears in foreign markets by requiring inspection and certification prior to export. Now, however, pear exporters find that the act is more of a hinderance than an asset for their exports. They wish to be able to export to all the markets willing to purchase U.S. pears. H.R. 4148 will allow U.S. farmers to increase pear exports.

Mr. Speaker, USDA supports enactment of H.R. 4148 and advises the committee that enactment of H.R. 4148 would not result in increased outlays. CBO estimates that there are no costs to H.R. 4148.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4148.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4148 which updates the Apple and Pear Export Act. For many years, as the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING) has explained, the act has served the very beneficial use for the two industries, but tonight the pear industry asked to be relieved from coming under that bill. The effect is to eliminate an outdated requirement for a law that worked well for many years but is now hindering further development for markets for U.S. pears.

The pear industry now believes that market opportunities will be enhanced by greater flexibility. For example, last year the sale of 200,000 cartons of pears to Russia was made possible by a January 1997 amendment to the act that allowed for the shipment of a more competitive grade of pears to that country. This bill gives greater control to the pear industry just as the Russian government has begun to privatize its economy.

Our farmers are increasingly dependent on foreign markets. It is, therefore, essential that the regulations they operate under are designed to help them compete in these markets.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this regulatory improvement which will provide our pear producers with much greater flexibility.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4148, a bill to amend the Export Apple and Pear Act. The Export Apple and Pear Act, enacted on June 10, 1933, requires that apples and pears meet certain standards prior to export in order to ensure only high quality U.S. fruit moves in foreign commerce.

Pears exported from the United States are grown almost exclusively in Oregon, California and Washington and the pear organizations in these states support this bill. U.S. pear producers and shippers recommended that pears should be dropped from the Act so that they can increase the volume of pear exports.

H.R. 4148 eliminates pears from the Act, thereby allowing U.S. exporters greater flexibility in the changing international marketplace and the opportunity to increase exports. The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) believes that mandatory federal quality standards for pears are no longer needed to assure the high quality of exported pears.

USDA supports enactment of H.R. 4148 and advises the Committee that enactment of H.R. 4148 would not result in increased outlays.

CBO estimates there is no cost to H.R. 4148.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4148.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4148.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4148, the bill just adopted.

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

There was no objection.

SELECTIVE AGRICULTURAL EMBARGOES ACT OF 1998

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4647) to amend the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 to require the President to report to Congress on any selective embargo on agricultural commodities, to provide a termination date for the embargo, to provide greater assurances for contract sanctity and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4647

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Selective Agricultural Embargoes Act of 1998".

SEC. 2. REPORTING ON SELECTIVE EMBARGOES.

The Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5711 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end of title VI:

"SEC. 604. REPORTING ON SELECTIVE EMBARGOES.

"(a) REPORT.—If the President takes any action, pursuant to statutory authority, to embargo the export under an export sales contract (as defined in subsection (e)) of an agricultural commodity to a country that is not part of an embargo on all exports to the country, not later than 5 days after imposing the embargo, the President shall submit a report to Congress that sets forth in detail the reasons for the embargo and specifies the

proposed period during which the embargo will be effective.

"(b) APPROVAL OF EMBARGO.—If a joint resolution approving the embargo becomes law during the 100-day period beginning on the date of receipt of the report provided for in subsection (a), the embargo shall terminate on the earlier of—

"(1) a date determined by the President; or

"(2) the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of the joint resolution approving the embargo.

"(c) DISAPPROVAL OF EMBARGO.—If a joint resolution disapproving the embargo becomes law during the 100-day period referred to in subsection (b), the embargo shall terminate on the expiration of the 100-day period.

"(d) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, an embargo may take effect and continue in effect during any period in which the United States is in a state of war declared by Congress or national emergency, requiring such action, declared by the President.

"(e) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—

"(1) the term 'agricultural commodity' includes plant nutrient materials;

"(2) the term 'under an export sales contract' means under an export sales contract entered into before the President has transmitted to Congress notice of the proposed embargo; and

"(3) the term 'embargo' includes any prohibition or curtailment."

