United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 25, 1999 No. 76

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 19, 1999, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 25 minutes, and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate be continued beyond 9:50 a.m.

THE JUVENILE JUSTICE BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHABOT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. HASTERT. On behalf of the elected entire Republican leadership, I rise today to talk about the efforts of the House to respond to the national crisis surrounding violence in our schools.

Last week's shooting in Conyers, Georgia, only reinforced the fears of many parents about the safety of the schools which their children attend. Studies show that our Nation's schools on average are safer than ever, but average means nothing to the mothers and fathers who send their children to school every day. They want more from us, and we will provide more.

Last week the other body passed legislation that responded in part to the situation in our schools. Part of that legislative response included gun control legislation.

We support commonsense legislation that keeps guns out of the hands of unsupervised children. We support tightening laws to bring uniformity between gun shows and gun shops. We support instant background checks at gun shows.

We intend to bring these measures to the floor of the House, and I believe they will pass, but passing these measures is only part of the solution.

As I said on this floor last week, our children need to learn the differences between right and wrong. They need moral instruction, and they need a culture that reinforces positive values that help create a safer and more secure society.

What happened in Littleton, Colorado, and Conyers, Georgia, are genuine national tragedies. It is natural that they should spur us to action, but it is wrong for anyone to simply try to score political points as a result of these tragedies.

I take a back seat to no one in this Congress when it comes to a desire to make our schools safer. I specifically spoke about safer schools from this well in my first speech as Speaker.

I taught high school for 16 years before entering public life. My two boys graduated from public high school not that long ago. My wife goes to work every day in a public school, just as she has for the last 33 years. I want her and the children she teaches to be safe.

Last week, in consultation with the minority leadership, we developed a timetable for consideration of a juvenile justice bill that would help make our schools safer. It was a very constructive meeting. I thought we had mapped out a very responsible, straightforward approach to handling this issue by prompt action of the authorizing committee, not riders on unrelated appropriation bills.

Unfortunately, it appears that despite the best efforts at the leadership level, more partisan elements are continuing to press for quicker, ill-considered action this week. We continue to believe, just as we proposed last week, that we should consider this bill in a timely yet responsible way.

In order to responsibly expedite matters, I asked the Committee on the Judiciary to move up its hearing on this issue by 3 weeks. They agreed, and will start hearings this Thursday.

I asked the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) to be prepared to mark up legislation the first week we get back from the Memorial Day district work period so it could be ready for the floor the next week. Again, this was much faster than originally proposed. He has agreed to do so.

Later today he and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) will announce an outline of our youth violence legislation.

This legislation will focus on making our schools and our streets safer by prosecuting those who break the current gun laws. It will keep lawbreakers in jail longer. It will enact a zero tolerance policy for children who bring guns to school, and it will make sure that dangerous juveniles will not be able to buy guns lawfully when they become adults, and that we have open and complete juvenile records to help us keep guns out of their hands.

When we consider this legislation, the House will be able to work its will regarding certain provisions from the Senate package, just as I had assured the minority leader last week.

The House will vote on trigger locks, background checks at gun shows, and closing the gun purchasing loophole. We will expedite this legislation, but we will not force it through the system without the proper consideration of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Some of my colleagues, sensing an advantage, may try to go outside of the rules of the House and attach ill-considered riders to legislation not relevant to the juvenile justice issue. That would be a mistake. I know emotions are running high, but let us be honest about this. Even if we did pass legislation this week, it would still be

Printed on recycled paper.

the middle of June at the earliest before we could send a bill to the White House.

Pretending otherwise, and promising the victims of these terrible tragedies something else, does a tremendous disservice not only to us and to our institution, but to the very people we are trying to protect.

Our Nation's schoolchildren deserve to attend the safest, most secure schools that we can provide, and the parents of our children should rest secure in the knowledge that everything is being done within our powers, both as citizens and legislators, to create precisely that environment.

This is not the time to play on the fears of our most vulnerable. This is the time for aggressive yet responsible leadership, one in which we can think carefully and examine all of the issues before we go off half-informed, searching for the snappiest sound bite rather than working together to develop the best legislation that we can.

This is one of those rare times when the national consensus demands that we act, but it does not require us to rush to judgment, to risk compounding the situation by stampeding toward what sounds like the best way to score points against each other. We can do better than that, and I am determined to see that we will.

By cooperating, we can get a bill to the White House promptly, while making sure that the policies are ready to be enforced when schools reopen in September. The Nation's eyes have turned towards us, looking for responsible leadership. We must resist the temptation to score political points at the expense of the lives and families of our Nation's children.

Demagoguery for the sake of partisan advantage will not serve the country well, nor will it produce the best legislative solution possible. We have the opportunity to rise above partisanship and do ourselves and our Nation proud. I appeal to all the Members not to let this opportunity slip away.

We have responsible legislation and it is ready to go. It can be made better. Rushing it to the floor this week will not result in a better product in the long run. Let us come together, move forward, and develop the best legislation we can so that all Americans can take pride in how we respond.

THE FUTURE AMERICAN FLAG WILL HAVE 51 STARS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MYRICK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Madam Speaker, when the House of Representatives debated legislation on Puerto Rico's self-determination, opponents argued that Puerto Ricans had a different culture, too alien from the rest of the Nation to become a partner.

But they were wrong. The ones that are not mainstream are those that subscribe to a nativist mindset. Have they listened to the radio? Have they watched a ballgame? Have they checked out who is doing art for the Treasury Department, or have they read Time Magazine lately?

Last week's cover of Time featured Puerto Rican pop star Ricky Martin, who boasts the number one song in America. The same article highlighted two other Puerto Rican pop culture success stories, vocalists Mark Anthony and actress-singer Jennifer Lopez.

Last year, baseball's American League recognized Puerto Rican Juan ''Igor'' Gonzalez of the Texas Rangers as its most valuable player, and 11-year-old Laura Hernandez from Puerto Rico is this year's First Place National Winner of the United States Savings Bond Poster Contest.

Right here next to Washington, D.C., in the Goddard Space Center, there are over 40 engineers and scientists who have come from Puerto Rico. They graduated from MIT; not Massachusetts Institute of Technology, but the Mayaguez Institute of Technology.

Time's May 24th cover story states, ''We have seen the future. It looks like Ricky Martin. It sings like Mark Anthony. It dances like Jennifer Lopez. Que bueno.'' I, too, have seen the future, and I saw our flag with 51 stars. Que bueno.

THE FUTURE OF SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I rise today to talk about an important issue for everyone in this country. It is social security. Everybody that is now receiving social security is concerned when Congress starts talking about changes in social security, because the fact is that one-third of the individuals that are now receiving social security depend on that social security check for 90 percent or more of their retirement income, a huge dependency. So it is easy to understand why seniors get nervous.

Everybody that is near retirement age is concerned, because they have planned their retirement and the fact is that social security is running out of money. Those individuals under 55 years of age are the generation most at risk, because they may be asked to spend a lot more paying for the retirement benefits of those that retired before them.

This week we are going to discuss what has been called a lockbox for social security. It does not fix social security, but it provides that Congress promises not to spend the social security trust fund surpluses for other government programs. It is a good start, but make no mistake, it does nothing to change the fundamentals of the programs and fix social security in the long run.

Briefly, let me describe, what the problems of social security are. When we started the social security program in 1934, it was developed as a pay-as-you-go program, where existing current workers paid in their social security tax for the benefits of existing current retirees, so essentially no savings. The social security taxes went in one week, and by the end of the week they were sent out in benefits to retirees.

The system worked very well in the early stages because there were 42 people working for every 1 retiree receiving those tax benefits. By 1950, the number of people working went down to 17 people working, sending in their social security taxes for every one retiree. Today it is 3 people working, sending in their social security taxes, for every retiree.

The estimate is that by 2030, there are only going to be 2 people working. So what we are asking those 2 people to do, without changes in the social security structure, without changes in the system, we are asking those two workers to try to earn and produce enough for their families plus one retiree; almost impossible.

The Federal Government, since it continues to raise taxes, and it has raised social security taxes 36 times since 1976, more often than once a year. Today 75 percent of our workers pay more in the social security tax than they do in income tax.

But as government raised those taxes on workers, they took the extra money coming in above and beyond what was needed for benefit payments for retirees and the families and the disabled and they spent the money on other government programs.

□ 0915

What that has done is dig us a $700 billion IOU to future retirees that government, that Congress, that the President has no idea how to pay back.

I plead with my colleagues and, Madam Speaker, I plead with the American people to look at Social Security, look at how it is going to affect their lives and the future if Congress and the President is not willing to step up to the plate and deal with the serious problems of Social Security.

I have a proposal that I will be introducing in the next week that, provided we start slowing down some of the benefits for those high-income retirees and use some of that money for private investment accounts, to put that money into individual accounts so those individuals own that money, instead of Congress spending it on other programs.

Let me just finish by saying what tremendously complicates and should concern all of us in terms of how we deal with Social Security is a Supreme Court decision. In fact, two Supreme Court decisions. The Supreme Court

has said there is no entitlement for Social Security benefits; that there is no relationship between the taxes we pay in and our right to receive any Social Security check when we retire. That means that the young generations, those under 55 years old, are completely dependent on future politicians deciding how much they might cut their benefits.

And just one last word, Madam Speaker. The longer we put this off, the more drastic the solution. Let us do it, let us get at it, and let us deal with it.

CONGRESS OWES AMERICAN PUBLIC LEGISLATION ON GUN SAFETY PRIOR TO MEMORIAL DAY RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MYRICK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I listened to the Speaker of the House this morning tell us that we cannot pass gun safety legislation in this body before we leave for the Memorial Day break for vacation. We owe it to the American people, to American families, to move on this legislation before we go home. We need to work on the people's timetable and not on the congressional timetable.

To delay this issue is politics. That is what this is about.

We have 13 children in the United States who die every single day because of gun violence. If this is not an emergency, I do not know what is an emergency. This House of Representatives has risen to occasions where there have been crises in this country. We can move on a dime. We can pass legislation in 24 hours or less if we have the will to do it.

The juvenile justice bill has been sitting in committee for the last 3 to 4 weeks. It is a bipartisan piece of legislation. It can be passed in a heartbeat if we have the will to do it. We have to pass gun safety legislation in our country if we are going to meet the pleas and the cries of American families today.

I saw a grandmother yesterday in my district in Connecticut. She lives in Connecticut, her family is in Indiana. And she said to me, ''Ms. DELAURO, when you go back, please pass gun safety legislation. My two grandchildren were evacuated from their schools just last week.'' And I am not the only one who is hearing the plea of the American public. Let us do what is responsible, let us respond to American families.

Last week the other Chamber did the right thing. They passed common-sense gun safety legislation. The House of Representatives this week has that opportunity. Let us take up this legislation and pass fair and sensible measures that we, in fact, know will save lives.

There are some who want to wait until mid-June. I say we have waited too long. We have done nothing despite repeated tragedies in our schools, and we sit idly by while, as I said, 13 children are killed by guns every single day.

Youth violence is a complex problem. It requires several answers. We need parental involvement, safe schools, guidance counselors, mental health services, and less violence in our media. But gun safety laws that protect children are part of a sensible response to a crisis that is killing our kids in the United States.

I call upon the Republican leadership, I call upon the Speaker of the House, to schedule that vote this week. Like the other Chamber, we must ensure that firearms are sold with child safety locks, that we have background checks at gun shows, and that a person is 21 years old before he or she buys a gun.

Let us take these steps. Our families, our children are relying on us, those of us who have been sent here to do the people's business. Let us take the people's House and let us be responsive to the American public this week, when they are in need of knowing that, in fact, we can represent them and their families and their children in this body. That is what our responsibility is this week.

My God, I hope that we are up to the task in this body.

HOUSE SHOULD VOTE ON THREE ELEMENTS OF SENATE GUN SAFETY LEGISLATION PRIOR TO MEMORIAL DAY RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I too rise out of a note of optimism and, frankly, a little sadness, having listened to the Speaker's comments on the floor of this House.

I have been in Congress only 3 years, but over the course of those 3 years we have been attempting repeatedly to have the Republican leadership allow us the opportunity to vote on simple, common-sense approaches that will make a difference for the epidemic of gun violence in this country. We, in fact, know that it will make a difference.

There are about six times that I have taken to the well of this Chamber after tragic shootings, not to try to take advantage of them, but thinking that for a moment there might be an opportunity that this would touch the conscience of the people who control what the Members of this body will be able to vote upon.

Nine times since I have been in Congress there have been multiple shooting deaths on school campuses around this country. One of them, tragically, was in my State of Oregon. I do not know how anybody who looks in the eyes of the families who have suffered this tragedy, who have looked in their souls to realize that we have taken steps in this Congress to deal with things like auto safety, yet we will not take the same simple approach to try and make a difference to reduce the carnage from gun violence for young people.

The concept of a livable community, from where I sit, is what the Federal Government is about. It ought to be a partnership with State governments, local governments, with the local communities, school districts, to try to make sure that when children go out the door in the morning that they are safe, that the family is economically secure and they are healthy.

Gun violence has a wrenching impact on all three of those factors. The economic costs are staggering, costing billions of dollars each year for the thousands who are dead and maimed, victimized directly and indirectly. It has a significant impact in terms of public safety and crime, and it certainly makes a difference in terms of people's sense of security.

In the last Congress we pleaded just to act on the child access protection legislation. Give us a chance to vote on it. Fifteen States have enacted it, including the State of Florida, the home State of the Chair of the Subcommittee on Violence, and it has made a difference in terms of making children safer.

I would think that, at a minimum, the Members of this body ought to come forward and demand that we vote at least on the three elements that are in the Senate legislation, pass those things out today, make that progress real; then we can come back after the recess and deal with the Speaker's more deliberative approach on a longer-range term.

We have legislation introduced by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) that a number of people on both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats, people of conscience, have signed that could be the vehicle that would deal comprehensively with these concerns.

I have legislation that I will be advancing that deals with making sure that the Product Safety Commission spends as much attention with real guns as it does with toy guns; that we would extend the prohibition against criminals having access to weapons under the Brady bill to others who have demonstrated a consistent pattern of violent behavior. This is overwhelmingly supported by the American public.

And last, but not least, that the Federal Government become a leader in personalizing guns to make sure that, for example, they cannot be used, the law enforcement service revolvers cannot be used against that man or woman in uniform. The Federal Government has a chance to make a huge difference in advancing this technology.

I find it a little ironic that the Speaker takes to the well of this Chamber urging caution and arguing against extraneous riders when we just passed an absolute abomination of a spending bill that was supposedly for the defense of our troops in Kosovo and, instead, included everything from reindeer to mining regulations. When it comes to special interests, we are willing to make exceptions, but not when it comes to our children.

I think our children ought to be the special interests. We ought to come forward with comprehensive legislation and we ought to do it now.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 10 a.m.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 27 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until 10 a.m.

□ 1000

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU) at 10 a.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray using the words of Psalm 147.

''Praise the Lord!

''How good it is to sing praises to our God; for He is gracious, and a song of praise is fitting.

''The Lord builds up Jerusalem; He gathers the outcasts of Israel.

''He heals the brokenhearted, and binds up their wounds.

''He determines the numbers of the stars; He gives to all of them their names.

''Great is our Lord, and abundant in power; his understanding is beyond measure.

''The Lord lifts up the downtrodden; He casts the wicked to the ground.

''The Lord takes pleasure in those who fear him, in those who hope in his steadfast love.'' Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. FOLEY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain 15 one-minute speeches on each side.

NUCLEAR SECRETS STOLEN UNDER OUR NOSES WHILE ADMINISTRATION DOES NOTHING

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, today we will release the Cox report on Chinese spying activities and the impact on national security. But I say today, rather than blame the Chinese, we should reflect on our own lax standards and security.

Do the initials ''CIA'' ring a bell? We spend billions on similar activities around the world, but we should be more concerned with protecting our own vital national security.

If I were the White House today reading some of the headlines, ''China Stole Nuclear Secrets for Bombs, White House Seeks to Minimize that Type of Problem,'' then I would want to change the subject, too. I would want to talk about campaign finance reform. I would want to talk about gun control in America. I would want to do anything to change the tone and tenor of what has occurred in the United States under this administration.

We have given up valuable secrets, valuable technology, right under our noses. We were informed about it. Yet, the President denied anybody even told him anything relative to these secrets being stolen. Wake up, America. Fool me once, shame on you. Fool me twice, shame on me.

BRING JUVENILE JUSTICE BILL TO THE FLOOR NOW

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, sending one's child to school should not take an act of courage. When children have died, when students have been shot sitting in class or studying at the library, when schools and communities have been torn apart, and when every American parent now worries when they send their children off to school, it is time for us to act. Not tomorrow. Not next week. Not next month. Now. Today.

There is a juvenile justice bill ready for us to consider that at least begins to address the school violence issue. Why will the Speaker not take up this bill? Is it because the NRA does not want him to? Is it because the far right in his party will not let him?

Whatever the reason, Mr. Speaker, it is not good enough. With 13 children dying each day from guns and with that gun violence spilling into our schools, his reasons are not good enough.

Let us protect our children and bring up the juvenile justice bill today. Not tomorrow. Not next month. Not another day. Not another life. But today.

SUPPORT MISSING, EXPLOITED AND RUNAWAY CHILDREN'S ACT

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, in this National Missing Children's Week, I urge my colleagues to support S. 249, the Missing, Exploited and Runaway Children's Act.

In my own district, Jimmy Ryce and Shannon Melendi were preyed upon by monsters.

Jimmy was abducted, raped, killed, and dismembered as he walked home from his school bus stop. Jimmy's parents channeled their grief into the establishment of the Jimmy Ryce Center.

Shannon disappeared from a softball field and was never seen again. Shannon's parents have taken their daughter's case to the public, pushing for stronger laws to keep sexual predators off the streets.

Shannon's father, Luis, said, ''What happened to us cannot be changed, but because of what happened to us, changes can be made.''

Passage of this bill will help protect our children from the predators who prey on our most innocent victims.

AMERICANS INSIST ON PEACEFUL NEGOTIATIONS, NOT CONTINUED BOMBING

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, NATO's deliberate bombing and knocking out of electric systems and water systems throughout Serbia takes the war to a new low.

NATO is assigning collective guilt to the entire population of Serbia. NATO is then exacting retribution against that civilian population. Violence cannot be redemptive.

NATO, whoever NATO is, does not represent this Congress, which voted against the bombing. The American people are opposed to this bombing. People want to know what they can do.

On Sunday night in Cleveland, 400 people marched in a driving rain along the city's largest bridge, a mile and a half procession for peace, to protest the bombing, to protest the ethnic cleansing, and to make a strong statement that we believe that the only way to resolve this is through peaceful negotiations. I say it is time to continue to insist that that is the way that we resolve this war.

COX REPORT RELEASED; IT IS ABOUT TIME

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, ''The Phantom Menace'' is the title to the new popular Star Wars movie. But it might also be an apt description of the Chinese espionage efforts against the United States as outlined in the Cox Report.

Unlike this popular movie, however, this Chinese espionage is not fiction, and it may have far-reaching national security consequences long into the future.

It has taken nearly 5 months of struggle and arguing with the Clinton administration to release the Cox Report. Mr. Speaker, for myself and the many concerned Nevadans that I represent, all I can say is, it is about time.

It is about time that the American people found out if China's nuclear arsenal was built from the genius of the American people, on the backs of the American taxpayer.

It is about time that the Americans learn if the U.S. nuclear weapons labs will meet even minimum security standards some time next year.

But it is ultimately about time that this administration accepts responsibility for its years of inaction in this unfortunate situation, and has the intestinal fortitude to make the appropriate changes.

I yield back this Chinese spy menace, Mr. Speaker, and hopefully today the phantoms will be revealed. It is about time.

CALLING FOR RESIGNATION OF SANDY BERGER

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the fact is Sandy Berger is our national security advisor. The fact is Sandy Berger was once China's chief lobbyist in America. The fact is now there is a hole in our national security so big we could throw Berger and all our secrets all the way to China nonstop. Beam me up.

I am not accusing Sandy Berger of any wrongdoing. But for the good of America, Sandy Berger should resign as our national security advisor. Sandy Berger is very close to China. In Washington, perception becomes reality.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back any secrets we have left.

MORE QUESTIONS ARISE ABOUT WHO KNEW WHAT WHEN REGARDING CHINESE ESPIONAGE

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

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, the long-awaited Cox Report on Chinese espionage becomes public today, and we already know many of the stunning details about the loss of our most sensitive nuclear secrets.

The President's press secretary says this goes back 20 years and there is no Democrat or Republican face on it. He is using the ''everybody does it'' defense. The Energy Secretary has cautioned us not to overreact.

But how should we react to the worst spy case in American history? It is clear that Clinton-Gore administration did not react at all after this was discovered in 1995. Why wasn't the President briefed on this in 1995, in 1996, 1997, 1998 or 1999? If he was, why was nothing done?

Attorney General Janet Reno is being set up to be the scapegoat in this scandal, but there are a lot more questions which the Clinton administration must answer about who knew it and when they knew it.

NATIONAL MISSING CHILDREN'S DAY

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

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying about there being a special God for children. Certainly we would like to think that someone is watching over our young people, protecting them from harm. But, tragically, we know this is not the case.

Our community in the central coast of California lost a beautiful 13-year-old girl last year. That forever changed the lives of the Williams family and the thousands of local volunteers who donated thousands of hours searching for us.

As innocently as many of our children do every day, Christina took the family dog for a walk on June 2, 1998. Seven months later, her parents' worst nightmare came true when her body was discovered January 12, 1999 three miles from the Williams home. The day Christina Williams' body was found was one of the darkest days I have seen on the central coast of California.

Her family and friends said good-bye and vowed never to forget their daughter, sister, and friend. We had to learn to turn our anger and pain into a mission to make our community a safer place to raise our children. From our effort can hopefully come a larger recognition/realization that if we lose one of our children to violence, our society is morally weaker, for we can only imagine the potential that a child had to offer that society.

I wear this ribbon as we observe National Missing Children's Day.

I am wearing this white ribbon as a symbol as we observe National Missing Children's Day. I extend my heartfelt condolences to the family of Christina Williams and to each and every parent and family who has lost a child and pledge my efforts to be a protector of our nation's children.

CHINESE THEFT OF NUCLEAR TECHNOLOGY HAS ADVANCED THREAT BY A GENERATION

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, the Rosenbergs were executed for giving the former Soviet Union secret information which allowed them to advance their atomic weapons program by 5 years.

The Chinese theft of nuclear weapons technology which has recently occurred under this administration has advanced the threat to our Nation by a generation.

This administration loves to say we have to do this, we have to do that for the children. Think of how much American children's lives have been endangered by this administration because of its lax security measures.

Campaign contributions from the head of the Chinese military intelligence to the Clinton administration; and this administration's response, we need campaign finance reform. They do not even follow the laws in the books that we have now.

Now the Clinton administration screams for gun control. Yet, they invite Chinese arms dealers to coffees at the White House, yes, for campaign donations. Unbelievable.

SUPPORT SAFE PARKS ACT OF 1999

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

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce an important bill, the Safe Parks Act of 1999.

Mr. Speaker, our national parks are not as safe as we would expect them to be. In 1997, there were over 550 reported sex offenses in our national parks. Even more disturbing, 1997 saw 33 forceful rapes and 11 attempted rapes in those same national parks. That is a rape or attempted rape about every 8 days on Federal lands that are supposed to be safe havens for our families.

That is why I am introducing the Safe Parks Act today. It is a simple bill, barring any convicted sex offender from entering our U.S. parks.

Mr. Speaker, in honor of National Missing Children's Day, please join me in supporting this measure to help defend the sanctity of our Federal parks for our kids.

NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

(Mr. KNOLLENBERG asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, this week is National Small Business Week. I rise in recognition of the important role that small businesses play in our Nation. Small businesses are vital to our economy and our communities. Just listen to some of these facts.

□ 1015

They account for 99.7 percent of the employers in our Nation; they employ 53 percent of the private work force and are responsible for 50 percent of the private gross domestic product in America.

Despite these enormous contributions, small businesses have to struggle under the weight of excessive taxation and unnecessary regulation handed down by the Federal Government. Clearly, I believe the time has come for Congress and the President to provide some relief to small business owners by cutting taxes and reining in overzealous regulators.

Mr. Speaker, I stand to work with both sides, all my colleagues, to promote an agenda that strengthens small business and creates new economic opportunities for the American people.

SCORE

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that my colleague who just spoke is emphasizing Small Business Week. This is Small Business Week. It is a time to celebrate the entrepreneurs that make the Nation's engine run. I want to take this opportunity to recognize a group of people that serve as that engine's mechanics, the Service Corps of Retired Executives, known as SCORE, which is celebrating their 35th anniversary this year.

SCORE is made up of a group of retired business executives. They volunteer their time and business expertise to counsel and advise our Nation's small business and entrepreneurs-to-be. With well over 50 percent of all new businesses failing within the first 6 years, counseling early on can make a difference between success and failure of a new business. SCORE's free counseling service does that job and it does it well.

In particular, I want to recognize the 166 SCORE volunteers in Colorado. Colorado SCORE counselors worked nearly 15,000 hours last year in support of the Colorado business community. Their support for Colorado's businesses are appreciated, and I encourage them to keep up the good work.

MILK PRICES IN MINNESOTA SHOULD BE SET BY MARKET

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, shortly after the hammer and sickle came down for the last time over the Kremlin, a business publication ran a column entitled, ''Markets Are More Powerful Than Armies'' and the 75-year experiment with government-fixed prices came to an end.

But, Mr. Speaker, for 60 years we have had a convoluted milk marketing order system whereby a farmer's milk is priced based on how far they are from Eau Claire, Wisconsin. The closer they are, the less they get. It makes no economic sense. Prices are fixed based on what the milk goes into and where it comes from.

Mr. Speaker, if the Russians are willing to let the market set the price of milk in Moscow, maybe we should try it in Minnesota.

WILL CHINESE ESPIONAGE SCANDAL BE DISMISSED?

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

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, on March 19th of this year, the President stated, in response to a question, ''To the best of my knowledge, no one has said anything to me about any espionage which occurred by the Chinese against the labs, during my presidency.''

Sorry, to have to ask this, but is that true? Chinese espionage was discovered in 1995.

Was the President not briefed on this in 1995?

Did no one tell him in 1996?

Was the President not told about this in 1997?

During all of 1998, did no one brief the President about these extremely grave matters?

Did the President not read the November 1998 report on Chinese espionage at the Energy Department labs?

Did the President not see the Cox report delivered to him in January of this year?

Did he forget that, in fact, he had been briefed about the most serious espionage case since the Rosenbergs many, many times?

Why the denial?

Will the other side simply dismiss this scandal too, saying, ''Hey, everybody lies about national security''?

INTRODUCTION OF SCHOOL SAFETY HOTLINE ACT OF 1999

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

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today not to talk about the horrible tragedies of the Columbine shootings, though they linger in all of our minds. Rather I would like to speak of the good that has come from the ashes of this horrid event.

All around my home community of Littleton, Colorado, we have seen a spirit of coming together. In Littleton our churches have been crowded to the walls with those turning to their faith for answers. Across my district, people of all colors, classes and backgrounds have embraced in the comfort of a mutual loss.

Unfortunately, many children still do not feel safe to go to school. As the school year ends, attendance rates across the district are still horribly low. Students and parents feel helpless in controlling the safety of their learning environment.

In Denver, on Friday, we announced another coming together. We brought together leaders from business, State and local governments into a partnership to create the School Safety Hotline, an anonymous hotline for students, parents and teachers to report violent or threatening behavior to authorities.

It is my sincere hope that this initiative will give our students a sense they can control the safety of their environment by calling in to report threatening behavior. For that reason, I would like to offer the School Safety Hotline Act of 1999.

This bill will allow state and local agencies all across the country to apply for federal grants to help create and maintain public-private partnership hotlines similar to ours in Colorado. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to encourage all of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to support this modest, but important, legislation. I ask my colleagues to use this legislation as the first step to reach out to your own community and business leaders, so that we may give back to our young students the feeling that they can do something to ensure a safe and healthy learning environment.

WHY IS ADMINISTRATION DENYING KNOWLEDGE OF NUCLEAR ESPIONAGE

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I am very disturbed today. If we go back to, I guess, the 1976 presidential debates between President Ford and President Carter, one of the questions asked of Jimmy Carter was what he thought was the biggest issue, at which point he quoted his daughter, Amy, and said, ''nuclear war.''

Well, I am here to say Amy Carter was right, nuclear war is, because we are giving nuclear warheads and secrets to China, which has not exactly been our staunchest ally over the years.

The W–88, which is one of the most powerful nuclear warheads in history, is now in the hands of the Chinese Communists despite the fact that the Deputy Intelligence Security Officer at the Department of Energy, as long as 3 years ago, warned the administration this was going on.

Sandy Berger, National Security Adviser, was told in April 1996. The President was informed July 1997. The President was informed again in November 1998, and then in January this year. And yet, as late as March, he was denying it and saying nothing happened on his watch.

There are two big issues here: Number one, what happened? Which should scare the death out of any American. And number two is, why did the administration deny this? This is not a partisan debate. This is a scary debate. And I was glad when Democrat liberal Senator TORRICELLI called for the resignation of Janet Reno.

It is time for bipartisan support, and I hope the Democrats will join us on this one because America and America's children depend on it.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 8, rule XX, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken later today.

MISSING, EXPLOITED, AND RUNAWAY CHILDREN PROTECTION ACT

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 249) to provide funding for the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 249

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 ''Missing, Exploited, and Runaway Children Protection Act''.

SEC. 2. NATIONAL CENTER FOR MISSING AND EXPLOITED CHILDREN.

(a) FINDINGS.—Section 402 of the Missing Children's Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5771) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (7), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (8), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(9) for 14 years, the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children has—

''(A) served as the national resource center and clearinghouse congressionally mandated under the provisions of the Missing Children's Assistance Act of 1984; and

''(B) worked in partnership with the Department of Justice, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Department of the Treasury, the Department of State, and many other agencies in the effort to find missing children and prevent child victimization;

''(10) Congress has given the Center, which is a private non-profit corporation, access to the National Crime Information Center of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the National Law Enforcement Telecommunications System;

''(11) since 1987, the Center has operated the National Child Pornography Tipline, in conjunction with the United States Customs Service and the United States Postal Inspection Service and, beginning this year, the Center established a new CyberTipline on child exploitation, thus becoming 'the 911 for the Internet';

''(12) in light of statistics that time is of the essence in cases of child abduction, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in February of 1997 created a new NCIC child abduction ('CA') flag to provide the Center immediate notification in the most serious cases, resulting in 642 'CA' notifications to the Center and helping the Center to have its highest recovery rate in history;

''(13) the Center has established a national and increasingly worldwide network, linking the Center online with each of the missing children clearinghouses operated by the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, as well as with Scotland Yard in the United Kingdom, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, INTERPOL headquarters in Lyon, France, and others, which has enabled the Center to transmit images and information regarding missing children to law enforcement across the United States and around the world instantly;

''(14) from its inception in 1984 through March 31, 1998, the Center has—

''(A) handled 1,203,974 calls through its 24-hour toll-free hotline (1–800–THE–LOST) and currently averages 700 calls per day;

''(B) trained 146,284 law enforcement, criminal and juvenile justice, and healthcare professionals in child sexual exploitation and missing child case detection, identification, investigation, and prevention;

''(C) disseminated 15,491,344 free publications to citizens and professionals; and

''(D) worked with law enforcement on the cases of 59,481 missing children, resulting in the recovery of 40,180 children;

''(15) the demand for the services of the Center is growing dramatically, as evidenced by the fact that in 1997, the Center handled 129,100 calls, an all-time record, and by the fact that its new Internet website (www.missingkids.com) receives 1,500,000 'hits' every day, and is linked with hundreds of other websites to provide real-time images of breaking cases of missing children;

''(16) in 1997, the Center provided policy training to 256 police chiefs and sheriffs from 50 States and Guam at its new Jimmy Ryce Law Enforcement Training Center;

''(17) the programs of the Center have had a remarkable impact, such as in the fight against infant abductions in partnership with the healthcare industry, during which the Center has performed 668 onsite hospital walk-throughs and inspections, and trained 45,065 hospital administrators, nurses, and security personnel, and thereby helped to reduce infant abductions in the United States by 82 percent;

''(18) the Center is now playing a significant role in international child abduction cases, serving as a representative of the Department of State at cases under The Hague Convention, and successfully resolving the cases of 343 international child abductions, and providing greater support to parents in the United States;

''(19) the Center is a model of public/private partnership, raising private sector funds to match congressional appropriations and receiving extensive private in-kind support, including advanced technology provided by the computer industry such as imaging technology used to age the photographs of long-term missing children and to reconstruct facial images of unidentified deceased children;

''(20) the Center was 1 of only 10 of 300 major national charities given an A+ grade in 1997 by the American Institute of Philanthropy; and

''(21) the Center has been redesignated as the Nation's missing children clearinghouse and resource center once every 3 years through a competitive selection process conducted by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention of the Department of Justice, and has received grants from that Office to conduct the crucial purposes of the Center.''.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Section 403 of the Missing Children's Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5772) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) the term 'Center' means the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.''.

(c) DUTIES AND FUNCTIONS OF THE ADMINISTRATOR.—Section 404 of the Missing Children's Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5773) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(2) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

''(b) ANNUAL GRANT TO NATIONAL CENTER FOR MISSING AND EXPLOITED CHILDREN.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall annually make a grant to the Center, which shall be used to—

''(A)(i) operate a national 24-hour toll-free telephone line by which individuals may report information regarding the location of any missing child, or other child 13 years of age or younger whose whereabouts are unknown to such child's legal custodian, and request information pertaining to procedures necessary to reunite such child with such child's legal custodian; and

''(ii) coordinate the operation of such telephone line with the operation of the national communications system referred to in part C of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5714–11);

''(B) operate the official national resource center and information clearinghouse for missing and exploited children;

''(C) provide to State and local governments, public and private nonprofit agencies, and individuals, information regarding—

''(i) free or low-cost legal, restaurant, lodging, and transportation services that are available for the benefit of missing and exploited children and their families; and

''(ii) the existence and nature of programs being carried out by Federal agencies to assist missing and exploited children and their families;

''(D) coordinate public and private programs that locate, recover, or reunite missing children with their families;

''(E) disseminate, on a national basis, information relating to innovative and model programs, services, and legislation that benefit missing and exploited children;

''(F) provide technical assistance and training to law enforcement agencies, State and local governments, elements of the criminal justice system, public and private nonprofit agencies, and individuals in the prevention, investigation, prosecution, and treatment of cases involving missing and exploited children; and

''(G) provide assistance to families and law enforcement agencies in locating and recovering missing and exploited children, both nationally and internationally.

''(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator to carry out this subsection,

$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003.

''(c) NATIONAL INCIDENCE STUDIES.—The Administrator, either by making grants to or entering into contracts with public agencies or nonprofit private agencies, shall—

''(1) periodically conduct national incidence studies to determine for a given year the actual number of children reported missing each year, the number of children who are victims of abduction by strangers, the number of children who are the victims of parental kidnapings, and the number of children who are recovered each year; and

''(2) provide to State and local governments, public and private nonprofit agencies, and individuals information to facilitate the lawful use of school records and birth certificates to identify and locate missing children.''.

(d) NATIONAL CENTER FOR MISSING AND EXPLOITED CHILDREN.—Section 405(a) of the Missing Children's Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5775(a)) is amended by inserting ''the Center and with'' before ''public agencies''.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 408 of the Missing Children's Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5777) is amended by striking ''1997 through 2001'' and inserting ''2000 through 2003''.

SEC. 3. RUNAWAY AND HOMELESS YOUTH.

(a) FINDINGS.—Section 302 of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5701) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking ''accurate reporting of the problem nationally and to develop'' and inserting ''an accurate national reporting system to report the problem, and to assist in the development of''; and

(2) by striking paragraph (8) and inserting the following:

''(8) services for runaway and homeless youth are needed in urban, suburban, and rural areas;''.

(b) AUTHORITY TO MAKE GRANTS FOR CENTERS AND SERVICES.—Section 311 of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5711) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

''(a) GRANTS FOR CENTERS AND SERVICES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall make grants to public and nonprofit private entities (and combinations of such entities) to establish and operate (including renovation) local centers to provide services for runaway and homeless youth and for the families of such youth.

''(2) SERVICES PROVIDED.—Services provided under paragraph (1)—

''(A) shall be provided as an alternative to involving runaway and homeless youth in the law enforcement, child welfare, mental health, and juvenile justice systems;

''(B) shall include—

''(i) safe and appropriate shelter; and

''(ii) individual, family, and group counseling, as appropriate; and

''(C) may include—

''(i) street-based services;

''(ii) home-based services for families with youth at risk of separation from the family; and

''(iii) drug abuse education and prevention services.'';

(2) in subsection (b)(2), by striking ''the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands,''; and

(3) by striking subsections (c) and (d).

(c) ELIGIBILITY.—Section 312 of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5712) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (8), by striking ''paragraph (6)'' and inserting ''paragraph (7)'';

(B) in paragraph (10), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(C) in paragraph (11), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(12) shall submit to the Secretary an annual report that includes, with respect to the year for which the report is submitted—

''(A) information regarding the activities carried out under this part;

''(B) the achievements of the project under this part carried out by the applicant; and

''(C) statistical summaries describing—

''(i) the number and the characteristics of the runaway and homeless youth, and youth at risk of family separation, who participate in the project; and

''(ii) the services provided to such youth by the project.''; and

(2) by striking subsections (c) and (d) and inserting the following:

''(c) APPLICANTS PROVIDING STREET-BASED SERVICES.—To be eligible to use assistance under section 311(a)(2)(C)(i) to provide street-based services, the applicant shall include in the plan required by subsection (b) assurances that in providing such services the applicant will—

''(1) provide qualified supervision of staff, including on-street supervision by appropriately trained staff;

''(2) provide backup personnel for on-street staff;

''(3) provide initial and periodic training of staff who provide such services; and

''(4) conduct outreach activities for runaway and homeless youth, and street youth.

''(d) APPLICANTS PROVIDING HOME-BASED SERVICES.—To be eligible to use assistance under section 311(a) to provide home-based services described in section 311(a)(2)(C)(ii), an applicant shall include in the plan required by subsection (b) assurances that in providing such services the applicant will—

''(1) provide counseling and information to youth and the families (including unrelated individuals in the family households) of such youth, including services relating to basic life skills, interpersonal skill building, educational advancement, job attainment skills, mental and physical health care, parenting skills, financial planning, and referral to sources of other needed services;

''(2) provide directly, or through an arrangement made by the applicant, 24-hour service to respond to family crises (including immediate access to temporary shelter for runaway and homeless youth, and youth at risk of separation from the family);

''(3) establish, in partnership with the families of runaway and homeless youth, and youth at risk of separation from the family, objectives and measures of success to be achieved as a result of receiving home-based services;

''(4) provide initial and periodic training of staff who provide home-based services; and

''(5) ensure that—

''(A) caseloads will remain sufficiently low to allow for intensive (5 to 20 hours per week) involvement with each family receiving such services; and

''(B) staff providing such services will receive qualified supervision.

''(e) APPLICANTS PROVIDING DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION AND PREVENTION SERVICES.—To be eligible to use assistance under section 311(a)(2)(C)(iii) to provide drug abuse education and prevention services, an applicant shall include in the plan required by subsection (b)—

''(1) a description of—

''(A) the types of such services that the applicant proposes to provide;

''(B) the objectives of such services; and

''(C) the types of information and training to be provided to individuals providing such services to runaway and homeless youth; and

''(2) an assurance that in providing such services the applicant shall conduct outreach activities for runaway and homeless youth.''.

(d) APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS.—Section 313 of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5713) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 313. APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—An application by a public or private entity for a grant under section 311(a) may be approved by the Secretary after taking into consideration, with respect to the State in which such entity proposes to provide services under this part—

''(1) the geographical distribution in such State of the proposed services under this part for which all grant applicants request approval; and

''(2) which areas of such State have the greatest need for such services.

''(b) PRIORITY.—In selecting applications for grants under section 311(a), the Secretary shall give priority to—

''(1) eligible applicants who have demonstrated experience in providing services to runaway and homeless youth; and

''(2) eligible applicants that request grants of less than $200,000.''.

(e) AUTHORITY FOR TRANSITIONAL LIVING GRANT PROGRAM.—Section 321 of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5714–1) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking ''PURPOSE AND'';

(2) in subsection (a), by striking ''(a)''; and

(3) by striking subsection (b).

(f) ELIGIBILITY.—Section 322(a)(9) of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5714–2(a)(9)) is amended by inserting '', and the services provided to such youth by such project,'' after ''such project''.

(g) COORDINATION.—Section 341 of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5714–21) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 341. COORDINATION.

''With respect to matters relating to the health, education, employment, and housing of runaway and homeless youth, the Secretary—

''(1) in conjunction with the Attorney General, shall coordinate the activities of agencies of the Department of Health and Human Services with activities under any other Federal juvenile crime control, prevention, and juvenile offender accountability program and with the activities of other Federal entities; and

''(2) shall coordinate the activities of agencies of the Department of Health and Human Services with the activities of other Federal entities and with the activities of entities that are eligible to receive grants under this title.''.

(h) AUTHORITY TO MAKE GRANTS FOR RESEARCH, EVALUATION, DEMONSTRATION, AND SERVICE PROJECTS.—Section 343 of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5714–23) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by inserting ''EVALUATION,'' after ''RESEARCH,'';

(2) in subsection (a), by inserting ''evaluation,'' after ''research,''; and

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking paragraph (2); and

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (10) as paragraphs (2) through (9), respectively.

(i) STUDY.—Part D of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5731 et seq.) is amended by adding after section 344 the following:

''SEC. 345. STUDY

''The Secretary shall conduct a study of a representative sample of runaways to determine the percent who leave home because of sexual abuse. The report on the study shall include—

''(1) in the case of sexual abuse , the relationship of the assaulter to the runaway; and

''(2) recommendations on how Federal laws may be changed to reduce sexual assaults on children.

The study shall be completed to enable the Secretary to make a report to the committees of Congress with jurisdiction over this Act, and to make such report available to the public, within one year of the date of the enactment of this section.''

(j) ASSISTANCE TO POTENTIAL GRANTEES.—Section 371 of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5714a) is amended by striking the last sentence.

(k) REPORTS.—Section 381 of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5715) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 381. REPORTS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than April 1, 2000, and biennially thereafter, the Secretary shall submit, to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, a report on the status, activities, and accomplishments of entities that receive grants under parts A, B, C, D, and E, with particular attention to—

''(1) in the case of centers funded under part A, the ability or effectiveness of such centers in—

''(A) alleviating the problems of runaway and homeless youth;

''(B) if applicable or appropriate, reuniting such youth with their families and encouraging the resolution of intrafamily problems through counseling and other services;

''(C) strengthening family relationships and encouraging stable living conditions for such youth; and

''(D) assisting such youth to decide upon a future course of action; and

''(2) in the case of projects funded under part B—

''(A) the number and characteristics of homeless youth served by such projects;

''(B) the types of activities carried out by such projects;

''(C) the effectiveness of such projects in alleviating the problems of homeless youth;

''(D) the effectiveness of such projects in preparing homeless youth for self-sufficiency;

''(E) the effectiveness of such projects in assisting homeless youth to decide upon future education, employment, and independent living;

''(F) the ability of such projects to encourage the resolution of intrafamily problems through counseling and development of self-sufficient living skills; and

''(G) activities and programs planned by such projects for the following fiscal year.

''(b) CONTENTS OF REPORTS.—The Secretary shall include in each report submitted under subsection (a), summaries of—

''(1) the evaluations performed by the Secretary under section 386; and

''(2) descriptions of the qualifications of, and training provided to, individuals involved in carrying out such evaluations.''.