SEC. 3. ADDITION OF PLANT NUTRIENT MATERIALS TO PROTECTION OF CONTRACT SANCTITY.

Section 602(c) of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5712(c)) is amended by inserting "(including plant nutrient materials)" after "agricultural commodity" each place it appears.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING).

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

Mr. Speaker, American agriculture plays a key role in the U.S. trade economy. The contributions of agricultural exports to the U.S. economy are impressive such as near record farm exports of just over \$57 billion in 1997 and a positive trade balance of \$21 billion among the largest of any economic sector.

Additionally the U.S. agricultural economy is more than twice as reliant on exports as the overall economy. This reliance makes agricultural specific embargoes especially painful for American farmers and ranchers.

I believe H.R. 4647 provides a vital and necessary foreign policy check and balance system. My legislation would require congressional review and approval of both houses of Congress if the President imposed an agricultural specific embargo on a foreign country. H.R. 4647 would require the President to submit a report to Congress detailing reasons for the embargo and a proposed termination date. Congress then has 100 days to approve or disapprove the embargo. If Congress approves the resolution, the embargo will terminate on the date determined by the President or 1 year after enactment, whichever occurs earliest. If a disapproving

resolution is enacted, the embargo will terminate at the end of a hundred day period.

This legislation would not impact embargoes currently in place nor would it impede the President's authority to impose cross sector embargoes. Additionally, this legislation would not take effect during times of war. This legislation was the official policy of the United States when the Export Administration Amendments Act was adopted in 1985. Unfortunately that act expired in 1994 when Congress failed to reauthorize it. It is important to note that the failure to reauthorize was not a result of any opposition to the agricultural embargo language. Congress just failed to act.

Mr. Speaker, according to the United States Department of Agriculture, the Soviet grain embargo cost the United States about \$2.3 billion in lost U.S. farm exports and U.S. Government compensation to American farmers.

□ 2015

The Soviet grain embargo is still very fresh in the minds of grain farmers throughout America. In the midst of an already poor overall economy, the imposition of the Soviet grain embargo triggered the worst agricultural economic turndown in America since the Great Depression.

As if we had not learned our lesson from the Soviet grain embargo, there are unilateral sanctions in effect today that have damaged our image as a reliable supplier of agricultural products. The problem with agricultural-specific embargoes is that our farmers and ranchers end up losing a share of the global marketplace while the embargoes often fail to achieve their purpose.

With the enactment of the Freedom to Farm Act, our farmers are dependent more and more on foreign markets for an increasingly significant portion of their income. In our global marketplace, the importance of being a reliable supplier of food and fiber cannot be overstated. Therefore, Congress should have input when the President decides to use American agriculture as a foreign policy tool. My legislation does not eliminate the President's ability to impose sanctions, it just includes Congress in the debate.

As many of my colleagues are aware, U.S. farmers and ranchers are increasingly dependent on the marketplace for a greater share of their incomes. To quote former President Ronald Reagan, "The freer the flow of world trade, the stronger the tides of human progress and peace among nations."

In echoing these sentiments, I believe we owe it to our farmers and ranchers to make sure that they do not bear a disproportionate share of the burden of U.S. foreign policy decisions.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the rest of my colleagues join to help the American farmer and rancher by voting "yes" on H.R. 4647 today.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Selective Agricultural Embargoes Act, which I am proud to cosponsor.

When Congress passed Freedom to Farm 2½ years ago, Congress promised to open foreign markets to U.S. Agricultural products. So far, we have failed to pass Fast-Track authority or provide funding for the International Monetary Fund.

This bill, however, recognizes that sanctions, imposed as a part of a coordinated effort with our allies, may be an effective tool of foreign policy. The focus of this legislation, however, is to provide for greater scrutiny of the ineffective unilateral embargoes we place on our trading partners at the expense of our farmers and ranchers.