(l) EVALUATION.—Section 384 of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5732) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 386. EVALUATION AND INFORMATION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—If a grantee receives grants for 3 consecutive fiscal years under part A, B, C, D, or E (in the alternative), then the Secretary shall evaluate such grantee on-site, not less frequently than once in the period of such 3 consecutive fiscal years, for purposes of—

''(1) determining whether such grants are being used for the purposes for which such grants are made by the Secretary;

''(2) collecting additional information for the report required by section 384; and

''(3) providing such information and assistance to such grantee as will enable such grantee to improve the operation of the centers, projects, and activities for which such grants are made.

''(b) COOPERATION.—Recipients of grants under this title shall cooperate with the Secretary's efforts to carry out evaluations, and to collect information, under this title.''.

(m) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 385 of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5751) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 388. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—

''(1) AUTHORIZATION.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title (other than part E) such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003.

''(2) ALLOCATION.—

''(A) PARTS A AND B.—From the amount appropriated under paragraph (1) for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall reserve not less than 90 percent to carry out parts A and B.

''(B) PART B.—Of the amount reserved under subparagraph (A), not less than 20 percent, and not more than 30 percent, shall be reserved to carry out part B.

''(3) PARTS C AND D.—In each fiscal year, after reserving the amounts required by paragraph (2), the Secretary shall use the remaining amount (if any) to carry out parts C and D.

''(b) SEPARATE IDENTIFICATION REQUIRED.—No funds appropriated to carry out this title may be combined with funds appropriated under any other Act if the purpose of combining such funds is to make a single discretionary grant, or a single discretionary payment, unless such funds are separately identified in all grants and contracts and are used for the purposes specified in this title.''.

(n) SEXUAL ABUSE PREVENTION PROGRAM.—

(1) AUTHORITY FOR PROGRAM.—The Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5701 et seq.) is amended—

(A) by striking the heading for part F;

(B) by redesignating part E as part F; and

(C) by inserting after part D the following:

''PART E—SEXUAL ABUSE PREVENTION PROGRAM

''SEC. 351. AUTHORITY TO MAKE GRANTS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may make grants to nonprofit private agencies for the purpose of providing street-based services to runaway and homeless, and street youth, who have been subjected to, or are at risk of being subjected to, sexual abuse, prostitution, or sexual exploitation.

''(b) PRIORITY.—In selecting applicants to receive grants under subsection (a), the Secretary shall give priority to nonprofit private agencies that have experience in providing services to runaway and homeless, and street youth.''.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 388(a) of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5751), as amended by subsection (m) of this section, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(4) PART E.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out part E such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003.''.

(o) CONSOLIDATED REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS.—The Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5701 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 383 the following:

''SEC. 385. CONSOLIDATED REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS.

''With respect to funds available to carry out parts A, B, C, D, and E, nothing in this title shall be construed to prohibit the Secretary from—

''(1) announcing, in a single announcement, the availability of funds for grants under 2 or more of such parts; and

''(2) reviewing applications for grants under 2 or more of such parts in a single, consolidated application review process.''.

(p) DEFINITIONS.—The Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5701 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 386, as amended by subsection (*l*) of this section, the following:

''SEC. 387. DEFINITIONS.

''In this title:

''(1) DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION AND PREVENTION SERVICES.—The term 'drug abuse education and prevention services'—

''(A) means services to runaway and homeless youth to prevent or reduce the illicit use of drugs by such youth; and

''(B) may include—

''(i) individual, family, group, and peer counseling;

''(ii) drop-in services;

''(iii) assistance to runaway and homeless youth in rural areas (including the development of community support groups);

''(iv) information and training relating to the illicit use of drugs by runaway and homeless youth, to individuals involved in providing services to such youth; and

''(v) activities to improve the availability of local drug abuse prevention services to runaway and homeless youth.

''(2) HOME-BASED SERVICES.—The term 'home-based services'—

''(A) means services provided to youth and their families for the purpose of—

''(i) preventing such youth from running away, or otherwise becoming separated, from their families; and

''(ii) assisting runaway youth to return to their families; and

''(B) includes services that are provided in the residences of families (to the extent practicable), including—

''(i) intensive individual and family counseling; and

''(ii) training relating to life skills and parenting.

''(3) HOMELESS YOUTH.—The term 'homeless youth' means an individual—

''(A) who is—

''(i) not more than 21 years of age; and

''(ii) for the purposes of part B, not less than 16 years of age;

''(B) for whom it is not possible to live in a safe environment with a relative; and

''(C) who has no other safe alternative living arrangement.

''(4) STREET-BASED SERVICES.—The term 'street-based services'—

''(A) means services provided to runaway and homeless youth, and street youth, in areas where they congregate, designed to assist such youth in making healthy personal choices regarding where they live and how they behave; and

''(B) may include—

''(i) identification of and outreach to runaway and homeless youth, and street youth;

''(ii) crisis intervention and counseling;

''(iii) information and referral for housing;

''(iv) information and referral for transitional living and health care services;

''(v) advocacy, education, and prevention services related to—

''(I) alcohol and drug abuse;

''(II) sexual exploitation;

''(III) sexually transmitted diseases, including human immunodeficiency virus (HIV); and

''(IV) physical and sexual assault.

''(5) STREET YOUTH.—The term 'street youth' means an individual who—

''(A) is—

''(i) a runaway youth; or

''(ii) indefinitely or intermittently a homeless youth; and

''(B) spends a significant amount of time on the street or in other areas that increase the risk to such youth for sexual abuse, sexual exploitation, prostitution, or drug abuse.

''(6) TRANSITIONAL LIVING YOUTH PROJECT.—The term 'transitional living youth project' means a project that provides shelter and

services designed to promote a transition to self-sufficient living and to prevent long-term dependency on social services.

''(7) YOUTH AT RISK OF SEPARATION FROM THE FAMILY.—The term 'youth at risk of separation from the family' means an individual—

''(A) who is less than 18 years of age; and

''(B)(i) who has a history of running away from the family of such individual;

''(ii) whose parent, guardian, or custodian is not willing to provide for the basic needs of such individual; or

''(iii) who is at risk of entering the child welfare system or juvenile justice system as a result of the lack of services available to the family to meet such needs.''.

(q) REDESIGNATION OF SECTIONS.—Sections 371, 372, 381, 382, and 383 of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5714b–5851 et seq.), as amended by this Act, are redesignated as sections 380, 381, 382, 383, and 384, respectively.

(r) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—The Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5701 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 331, in the first sentence, by striking ''With'' and all that follows through ''the Secretary'', and inserting ''The Secretary''; and

(2) in section 344(a)(1), by striking ''With'' and all that follows through ''the Secretary'', and inserting ''The Secretary''.

SEC. 4. STUDY OF SCHOOL VIOLENCE.

(a) CONTRACT FOR STUDY.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Education shall enter into a contract with the National Academy of Sciences for the purposes of conducting a study regarding the antecedents of school violence in urban, suburban, and rural schools, including the incidents of school violence that occurred in Pearl, Mississippi; Paducah, Kentucky; Jonesboro, Arkansas; Springfield, Oregon; Edinboro, Pennsylvania; Fayetteville, Tennessee; Littleton, Colorado; and Conyers, Georgia. Under the terms of such contract, the National Academy of Sciences shall appoint a panel that will—

(1) review the relevant research about adolescent violence in general and school violence in particular, including the existing longitudinal and cross-sectional studies on youth that are relevant to examining violent behavior,

(2) relate what can be learned from past and current research and surveys to specific incidents of school shootings,

(3) interview relevant individuals, if possible, such as the perpetrators of such incidents, their families, their friends, their teachers, mental health providers, and others, and

(4) give particular attention to such issues as—

(A) the perpetrators' early development, families, communities, school experiences, and utilization of mental health services,

(B) the relationship between perpetrators and their victims,

(C) how the perpetrators gained access to firearms,

(D) the impact of cultural influences and exposure to the media, video games, and the Internet, and

(E) such other issues as the panel deems important or relevant to the purpose of the study.

The National Academy of Sciences shall utilize professionals with expertise in such issues, including psychiatrists, social workers, behavioral and social scientists, practitioners, epidemiologists, statisticians, and methodologists.

(b) REPORT.—The National Academy of Sciences shall submit a report containing the results of the study required by subsection (a), to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Chair and ranking minority Member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives, and the Chair and ranking minority Member of the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate, not later than January 1, 2001, or 18 months after entering into the contract required by such subsection, whichever is earlier.

(c) APPROPRIATION.—Of the funds made available under Public Law 105-277 for the Department of Education, $2.1 million shall be made available to carry out this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Missing, Exploited and Runaway Children's Protection Act. This legislation authorizes the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act and the Missing Children's Assistance Act. It provides an authorization for the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children and it directs the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a study of the cultural influences on youth violence.

Mr. Speaker, this is National Missing Children's Day, and obviously, we have had a great number of hardships in America in recent weeks that all of us want to address. Hopefully, what we are going to do today will in some small part start to address these problems.

This legislation authorizes the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act to provide services for the 0.5 million to 1.5 million youth estimated to run away annually. The legislation continues the runaway and homeless youth programs found in current law, including the basic center grants and the transitional living grants.

These effective programs protect youth by keeping them off the streets, away from criminal activities and out of desperate circumstances. These programs provide assistance to homeless and other youth who are without adult support so they learn to live independently and become productive adults.

This legislation also provides for the continuation of services under the Missing Children's Assistance Act. For instance, this act authorizes grants for research, demonstration projects and service programs in areas such as abduction prevention education.

The provision of this bill that I particularly want to focus my colleagues' attention on is its authorization of an appropriation for the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children helps families who have a missing child locate that child. Since 1984, the Center has worked with law enforcement on the cases of 67,173 missing children, resulting in the recovery of 46,031 children. In 1998 alone, it assisted in finding 5,835 missing children.

The Center works with the families of 80 missing children in my own State of Delaware. The Center services, including its National Missing Child Hotline, are essential to all families of missing children.

Recognizing the Center's substantial success rate in recovering missing children and its annual designation as the national clearinghouse for information on missing children, the legislation authorizes a $10 million yearly appropriation for fiscal years 2000 through 2003 for the Center. This authorization ensures that for the next 4 years the Center can focus on providing assistance to families without interruption.

Some of my colleagues may remember that I have been working to get this legislation passed since the 105th Congress. I am pleased we are one step closer to completing this effort. The Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, the Missing Children's Assistance Act and the National Center for Missing and Exploited Youth provide much needed services for missing and runaway youth.

Finally, I would like to mention an important study contained in this legislation. As Members may know, my subcommittee has held hearings on the issue of school violence in response to the tragic shootings that have traumatized our Nation's schools. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD), an active member of the subcommittee, has crafted legislation to help us obtain information on why students commit such violent acts.

A great deal of blame has been spread around, and I believe it is important that we really understand the causal factors that place youth at risk for school violence.

Before I conclude, I would like to thank several Members for their assistance on this legislation. I would like to thank the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING). I would also like to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), who will be managing the bill on the opposite side of the aisle, as well as the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), for their hard work on the school violence study.

Mr. Speaker, this is good legislation and it deserves the support of the House of Representatives. The Senate has already passed comparable legislation. We would like to pass our legislation and proceed to conference as quickly as possible. It has been far too long that these important programs have been without an authorization.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, S. 249, the Missing, Exploited and Runaway Children Protection Act makes vital improvements to the National Center for Missing and

Exploited Children and the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act and deserves the strong support of all the Members here today.

This legislation will streamline and refocus the existing basic Center grants, the transitional living grants and the drug education program into one reauthorization, while maintaining the distinct nature of each program. I believe this is an essential improvement that will strengthen the ability of localities to provide services to the vulnerable populations of runaway and homeless children.

Mr. Speaker, S. 249 also requires a National Academy of Sciences study to examine which factors contribute to violence around and in our schools. This study will better enable us to understand what leads our young people to commit such tragic acts as those in Littleton, Colorado, and other places that have shared the unfortunate experience of having school violence touch its teachers, parents, students and communities.

This study, which has been a cooperative effort between the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), and myself is necessary so we can gain a better understanding of the profile of those most likely to commit violence and provide them with appropriate interventions and supportive services.

It is my hope we can constructively use the results of this study to lessen the violence which presently is troubling our schools.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this legislation is worthy of Members' support, and I urge its adoption.

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

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

□ 1045

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

I, too, rise in support of the Missing, Exploited and Runaway Children's Protection Act. The programs and activities under this legislation aim to improve the well-being of our Nation's runaway, homeless, and missing children. This legislation authorizes the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act. And one program under this Act is the Transitional Living Project for ages 16 to 21, children who cannot safely live at home.

I share the enthusiasm of the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) for the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. The Center has trained at least 42 law enforcement officers in Pennsylvania on how best to handle missing children's cases, a service available to law enforcement officers across the country.

Additionally, on its web site and through other avenues, the Center provides actual photographs of missing children along with age progression computerized images of the missing children. Currently, the Center's web site includes a photograph and computerized image of 51 missing children from Pennsylvania. I must commend the Center on its extraordinary success rate in finding missing children.

Another key provision of the legislation will address an issue that has weighed heavily on our minds over the past few months. In a hearing held by the Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Youth and Families last week, we heard firsthand testimony from students who have been the victims of violent acts in their schools. We heard loud and clear the fear in their voices and their concerns about future violence in their schools.

But we still have no clear answers to the core casual factors of school violence. This legislation includes a study to be performed by the National Academy of Science which will explore the causes of school violence. Information gathered through this study will help us to improve the effectiveness of our current violence prevention efforts.

I would like to thank members of the committee for their hard work and their staffs, particularly the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) for his leadership. Also, I would like to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) for their guidance on the School Science Study. The result is a quality piece of legislation.

I encourage my colleagues to support the legislation.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY).

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the House amendments to the Missing, Exploited and Runaway Children's Protection Act. I want to thank the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce for their bipartisan work on this legislation.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) for his excellent work as a sponsor of this legislation and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), my dear colleague.

The bill before us today provides the resources for families to deal with the terrible issue of missing, exploited and runaway children. The National Center for Missing, Exploited and Runaway Children operates a National Resource Center and a toll-free hot line to provide assistance to state and local governments in finding missing children and preventing the exploitation of children.

I believe this is important, Mr. Speaker. This legislation utilizes all of our law enforcement and child services tools once a child is missing, but the legislation also is designed to prevent the terrible occurrence of a missing, exploited or runaway child. I am glad that we are addressing this bill today.

In the last 6 weeks, I have had a personal experience. I got a call late one Saturday night and it was my girlfriend of over 30 years. She said, ''Carolyn, I do not know what I am going to do. My daughter's two children have been kidnapped.''

With that, I gave her the information, only because I have learned about this through Congress. I gave her the phone numbers to call. And within hours, the photos of the missing children were put out across this country. I am happy to say that one child has been recovered. The other one is still missing. But with all the resources coming together, I am grateful that we, hopefully, will find the other child.

Also, since being in Congress, one of the provisions of this bill is also helping with children that have nowhere else to go. I have been privileged to meet and work with a number of groups on Long Island; and I have to tell my colleagues, I was shocked on how many homeless children we have just on Long Island.

We have found that we can give them shelter. We have found that we can give them training. We have found that they turn their lives around and become productive citizens. This is something that really helps our children across this Nation. It is something that we should be working on more and more. It shows, when we work together, we can make a difference here in Congress.

I am glad that we are addressing this bill today, and I urge my colleagues to support this important bill. I thank the Committee on Education and the Workforce for their bipartisan work.

I believe the true measure of our Government's efficiency can be found in the way we treat our children, the extent to which we protect our children. The legislation before us today demonstrates there is an important role in protecting our children and saving our children's lives. I thank everyone for the work that they have done, and may we continue to do this.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD), another distinguished gentleman from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania who has worked hard in the Congress of the United States on the issues of children.

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

Mr. Speaker, I also rise in support of the Missing, Exploited and Runaway Children's Protection Act; and I do so with a deep sense of gratitude. As a former caseworker who worked with abused and neglected children, I understand the importance of this legislation.

I would like to focus my remarks on that part that I worked on, and that is the study that we are asking the National Academy of Science to conduct with regard to school violence.

Mr. Speaker, the Nation has been horrified and people have been saddened and perplexed and to some extent we have been divided over the issues of these school shootings. America asks the question, ''Why? Why would children take firearms to their schools and shoot their classmates and shoot their teachers?'' America then quickly responds with the command, ''Do something. Somebody do something.'' And, as policymakers, that is part of our responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I think, for the most part, the short-term efforts to prevent school violence must be community based and they must be school based and they must be home based. But there are some things that the Congress can do and there are things that we need to do in terms of a long-run strategy.

This legislation will direct the National Academy of Sciences to do a study on the antecedents of school violence. Researchers, the best social scientists and child psychologists that we can gather in this country, will literally travel to Pearl, Mississippi, to Paducah, Kentucky, to Jonesboro, Arkansas, to Springfield, Oregon, to Edinboro, Pennsylvania, to Fayetteville, Tennessee, indeed to Littleton, Colorado; and, regretfully, most recently we have had to amend this language to include Conyers, Georgia.

The scientists will interview, when they can, the perpetrators, the actual shooters. They will interview their parents, their siblings, their neighbors, their classmates, their teachers, their guidance counselors, any professionals that have dealt with these young people, to try to find out what were the early childhood experiences of these kids, what were their school experiences, what were the relationships between the perpetrators and the victims, how did the perpetrators gain access to firearms, and what were the impact of cultural influences and exposure to the media, video games and the Internet.

They will report back to America about their findings. And, hopefully, in a sober and thoughtful and disciplined way, America will understand how some of our communities impacted some of our children in ways that made them so inexplicably violent.

Mr. Speaker, it is my experience that the left-most of our political spectrum tends to look at this issue and turn immediately and almost exclusively to guns and the right-most of our political spectrum tends to look exclusively at the cultural impacts.

It is my belief that we need to look at the children. We need to understand how our children are affected by experiences in their home, in their schools and in their communities and how we as a society can value our children more than we do so that all of our children are uplifted by our actions.

I would like to thank the chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), for his help and cooperation with this. I would like to thank the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and the Speaker for his condolences, his help as well.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KLINK).

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I think a lot of good work has been done on this bill; and I would like to laud Members on both sides of the aisle for this work.

The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children is a private, non-Federal corporation that was founded back in 1984; and they have helped over the last 15 years to recover over 40,000 missing children. I first worked with them back in 1985. They were one year in existence at that time. And I was a news reporter working back in Pennsylvania.

One afternoon after getting off the school bus near the town of Cabot, Pennsylvania, 8-year-old Cherrie Mahan disappeared, never to be seen or heard from again. There was a police bulletin which went out, went all over the Nation, looking for a van with a ski scene on the side. That is what they believed the people were driving who they thought abducted Cherrie.

That was never proven. The van was never found. But a very quiet, rural community was upended. The family was upended. This 8-year-old girl had just gotten off the bus on her way home, never to be seen, never to be heard from again. Where do they look? Where do they turn to?

And finally, the people from that community found the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. People in the community worked together. They searched. They looked for clues. They put out every kind of feeler they could trying to find out who knew about this young girl's abduction. And they collected money for a reward. All told, they collected from their hard-earned dollars $58,000.

Last October, when it was determined that Cherrie was not going to come back and she was declared legally dead, that $58,000 was presented by me along with those people, the friends and neighbors of Cherrie Mahan, a $58,000 check, to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children so that that money could be used as a resource to help establish computer networks across this country to find runaway kids, to find kids who have been abducted, and to help fight against violence in our schools.

In return, the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children gave an $8,000 TRAC system, called Technology to Recover Abducted Kids, back to the Butler State Police Barracks in Butler, Pennsylvania. And they hoped that if they ever have to see another sad situation like the tragic disappearance of Cherrie Mahan, that the community will be better prepared, that they will be better armed with this new technology, and that we in the Federal Government can be a partner in that, making sure that the resources are there so that the sadness that the Mahan family has had to live with will never be felt by other families across this Nation.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this measure, S. 249, focuses on the terrible problem confronting all too many American families: missing, exploited and runaway children. I commend the sponsors of the House and Senate resolution, the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) and the distinguished senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), for their diligence in bringing it to the Congress.

As a parent, few things can be more painful than the uncertainty and anxiety that arises when a child becomes missing. The void of not having a loved one present, plus the fear and anxiety of what that loved one may be undergoing, are cruel hardships that no one should ever have to endure.

Although this measure focuses primarily upon the domestic aspect of this problem and improves the way our Government addresses the problems that may be associated with missing or exploited children, I want to highlight an issue that I have become increasingly involved with, the problem of internationally abducted children.

In an interdependent world, we are finding American citizens often marrying and having children with foreign nationals and a corresponding increase in the number of children that are taken to or illegally retained in another country.

This measure highlights the excellent work of our National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. I join in commending that organization and add my voice to those who feel that the role of NCMEC should be straightened in the cases of international parental abductions. Our citizens deserve an able advocate for their rights as parents, and I am confident that NCMEC is the appropriate organization to serve this vital function.

There are efforts underway in some parts of our Government to curtail NCMEC's role in assisting our citizens recover their illegally abducted or wrongfully retained children from other countries. I urge that all supporters of this measure exercise their vigilance to make certain that does not

occur. Our citizens who are victims of child abduction deserve to have an organization such as the NCMEC to support them.

I thank the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) for his courtesy in yielding, and I urge our colleagues to fully approve S. 249 on behalf of our missing, exploited and runaway children.

□ 1045

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON).

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding me this time.

First, I would like to associate my remarks with those of the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) regarding his work with the international effort to return children who are taken from our country, and I look forward to working with the gentleman from New York on that issue.

I rise today to encourage all of my colleagues to cast their votes in favor of S. 249, the Missing, Exploited, and Runaway Children Protection Act. Two years ago when I first joined all of you in Congress, I wanted to address all of the problems that we face here, education, Social Security and health care. But unfortunately in April, right after my first swearing-in, all of my plans drastically changed when a 12-year-old little girl, Laura Kate Smither from Friendswood, Texas, was abducted and savagely murdered. After seeing the faces of the Smither family and the outpouring of support from the community of Friendswood, I knew that I wanted to work on behalf of our children and their families.