In the words of U.S. Trade Representative Charlene Barshefsky, unilateral sanctions send the message, "Stop that, or I'll shoot myself."

By providing for congressional review of unilateral agricultural sanctions, this bill will require us to put a little more thought into our actions, to think before we concede our agricultural markets to our competitors.

The bill will also help to maintain our reputation as a reliable supplier of food, which is essential to building long-term market share. It is time to find a more effective way to implement our foreign policy goals and to recognize that unilateral sanctions do not work.

Let us pass this bill and give our farmers and ranchers a fighting chance. It is a very good first step towards comprehensive reform.

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

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BARRETT).

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding to me, and I congratulate him on his introduction of H.R. 4647.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly rise in support of the bill. As a matter of fact, an editorial in today's Journal of Commerce describes which national farm organizations support and which oppose trade. The analysis: most farmers support international trade.

If you had asked me this question 6 months ago, I would have readily agreed. But due to the problems in the agricultural economy and resulting mood in the countryside, I am not so sure today. American farmers in rural communities are hurting, and trade is blamed for many of these problems.

Farmers know that trade is the way to better prices and higher incomes. Many believe that trade has been a disaster for agriculture. While I disagree, I can certainly understand this feeling. Unfortunately, our government is a large part of the problem.

Agriculture has been used as a weapon to achieve questionable foreign policy far too often. It has not received the attention it deserves by this ad-

ministration. In fact, it has been badly misused, often for political purposes. No wonder there is such disconnect with the government's role in trade in rural America. The government's actions or inactions, as the case may be, affect farmers' and ranchers' perceptions of their future.

I support H.R. 4647 because it will require the House and the Senate to approve an agriculture-specific embargo imposed by the President. We used to do this, and I am glad to see that we are on the way to doing that again. Congress must have a chance to analyze any proposed agriculture embargo in order to mitigate any unintentional consequences that do hurt farmers and ranchers.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, let me express my appreciation to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SMITH), the Committee on Agriculture chairman, for his leadership on trade. He has made a difference, and he will be missed.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL).

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING). It is good to be on the floor with them on this very, very important matter.

I appreciate the efforts that they have made, and we can come and talk about something that has a great impact on all of us, the whole country, as well as the producers and farmers and ranchers.

I used to, as a youngster, go work for a neighbor, one of my first jobs. He had an old horse that he called Jack. He would just about do anything that you asked him to do.

I went over early one morning, though; and as he was kind of getting the harness on old Jack, why Jack pawed and bit at him. He just reached around behind the fence and picked up about a 4-foot two-by-four, and he swatted him pretty good. And he turned to me; and, as a youngster, I was kind of dismayed. He said, "Well, you've got to get his attention." He said, "He will be okay for the rest of the day." So it worked out pretty good.

Well, I think that we have been swacked pretty good, too, as we have had some of these trade sanctions. It has hurt us a lot. I trust that it has got us our attention.

I agree with the things that both of the previous speakers have said. This is, not only important to the world economy that we live in, but to our country as a whole. The agriculture community can ill-afford these kind of things.

Then when we have had the opportunity to travel some around this world and have seen some of the places where people go without food and fiber, it is a very serious situation.

The combines are running in Iowa right now and other parts across the country. Because their prices are so

low, the lack of market, so low, there is going to be a lot of grain piled out on the ground. It is going to rot. Much of it will not be used where it could have been used for people that could use it for their very livelihood.

So I am very supportive of H.R. 4647. I think it is a step in the right direction that, if something like this is going to be thought of in a unilateral sense, that they would come back and talk to us, the Members of the Congress, that we could discuss this and look it over and be sure that we are doing the right thing.

So I support this, and I appreciate the opportunity to speak, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight also to support legislation that is vital to the U.S. agricultural interests, to the farmers and ranchers of Kansas and across the country. The Selective Agricultural Embargo Act is an important first step in our commitment to reign in embargoes and open markets for U.S. agricultural products.

Just last Friday, this Congress took a step to address the short-term needs of farmers by passing a disaster relief bill. Now it is time for Congress to help solve the long-term needs of producers by removing sanctions and opening agricultural markets.

The Soviet grain embargo cost United States farmers \$2.3 billion. The damage from that embargo left a lasting imprint upon agriculture and scarred our industry in a way that few would have imagined. However, it appears that we have not yet learned our lesson.

Wheat imports to North Korea, to Cuba, to Iran, and to Iraq have all doubled since 1995, just a few years ago, since then they have doubled, and now account for over 10 million tons of wheat. However, these growing markets are off limits to U.S. producers but not to Canadian and Australian farmers.

In today's global economy, unilateral sanctions unfairly penalize U.S. producers, reward our competitors, and have little impact on changing behavior on targeted countries. The American farmer is tired of paying the price for this failed U.S. policy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this important measure.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY).

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to begin by commending the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING), the subcommittee chairman, for sponsoring this legislation, H.R. 4647, the Selective Agricultural Embargoes Act of 1998.

We have, from time to time, embarked on a horribly foolish embargo strategy. The unilateral embargo has absolutely had the effect of the hurt America first strategy.

I remember vividly the reaction in our part of the country to the ill-advised Soviet grain embargo of 1980. Farmer after farmer could watch their year's profits go down the drain as, as a Nation, we embarked on a policy that did nothing to discourage the Soviet Union, the object of that embargo, but did everything to give great encouragement to our trade competitors who rushed in with their own grain, easily filling the market while we bore 100 percent of the cost of that venture.

Let us learn from this mistake, because an embargo of that nature does not just cost us in terms of this year's lost markets, it makes us unreliable as a trading partner, so that next year we do not get the sale and the year after that we do not get the sale.

We need to establish structurally everything we can to have confidence in our ongoing presence as a trading partner. That is why I think this bill is so well put together. It does not unilaterally say no, no, never, never, because we cannot possibly foresee the future, but it does bring Congress fully into the mix.

After 100 days, the evaluation period provided in this legislation, we can be darn sure that, if an embargo continued, it was only because there was a very strong, very deep national consensus that this is the direction that we ought to go.

I think that this legislation gets the balance just right and hopefully is going to put an end to the hurt America first strategy of prior agriculture embargoes.

I want to end with a word of caution, because this legislation itself is not in any way a comprehensive response to the deep crisis we have today in the farm country. We need to do our part to replenish the International Monetary Fund.

Our trading partners across the country, our grain customers are in deep financial trouble. We need to do our part in this international effort to shore up the stability of the financial markets across the world.

Secondly, even today, we have States imposing rigorous grain inspections against Canadian grain imports. Under-scoring that it is not just free trade, it is fair trade that we have to focus on, and the subsidized grain imports into our country are not fair trade, and we have a right to fair trade with respect to those imports.

Finally, we will continue in this town in the next few days to evaluate whether the package of agriculture relief appropriated by the House last Friday is adequate.

I adamantly maintain that we have not done enough to help farmers through this period of prices tanking because, after all, prior farm bills provided a measure of protection when prices collapsed.

We are now in a farm bill environment that does not provide the protection, and we are going to lose farmers if we do not make a very significant re-

sponse, one more significant than the one that this Congress has moved forward.

In the end, though, I commend the chairman for his legislation and also would like to reiterate the comments of another subcommittee chairman regarding the leadership the gentleman from Oregon (Chairman SMITH) has brought to the Committee on Agriculture. I have respected him about as much as any legislator I have had the opportunity to work with. His departure is going to leave a big old hole in the Committee on Agriculture. He has done a wonderful job as the chairman in this session.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the outstanding gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), an expert on world trade matters.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Selective Agriculture Embargoes Act, H.R. 4647. I would also like to commend the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING) for his initiative and his persistence in bringing this important legislation to the floor prior to our adjournment. I also thank him for his kind words.