After meeting Ernie Allen, the President of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, and his dedicated staff, I decided to work diligently to establish the first-ever Congressional Missing and Exploited Children's Caucus with my colleagues the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CRAMER) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANKS) to provide a unified and loud voice for missing and exploited children here in Congress.

I am pleased to report, as of today, this bipartisan caucus now has 126 members. We work on legislation to impose tougher penalties on those who commit sexual offenses against children and to make sure our communities are notified when convicted sex offenders move into their neighborhoods.

The caucus would not be nearly as effective in producing innovative legislation and helpful district safety workshops without the advice and programs offered at the National Center. The Center's outreach programs help chiefs of police and sheriffs to develop fast response plans through the Jimmy Ryce Law Enforcement Training Program, to comb neighborhoods and streets for our children who have been reported as missing. The Center also focuses its educational outreach programs toward children who can learn how to protect themselves from the dangers that they face in today's world. I am proud to have helped the Center unveil a nationwide program called ''Know the Rules.'' It was a public service campaign that was started here in Washington just a couple of years ago.

''Know the Rules'' is a set of simple rules all children, but especially teenage girls between the ages of 12 and 17, should use in their everyday lives to build self-esteem and to help them escape potentially dangerous situations.

I have two daughters and will become a grandfather for the first time in November. I am convinced that funding the National Center is as good an investment of taxpayer dollars as can be made to ensure the safety of our Nation's children.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of our colleagues from Oregon to Ohio and California to Connecticut to support the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children on this National Missing Children's Day by voting for S. 249.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) who is not only from Colorado, but has been through a difficult 5 weeks living in the shadow of Columbine High School.

Mr. TANCREDO. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill, the Missing, Exploited, and Runaway Children's Act, but more specifically in support of the school violence study that has been referred to here several times.

Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that we have now had to deal with for quite some time, but it has been brought home to us more dramatically in the last few weeks than perhaps anytime in the recent past. That fact is that we are a violent country.

The character of the American people, unfortunately, we have a violent character. The history of this Nation is replete with violence. It is not a good thing that I say but it is unfortunately a true thing.

What is completely unusual, what is not at all to be explained by our history, however, is the violence we see now in schools and with children. Because although we have always had a violent society, the fact is we have never in the history of this country had a situation where children were participants to the extent that they are today in that violent nature.

So something has happened. Something has changed. This is one thing we know for sure, that this is a brand new phenomenon. We have to figure out why this is occurring.

There was a recent study that was a fascinating study I commend to my colleagues. It was done by an individual who works for the armed forces. His task really is to desensitize members of the armed forces to the actual act of killing another human being because, as he says, this is a very difficult thing. People do not do it naturally.

Taking the life of another member of your own species is not natural and you have to work at it. When we do it in the armed forces under controlled circumstances, you use technology to desensitize members of the armed forces to actually taking a life. But that is in a very controlled environment.

What has happened is that some of the same technology that is used by the armed forces, in particular a computerized game called Doom, is a game that is now available to everyone, to youngsters in our society, over the Internet. As a matter of fact, the two shooters in Colorado, Mr. Klebold and Mr. Harris, were compulsive about this game, Doom, were into it to a very great extent.

I do not know whether or not that one thing had everything to do with what happened in Columbine. I do not know how much of an impact it had on what they decided to do. All I do know is this, that something has changed in our society, and we are turning children into killers. We are turning children into individuals without a conscience.

This is new, Mr. Speaker, and this is frightening. We have to find out why this is happening. Therefore, I commend my colleagues on the committee for this bill and specifically for the study on school violence, which I hope will bring to our attention the cause of this new phenomenon.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the bipartisan spirit in which this bill has been written from beginning to end. I think we have a very good bill here. I urge its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER).

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, it is a parent's worst nightmare when you come in from work and you call out your child's name and she does not answer, and you begin to look for her and you cannot find her; and as you begin to search, your apprehension turns to panic and then your concern turns to pure terror.

Unfortunately, that happens in literally thousands of homes in America today. In fact, if you are the parent of an 11-year-old girl, you will be sad to know that that group is the most at risk for murder and abduction in this country today.

Unfortunately, there are so many of the colleagues that could speak today who will name the name of a child who is missing in their community. In my case, her name is Opal Jennings. She is a darling little girl who is missing from our community. Unfortunately, a number have been missing from our community. That is what we are talking about today.

The Missing, Exploited, and Runaway Children Protection Act would do something to help those parents. It would authorize $10 million a year for a period of 5 years for the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. Among other things, this money would help operate a 24-hour toll free telephone line to report those children and public and private programs to locate, recover and hopefully reunite them with their family. This is something that needs to be done, it should have wonderful bipartisan support in this Congress, and it is the least we can do for our children.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I would just point out a couple of things. One, we have spoken to various parts of this legislation, but I think we all in the House of Representatives need to understand the importance and the components of what we are dealing with here. It first authorizes, as I said in my opening, the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act and Missing Children's Assistance Act. It also provides an authorization, which we heard about very eloquently from several speakers for the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children; and it does, as we also heard from the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) and others, direct the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a study of the cultural influences on youth violence.

These things, in and of themselves, may not prevent all the problems of youth in this country, it will not; but it may in some small way start the mending process which we consider to be so important.

I would just like to thank all of those who took the time to come to the floor to speak to this today and all the Members of the House, who I believe will be supportive of what we consider to be very significant legislation to help with these problems.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, organizations like the Center for Missing and Exploited Children should be commended and supported for their work on this critical issue. However, I must oppose this legislation as it is outside the proper Constitutional role for the federal government to spend money in this way; such spending is more appropriate coming from the states and private donations. As always, I am amazed that Members of Congress are so willing to be generous with their constituent's tax dollars, yet do not seem willing to support such causes out of their own pockets.

This legislation would spend more than $268 million on issues that are simply outside the constitutional jurisdiction of the federal government. In addition, legislation like this blurs the lines between public and private funds, and opens good organizations to needless regulatory control for Congress. The legislation even opens the door to public money being used to support sectarian organizations, in direct violation of the First Amendment.

The moral decay of our nation is a serious issue that must be addressed. However, after some forty years of federal meddling in education and other social issues, it is clear politicians on Capitol Hill have made matters worse for our children, not better.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, today is National Missing Children's Day. Fitting enough, today we will also be voting on legislation to help locate missing, exploited and runaway children in our society.

Congress first established Missing Children's Day in 1982 to increase public awareness regarding the thousands of children who disappear each year. Through the hard work of organizations such as the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, I am proud to say that within the past 13 years, more than 35,000 children have been located, many having been saved from child abductions, molestations and sexual exploitation.

Mr. Speaker, it is only fitting that today we will vote on S. 249, The Missing, Exploited and Runaway Children Protection Act. This legislation will provide funds for the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children to meet several of our nation's needs as they work to reunite missing and exploited children and their families.

For parents who have missing children, every day is a struggle. I urge my colleagues to help families stricken with this awful tragedy by supporting S. 249.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, this legislation is very important, and it is particularly significant to me due to the tragic murder of Polly Klaas that occurred in my home town of Petaluma in 1993.

Polly Klaas was taken from her home at knife point during a slumber party while her mother slept in the next room. Richard Allen Davis, the brutal kidnapper, was later stopped by police in a nearby community. The officers did not know that there was a suspect being sought at that moment, so unfortunately they let him go. Could Polly have been saved if a more sophisticated computer system had been in place allowing different police jurisdictions to communicate? We'll never know.

What I do know is that—thanks to a COPS grant recently awarded to the Sonoma County Police Consortium—such a computer system will soon be in place. This $6.2 million grant will permit the agencies in my district to upgrade dispatch systems, connect mobile police units, and increase the efficiency in filing incident reports. This is just one important step in improving our safely net for children.

I am forever heartbroken that we were not able to save Polly, but I know that the best way we can honor Polly and other missing children is by doing our utmost to prevent such atrocities from happening to another child, another family, another community.

This bill today, the Missing, Exploited, and Runaway Children Protection Act, will allow such vital assistance programs as the Center for Missing and Exploited Children and the national toll-free hotline to continue. Without such resources, it is nearly impossible to conduct a responsive, nationwide search that could be the key to the missing child's survival.

I am also proud to be a Member of the Missing and Exploited Children's Caucus in Congress, because it heightens awareness that we must continue to make progress in protecting our children. We cannot let our guard down. Saving the lives of the most vulnerable in our population should be our most important priority. Children are 25% of our population, but they are 100% of our future.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to encourage all my colleagues to support the Missing, Exploited, and Runaway Children Protection Act. Today I would like to focus on one specific facet of this Act, the authorization of Congressional support for the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. Since 1984, the Center has proven to be an invaluable resource for state and local governments who struggle each day to recover missing children and to prevent the exploitation of children.

Through its toll-free hotline, its training programs for state and local professionals, and its coordination of recovery programs, the Center is a focal point mobilizing citizens and communities in the pursuit of safety for all of America's children. The convergence of public and private resources in pursuit of this common goal has resulted in the recovery of more than 40,000 children—40,000 children who could have been lost without the contributions of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.

The Center is particularly important to South Florida because one of its affiliated programs, the Jimmy Ryce Law Enforcement Training Center, was established by Congress in 1996 in memory of my constituent, Jimmy Ryce, the son of Don and Claudine Ryce. In 1995, at 9 years of age, Jimmy was abducted and brutally murdered while walking home from school. The Ryce Center, a joint project of the Center for Missing and Exploited Children and the Justice Department's Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, trains Chiefs of Police and Sheriffs in the most up-to-date methods of searching for missing children. The Ryce Center promotes swift, effective investigative response to missing and exploited children cases, provides comprehensive training in case investigations, ensures the consistent and meaningful use of reporting systems, and promotes the use of important national resources to assist in these cases.

The Ryce Center is an invaluable resource to law enforcement officials throughout the country, and in just a few short years has made enormous strides in changing the way America deals with cases of missing and exploited children. In the face of a problem which none of us should have to face, Don and Claudine have turned their personal tragedy in to a positive effort to help ensure the safety of millions of American children just like Jimmy. I urge all of my colleagues to support the passage of this bill.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on S. 249.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 249, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

TRADE AGENCY AUTHORIZATIONS, DRUG FREE BORDERS, AND PREVENTION OF ON-LINE CHILD PORNOGRAPHY ACT OF 1999

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1833) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for the United States Customs Service for drug interdiction and other operations, for the Office of the United States Trade Representative, for the United States International Trade Commission, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1833

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 ''Trade Agency Authorizations, Drug Free Borders, and Prevention of On-Line Child Pornography Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.
Sec. 2. Table of contents.

TITLE I—UNITED STATES CUSTOMS SERVICE

Subtitle A—Drug Enforcement and Other Noncommercial and Commercial Operations

Sec. 101. Authorization of appropriations for noncommercial operations, commercial operations, and air and marine interdiction.
Sec. 102. Illicit narcotics detection equipment for the United States-Mexico border, United States-Canada border, and Florida and the Gulf Coast seaports.
Sec. 103. Peak hours and investigative resource enhancement for the United States-Mexico and United States-Canada borders.
Sec. 104. Compliance with performance plan requirements.

Subtitle B—Child Cyber-Smuggling Center of the Customs Service

Sec. 111. Authorization of appropriations for program to prevent child pornography/child sexual exploitation.

Subtitle C—Personnel Provisions

CHAPTER 1—OVERTIME AND PREMIUM PAY OF OFFICERS OF THE CUSTOMS SERVICE

Sec. 121. Correction relating to fiscal year cap.
Sec. 122. Correction relating to overtime pay.
Sec. 123. Correction relating to premium pay.
Sec. 124. Use of savings from payment of overtime and premium pay for additional overtime enforcement activities of the Customs Service.
Sec. 125. Effective date.

CHAPTER 2—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 131. Study and report relating to personnel practices of the Customs Service.

TITLE II—OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

Sec. 201. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE III—UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

Sec. 301. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE I—UNITED STATES CUSTOMS SERVICE

Subtitle A—Drug Enforcement and Other Noncommercial and Commercial Operations

SEC. 101. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR NONCOMMERCIAL OPERATIONS, COMMERCIAL OPERATIONS, AND AIR AND MARINE INTERDICTION.

(a) NONCOMMERCIAL OPERATIONS.—Section 301(b)(1) of the Customs Procedural Reform and Simplification Act of 1978 (19 U.S.C. 2075(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

''(A) $999,563,000 for fiscal year 2000.''; and

(2) in subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

''(B) $996,464,000 for fiscal year 2001.''.

(b) COMMERCIAL OPERATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 301(b)(2)(A) of the Customs Procedural Reform and Simplification Act of 1978 (19 U.S.C. 2075(b)(2)(A)) is amended—

(A) in clause (i) to read as follows:

''(i) $1,154,359,000 for fiscal year 2000.''; and

(B) in clause (ii) to read as follows:

''(ii) $1,194,534,000 for fiscal year 2001.''.

(2) REPORTS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not later than each subsequent 90-day period, the Commissioner of Customs shall prepare and submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate a report demonstrating that the development and establishment of the automated commercial environment computer system is being carried out in a cost-effective manner and meets the modernization requirements of title VI of the North American Free Trade Agreements Implementation Act.

(c) AIR AND MARINE INTERDICTION.—Section 301(b)(3) of the Customs Procedural Reform and Simplification Act of 1978 (19 U.S.C. 2075(b)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

''(A) $109,413,000 for fiscal year 2000.''; and

(2) in subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

''(B) $113,789,000 for fiscal year 2001.''.

(d) SUBMISSION OF OUT-YEAR BUDGET PROJECTIONS.—Section 301(a) of the Customs Procedural Reform and Simplification Act of 1978 (19 U.S.C. 2075(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) By no later than the date on which the President submits to the Congress the budget of the United States Government for a fiscal year, the Commissioner of Customs shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate the projected amount of funds for the succeeding fiscal year that will be necessary for the operations of the Customs Service as provided for in subsection (b).''.

SEC. 102. ILLICIT NARCOTICS DETECTION EQUIPMENT FOR THE UNITED STATES-MEXICO BORDER, UNITED STATES-CANADA BORDER, AND FLORIDA AND THE GULF COAST SEAPORTS.

(a) FISCAL YEAR 2000.—Of the amounts made available for fiscal year 2000 under section 301(b)(1)(A) of the Customs Procedural Reform and Simplification Act of 1978 (19 U.S.C. 2075(b)(1)(A)), as amended by section 101(a) of this Act, $90,244,000 shall be available until expended for acquisition and other expenses associated with implementation and deployment of illicit narcotics detection equipment along the United States-Mexico border, the United States-Canada border, and Florida and the Gulf Coast seaports, as follows:

(1) UNITED STATES-MEXICO BORDER.—For the United States-Mexico border, the following:

(A) $6,000,000 for 8 Vehicle and Container Inspection Systems (VACIS).

(B) $11,200,000 for 5 mobile truck x-rays with transmission and backscatter imaging.

(C) $13,000,000 for the upgrade of 8 fixed-site truck x-rays from the present energy level of 450,000 electron volts to 1,000,000 electron volts (1–MeV).

(D) $7,200,000 for 8 1–MeV pallet x-rays.

(E) $1,000,000 for 200 portable contraband detectors (busters) to be distributed among ports where the current allocations are inadequate.

(F) $600,000 for 50 contraband detection kits to be distributed among all southwest border ports based on traffic volume.

(G) $500,000 for 25 ultrasonic container inspection units to be distributed among all ports receiving liquid-filled cargo and to ports with a hazardous material inspection facility.

(H) $2,450,000 for 7 automated targeting systems.

(I) $360,000 for 30 rapid tire deflator systems to be distributed to those ports where port runners are a threat.

(J) $480,000 for 20 portable Treasury Enforcement Communications Systems (TECS) terminals to be moved among ports as needed.

(K) $1,000,000 for 20 remote watch surveillance camera systems at ports where there are suspicious activities at loading docks, vehicle queues, secondary inspection lanes, or areas where visual surveillance or observation is obscured.

(L) $1,254,000 for 57 weigh-in-motion sensors to be distributed among the ports with the greatest volume of outbound traffic.

(M) $180,000 for 36 AM traffic information radio stations, with 1 station to be located at each border crossing.

(N) $1,040,000 for 260 inbound vehicle counters to be installed at every inbound vehicle lane.

(O) $950,000 for 38 spotter camera systems to counter the surveillance of customs inspection activities by persons outside the boundaries of ports where such surveillance activities are occurring.

(P) $390,000 for 60 inbound commercial truck transponders to be distributed to all ports of entry.

(Q) $1,600,000 for 40 narcotics vapor and particle detectors to be distributed to each border crossing.

(R) $400,000 for license plate reader automatic targeting software to be installed at each port to target inbound vehicles.

(2) UNITED STATES-CANADA BORDER.—For the United States-Canada border, the following:

(A) $3,000,000 for 4 Vehicle and Container Inspection Systems (VACIS).

(B) $8,800,000 for 4 mobile truck x-rays with transmission and backscatter imaging.

(C) $3,600,000 for 4 1–MeV pallet x-rays.

(D) $250,000 for 50 portable contraband detectors (busters) to be distributed among ports where the current allocations are inadequate.

(E) $300,000 for 25 contraband detection kits to be distributed among ports based on traffic volume.

(F) $240,000 for 10 portable Treasury Enforcement Communications Systems (TECS) terminals to be moved among ports as needed.

(G) $400,000 for 10 narcotics vapor and particle detectors to be distributed to each border crossing based on traffic volume.

(3) FLORIDA AND GULF COAST SEAPORTS.—For Florida and the Gulf Coast seaports, the following:

(A) $4,500,000 for 6 Vehicle and Container Inspection Systems (VACIS).

(B) $11,800,000 for 5 mobile truck x-rays with transmission and backscatter imaging.

(C) $7,200,000 for 8 1–MeV pallet x-rays.

(D) $250,000 for 50 portable contraband detectors (busters) to be distributed among ports where the current allocations are inadequate.

(E) $300,000 for 25 contraband detection kits to be distributed among ports based on traffic volume.

(b) FISCAL YEAR 2001.—Of the amounts made available for fiscal year 2001 under section 301(b)(1)(B) of the Customs Procedural Reform and Simplification Act of 1978 (19 U.S.C. 2075(b)(1)(B)), as amended by section 101(a) of this Act, $8,924,500 shall be available until expended for the maintenance and support of the equipment and training of personnel to maintain and support the equipment described in subsection (a).

(c) ACQUISITION OF TECHNOLOGICALLY SUPERIOR EQUIPMENT; TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner of Customs may use amounts made available for fiscal year 2000 under section 301(b)(1)(A) of the Customs Procedural Reform and Simplification Act of 1978 (19 U.S.C. 2075(b)(1)(A)), as amended by section 101(a) of this Act, for the acquisition of equipment other than the equipment described in subsection (a) if such other equipment—

(A)(i) is technologically superior to the equipment described in subsection (a); and

(ii) will achieve at least the same results at a cost that is the same or less than the equipment described in subsection (a); or

(B) can be obtained at a lower cost than the equipment described in subsection (a).

(2) TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Commissioner of Customs may reallocate an amount not to exceed 10 percent of—

(A) the amount specified in any of subparagraphs (A) through (R) of subsection (a)(1) for equipment specified in any other of such subparagraphs (A) through (R);

(B) the amount specified in any of subparagraphs (A) through (G) of subsection (a)(2) for equipment specified in any other of such subparagraphs (A) through (G); and

(C) the amount specified in any of subparagraphs (A) through (E) of subsection (a)(3) for equipment specified in any other of such subparagraphs (A) through (E).

SEC. 103. PEAK HOURS AND INVESTIGATIVE RESOURCE ENHANCEMENT FOR THE UNITED STATES-MEXICO AND UNITED STATES-CANADA BORDERS.

Of the amounts made available for fiscal years 2000 and 2001 under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 301(b)(1) of the Customs Procedural Reform and Simplification Act of 1978 (19 U.S.C. 2075(b)(1)(A) and (B)), as amended by section 101(a) of this Act, $127,644,584 for fiscal year 2000 and $184,110,928 for fiscal year 2001 shall be available for the following:

(1) A net increase of 535 inspectors, 120 special agents, and 10 intelligence analysts for the United States-Mexico border and 375 inspectors for the United States-Canada border, in order to open all primary lanes on such borders during peak hours and enhance investigative resources.

(2) A net increase of 285 inspectors and canine enforcement officers to be distributed at large cargo facilities as needed to process and screen cargo (including rail cargo) and reduce commercial waiting times on the United States-Mexico border.

(3) A net increase of 40 inspectors at sea ports in southeast Florida to process and screen cargo.

(4) A net increase of 300 special agents, 30 intelligence analysts, and additional resources to be distributed among offices that have jurisdiction over major metropolitan drug or narcotics distribution and transportation centers for intensification of efforts against drug smuggling and money-laundering organizations.

(5) A net increase of 50 positions and additional resources to the Office of Internal Affairs to enhance investigative resources for anticorruption efforts.

(6) The costs incurred as a result of the increase in personnel hired pursuant to this section.

SEC. 104. COMPLIANCE WITH PERFORMANCE PLAN REQUIREMENTS.

As part of the annual performance plan for each of the fiscal years 2000 and 2001 covering each program activity set forth in the budget of the United States Customs Service, as required under section 1115 of title 31, United States Code, the Commissioner of the Customs Service shall establish performance goals, performance indicators, and comply with all other requirements contained in paragraphs (1) through (6) of subsection (a) of such section with respect to each of the activities to be carried out pursuant to sections 111 and 112 of this Act.

Subtitle B—Child Cyber-Smuggling Center of the Customs Service

SEC. 111. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR PROGRAM TO PREVENT CHILD PORNOGRAPHY/CHILD SEXUAL EXPLOITATION.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Customs Service $10,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 to carry out the program to prevent child pornography/child sexual exploitation established by the Child Cyber-Smuggling Center of the Customs Service.

(b) USE OF AMOUNTS FOR CHILD PORNOGRAPHY CYBER TIPLINE.—Of the amount appropriated under subsection (a), the Customs Service shall provide 3.75 percent of such amount to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children for the operation of the child pornography cyber tipline of the Center and for increased public awareness of the tipline.