Last Friday, the New York Times ran an article on the massive grain surplus building in the Pacific Northwest.

□ 2030

Though the article focused on the damaging impact of the Asian financial crisis on U.S. grain exports, the article also said, "What is also clear is that many farmers are increasingly angry over the trade embargoes that the United States has imposed on many nations around the world."

Would my colleagues believe it? We have imposed trade sanctions on 35 countries in the last 5 years, and we have trade sanctions standing on 75 or 80 countries now under existing law.

One farmer and State representative from Washington State was quoted as saying, "If we take their money and they take our grain, I don't think there is going to be anyone hurt."

Mr. Speaker, that farmer correctly understands that unilateral embargoes of U.S. food exports do not hurt or effect any real change on the targeted country. All U.S. farmers have a right to be angry that they are being used by both the executive and legislative branches to carry out symbolic acts so foreign policymakers can appear to be doing something about our toughest foreign policy problems.

There are three types of embargoes: Short supply embargoes, foreign policy embargoes, and national security embargoes, and all, unfortunately, end up hurting the people who should be least hurt by the intent of the authors.

Those farmers, I think, have a legitimate right to be angry, because when Congress and the President point the

sanctions gun at a foreign country, that gun, more often than not, gets pointed at the guy on the tractor who is simply trying to provide for his family.

Hopefully, certain Members of Congress and the President relearned this lesson again this summer when American farmers lost, or nearly lost, at least, a \$300,000 metric ton wheat sale to Pakistan because of our unilateral nonproliferation sanctions on that country. Sensing our serious mistake, those of us concerned in Congress rushed to reverse that sanction just hours before the bids for the wheat sale were made. Had we not acted, I am sure that Australian, French or Canadian wheat farmers would gladly become Pakistan's new primary supply of wheat.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is very important in that it takes the first step towards rationalizing our sanctions policy by requiring the President to report to Congress on any selective embargo on agriculture commodities. It provides a termination date for any embargo, and it provides greater assurances for contract sanctity. In addition, the bill requires Congress to approve the embargo for it to extend beyond 100 days.

It is important to state what this legislation does not do. First, it does not alter any current sanctions because it only affects embargoes that apply selectively to agriculture products like President Carter's ill-fated and totally ineffective grain embargo on the Soviet Union in 1980, or President Ford's unilateral, farmer-damaging, short-supply soybean embargo. Additionally, this legislation does nothing to restrict the President's ability to impose cross-sector embargoes or embargoes that apply to agriculture as well as other U.S. export goods.

Mr. Speaker, the Selective Agriculture Embargoes Act is straightforward, common-sense legislation that aims at ensuring that our future sanctions do not unnecessarily hurt our farmers and our agricultural sector, while having no impact on the targeted country. This Member, therefore, urges his colleagues to vote for H.R. 4647.

I thank my colleague from Illinois for his outstanding work on this. I would say to my colleague from North Dakota who addressed the House just a minute ago, I happen to agree with him on his view on the adequacy, or I should say the inadequacy, of the assistance rendered to farmers. I believe that the transition payments, even though they were up perhaps 29 percent, should be higher, because no one could really have anticipated the Asian financial crisis or the fact that the U.S. dollar was very much stronger suddenly than our major competitors. It is for that reason that I voted for his motion to recommit on the Agriculture Appropriation Conference Report.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the resolution.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the

gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I also want to join my colleagues in supporting H.R. 4647, the Selective Agriculture Embargoes Act. It is a reasonable act. It is a balanced approach. It is much needed. However, it is not all we need. It is, indeed, the first step and has gone a long way to make sure that agriculture will not be singularly selected as to be the area, the sector, that will be suffering.

Obviously, our farmers now depend more than ever before on the global market, and we need to make sure that the global market has a sense of stability. This also recognizes that we have a corresponding responsibility in adding to that stability. This allows us to be stable providers of food, and it also allows us not to be the victim of unilateral sanctions.

I commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING) for the legislation, and I am delighted to join him as a co-sponsor of this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers on this side. I commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING) for his initiative in bringing this legislation to us tonight, and I encourage all of our colleagues to vote for it.

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

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

I want to close by thanking the gentleman from Texas and the gentlewoman from North Carolina and the gentleman from North Dakota and the Members on this side of the aisle that have come down here and talked about something that I think really is a hot button among farmers and ranchers across this country, and that is when their government unilaterally says, we are not going to allow you to deal with another country because we believe we can make a point by not allowing you to trade with them agriculturally. They are very much concerned about it. They want to see legislation like H.R. 4647 on the books to protect them from that kind of unilateral action.

So tonight I am pleased to be here with this bill, pleased to have the support of my colleagues in a bipartisan effort to address this problem.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4647, the Selective Agriculture Embargoes Act, introduced by Mr. Ewing, the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Risk Management and Specialty Corps.

The Selective Agriculture Embargoes Act of 1998 requires the President to report to Congress on any selective embargo on agricultural commodities and specifies the period during which the embargo will be in effect.

For American farmers and ranchers, trade is an essential part of their livelihood. Currently exports account for 30% of U.S. farm cash re-

ceipts and nearly 40% of all agricultural production is exported. U.S. farmers and ranchers produce much more than is consumed in the United States, therefore exports are vital to the prosperity and success of U.S. farmers and ranchers.

In order to continue to meet the worldwide demand for U.S. agricultural products, farmers and ranchers must continually assess the world market to determine where those markets are for specific agricultural products. It has become increasingly difficult to make this assessment because farmers and ranchers are denied access to certain world markets due to economic sanctions and embargoes, among other reasons.

For U.S. agriculture, embargoes or sanctions, whether imposed by the Administration or by law, often have unintended consequences that can fail unfairly on U.S. farmers and ranchers. U.S. agriculture remembers the 1980 Soviet grain embargo. The one lasting impression left of that embargo is that the U.S. could not be considered to be a reliable supplier of wheat. The past 18 years have been spent attempting to reverse that opinion.

Therefore because of the importance of assuring the reliability of the U.S. as a supplier of food and agricultural products, we must address the effects of embargoes on U.S. agriculture.

The Ewing bill amends the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 to require that if the President acts to implement an embargo of any agricultural commodity to any country, the President must submit a report to Congress, within 5 days of imposing the embargo, that describes the reasons for the embargo and the period of time the embargo will be in effect. This requirement is applicable when there is an embargo of agriculture commodities to a country and that embargo does not include all exports to that country.

The bill also provides that if within 100 days of receiving the President's report, a joint resolution is enacted that approves the embargo, the embargo will end on the date determined by the President or 1 year after the date of enactment of the joint resolution, whichever is earlier. If a joint resolution disapproving the embargo is enacted during that 100-day period, the embargo will terminate at the end of that 100-day period.

The bill includes an exception providing that an embargo may take effect during any period in which there is a state of war declared by Congress or a national emergency declared by the President.

The bill also clarifies that "plant nutrient materials" are to be included in the category of agricultural commodities in the section of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 regarding contract sanctity. Therefore the protection afforded agricultural commodities in regard to suspension of trade and contract sanctity will be applied to plant nutrient materials.

Plant nutrient materials under export sales contracts will be protected from suspension of trade, as long as the contract is entered into before the suspension of trade is announced and the contract terms require delivery within 270 days after suspension of trade is imposed.

Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent that correspondence between Mr. Gilman, the Chairman of the Committee on International Relations, and I be included in the RECORD at this point.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4647.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RE-
LATIONS,

Washington, DC, September 28, 1998.

Hon. ROBERT F. SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SMITH: I understand that the Committee on Agriculture is requesting that the House leadership permit the consideration of H.R. 4647 on the suspension calendar. This bill is identical to H.R. 3654 as introduced, with the exception of a technical change.

My understanding is that because of our Committee's jurisdiction over exports and national security issues under Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, our Committee would be entitled to a sequential referral of this bill were it reported in the form introduced.

As I have discussed with Mr. Ewing, the sponsor of the bill, because of the need for prompt disposition of this matter, we have no objection to the consideration of this bill as introduced as a suspension item.

While not objecting to the consideration of the bill on the suspension calendar, however, I would like to state that we do not waive our jurisdiction over this bill or its subject matter. I would request that, in light of our support for early action on the bill on the suspension calendar, (a) you undertake to support the naming of members of the Committee on International Relations as conferees on this bill, should a conference occur, and (b) you consult with me on any further action on the bill or on any counterpart from the Senate.

I also request that you include this correspondence and your response to it in the Record when the bill is considered.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

BENJAMIN A. GILMAN,
Chairman.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC, September 28, 1998.

Hon. BEN GILMAN,
Chairman, House Committee on International
Relations, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GILMAN: Thank you for your correspondence on H.R. 4647.

We appreciate the position of your Committee that you will not object to the early consideration of the bill, as introduced, on the suspension calendar.

In light of your Committee's jurisdictional claim, should a conference be agreed to on the bill, I would support the naming of conferees from the Committee on International Relations, and I will certainly consult with you on any Senate amendment to the bill or further action on it or a counterpart from the Senate. Thank you again for your cooperation in this matter, and please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

ROBERT F. "BOB" SMITH,
Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4647.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4647, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF CONFEREES AND APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 2073, JUVENILE CRIME CONTROL AND DELINQUENCY ACT OF 1998

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to clause 6(f), rule X, the chair removes the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) as conferees on the Senate bill (S. 2073) to authorize appropriations for the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, and appoints the gentleman from California (Mr. RIGGS), and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) to fill the vacancies.

There was no objection.

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

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SKAGGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DIAZ-BALART addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CASTLE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

A TRIBUTE TO SANTA MARIA'S PEACE WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, as this session of Congress races to a close, we often lose sight of some of the wonder-

ful things happening at home in our communities, and this is especially true when Washington, D.C. is consumed by political battles. That is why I rise today to commend the remarkable city of Santa Maria, California, which I am very proud to represent, in the 22nd district for its second annual Peace Week.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this year I stood on the House floor to congratulate Santa Maria on being named one of 10 All-American Cities. This high honor was justly granted to a city that has distinguished itself by its diversity and the fact that all the residents of Santa Maria work together to find innovative ways to solve their problems.

One glowing example of this community cohesiveness is Peace Week; Peace Week, which begins today. The goal of Peace Week is to stress nonviolence and conflict mediation. Each day brings a focus on a new topic and allows community members of all ages and cultures to discover ways they can make a difference in their own lives and in the lives of their neighbors.

Examples of innovative Peace Week activities include a candlelight march, nonviolence education, and a lecture by a nationally acclaimed advocate, Father Gregory Boyle. Another highlight of Peace Week is a project entitled, "Let's Piece it Together," which features a peace quilt constructed by schoolchildren and senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, Peace Week is the product of an entire city and its enlightened leadership. I want to pay special tribute to my friend, Sister Janet Corcoran of Marian Medical Center Mission Services, for her remarkable dedication and tireless work on behalf of her community and the precious cause of peace. She is a role model for me and a role model for us all.

THE SURVIVAL OF THE SMALL FARMER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, why is it that we refuse to help small farmers and ranchers to succeed, yet we refuse to let big business fail? Why is that small farmers and ranchers get little help, while big business gets much help? Small farmers and ranchers are struggling to survive in America, and because they are struggling to survive, quality and affordable food and fiber for all of us is at risk.

They are not struggling to survive for the want of effort. No, Mr. Speaker. Small producers are struggling to survive because of the pressures they are experiencing from a constant barrage of hurricanes, unexpected flooding, unprecedented drought and economic downturns, exacerbated by failing foreign markets.

Much of the problem, too, however, springs from the onerous provisions of the 1996 farm bill that bans family