Subtitle C—Personnel Provisions

CHAPTER 1—OVERTIME AND PREMIUM PAY OF OFFICERS OF THE CUSTOMS SERVICE

SEC. 121. CORRECTION RELATING TO FISCAL YEAR CAP.

Section 5(c)(1) of the Act of February 13, 1911 (19 U.S.C. 267(c)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

''(1) FISCAL YEAR CAP.—The aggregate of overtime pay under subsection (a) (including commuting compensation under subsection (a)(2)(B)) that a customs officer may be paid in any fiscal year may not exceed $30,000, except that—

''(A) the Commissioner of Customs or his or her designee may waive this limitation in individual cases in order to prevent excessive costs or to meet emergency requirements of the Customs Service; and

''(B) upon certification by the Commissioner of Customs to the Chairmen of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate that the Customs Service has in operation a system that provides accurate and reliable data on a daily basis on overtime and premium pay that is being paid to customs officers, the Commissioner is authorized to pay any customs officer for one work assignment that would result in the overtime pay of that officer exceeding the $30,000 limitation imposed by this paragraph, in addition to any overtime pay that may be received pursuant to a waiver under subparagraph (A).''.

SEC. 122. CORRECTION RELATING TO OVERTIME PAY.

Section 5(a)(1) of the Act of February 13, 1911 (19 U.S.C. 267(a)(1)), is amended by inserting after the first sentence the following new sentences: ''Overtime pay provided under this subsection shall not be paid to any customs officer unless such officer actually performed work during the time corresponding to such overtime pay. The preceding sentence shall not apply with respect to the payment of an award or settlement to a customs officer who was unable to perform overtime work as a result of a personnel action in violation of section 5596 of title 5, United States Code, section 6(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, or title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.''.

SEC. 123. CORRECTION RELATING TO PREMIUM PAY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5(b)(4) of the Act of February 13, 1911 (19 U.S.C. 267(b)(4)), is amended by adding after the first sentence the following new sentences: ''Premium pay provided under this subsection shall not be paid to any customs officer unless such officer actually performed work during the time corresponding to such premium pay. The preceding sentence shall not apply with respect to the payment of an award or settlement to a customs officer who was unable to perform work during the time described in the preceding sentence as a result of a personnel action in violation of section 5596 of title 5, United States Code, section 6(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, or title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.''.

(b) CORRECTIONS RELATING TO NIGHT WORK DIFFERENTIAL PAY.—Section 5(b)(1) of such Act (19 U.S.C. 267(b)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

''(1) NIGHT WORK DIFFERENTIAL.—

''(A) 6 P.M. TO MIDNIGHT.—If any hours of regularly scheduled work of a customs officer occur during the hours of 6 p.m. and 12 a.m., the officer is entitled to pay for such hours of work (except for work to which paragraph (2) or (3) applies) at the officer's hourly rate of basic pay plus premium pay amounting to 15 percent of that basic rate.

''(B) MIDNIGHT TO 6 A.M.—If any hours of regularly scheduled work of a customs officer occur during the hours of 12 a.m. and 6 a.m., the officer is entitled to pay for such hours of work (except for work to which paragraph (2) or (3) applies) at the officer's hourly rate of basic pay plus premium pay amounting to 20 percent of that basic rate.

''(C) MIDNIGHT TO 8 A.M.—If the regularly scheduled work of a customs officer is 12 a.m. to 8:00 a.m., the officer is entitled to pay for work during such period (except for work to which paragraph (2) or (3) applies) at the officer's hourly rate of basic pay plus premium pay amounting to 20 percent of that basic rate.''.

SEC. 124. USE OF SAVINGS FROM PAYMENT OF OVERTIME AND PREMIUM PAY FOR ADDITIONAL OVERTIME ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES OF THE CUSTOMS SERVICE.

Section 5 of the Act of February 13, 1911 (19 U.S.C. 267), is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

''(e) USE OF SAVINGS FROM PAYMENT OF OVERTIME AND PREMIUM PAY FOR ADDITIONAL OVERTIME ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES.—

''(1) USE OF AMOUNTS.—For fiscal year 1999 and each subsequent fiscal year, the Secretary of the Treasury—

''(A) shall determine under paragraph (2) the amount of savings from the payment of overtime and premium pay to customs officers; and

''(B) shall use an amount from the Customs User Fee Account equal to such amount determined under paragraph (2) for additional overtime enforcement activities of the Customs Service.

''(2) DETERMINATION OF SAVINGS AMOUNT.—For each fiscal year, the Secretary shall calculate an amount equal to the difference between—

''(A) the estimated cost for overtime and premium pay that would have been incurred during that fiscal year if this section, as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of sections 122 and 123 of the Trade Agency Authorization, Drug Free Borders, and Prevention of On-Line Child Pornography Act of 1999, had governed such costs; and

''(B) the actual cost for overtime and premium pay that is incurred during that fiscal year under this section, as amended by sections 122 and 123 of the Trade Agency Authorization, Drug Free Borders, and Prevention of On-Line Child Pornography Act of 1999.''.

SEC. 125. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This chapter, and the amendments made by this chapter, shall apply with respect to pay periods beginning on or after 15 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

CHAPTER 2—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 131. STUDY AND REPORT RELATING TO PERSONNEL PRACTICES OF THE CUSTOMS SERVICE.

(a) STUDY.—The Commissioner of Customs shall conduct a study of current personnel practices of the Customs Service, including an overview of performance standards and the effect and impact of the collective bargaining process on drug interdiction efforts of the Customs Service and a comparison of duty rotation policies of the Customs Service and other Federal agencies that employ similarly-situated personnel.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commissioner of Customs shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate a report containing the results of the study conducted under subsection (a).

TITLE II—OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

SEC. 201. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 141(g)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2171(g)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''not to exceed the following'' and inserting ''as follows'';

(B) in clause (i) to read as follows:

''(i) $26,501,000 for fiscal year 2000.''; and

(C) in clause (ii) to read as follows:

''(ii) $26,501,000 for fiscal year 2001.''; and

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) in clause (i), by adding ''and'' at the end;

(B) by striking clause (ii); and

(C) by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (ii).

(b) SUBMISSION OF OUT-YEAR BUDGET PROJECTIONS.—Section 141(g) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2171(g)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) By no later than the date on which the President submits to the Congress the budget of the United States Government for a fiscal year, the United States Trade Representative shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate the projected amount of funds for the succeeding fiscal year that will be necessary for the Office to carry out its functions.''.

TITLE III—UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

SEC. 301. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 330(e)(2)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1330(e)(2)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i) to read as follows:

''(i) $47,200,000 for fiscal year 2000.''; and

(2) in clause (ii) to read as follows:

''(ii) $49,750,000 for fiscal year 2001.''.

(b) SUBMISSION OF OUT-YEAR BUDGET PROJECTIONS.—Section 330(e) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1330(e)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(4) By no later than the date on which the President submits to the Congress the budget of the United States Government for a fiscal year, the Commission shall submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate the projected amount of funds for the succeeding fiscal year that will be necessary for the Commission to carry out its functions.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1833.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1833, the Trade Agency Authorizations, Drug Free Borders, and Prevention of On-Line Child Pornography Act of 1999 contains budget authorizations for the United States Customs Service, the Office of the United States Trade Representative and the International Trade Commission. H.R. 1833 also reforms Customs inspectors overtime and shift differential pay.

H.R. 1833 passed the committee unanimously by a vote of 36–0.

H.R. 1833 authorizes the President's budget request for USTR and the ITC, but goes beyond the President's request for the Customs Service in order to provide more funding for drug interdiction, child pornography prevention initiatives and Customs automation.

Illegal drugs are killing our youths. Sex predators stalk our children on the Internet. We must protect our children from the scourge of illegal drugs and on-line sex predators. H.R. 1833 aims to do just that.

Today is Missing Child Day. It is tragic that we need to recognize such a day. H.R. 1833 would authorize $10 million for the Customs Cyber-smuggling Center so that customs can step up protection of our children from on-line predators and pedophiles. Part of this authorization would go to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children's cyber tipline that handles calls and on-line reports of sexual exploitation of children.

While I am on this portion of the bill, I would like to pay tribute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) because she was the one that was in the vanguard of incorporating these provisions dealing with trying to monitor pornography on the Internet. She deserves the overwhelming credit of one and all on a bipartisan basis for her work. She will elaborate more fully later.

H.R. 1833 also includes more than $400 million over the President's budget request for drug interdiction in fiscal year 2000 and fiscal year 2001. This funding would allow Customs to purchase drug detection equipment and hire additional inspectors to keep illegal drugs from crossing our borders into our children's hands.

Customs must also keep our trade moving smoothly. Customs current Automated Commercial System, ACS, is 16 years old and on the brink of continual brownouts and shutdowns. This costs the American taxpayer millions of dollars. Customs has begun building a new system, Automated Commercial Environment, ACE, but the President did not see fit to request funding for ACE for fiscal year 2000. Instead, the President requested a fee that the administration did not justify. The American public cannot wait for the President, so Congress must take action. H.R. 1833 does just that. It authorizes $150 million for ACE in fiscal year 2000 and fiscal year 2001.

H.R. 1833 also makes common-sense changes to Customs officers overtime pay and nighttime pay. The legislation maintains, and even increases, some benefits to Customs inspectors in recognition of their hard work and the valuable services they perform.

□ 1100

The revisions also correct some anomalies in Customs officers' overtime and differential pay. Under H.R. 1833, officers would be paid overtime only for overtime hours worked. Also, officers would be paid shift differential only for night work instead of daytime work under the present system. This saves the American taxpayer money.

In short, this legislation will help prevent illegal drugs from crossing our borders, prevent on-line child pornography, prevent waste of taxpayers' dollars and prevent delays in moving our trade.

Finally, I note that at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight we had to drop a provision in the bill that would put the Commissioner of Customs at the same pay level as other Treasury Department bureau heads. That provision is the only provision within the jurisdiction of that committee.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this package and pass this legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this suspension procedure that we use in the House is supposed to be reserved for bills that are not controversial. Where there is controversy in the committee or subcommittee, members of the minority

and the majority should have an opportunity to at least discuss those issues and vote on those issues.

Today we see a violation, a real violation, of that principle, because here we find a good bill, a bill there that is supposed to support the United States Trade Represenative's Office, the International Trade Commission, a bill that the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) worked so hard on to prevent child pornography, which all of us find repugnant to everything that we believe in as Americans, as human beings, and we find a real attack against drug trafficking by providing sophisticated equipment for those men and women who have dedicated themselves to protect our borders against these drugs coming into the United States.

Why in God's name then, Mr. Speaker, do we find on the suspension calendar, incorporated in this bill, that which prevents us from debating, prevents us from voting for it, a provision that nobody wants except one or two people in the majority on the committee? Where did it come from? Where did it start? Where were the hearings? Where was the reports? Where is the evidence that indicated that Customs inspectors were overpaid?

It certainly did not come from hearings which we had on this issue before we voted on this, and even when we were marking up the bill, the only evidence we had was a staff member from the majority giving us information that was not available through any official report. Here we have Customs officials that put their lives on the line each and every day protecting our borders; three were killed in the line of duty. They fight every day, they struggle every day, and the commissioner and the unions were never discussed on this issue, but somebody knew better than them on the committee and revised it because they did not like the wording of it in the regulation.

It is not fair, Mr. Speaker, and it comes almost close to being illegal, to fold something like that, a controversial subject like that, into a bill that no one politically is prepared to vote against on the suspension calendar for fear that we would be supporting child pornography, that we would be supporting drug trafficking, that we would not support the USTR and the ITC.

There is no excuse for this being included in this bill. It divided our committee, it divides our subcommittee, and it is things like this that cause divisions in the House of Representatives.

We knew why these people were paid overtime pay, we know the reasons they were done, and it is because, unlike other federal law enforcement officers, the Customs do not give and we did not provide the same type of benefits that law enforcement officials get. They do not get the 20-year pension retirement, they do not get a whole lot of perks that law enforcement officials get, and this was folded into their pay in order to compensate for the fact that some do law enforcement work and they do not get paid law enforcement salaries.

Was it controversial? Ask anybody on the majority whether it was controversial. So, why should it be included in this suspension calendar in a bill that certainly is without controversy? I suspect it is because they once again want to deny us the opportunity to reconsider the amendment that was offered in committee and deny us the opportunity to be able to vote on this issue singularly, like it should be.

I know that the Committee on Ways and Means has traditionally enjoyed closed rules when it comes to the House, but this is not a tax issue, and this is not an issue that is coming to the House in regular form. It comes to us as a suspension bill, and I am really disappointed that my committee would see fit to fold a controversial subject into a suspension bill and deny us the opportunity once again to debate it.

I would just like to say Ray Kelly is the Commissioner of Customs; he opposes it. The union opposes it, the Secretary of Treasury opposes it, the administration opposed it, and almost half of the members of the Committee on Ways and Means opposed it, but we will not get an opportunity to vote on that issue.

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

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and in response to some of the concerns registered, and I can certainly sympathize with our distinguished colleague, but I do think that we have put together here a good bill, and it is one that in committee the total package enjoyed the support of both sides of the aisle overwhelmingly. But we are, I think, making some common sense changes, and at the same time we are maintaining and even increasing some benefits as Customs inspectors or to Customs inspectors in recognition of their hard work and the valuable services they perform. These revisions are identical to those that this committee and the full House passed overwhelmingly last year.

The night pay reform still keeps Customs officers in a better position than other federal employees, and the bill does not change some of the other special benefits that Customs officers receive. For example, Customs officers receive twice the hourly rate for overtime while FEPA employees receive only one and a half times the hourly rate. The night pay reform is not meant to penalize our hard-working Customs officers. Instead, it is designed to advance common sense.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER), our colleague who serves on the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this important legislation today, and first, let me begin by commending my friend and colleague from Illinois (Mr. CRANE), chairman of the Subcommittee on Trade, putting forward a good bill, a bill which was endorsed by unanimous bipartisan vote, the Committee on Ways and Means just this past week. I rise in support of this legislation, the Trade Agency Authorizations, Drug-free Borders, Prevention of On-line Pornography Act of 1999. It is important legislation designed to protect children from drugs and child pornographers. Amongst the most important provisions of H.R. 1833, the bill authorizes $10 million for the Child Cyber Smuggling Center to provide the U.S. Customs Service with the necessary tools to prevent child pornography and child sexual exploitation initiated over the Internet. I also want to commend my friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) for her leadership on this issue as she authored the original legislation that was included in this bill today.

Protecting children from Internet predators is an issue that is important to the folks back home in the south suburbs of Chicago. This last year I received a phone call from a mother asking for help in responding to a situation affecting her 9-year-old daughter. An Internet predator posted her child's name on several pornographic Internet sites and in chat rooms and advertised for certain favors. To protect their daughter, their family was forced to move from their home and to hide from those they feared would contact them as a result of this Internet advertising. When they sought the help of local police, they were told there is no law preventing predators from doing this to young children. I am proud that legislation I authored, which became law last year, the Protecting Children From Internet Predators Act which made it illegal to use the Internet to target an individual under the age of 16 for sexually explicit messages or contacts, is now law, and I want to thank this House for the bipartisan support.

Let me explain very clearly with some startling facts and statistics why this legislation is so important and deserves bipartisan support, because we should all care about kids, and we should all care about child pornography and its impact on children. It is estimated that by the year 2002 more than 45 million children will be on-line with access to the Internet. The number of child pornography and pedophilia sites is impossible to determine, but the Center for Missing Children estimates that are 10,000 web sites maintained by pedophiles while the CyberAngles organization estimates 17,000 pedophile web sites available via the Internet. The United States alone law enforcement has confiscated more than 500,000 indecent images, photos of children, some as young as 2 years of age, and since January 1 of 1998 federal law enforcement has arrested over 460 adults for Internet-related child sexual exploitation offenses.

Mr. Speaker, we need to do more to protect kids from child pornography, to protect children from being exploited by those who would prey on them via the Internet. This legislation gives the United States Customs Service the tools they need. It deserves bipartisan support. Let us protect the kids from pornographers.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the objective of H.R. 1833 to provide the U.S. Customs Service with the resource it needs to safeguard our borders and to put a stop to the spread of child pornography on-line. The men and women of the U.S. Customs Service perform vital functions with respect both to law enforcement and preserving the integrity of U.S. trade with foreign nations there on the front line.

Much of this bill is devoted to authorizing the appropriation of funds for the acquisition of sophisticated narcotics detection equipment by the Customs Service. Ironically, however, Section 123 (b) would cut the pay of some of the very people who will be operating that equipment. The current pay structure for Customs inspectors and officers was put into place in 1993. It was designed to reflect the unusual demands of inspectors' and officers' jobs, the odd hours, the unpredictability of schedules, the physical safety risk. Under this system, if a majority of the hours in an inspector officer's shift falls within the window from 3 p.m. to 8 a.m., the inspector officer is paid at a premium rate for the shift. 1833 would change it. Let me just give my colleagues an example.

For example, take the Customs inspector who regularly works the 3 a.m. to 11 a.m. shift. Assuming that that inspector earns $19.25 per hour as base pay, his or her premium pay under the current system is $154 per week. Under H.R. 1833, the premium pay would be reduced by $96.25 per week, and assuming that shift would work throughout the year, it would amount to a reduction in pay of $5,000 a year.

Why this provision? It was introduced without adequate consideration of the adverse impact it would have on actual Customs inspectors and officers. The sponsors of this provision relied on a report by the Inspector General that did nothing more than calculate the absolute increase in night pay differential over a 3-year period since enactment of the current arrangement.

□ 1115

The report did not study the cause of that increase, nor did it purport to find that that increase was unjustified. It was simply an accounting of the size of the increase.

So what happens? The majority decides to bring this bill under suspension, with no ability for us to present an amendment. This is a distortion of the suspension process. The chair of the subcommittee and others have said this passed unanimously. True, after an amendment was introduced to strike it, it was debated. We lost it on a straight party vote, but we had a chance to raise it.

What the majority is doing here is putting forth a bill that is good in almost all of its provisions and tying in a provision that is not justified and, I think, is not justifiable. They essentially trapped the minority, saying if you want to vote against a bill that is generally good because of one provision and it is a serious one, go ahead and do it.

Mr. Speaker, bipartisanship should have some meaning in this place. There is no excuse whatsoever for this procedure. It was tried last session, the same trick was tried, and what happened? The bill died in the Senate because of provisions that are not related to the important work of the Customs force and had nothing to do with child pornography, which we obviously must be very concerned about.

This is not a tax bill. There is no reason to have this bill brought on suspension or in any other way that prevents an amendment.

Mr. Speaker, we talk about common sense. Common sense and common decency in a legislative body mean giving people a chance to present an amendment and debating it. This is not a defensible procedure.

I suggest that we vote ''aye,'' because the bill, in all but one of its major provisions, is a strong bill that we should pass. But I just want the majority here to understand that we resent this procedure. There is no reason for it. It undermines the bipartisanship that the majority sometimes says it believes in. We will do what happened last time. We will march over to the Senate and ask it to extricate this House from an unfair procedure.

My colleagues may think they are being politically clever, but they are going to pay for it in terms of feelings between the majority and the minority.

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

Last year in committee we considered identical provisions on reforming pay, and my colleagues across the aisle did not move to strike. I find it difficult now for them to say that we are being unfair today.

The irony of the current system is that one can receive night pay for the entire noon-to-8-p.m. shift, but one would receive no night pay for working a 4-a.m.-to-noon shift, even for those brutal hours between 4 a.m. and 6 a.m., and that makes no sense. This bill would fix this problem.

Our goal is not to penalize Customs officers, but to correct an anomaly in the law.

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

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

I do not think there is any controversy about the facts between the majority and the minority. It was opposed last year by the Democrats; it was opposed by the Commission of Customs, it was opposed by the union, it was opposed by the employees, and it is still being opposed, and it has no place in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, there is much good in this bill. As the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has pointed out, there are a lot of provisions in here that are extremely important to the Customs Service. H.R. 1833 provides additional resources needed for the U.S. Customs Service to combat illegal drug activities across our border; it will provide additional equipment with the latest technology for the antidrug enforcement provisions. It provides additional funds for the Child Cyber-Smuggling Center to assist in our efforts to prevent child pornography.

So there is a lot of good in this bill. We are going to support it. I think it is going to get a large vote.

But there is bad in this bill. There are provisions that should not be in here. It amends existing laws concerning the payment of night-shift pay for our Customs officers.

Let me talk a little bit about what this Congress did before, why we put shift pay differential in the law. Congress found that these odd hour shifts that Customs officials are assigned, they do not volunteer, are assigned as part of their work, have an adverse impact on the quality of life of Customs officials who are required to work regularly scheduled shifts at night, on Sundays or holidays. We found, as a body, that the shift differential compensation levels are substantially greater than applied generally to other Federal employees for such regularly scheduled work. So what this legislation is doing is altering the balance that we took in 1993, and that is just wrong.

U.S. Customs Service performs vital functions of both law enforcement and preserving the integrity of U.S. trade laws with foreign nations. The current compensation structure was designed to take account of the unusual stresses of their job, both on-job safety risks and irregular work hours. We should honor that, and I agree with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the process should provide us an opportunity as a body to express our will on the subject. But the process that has been used by the majority will deny that opportunity today.

Yes, we will support the bill because of the important provisions in it, but the provision concerning pay differential is wrong; it should be removed from the bill.

This bill alters the balanced approached crafted in 1993 in two ways. First, the provision restricts the hours that qualify for the night shift differential to hours between 6 p.m.

and 6 a.m. Second, the provision compensates Customs officers at the differential rate only for those hours that occur between 6 p.m. and 6 a.m. (with one limited exception), and not the entire shirt. Effectively, these changes will mean that a Customs officer who works a shift starting at 3 a.m. and ending at 11 a.m. will receive the shift differential for only 3 hours of that shift.

To offset some of the loss in pay likely to occur, section 121 of the bill adjusts the overtime cap that, under current law, restricts the amount of overtime pay a Customs officer may earn in one year. In effect, this adjustment would allow Customs officers to work more overtime to compensate for lost wages, or put another way, Customs officers will have to work more to get the same pay. Such a result seems unfair, given that no one (including Customs) has alleged that Customs officers are overcompensated. Moreover, only a small percentage of officers currently reach the overtime cap, and therefore would even benefit from the new provision.

A single report, done in 1996 by the Office of Inspector General (OIG), has been offered to support this change to night shift differential pay. That report purportedly reviews the operation of the night pay differential and the overtime cap since COPRA. The report, which concludes that the COPRA resulted in an increase in overall premium night shift differential payments, is, however, seriously flawed.

First, the OIG report merely calculated the absolute increase in night differential pay over a three year period. The report did not investigate the cause of the increase. The OIG's report did not investigate whether the increase was due to an overall increase in the number of hours being worked, whether there was an increase in the number of late shifts being worked due to increased trade, or whether the increase in cost was attributable to an increase in base wages. Rather, the OIG report merely concludes that the increase was due to COPRA without investigating, entertaining or otherwise considering any other possible reasons for the increase.

Second, the OIG report did not assess the impact on Customs employees' salaries. As discussed above, the 1993 changes to the methods of calculating premium night shift differential payments was part of a comprehensive package of reforms intended to ensure that Customs officers would receive pay adequate compensation for the hard and, often dangerous, work they perform. Altering the carefully crafted package Congress created in 1993 without assessing the impact on Customs officers' overall pay is irresponsible, and could result in an unwarranted pay cut for many of these officers. Such a result seems unfair, given that no one, including OIG and Customs, has alleged that Customs employees are overpaid. Third, OIG did not find any evidence of abuse in this system. In fact, to the contrary, the OIG report specifically states that Customs management did not change work schedules to allow employees to earn more shift differential pay. Rather, Customs management continued to schedule shifts to fit customer's demand.

We are not opposed to considering amendments to Customs officers pay, if a credible study evaluates and recommends that legislative changes be made. However, we are opposed to cutting someone's wages based on report that shows nothing. The men and women of the U.S. Customs Service perform vital functions with respect to both law enforcement—keeping drugs and other contraband from crossing our borders—and preserving the integrity of U.S. trade with foreign nations. Their current compensation structure was designed to take account of the unusual stresses of their job—both the on-the-job safety risks and the irregular hours. We do not believe that there is clear evidence that those aspects of a Customs officer's job have changed in a way that would justify reducing their pay, which is precisely what H.R. 1833 will do.

It's too bad, Mr. Speaker. We have a good bill here. We found a flaw and I believe there would have been a way to address this issue that would have made both sides of this Congress happy and would have been supported by the men and women who will actually be affected by our vote today. I am sorry we missed an opportunity.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for yielding me this time.

There is good news, obviously, and some bad news in regard to H.R. 1833. The good news, as we have heard, is that this bill contains authorizations for funds which are desperately needed for drug interdiction, to combat child pornography, and to help the Customs Department automate its very antiquated computer system.

By the way, with regard to that computer system, which is about 15 years old, it has browned out on several occasions. That means it has come close to actually blacking out completely. The 6-hour lapse of that brown-out caused the Customs caseload to increase not 6 hours, but by 2 weeks. Businesses across the country were thrown off their schedule for months.

We are desperately in need of updating our computer system at the Customs Department because of the constantly growing load of import and export product coming into this country and leaving this country.

Mr. Speaker, there is also bad news with H.R. 1833, and that is that it contains a provision that has nothing to do with Customs running its shop well, nothing to do with treating its employees well; and has no place in this bill, and should not come up through this suspension process for a vote. Unfortunately, this is a heavy-handed approach to try to get something done that was not approved by either the employees of the Customs Department or the Customs Department itself.

Management and labor do not agree with this provision, yet it is in here. That is a heavy-handed approach to try to impose upon both the agency and its employees something that they do not believe in. It is unfortunate that we have to micromanage at this stage a bill that, for the most part, does great good for the Customs Department.

That agency is in need of our support. Its workload is growing constantly with regard to trying to interdict drugs. We know the issue of child pornography and trying to stop it from coming into this country. Why we would clutter a good bill with a bad provision makes no sense. But because of the procedural mess we find ourselves in, unfortunately, we have very little choice. Do we oppose a bill that for the most part is very good, to make a point, or do we vote for a bill, understanding that we are providing for legislation the possibility of enacting a law that would change the rules of the game for employees who have no say as to their work hours?

It is unfortunate that we are there; it is unfortunate that employees at Customs find themselves in this situation, not because management at Customs wants to do this, but because Congress, in its wisdom to micromanage, has decided to include a provision which they do not want.

If we extract this, this bill would fly without any no votes, I would suspect. But with this, unfortunately, there are a number of people who have to pause. Pause because while we want to do good, we do not want to do bad at the same time. Unfortunately for Customs employees, it looks like they are going to have to swallow some bad to politically take the good. That is unfortunate, and it should never happen.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I know this bill is to reauthorize the Customs Service, and I know the Customs Service has a difficult job. One of the jobs I wanted to just mention to my colleagues as we are debating this bill involves a company in my State that imports lots of items that are under the classification of festive items, Christmas items. Those items have a different tariff duty than other items do, and just so the House is aware, recently one of their items, an item that was an inexpensive music box that played Silent Night, the Customs folks would not classify that a ''festive item'' because, they said, it was a music box and because, they said, it played Silent Night instead of Jingle Bells, I am not sure which. But the code is specific. It tries to set aside that type of item.

Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if we could not ask the Customs Service to be more reasonable in applying those laws. This is not an expensive thing; it is not a musical instrument. It is a one-time-a-year use that happens to play a religious Christmas-type of song.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to reassure my colleague that we will look into it. This is the first I have heard of it, and it does sound a little bizarre, and I hope it is just a parochial, isolated case and not universal.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRANE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman being willing to look into it, and I appreciate the time of the Members here today.

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

While the distinguished subcommittee chairman is looking into the controversy of Jingle Bells and Silent Night, I hope he might take some time to read the letter from the Commissioner of Customs, Raymond Kelly, who indicated on May 25 that he is opposed to this subtitle C, sections 122, 123 and 124 of the bill that is before us today, and a bill that apparently we are unable to do anything about.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the subcommittee chairman and ask him whether or not he would consider reconsidering this provision since it is a good bill and a lot of people worked hard on this bill. It helps prevent drugs, it helps prevent the spread of child pornography, it supports the administration for things that they have been waiting for, and we want to be able to go over to the Senate and say it is a good bill and that this provision should be reconsidered.

I hope the majority might consider excluding this provision or reconsidering this provision in conference, because it is a good piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I know how difficult it is for the majority to rule with just six votes in the majority, but I think that is the reason why now more than ever we should try to work together on those things that we agree on, because that is what the American people want.

□ 1130

They do not want to see us coming down here each and every day fighting each other over things that deal with procedure while they are working for substantive issues to be passed.

There is no need for us to have had to discuss this provision today, Mr. Speaker, because it had no place in this bill. If certain Republicans wanted it that badly, they should have brought it to the floor and had debate on it. It is just wrong to fold this into the suspension calendar, which says that it is not a controversial position.

We can hear what we want from the other side, we can examine the RECORD, but no one challenges that the employees did not want this, the union did not want this, the Commissioner of Customs did not want this, the President of the United States and his administration did not want this.

There is not one scintilla of evidence that substantiates the need for changing this except somebody on the other side of the aisle, somebody whose name is not in the record, wanted this change, and waited until the middle of the night on the suspension calendar to fold it into basically a good bill. It is wrong to do this, and I hope it does not happen again.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Department of the Treasury Inspector General issued a very rigorous recommendation to end the night pay anomaly back in 1996. The Inspector General went further and asked for a 10 percent pay differential. Our bill does not go so far and preserves a 15 to 20 percent differential, better than any other Federal employee, in recognition of the hard work by our Customs employees.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the recommendation of the Inspector General, since my colleague on the other side of the aisle thinks this came from us.

He said, ''The Assistant Secretary (Enforcement) should direct Customs to seek legislation that would lessen the number of hours available for Customs officers to earn night differential and reduce the night work differentials to a 10 percent premium on base pay.'' As I said, that is in contrast to our 15 to 20 percent.

''The change to the COPRA should create a night differential payment package that would more accurately reimburse Customs officers for hours actually worked at night, as was done previously under the FEPA. We believe guidance similar to the FEPA would accomplish this purpose.''

So this is not new. That was 1996 when that recommendation was made.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to quickly recite some other facts of the Customs bill that deals with trying to curb the abuses by pedophiles on the Internet.

In the United States alone, law enforcement has confiscated more than 500,000 indecent images of children, some as young as 2 years old. Since January 1 of last year, Federal law enforcement has arrested over 460 adults for Internet-related child sexual exploitation offenses, and according to some police estimates, as many as 80,000 child pornography files are traded online every week.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON), our distinguished colleague who is responsible for that precious component of this legislation.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation and its many provisions to improve the effectiveness of the Customs Office, but I will focus my comments on the provisions of this bill that strengthen Custom's ability to combat cyber predators.

The Internet has revolutionized the way we learn, communicate, and even shop. It is making a reality of equal opportunity by providing truly equal access to information and the power that knowledge confers. But there is a dark side to the Internet that we must confront. Parents need to know that just as there are dangerous areas in every city, there are dangerous sites on the Internet. We need to do a better job of protecting our children from entering a website or chatroom that could lead them to harm.

The old question of ''Do you know where your child is'' has a whole new meaning in the age of cyperspace. Most people are not aware that the Internet is now the number one choice, the number one choice, of predators as a means of preying on children and trafficking in child pornography.

There are an estimated 10,000 websites maintained by pedophiles. Trading in images of child pornography on the Internet takes place 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Let us make no mistake about it, these people are out there lurking in cyberspace, and any child on the Internet could fall prey to these pedophiles.

Roughly 12 million children use the Internet every day, spending an average of 8 hours a week in chatrooms where they can come into contact with online pedophiles. The danger of these chatrooms is that they provide sex predators with a forum to prey on unsuspecting kids who cannot see who is behind the screen on the other end of the line.

When I go into fifth grade classrooms, I ask those kids, what does your mom tell you about talking to strangers? And they all know the answer. What do your folks tell you about getting into the cars of strangers? And their little faces just light up, because they know they should not do that and they will not do that, and that I can count on them, that they will not do that.

It is a new world. We have to understand the new rules, and just as our kids will not talk to a stranger or get in the car of a stranger, we have to teach them not to go into the chatrooms, where everyone is a stranger.

These cyber predators use their anonymity to lure our children out of their homes to meet people solely for the purpose of sexual assault. Sexual predators used to lurk around the schoolyard. Now they lurk in our living rooms, they lurk in our children's bedrooms, they lurk wherever we have our computer terminal.

Listen to the Hartford Current of February 18, 1999: ''A 31-year-old Enfield man was arrested Wednesday on charges that he sexually assaulted a 12-year-old East Hartford girl he met on America Online chatroom.

She told the police, and I am skipping forward, she told them that she had met Ed in the chatroom on America Online, and that they had graphic sexual discussions over the Internet. She identified herself to him as Veronica, which was not her real name. They would talk for hours at night while the girl's mother was at work and she was babysitting for her younger sister.

On February 4, they arranged to meet in the parking lot of the East Hartford apartment complex so her mother would not know.

Kids think this is a game, like so many other games they play on television. This did not turn out to be a game for this kid. This turned out to be a terrible experience.

These cyber predators use their anonymity to lure our children out of our homes for the sole purpose of sexual assault. This legislation will help the Customs Service expand their work in combatting cyber predators and purveyors of child pornography.

They have done a phenomenal job. They have gotten a conviction of every single arrest. But they need better funding, they need more people, and they need more authority. This Congress is working on all three of those fronts.

This bill authorizes better funding of the child pornography and child sexual exploitation program that is designed to capture online pedophiles, and it would also better fund the operation of the child pornography cyber tip line run by the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children that helps identify and locate online predators.

As more kids go online every day, we need to ensure their safety. It is time to let online pedophiles know that they can no longer hide behind our computer screens. I urge support of this legislation, and full funding of the needed $10 million in the appropriations process.

I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for his long work on this and for his leadership.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1½ minutes in support of this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU). Is there objection to each side being granted an additional 1 minute for debate?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON) is recognized to control 1 minute.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise for 2 reasons: First, to applaud the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) for her efforts to help the U.S. Customs Service battle against child exploitation on the Internet, and second, to support the provisions of her legislation included in H.R. 1838.

Child pornography was a worldwide industry that was all but eradicated in the 1980s, but the explosive growth of computer technology via e-mail, chatrooms, and news groups have created a bigger demand for pornographic pictures of our children on the information superhighway.

Congress must step up to the plate and take some action to stem the growing tide of child exploitation on the Internet. In February, I introduced a bill to authorize $5 million to appropriate each year for the next 4 fiscal years to fund the Cyber Smuggling Center.

Until that bill reaches the floor, I would ask Members' complete support for H.R. 1838, which contains provisions championed by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON), including the addition of $100,000 for the Cyber Smuggling Center for fiscal year 2000.

I urge all of the Members, on this National Missing Children's Day, to support the Customs Service's fight against child pornography on the Internet by voting in favor of H.R. 1833.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) is recognized for 1 minute in closing.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield my final 1 minute to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE).

Mr. NUSSLE. I thank the chairman for yielding time to me, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this commonsense legislation. It is about time that we have the opportunity here today on this floor to move legislation that will, as my colleague, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) said, begin the process of patrolling what is happening with pornography, of being able to work on drugs coming into this country, being able to do what every one of our constituents back in our districts at town meetings across this country have told us, that we need to do a better job at our borders.

We finally have the opportunity to pass this commonsense reform today. Yet, for some strange reason there seems to be some lingering technicality out there with regard to this legislation which is making it very difficult for all of the very positive reasons for maybe some of the Democrats to not support this legislation.

I would implore those who are listening in their offices and getting ready to come over to consider voting for this that it is time that they put their word and deeds where the actions of our constituents have requested us to, and that is to pass this commonsense reform for our Customs Service.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend my colleague from Illinois, Representative CRANE, for his hard work in bringing this important legislation forward early on in this Congress. H.R. 1833 will provide the U.S. Customs Service with additional tools to prevent illegal drugs from entering our nation. This is a vital bill that will go a long way in winning the war on drugs but the most valuable asset of any agency is its workforce.

Unfortunately, H.R. 1833 also contains a provision which I believe will seriously harm the morale of our Customs agents and impede our ability to recruit qualified individuals. H.R. 1833 contains a provision that restricts the hours during which customs agents can earn night shift differential pay to between the hours of 6 p.m. and 6 a.m. Currently, Customs agents earn night shift differential pay between the hours of 3 p.m. and 8 a.m. The Customs Agency is the only federal agency where employees work a constantly changing shift. For example, employees work days for two weeks, then evenings, then nights. Night shift differential pay is a standard law enforcement benefit and one of the few federal law enforcement benefits extended to Customs agents.

If this bill passes the House, we will reduce the amount of pay at Customs agent earns by an average of $96.00 a week or $5000.00 a year. A Customs agent making $40,000 a year will face a reduction in pay of nearly 12%. Do we really want to tell Customs agents that we are only willing to spend more money on desperately needed equipment to fight the war on drugs if they give up a portion of their yearly salary? I think not, this provision sends entirely the wrong message to these brave men and women.

Moreover, I have serious concerns that this provision says to Customs agents that they can make up for the lost night shift differential pay due to enhancements in overtime benefits. But in order to earn back lost pay, an individual would be required to work more than forty hours a week. This is simply wrong. We would be telling these federal workers that they must spend greater and greater amounts of time away from their family just to meet their current needs. Again, this is backwards and contrary to the family values we should be promoting. This provision sends the wrong message to the indvidiuals who play a significant role in protecting our border and our entire nation from shipments of illegal drugs.

During the week of May 10th, a Customs Agent was shot on his way home from work by an individual who had targeted him as a law enforcement official. The Federal Government does not extend most law enforcement officer benefits to Customs Agents. This bill would limit one of the few law enforcement benefits that Customs Agents receive.

I am greatly disappointed that H.R. 1833 is on the Suspension Calendar today, and that we do not have the opportunity to even offer an amendment that would have removed section 123(b), the new night shift differential pay provisions. I think that Members of this House deserve the opportunity to support this important bill while also supporting our U.S. Customs Agents.

Mr. Speaker, again, I would like to thank my colleague, Representative CRANE for all of his work in bringing H.R. 1833 forward and express my profound disappointment in the currently included night shift differential pay provisions. I believe we need to strengthen the Customs Agency if we are going to stop illegal drugs from entering our Country and we must do all that we can to protect our children. However, we must not say to Customs Agents that their tireless efforts are insufficient, and that equipment counts more than the personnel. I firmly hope that we can work our differences out when this bill goes to Conference with the Senate.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, here we go again. We all oppose child pornography. We all want to fight drugs. But why include provisions to cut our Customs officers' pay in this important bill?

This does not make sense! How can you ask Customs employees—who enforce more laws than any other federal officers—to be more effective when you open the door to cutting some of their pay up to $96 a week? Giving employees $5,000 less pay in a year is an incentive to help them do their jobs better?

The bill undermines the partnership that has flourished between Customs personnel and their managers in the successful drug interdiction efforts. How does cutting Customs employees pay for working their regular night shifts help bolster our War on Drugs?

I support the provisions of H.R. 1833 that would increase the number of Customs Service employees along the border and provide Customs with state-of-the-art drug detection equipment. I support the $10 million to prevent the imports of on-line child pornography. But I reject the provisions that cut Customs hazardous pay for essential nighttime shifts.

H.R. 1833 gives us tools to fight the War on Drugs, but puts those who will use the tools in straitjackets. We will lose the War on Drugs and waste taxpayers' money if we spend money on expensive, cutting-edge equipment at the same time we undermine employee morale and labor standards.

I support the frontline soldiers in the War on Drugs—our Customs personnel—and urge support for legislation that enhances, rather than detracts, from their good work.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to rise in support of H.R. 1833. This bill reauthorizes the U.S. Trade Representative and Custom offices as well as increase efforts to patrol our borders and protect the Internet from online predators.

H.R. 1833 affects agricultural trade with its authorization of the United States Trade Representative. I support this bill and I believe this bill is an opportunity to urge the Ways and Means Committee to work with me to reform our sugar subsidy problem. I have introduced with Congressman GEORGE MILLER (D–CA) H.R. 1850, the Sugar Program Reform Act. The Miller-Miller bill would phase out the sugar program by the end of 2002.

The sugar program is the ''sugar daddy'' of corporate welfare. Why? Because most of the benefits of this program go to huge corporate sugar producers, not the typical family farmer.

The sugar program's sole purpose is to prop up the price of sugar in the United States through a complex system of low-interest, nonrecourse loans and tight import restrictions. In fact, the price of sugar in the United States today is roughly four times as high as the price of sugar world wide.

As a result, the sugar program imposes a ''sugar tax'' on consumers, forcing them to more than $1 billion in higher prices for food and sugar every year.

It devastates the environment, particularly the fragile Everglades in my home State of Florida. Higher prices for sugar have encouraged more and more sugar production in the Everglades Agricultural Area, leading to high levels of phosphorus-laden agricultural runoff flowing into the Everglades, which has damaged the ecosystem.

It has cost many Americans their jobs because it has restricted the supply of sugar that is available on the American market, resulting in the closure of a dozen sugar refineries across the country.

Finally, it hampers our ability to expand trade opportunities for America's farmers. It is hypocritical for the United States to protect domestic sugar production while urging other countries to open their agricultural markets. America loses leverage in trade negotiations as a result.

I am not here to talk about my bill, but to raise the issues of trade in H.R. 1833. This bill reauthorizes funding for the United States Trade Representative. The USTR is charged with helping to enforce trade laws and to break down barriers around the world. As a matter of fact, there will be important trade talks in Seattle later this year to discuss eliminating trade barriers. However, the USTR will head into Seattle with little credibility as long as the U.S. sugar program is in existence.

At Seattle, our USTR will try to have foreign nations lower their subsidies claiming that subsidies are unfair to consumers, taxpayers and trading nations. At the same time, the U.S. will greatly impair the ability of foreign sugar to come into this huge market because of our crazy sugar policy. This double standard will greatly affect our ability to argue the benefits of no trade barriers. All countries will try to protect their favorite subsidy or tariff as long as the United States maintains its indefensible defense of the sugar barons. I am hopeful that passage of this legislation will give the USTR the resources necessary to break down foreign barriers while educating all policy makers on the importance of lowering our own barriers on sugar.

The sugar program is an archaic, unnecessary government handout to corporate sugar producers at the expense of consumers, workers, and the environment. It is truly deserving of reform. I hope the USTR will work to eliminate the double standard of the sugar program.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1833.

While this bill contains many worthy provisions, there are a number of provisions contained in H.R. 1833 of particular importance to my constituents in South Florida. For example, the bill directs the following additional resources to Florida and Gulf Coast ports: $4.5 million for 6 vehicle and container inspection systems; $11.8 million for 5 mobile truck x-rays; $7.2 million for 8 1-MeV pallet x-rays; $0.25 million for portable contraband detectors; and $0.3 million for 25 contraband detection kits.

The bill also authorizes a net increase of 40 inspectors at southeastern Florida seaports (Port of Miami, Port Everglades, and Port of Palm Beach) to process and screen cargo.

In sum, this bill renews Congress' commitment to interdict drugs in Florida. For too long, Customs resources have been diverted to the southwestern border and Puerto Rico while drugs have poured into Florida. This bill begins to rectify that situation.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1833 is an excellent bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1833, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

CONCERNING TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF TIANANMEN SQUARE MASSACRE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 178) concerning the tenth anniversary of the Tiananmen Square massacre of June 4, 1989, in the People's Republic of China.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 178

Whereas the United States was founded on the democratic principle that all men and women are created equal and entitled to the exercise of their basic human rights;

Whereas freedom of expression and assembly are fundamental human rights that belong to all people and are recognized as such under the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights;

Whereas the death of the former General Secretary of the Communist Party of the People's Republic of China, Hu Yaobang, on April 15, 1989, gave rise to peaceful protests throughout China calling for the establishment of a dialogue with government and party leaders on democratic reforms, including freedom of expression, freedom of assembly, and the elimination of corruption by government officials;

Whereas after that date thousands of prodemocracy demonstrators continued to protest peacefully in and around Tiananmen Square in Beijing until June 3 and 4, 1989, until Chinese authorities ordered the People's Liberation Army and other security forces to use lethal force to disperse demonstrators in Beijing, especially around Tiananmen Square;

Whereas nonofficial sources, a Chinese Red Cross report from June 7, 1989, and the State Department Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 1989, gave various estimates of the numbers of people killed and wounded in 1989 by the People's Liberation Army soldiers and other security forces, but agreed that hundreds, if not thousands, of people were killed and thousands more were wounded;

Whereas 20,000 people nationwide suspected of taking part in the democracy movement were arrested and sentenced without trial to prison or reeducation through labor, and many were reportedly tortured;

Whereas human rights groups such as Human Rights Watch, Human Rights in China, and Amnesty International have documented that hundreds of those arrested remain in prison;

Whereas the Government of the People's Republic of China continues to suppress dissent by imprisoning prodemocracy activists, journalists, labor union leaders, religious believers, and other individuals in China and Tibet who seek to express their political or religious views in a peaceful manner; and

Whereas June 4, 1999, is the tenth anniversary of the date of the Tiananmen Square massacre: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) expresses sympathy to the families of those killed as a result of their participation in the democracy protests of 1989, as well as to the families of those who have been killed and to those who have suffered for their efforts to keep that struggle alive during the past decade;

(2) commends all citizens of the People's Republic of China who are peacefully advocating for democracy and human rights; and

(3) condemns the ongoing and egregious human rights abuses by the Government of the People's Republic of China and calls on that government to—

(A) reevaluate the official verdict on the June 4, 1989, Tiananmen prodemocracy activities and order relevant procuratorial organs to open formal investigations on the June fourth event with the goal of bringing those responsible to justice;

(B) establish a June Fourth Investigation Committee, the proceedings and findings of which should be accessible to the public, to make a just and independent inquiry into all matters related to June 4, 1989;

(C) release all prisoners of conscience, including those still in prison as a result of their participation in the peaceful prodemocracy protests of May and June 1989, provide just compensation to the families of those killed in those protests, and allow those exiled on account of their activities in 1989 to

return and live in freedom in the People's Republic of China;

(D) put an immediate end to harassment, detention, and imprisonment of Chinese citizens exercising their legitimate rights to the freedom of expression, freedom of association, and freedom of religion; and

(E) demonstrate its willingness to respect the rights of all Chinese citizens by proceeding quickly to ratify and implement the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights which it signed on October 5, 1998.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this measure.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for drafting this important legislation. I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for his support of the legislation.

I strongly support House Resolution 178, a resolution concerning the 10th anniversary of the Tiananmen Square massacre of June 4, 1989, in the People's Republic of China. Our government's policy concerning the People's Republic of China has failed to promote human rights in China.

□ 1145

It has failed to promote our national security and failed to ensure a modicum of trade fairness.

The arrest, the executions, the torture and imprisonment of prodemocracy activists in China, occupied Tibet and East Turkestan continue unabated. The government in Beijing is just as determined as ever to distort the truth and prevent that truth from getting out.

Just yesterday the Washington Post reported that, in an effort to ensure that there are no demonstrations regarding the anniversary of the massacre, they arrested Yang Tao, a student leader of the 1989 demonstrations.

One campaigner who has led the effort to give compensation for and urged a government apology to the families of the victims of the massacre has been under virtual house arrest since May 4.

An AP report mentioned that Beijing is trying to stop internet news in China regarding the massacre in Tiananmen Square.

But coming to grips with reality is not just a problem facing Beijing. For too long, we have failed to respond adequately to the challenge of the People's Republic of China represents.

We hope that with the release of the Cox Report today, our Nation will begin to address this serious issue. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let me at the outset commend the gentlewoman from San Francisco, California (Ms. PELOSI) for her leadership on this issue, as well as the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), and many others.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to take a moment to remember Tiananmen Square. Ten years ago on the 4th of June, thousands and thousands of democratically inclined students and citizens of China demonstrated peacefully. On that fateful day, the full force of the Chinese military and security apparatus came down on them with brutality and ferocity of incredible proportions.

Thousands were killed. Tens of thousands were injured. Thousands were imprisoned. There came a dark night in China for all who were hoping for some measure of human rights.

When we introduced this legislation to commemorate the 10th anniversary of this outrage against all standards of civilized conduct, we merely wanted to do just that, to call attention to the fact that 10 years ago, this outrage occurred.

But there is an additional outrage that occurred just a few weeks ago which I believe is highly relevant to this resolution. When the United States, by mistake, bombed the Embassy of China in Belgrade, the Chinese Government engaged in a degree of cynical and hypocritical manipulation of both its own public opinion and global public opinion.

They never told the Chinese people that NATO's air strikes were in response to the killing and mass rape and expulsion of over a million and a half ethnic Albanians. When this mistake occurred, for which the United States apologized at the highest levels, they claimed that the hit on the Embassy of China in Belgrade was not a mistake but a deliberate act of atrocity.

This, Mr. Speaker, underscores the obvious fact. This Communist totalitarian dictatorship has not changed since that fateful day on June 4, 1989. It continues to lie, to fabricate to its own people and to the rest of the world.

By this attempt, it tries to equate morally the deliberate killing of thousands of democracy-loving Chinese citizens at Tiananmen Square with the inadvertent killing of three innocent journalists at the embassy in Belgrade. The civilized world will not allow this attempt at moral equivalence to succeed.

The Chinese Communist government stands self-condemned before the court of global public opinion, both for what it did at Tiananmen Square 10 years ago and what it has been doing the last few weeks, attempting to destroy the functioning Embassy of the United States in Beijing, encouraging mobs of Chinese to attack the embassy, to keep its staff and our ambassador captive, and to engage in the most cynical manipulation of its media and the media of the world.

We are here to commemorate the fallen heroes of Tiananmen Square. When my colleagues come to my office, Mr. Speaker, in the entry hall there is that forever to be remembered poster of a single unarmed Chinese student facing down a column of tanks, the most poignant reminder of human courage and dignity against overwhelming odds.

While that student may have been killed, as were thousands of others, the cause of freedom has not been extinguished in China. The future belongs to the students and citizens of China who, even under these impossible conditions, are insisting on freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of religion, the right to make their own decisions about their own future.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote for this resolution.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), and I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to control that time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly delighted to yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), who has been a leader on this issue for many years in the Congress.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time and for his very generous comments. They are reciprocated by me in terms of his leadership on this issue for the past 10 years, really for his whole life, as a champion of human rights throughout the world.

I want to also thank the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), chairman of the Committee on International Relations, for his steadfastness.

Ten years have gone by, and we have been working on this issue a very, very long time. I wish the outcome, this 10 years later, would be a better one to report on human rights in China. But I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) for his leadership over the years and in the recent days in moving this legislation out of the committee. I appreciate that very much.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. PELOSI. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, we cannot thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) enough for her continued, diligent effort in reminding the entire Congress of the violations of human rights in China, particularly when we discussed most favored nation with China. I hope our colleagues will be reminded of that in our next debate on most favored nation for China.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, one of the most enduring images of the 20th Century is the picture of the lone man before the tank in Tiananmen Square. The distinguished gentleman from San Francisco, California (Mr. LANTOS) mentioned it as an icon that is in the entrance of his office.

It is a constant reminder to all of us of the courage of the young people in Tiananmen Square, and of course of the sadness that the human rights situation has not improved in China yea these many years.

In fact, the policy of our country which was to provide trickle down liberty. If economics goes well and trade goes well, then the political freedom will follow. That simply has not happened. In fact, for all of our concessions to the Chinese, our trade deficit has gone from, $2 million when we started this debate, to this year when it will be well over $60 billion with China.

The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction by China still continues, no matter what anyone tells us. Of course we are witnessing the abuse of the good nature of our President with the violations by the Chinese on proliferation, trade, and the continuing violations of the human rights of people there.

As a tribute to the brave dissidents who gave their lives, risked their personal security, and continue to do so in China, and in commemoration of the 10-year anniversary of the Tiananmen Square massacre, I was pleased to join my colleagues, some of who are present here, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the gentleman from California (Mr. Cox), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), and others who, being lead sponsors on this resolution. A resolution that is not about economics, it is not about politics, it is about remembering.

It is about remembering the challenge that these young people undertook in the spring of 1989. Millions of Chinese students and workers across China demonstrated peacefully for freedom of expression and the elimination of corruption by government officials.

On June 3, the Chinese regime responded to these peaceful demonstrations by ordering the People's Liberation Army to use lethal force on the protesters around Tiananmen Square. Hundreds, if not thousands, we do not know the number because the Chinese Government will not give us access to that, were slaughtered in that night of horror. Thousands more were injured, and over 20,000 prisoners of conscience were arrested and sentenced without trial, to prison, to labor camps, and to years of torture.

Prisoners of conscience tell us that one of the most extricating painful forms of torture occurs when the perpetrators of their torture tell them that no one even knows about them, cares about them, or cares about the cause for which they are in prison.

The purpose of our legislation, which has strong bipartisan support in the House, I am pleased to cosponsor the legislation with my colleague whom I respect so much, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), has strong bipartisan support in the House and in the United States Senate. The purpose of this legislation is to tell the prisoners and their torturers and the Chinese regime and the world that the American people remember.

We remember the brave students who modeled their Goddess of Democracy after our own Statue of Liberty. We remember how the brave students echoed the words of our Founding Fathers in their courageous appeals to the regime. We remember the regime's responding with guns and tanks to crush the peaceful demonstrations. We remember today the many political prisoners who still languish these 10 years later in Chinese prisons.

Our legislation parallels the petition being circulated by the Tiananmen leader Wang Dan and the global campaign for the anniversary of June 4. The petition calls on the Chinese Government to reverse the verdict of Tiananmen Square, to free the prisoners, to allow them and all Chinese to speak freely, and to allow for the return of the Chinese exiles.

The petition has been endorsed by Human Rights Watch, Amnesty International, and International Pen, to name a few organizations.

On the day we introduced our Tiananmen resolution, the Chinese Government arrested dissidents for planning to distribute leaflets seeking redress for the massacre. The location of these pro-democratic activists is still unknown. That same day, a member of the banned China Democratic Party was beaten and stripped of his clothes by the police for merely speaking about democracy in a public park.

At the same time, the regime, speaking through a signed editorial in the People's Daily, the official Chinese newspaper, claimed that overseas dissidents, exiles, and escapees are ''crowing'' at the ''murder'' of their compatriots who died in the NATO bombing of the Chinese Embassy in Belgrade.

What a pathetic commentary on the Beijing regime, that it feels threatened by dissidents in China and abroad!

□ 1200

The regime has the power of their military and security forces at home and they have their economic partners abroad and supporters, including the U.S. Government, bowing to their every whim, and yet they are still frightened.

And speaking of the U.S. Government, while we have bowed to their every whim, sad to say, the Chinese have not returned any friendship to the Clinton administration.

As the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) pointed out, when the stupid mistake of bombing the embassy occurred, the President apologized and apologized and apologized and apologized, but his friends in the regime whom he visited and gave great face to last year, would not even let the Chinese people know that the President had apologized. And they participated in the orchestration of rocks being thrown at our embassy for 3 days, one of our consulates being set on fire, and the ambassador, in his own words, being a hostage in the embassy. This, after we have, as a government, catered to their every whim.

And I might say that the President's apology was exceptional, because we usually do not apologize when we do not do something intentional. This was a mistake; it was not intentional.

It might be of interest to our colleagues to know that when 20 Europeans were killed in a ski lift accident, which occurred in Italy, the United States of America expressed regret. And when we had the problem in Iran, when we mistakenly killed Iranian civilians, President Reagan expressed regret. So an apology is an intensified response to this accidental and mistaken bombing. The Chinese Government would not even accept what the President of the United States was stooping to in this case.

I certainly think the Chinese people deserve to be apologized to or have our regrets extended to them. We should make reparations, we should investigate how the bombing took place, but we should not extend any favors to them on the economic front like premature entry into the WTO unless under commercially viable terms, and we should not ignore their continued violations of human rights in China.

Our President went to China last year. He went to the extreme step of leading the People's Liberation Army band with a baton. He gave face to the regime and came back with a message that this was going to help improve democratic freedoms in China. It has not. It has not.

On the heels of the President's visit, people who supported the China Democracy Party felt emboldened, spoke out, and they are now in prison.

I know I have taken a great deal of time, but with the Chairman's indulgence, I would like to read some of the

names of the people still in prison right now. Xu Wenli, for example, a leader of the China Democracy Party was arrested immediately upon speaking out. In addition we are remembering about people who are still in prison 10 years later for their activities at the time of the 1989 Tiananmen Square massacre. Cao Yingyuan, Chang Jingqiang, Chang Yongjie, Chen Dongxiang, Chen Qiulong, Chen Yanbin. And it is a long, long, long list, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to submit it for the RECORD. It is a list compiled by Human Rights in China, an organization dedicated to freeing the prisoners arrested at that time.

HUMAN RIGHTS IN CHINA

BEIJING CITIZENS STILL IN PRISON IN CONNECTION WITH 1989 JUNE FOURTH CRACKDOWN

Ten years after the Beijing Massacre and subsequent crackdown, hundreds remain in prison for their role in the 1989 protests. The list below contains the names of 144 individuals from Beijing alone who are serving lengthy prison sentences for their participation in the 1989 democracy movement.

This information was primarily compiled by Li Hai, 44, a former Beijing student who was arrested in 1995 for making the list public. He was subsequently sentenced to a nine-year prison term for ''prying into and gathering'' ''state secrets.''

The individuals listed below include a wide variety of Beijing residents—from peasants, security guards and factory workers to engineers and cadres in the State Planning Commission. At the time of their arrest, they ranged in age from 17 to 71. In the official propaganda, these demonstrators were called ''rioters,'' and were charged with ''arson,'' ''hooliganism,'' ''disturbing social order,'' and other criminal offenses. For the most part they are people who were seen on television screens around the world in May 1989, marching in the streets, blocking the path of the troops entering the city with improvised barricades, running through the streets on the night of June 3–4, and throwing rocks and paving stones at tanks and armed personnel carriers. Many are thought to have been detained merely because they were out on the streets. In general, these people were brought to trial more quickly and received more severe sentences than did the prominent students and intellectuals who were arrested. The average sentence of those not given life terms is approximately thirteen years.

Li Hai, the persons on this list, and the many other ''namesless'' individuals jailed throughout China in connection with the 1989 crackdown might not be as internationally well-known as some dissidents, but their lives and liberty are equally significant.

Human Rights in China submits the following list to President Clinton for presentation to Prime Minister Zhu Rongji during his visit.

Human Rights in China urges the Chinese government to demonstrate its commitment to making genuine improvements in the human rights situation by releasing all of the prisoners on this list, as well as the thousands of other political and religious detainees throughout China.

LIST OF BEIJING CITIZENS STILL IN PRISON IN CONNECTION WITH 1989 TIANANMEN SQUARE CRACKDOWN

Beijing No. 2 Prison: Name, Age—Sentence, Charge (see key below for charge name).

Cao Yingyuan, 40—10 years, #6; Chang Jingqiang—25, Life, #4, 5; Chang Yongjie, 31—Susp. death #4, 6, 9; Chen Dongxiang, 57—14 years #3; Chen Qiulong, 38—13 years, #3; Chen Yanbin, 23—15 years, #7; Liang Zhaohui, 26, worker—13 years, #4; Liang Zhenyun, 32, auto-mechanic—12 years, #11; Liang Zhixiang, 25, worker—10.5 years, #4; Liu Changqing, 34—15 years, #4; Liu Chunlong, 26—12 years, #4; Liu Huaidong, 31, cadre—13 years, #10; Liu Jianwen, 29, worker—20 years, #11, #10; Liu Kunlun, 43, cadre—13 years, #4; Liu Quann, 44—15 years, #4, #13; Liu Xu, 28, worker—15 years, #4; Liu Zhenting, 36, worker in Beijing No. 2 auto plant—17 years, #9; Lu Xiaojun, 36, worker—13 years, #9, #10; Ma Guochun, 35—11 years, #9, #10.

Ma Lianxi, 44—15 years, #11; Ma Shimin, 26—11 years, #4; Meng Fanjun, 29, worker—13 years, #11; Mi Yuping, 39, worker—13 years, #4; Niu Shuliang, 26, worker—12 years, #4; Niu Zhanping, 43, worker—12 years, #4, #12; Peng Xingguo, 41—15 years, #4; Qiao Hongqi, 38, worker—12 years, #11; Shan Hui, 28, worker—14 years, #9; Shi Xuezhi, 58—Life, #4; Song Shihui, 24, worker—11 years, #9, #10; Su Gang, 28, teacher—15 years, #4; Sun Chuanheng, 28—Life, reduced to 20 years, #2; Sun Hong, 27, worker—Susp. death, #4; Sun Yancai, 32—Life, #9; Sun Yanru, 27—13 years, #9; Sun Zhengang, 33, worker—14 years, #4; Wang Jian, 30, worker—13 years, #9; Wang Lianhui, 31—Life, #9; Wang Lianxi, 43, worker—Life, #4; Wang Xian, 30, worker—Life, #4.

Wang Yonglu, 30, worker—11 years, #11; Wang Yueming, 32—13 years, #4; Wang Chunmo, 34—11 years, #9; Wang Dongming, 37, worker—13 years, #4; Wu Ruijiang, 28, cadre—13 years, #9, #10; Xi Haoliang, 27, worker—Susp. death, #4, #5; Xu Ning, 26, worker—12 years (reduced by 2 years), #4; Yan Jianxin, 30, worker—11 years, #9, #10; Yang Guanghui, 25—12 years, #4; Yang Jianhua, 38, worker—14 years, #9, #12; Yang Pu, 34—Susp. death, #4; Yang Yupu, 33—15 years, #4; Yu Wen, 29, worker—12 years, #10; Zhang Baojun, 27—13 years, #4, #9; Zhang Baoku, 29, worker—12 years, #4; Zhang Baoqun, 32—Life, #4; Zhang Fukun, 39—Life, #4; Zhang Guodong, 27—Life, #4; Zhang Kun, 28, worker—11 years, #4; Zhang Maosheng, 30—Susp. death, #4; Zhang Qijie, 32, worker—Susp. death, #9, #10, concealing a weapon; Zhang Qun, 27, worker—Life, #4.

#7—Organizing a counterrevolutionary group

#8—Conspiring to subvert the government

Common criminal charges: #9—Robbery; #10—Hooliganism; #11—Stealing or seizing gun or ammunition; #12—Disturbing social order; #13—Disrupting traffic.

Notes: (1) Some of the ages of prisoners in Qinghe Farm No. 3 Branch are age at date of arrest; (2) Sentences marked with an asterisk * could have been subject to reduction or supplementation; (3) ''Susp. death'' means a death sentence with a two-year reprieve. This means that if the prisoner has behaved well during the two-year period, the sentence is normally commuted to life.

I want to call the attention of my colleagues to the Global Petition Campaign for the 10th anniversary of the June 4th massacre. It is an open letter to the Government of the People's Republic of China calling upon the regime to reverse the verdict of Tiananmen Square. So we are associating ourselves in the Congress today with the aspirations of those brave people, including Wang Dan who was imprisoned for his political beliefs and his participation at the time of Tiananmen and after; and we are also associating ourselves with those many people who are still imprisoned.

Free the prisoners. It is 10 years later. What do you have to be afraid of?

And then in closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that were it not for this Congress, we really would not be having much to talk about today. But year in and year out we keep this on the front burner. There is no story written about China that doesn't talk about the disagreement we have between at least the Congress of the United States and the Chinese regime about promoting democratic freedoms.

We do not in this body subscribe to the principle of trickle-down liberty. We subscribe to what our Founding Fathers established this country on. Those words of our Founding Fathers were echoed by the young people in Tiananmen Square. For that, they were crushed by tanks, and for that, they will be remembered by us in this resolution remembering Tiananmen.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time and I thank the gentleman for his indulgence in affording me the opportunity to speak at this length on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the material I referred to above.

I want to call to the attention of my colleagues the Chinese activists detained in recent crackdown around June 4.

Yang Tao—Detained May 5, 1999; Present situation unknown. Mr. Yang, 29, is a former student leader of the 1989 Democracy Movement. In 1989, Yang was listed as #11 on the central governments most wanted list of 21 leaders of the democracy demonstrations. Now based in Guangzhou city, Guangdong Province, Yang previously served a one-year sentence for ''instigating a counter-revolutionary rebellion'' for his 1989 activities. Human rights monitors in Hong Kong reported Yang had been formally arrested on May 24 and faces criminal prosecution for his recent activism.

Jiang Qisheng—Detained May 19, 1999; Present situation unknown. Mr. Jiang, 51, is a former graduate student leader of the 1989 Democracy Movement. Jiang was elected by People's University classmates as a representative on the ''Dialogue Delegation'' that conveyed student communications with central government representatives in May 1989. He served a 17-month sentence for his 1989 activities. Since his release, Jiang worked closely with Prof. Ding Zilin, the mother of one of the demonstrators killed on June 4, 1989, and participated in numerous petition campaigns.

Liu Xianli—Sentenced to four years for inciting to overthrow state power on May 9, 1999. Mr. Liu was arrested in March 1998 while putting together a book of interviews with many Chinese democracy and human rights movement. His secret trial was held in November 1998, but his sentence was only recently released to his family.

The following are the names of the Chinese worker prisoners still imprisoned for 1989 democracy activities.

Yu Zhijian—life sentence for counter-revolutionary sabotage. Yu Zhijian, 31, is a former primary-school teacher from Hunan Province. Yu gave speeches in Hunan during the early spring in support of the 1989 democratic movement. He traveled to Beijing in May 1989 to join the demonstrations there. On May 23, Yu and two friends threw ink- and paint-filled

eggs at the portrait of Mao Zedong in Tiananmen Square. Yu was sentenced to life in prison in August 1989. According to a 1996 Human Rights Watch report, he was believed to be serving in solitary confinement at the Lingling Prison in Hunan Province.

Yu Dongyue—20 years for counter-revolutionary sabotage. Yu Dongyue is a former fine arts editor of the Liuyang News, a city paper of Liuyang city, Hunan Province. He traveled to Beijing in May 1989 to join the demonstrations there. On May 23, Yu and two friends threw ink- and paint-filled eggs at the portrait of Mao Zedong in Tiananmen Square. Yu was sentenced to twenty years imprisonment in August 1989. He reportedly served at least two years in solitary confinement. He is said to be serving in Hunan Province Yuanjiang No. 1 Prison. Recent news articles report Yu ''was suffering severe mental illness.''

Lu Decheng—16 years for counter-revolutionary sabotage. Lu Decheng is a former worker at the Liuyang (Hunan Province) Public Motors Company. He traveled to Beijing in May 1989 to join the demonstrations there. On May 23, Lu and two friends threw ink- and paint-filled eggs at the portrait of Mao Zedong in Tiananmen Square. Yu was scentenced so sixteen years imprsonment in August 1989. He reportedly served at least two years in solitary confinement. He is said to have been moved from his original prison in 1992, but no updated informaiton is available.

Chen Zhixiang—10 years for counter-revolutionary propaganda and incitement. Chen Zhixiang, 33, is a former instructor at the Guangzhou (Guangdong Province) Maritime Transport Academy. Chen was involved in the Guangzhou city-wide 1989 democratic protest and arrested in late 1989. He was convicted of ''counter-revolutionary propaganda and incitement'' in January 1990 and received a ten year sentenced. He is reportedly held in the Shaoguan Laogai Detachment in Guangdong Province.

Li Wei—13 years for taking part in a counterrevolutionary group. Li, a worker at the Changchun (Jilin Province) No. 1 Motor Works, joined a 'workers' forum' in 1987 and 1988. In Spring 1989, he joined a number of marches led by workers at the Changchun No. 1 Motor Works in support of the democratic movement. Li was detained in June 1989 and convicted of actively taking part in a counterrevolutionary group'' in November 1990. He was sentenced to 13 years imprisonment. Chinese authorities confirmed Li's sentence to the US government in November 1991. He is reportedly being held in the Liaoning Province Lingyuan No. 2 Laogai Detachment.

Wang Changhuai—13 years for subversion. Wang was the Chairman of the Hunan Workers Autonomous Federation prior to the crackdown on the democratic protests of Spring 1989. Formerly a worker at the Changsha Au tomobile Engine Factory, Wang turned himself in to authorities in late June 1989. Wang was sentenced to 13 years improsonment for 'subversion'. He is reportedly being held in Hunan Province Yuanjiang No. 1 Prison.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), who has been indefatigable in his attempts to promote human rights not just in China but around the world.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 178, a resolution concerning the massacre at Tiananmen Square on June 3 and June 4 of 1989. Next week marks the 10th anniversary of that historic tragic event, and so the Chinese Government ought to know we are not going to forget about it. But more importantly, we want the men and women who are still in jail to know.

And I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH). He and I visited Beijing Prison Number One, where we saw 40 Tiananmen Square prisoners working on socks to export to the United States.

Also, by us doing this and the Congress voting this way, it sends a message the same way we did to Sharansky. When Sharansky was in Perm Camp 35, he told us he knew every time the United States Congress spoke out on behalf of him and other Soviet dissidents. It encouraged them and emboldened them and let them know that the West cared and was going to stand with them no matter what.

So it has been a decade since the crackdown, but we are not going to forget.

Also, Mr. Speaker, it is important to know that the persecution of the church and the persecution in Tibet still continues unabated in China. They have Catholic priests in jail, Catholic bishops in jail; they have plundered Tibet, they are persecuting the Buddhist monks, they are persecuting the Muslims in the northwest portion of the country. So in addition to commemorating the 10th anniversary, to letting the Tiananmen Square demonstrators know we stand in solidarity, it also sends a message that this government has not changed.

I am convinced that the Chinese Government cannot last much longer. I am convinced they will go the way of the Ceausescu administration. In fact, they must have found Ceausescu's playbook because everything Ceausescu did against the church they are doing against the church. Everything Ceausescu did against the demonstrators in Tiananmen Square in Bucharest, they are doing.

And so this government and all of us here, all of us in this body, will live to see the day that they fall. And one day in China, in the not too distant future, the good people of China, and they are good people, will be free, able to choose their leaders in democracy and free elections and they will free the press and have freedom of worship.

Until then, we applaud all those fighting inside China to keep the struggle for human rights and democracy alive. We call on the Chinese Government to show its respect for human rights by releasing all of the prisoners of conscience. If we were to wake up tomorrow or in celebration of the anniversary and were to see they were to release all of the prisoners of conscience, that may make a big difference in this country. But until they do that, we will remember.

Lastly, for the administration and Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle to talk about giving this country Most Favored Nation trading status is absolutely crazy. And after the Cox report, released today, if we have a vote on MFN, it ought to go down overwhelmingly. And, quite frankly, the administration ought not even send anything up.

But more importantly, back to the brave young men and women and their families, we will remember and stand with them in solidarity and will celebrate in victory in Tiananmen Square when freedom comes to China.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself strongly with the remarks of all the previous speakers, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI). And I want to thank the gentlewoman for her leadership in drafting this legislation. I am very proud to be a cosponsor of it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote on H. Res. 178, which many of us want to see passed unanimously today. Ten years ago, Mr. Speaker, the ground at Tiananmen Square was hallowed by the blood of thousands of peaceful democracy advocates. Those Chinese patriots were slaughtered by a Communist regime that remains defiantly unapologetic for its actions and that continues to deny the very truth of what happened.

I was gravely disappointed last year when the President of the United States and our country, which more than any other in the world ought to bear the standard of freedom and democracy and do so very, very diligently, met at that very site with the dictators who continued to lie about the murders committed less than a decade ago. In December of 1996, Mr. Speaker, General Chi Haotian, the Defense Minister of the People's Republic of China and the operational commander of the forces that attacked the pro-democracy demonstrators, we call him the ''Butcher of Beijing,'' was invited to the United States by the Clinton administration.

During his visit he was given full military honors, a 19-gun salute, visits to several military bases and a tour of Sandia Nuclear Laboratory. And I would just say parenthetically, the Cox report suggests that that visit probably was not needed. He even had a personal meeting, Mr. Speaker, with the President of the United States at the White House.

He also stated in what he called a responsible and serious manner, and I quote this, ''Not a single person lost

his life in Tiananmen Square.'' He claimed that on June 4th, 1989, the People's Liberation Army did nothing more violent than pushing. General Chi Haotian said the only thing they did in Tiananmen Square was push people that he called hooligans. General Chi's remarkable ''big lie'' statement about Tiananmen Square helped the American people and the world to understand what he and his government are really like.

Mr. Speaker, my Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights of the Committee on International Relations has had more than a dozen hearings on China and its repressive human rights regime, and during one of those, when we heard those outrageous remarks, we very quickly put together a hearing with people who were there on the ground—students—and we also had a man that was a journalist from the People's Daily, who was actually arrested for his honest reporting as to what had occurred, a Time magazine correspondent, and, like I said, some of the students. But we also invited General Chi.

The gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and I, then the ranking member, wanted to give the Chinese an opportunity to give an account for Tiananmen Square. The General was mouthing off to audiences here in the United States that nobody died. We offered that he come without delay before the people's body and give an account, because we happened to have evidence that would prove contrary. General Chi didn't make it. He didn't show up.

We offered it to a representative of his government and we also invited Ambassador Lee for a roundtable discussion, and at the very last minute, he opted out. C–SPAN, everybody was there to cover it and there was another empty chair because they do not want to be held accountable for the atrocities.

Perhaps General Chi, perhaps the ambassador, perhaps any representative of the government could tell us that there are no persecuted Christians in China. Perhaps they could tell us there is no ethnic and religious persecution in Tibet or Xinjiang. Perhaps they could tell us there is no forced abortions or forced sterilization, no dying rooms for unwanted children, usually baby girls and usually handicapped children.

They also perhaps could tell us there is no political suppression or dissent and no torture. Of course, we would know that is a lie, but it is about time we held them to account.

At one of our hearings recently, Mr. Speaker, Amnesty International issued a report card and on every one of the items they came to the conclusion that there was a total failure by the dictatorship. For example, release of all Tiananmen Square prisoners and other prisoners of conscience. Amnesty's response, total failure. Not one Tiananmen Square prisoner has been released since President Clinton's visit. Review all counterrevolutionary prison terms, about 2,000 of them; total failure. Not one counterrevolutionary prison sentence has been reviewed.

There has been no indication by Chinese authorities that they will undertake a systematic review of such cases; according to Amnesty. Allow religious freedom; continued strong repression, says Amnesty.

□ 1215

There has been no indication of improvement since the President's visit. On the gross violation of coercive family planning and the harvesting of organs, again, Amnesty International reports no progress whatsoever. Those are crimes against humanity.

The information concerning the practice of coercive population control is ''unequivocal''. And the Chinese authorities have announced no steps to stop it.

Review of the system and reeducation through labor; total failure says Amnesty. Chinese authorities have made no changes in the system, nor have they announced any plans to do so.

End police and prison brutality. Amnesty reports total failure in these two areas as well. Chinese authorities continue to use torture and beatings.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, General Chi did not respond to our invitation. Nor has the ambassador. And we reissue it again to them. Come and speak before the House, through our subcommittee or any other forum, because we think that there is much to be held accountable for.

What really happened on Tiananmen Square? I think Ms. PELOSI put it so well. There were people there on the ground who reported. Let us not forget the very images we saw. It was captured on videotape. And yet, they still lie right through their teeth.

Nicholas Kristoff of the New York Times, who was in the Square on that night, reports, and this is his reporting, ''The troops began shooting. Some people fell to the ground wounded or dead. Each time the soldiers fired again and more people fell to the ground.''

When he went to the Xiehe Hospital, the nearest to the Square, ''It was a bloody mess with hundreds of injured lying on the floors. I saw bullet holes in the ambulances.''

Jan Wong of The Toronto Globe and Mail, looking down from a balcony in Beijing, ''watched in horror as the army shot directly into the crowds. People fell with gaping wounds.''

Later she reported, ''The soldiers strafed ambulances and shot medical workers trying to rescue the wounded.'' ''In all,'' she reported, ''I recorded eight long murderous volleys. Dozens died before my eyes.''

General Chi said this was just pushing. What an outrageous big lie, reminiscent of what the Nazis did during their terrible reign of terror.

This is what Tiananmen Square means to the people of China, Mr. Speaker, and to the world. We should mark the tenth anniversary of that tragedy by remembering those who lost their lives in Tiananmen Square and by publicly committing ourselves to the cause for which they died, freedom for the people of China.

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

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. The Congress is always at its best when we speak with a bipartisan voice. There is no issue on which we speak with a stronger, clearer, more articulate bipartisan voice than the issue of human rights violations in China and in Tibet.

All of my colleagues who have spoken and all who will vote for this resolution express our determination that we shall not rest until China becomes a free and open and democratic society. The Chinese people deserve no less, one of the most talented people with an incredible record in science, literature, music, art, in every aspect of human endeavor, who are suffering under the yoke of an unspeakable totalitarian communistic dictatorship. The day of the Chinese people will come.

I call on all my colleagues to vote for this resolution.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, following the death of Mao and the end of the chaotic Cultural Revolution in 1976, China embarked down the path of significant economic and political reform, comparatively speaking. With Deng Xiaoping's Reform and Opening Policy, trade and foreign investment expanded and rigid communist economic policies were relaxed. As a result, the Chinese people were exposed to new standards of living, access to information and commercial freedoms never before realized. These progressive economic reforms stimulated the desire for increased political freedom and democratization, especially among students in China.

Unfortunately, while the Chinese Communist Party leadership acknowledged that economic reform was necessary and encouraged it, these leaders fearfully viewed even modest political liberalization as a serious threat to the Communist Party's monopoly on power. Thus, when Chinese students peacefully demonstrated for democratic change, hard-line Communist leaders responded with tanks, bullets and mass arrests. The most visible and brutal incidents occurred on June 3rd and 4th in Tiananmen Square. Many people were killed by the People's Liberation Army and other security forces. A great many more were wounded. It is reported at over 20,000 people nationwide suspected of taking part in the democracy movement were arrested and sentenced without trial to prison or labor camps. Hundreds of these individuals remain incarcerated today.

As the Chairman of the House International Relations Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, this Member follows developments in China as closely as possible and believes that it is certainly in America's national security interests to integrate China into the international community. Yet, it is clear that Sino-American relations are complex and comprehensive, and have become increasingly problematic. Our concerns continue to multiply in scope and seriousness: espionage, illegal campaign contributions, weapons proliferation, abortion,

Tibet, Taiwan, unfair trade and human rights. Each of these issues needs to be addressed by the appropriate means in the appropriate fora.

In some cases we will find ourselves in concert with the views or policies of China. For example, we have a shared interest in supporting a sustainable recovery from the Asian financial crisis. In other matters, such as to what constitutes a respect and proper actions on matters relating to human rights, we strongly disagree. Responsible engagement does not equate to appeasement. It is a comprehensive approach focusing on both areas of agreement and disagreement.

Freedom and democracy are the very foundation of the United States and are principles the American people cherish. Americans were outraged watching Chinese students whose only apparent crime was asking for more political freedom being crushed by PLA tanks and shot in the back as they tried to flee Tiananmen Square. Our consciences will not allow us to quietly ignore this tragic misconduct of a government towards its people. While Tiananmen Square may have been cleared of protesters ten years ago, the aftermath of that violence remains.

Over the past decade since the tragic incident in Tiananmen Square, the human rights situation in China gradually began to improve, relatively speaking. Unfortunately, that encouraging progress was reversed six months ago when hundreds of prodemocracy activists, journalists, labor union leaders, religious believers, and others labeled by the Communist Party as dissidents began to be exiled, imprisoned or harassed.

Therefore, as part of our policy of responsible engagement, this Member supports H. Res. 178, the resolution before the House concerning the tenth anniversary of the Tiananmen Square massacre of June 4, 1989, in the People's Republic of China. This is an appropriate and measured way to send a message to the Communist leadership in Beijing and to the Chinese people at large that Americans are understandably and as a matter of principle and conscience very much concerned about human rights and democratic reform in China.

If China is to be integrated and welcomed into the international community as a responsible member and positive force, China ultimately must respect the rule of law. H. Res. 178 serves as a strong reminder that, in the opinion of the House of Representatives, very significant actions still need to be taken by Beijing to achieve that standard.

Mr. Speaker, with the 10th anniversary of the Tiananmen Square massacre just a week away, this Member urges his colleagues to join him in supporting H. Res. 178.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate a group of courageous individuals and their commitment to freedom and democracy—the thousands of Chinese students and activists who took part in the Tiananmen Square demonstration in May and June of 1989.

I want to thank the chairman of the Congressional Working Group on China, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and the gentle lady from California (Ms. PELOSI) for bringing this resolution to the floor of the House so quickly and in such a timely fashion.

Days after the June 4th massacre, the Congressional Human Rights Caucus, held a briefing on this event. The pictures we saw, and the stories we heard are some of the most disturbing pictures of brutality and barbarity I have ever been exposed to.

And yet, ten years later the perpetrators of this massacre have not been brought to justice. Hundreds of people are still held in prison for their involvement. Thousands more have been jailed since for similar reasons. Far too much time has passed for these cries of democracy to go unheard.

The Chinese leadership remains unapologetic about the events of June 4, 1989, they continue to vilify, imprison and exile these and other brave democracy activists. As recently as the beginning of this month, Yang Tao, a student leader of Tiananmen Square, was picked up from his house and arrested for calling on the government to ''re-evaluate'' its position on the events of June 1989. Other leaders have been put under house arrest for calling on the government to apologize for the murders and compensate the victims' families. Radio Free Asia reports in the days following the bombing of the Chinese Embassy, over half of the callers to their talk show were critical of the Chinese Government.

The time has come for the Chinese government to take a close look at what happened ten years ago and to apologize to its people. The government cannot continue its harassment and imprisonment of its citizens who exercise their rights of freedom of speech, expression and religion. The hope and desire for democracy is still alive. We must do all we can to support it. I stand in strong support of H. Res. 178.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, today, I honor the hundreds, if not thousands of Chinese students that were brutally slain on June 4, 1989, by the Communist Chinese authorities. On that fateful day ten years ago, the best and brighest of a generation perished needlessly and the lives of countless Chinese families were disrupted forever.

I commend my colleague NANCY PELOSI for her continuing leadership on China issues and for introducing H. Res. 178, to commemorate the Tenth Anniversary of the Tiananmen Square massacre. Her efforts insure that the U.S. House of Representatives and the American people will never forget.

To all the activists in China fighting today for the freedom of their country, I vow never to forget Tiananmen Square. I remind you that your allies across the globe continue to fight for your universal cause; to attain freedom, democracy and human rights for the Chinese people.

The Chinese leaders say that they want to bring China into the modern world economy. I say to the Chinese leaders, you can't have capitalism without democracy and human rights. Capitalism and democracy go hand in hand, you can't have one without the other.

The democratic rights advocated by these slain students ten years ago are universal, not uniquely western values as the Chinese leadership would have us believe. Indeed the blooming of full democracy in Taiwan, Korea, South Africa, Eastern Europe, Russia and many other countries since 1989 proves the universality of democracy and human rights.

Ultimately, the values of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights will prevail. As that document states, ''All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood.'' Until that day I will join NANCY PELOSI, many of my colleagues here in the House, and countless others around the world in fighting for this just cause.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I too yield back the balance of my time, and I urge a ''yes'' vote on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 178.

The question was taken.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

JENNIFER'S LAW

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

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to announce, this being National Missing Children's Day, that an important piece of legislation which will be known as Jennifer's Law, an effort to ensure that States have the resources to create a database including DNA and fingerprints and other important information through identified persons, that will be matched with a missing persons list that is created through a database throughout our Nation, that that important legislation will be on the floor, will be available for suspension vote right after we return from the Memorial Day recess.

I speak on behalf of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the majority leader, as the assistant majority leader today; and I speak on behalf of a young lady from my district, 21-year-old Jennifer, who in 1993 moved from her parents' suburban home in New York to California.

She was in pursuit of her dream. Her mom was lonely for her and sent her a ticket to come home, but she never picked up that ticket. She was never seen again. And this is for Jennifer and for the many tens of thousands of families that need to bring closure and peace of mind. This important bill, Jennifer's Law, will help States and the Federal Government partner together to do just that.

So I just wanted to announce to the House that that will be introduced today, will be available, and will be brought to the floor of this House as soon as we return from the Memorial Day recess.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1906, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 185 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 185

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1906) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 4(a) of rule XIII or section 306 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

House Resolution 185 is an open rule, providing for the consideration of H.R. 1906, the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 2000.

The rule waives clause 4(a) of rule 13, requiring a 3-day layover of the committee report, and Section 306 of the Congressional Budget Act, prohibiting consideration of legislation within the Committee on the Budget's jurisdiction, unless reported by the Committee on the Budget, against consideration of the bill. Further, the rule waives clause 2 of rule XXI, prohibiting unauthorized and legislative provisions in an appropriations bill, against provisions in the bill.

As has become standard practice since the 104th Congress, Mr. Speaker, the rule provides Members who have preprinted their amendments in the RECORD prior to their consideration priority in recognition to offer their amendments.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone votes during consideration of the bill and reduce voting time to 5 minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a 15-minute vote.

Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

I would like to urge my colleagues to support this open rule on our first appropriations measure to come to the floor in the 106th Congress, Agriculture Appropriations.

I commend the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. Kaptur), for their hard work in producing this year's bill, which provides significant assistance for agriculture. I know that spending levels are extremely tight, and I believe they did a good job of working within their limits.

The Agriculture Appropriations bill funds programs that help benefit each of us every single day. From improving nutrition to helping ensure safe and nutritious food to put on America's tables, the funds in this bill make it possible for less than 2 percent of the American population to provide food that is safe, nutritious, and affordable for all 272 million people in the United States of America, as well as others throughout the world.

I have consistently been an admirer and supporter of American agriculture, and I commend the hard work and efficiency of the American farmer. I am pleased to support both this open rule providing the means to bring forth this legislation today and the underlying bill. I urge my colleagues to support this rule.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) for yielding me the time.

This is an open rule on the Agriculture Appropriations bill. As my colleague has described, this rule provides for one hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The rule permits amendments under the 5-minute rule, which is the normal amending process in the House. Members on both sides of the aisle will have the opportunity to offer amendments which are germane and which follow the rules for appropriations bills.

The Agriculture Appropriations bill is one of the most important measures that we consider. It funds programs that feed hungry people in the United States and around the world. It supports the American farmers, who are so important to the U.S. economy.

This bill represents a compromise. I wish that some of the funding levels could be higher. However, I recognize that appropriators were working under restraints and they faced many difficult decisions. Overall, this is a worthwhile bill.

I appreciate the efforts of the Appropriations subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), and especially the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), ranking minority member, in crafting the bill. They did a good job. They had to work under difficult constraints, but they did a very, very good job and funded some very important programs.

The committee restored $50 million cut by the administration for Title 2 of the P.L. 480 ''Food for Peace'' program. This program donates crops grown by American farmers to hungry people in impoverished and war-torn countries. This is the cornerstone of America's humanitarian assistance around the world.

The bill provides $4 billion for the WIC program, which provides nutrition to women, infants, and children. This is $81 million more than the current level of funding but $100 million less than the administration's request. According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, this level is not adequate to maintain the current participation level of 7.4 million recipients.

Mr. Speaker, I note that once again the Committee on Rules has been forced to waive the 3-day layover for committee reports. This rule guarantees that all Members have at least 3 days to examine a bill before the committee files a report with the House. By waiving this rule, the House risks that some Members will not have enough time to study a bill before it is considered on the House floor.

This is the 13th time this year the Committee on Rules had to waive this rule. But it is an important bill and we need to act quickly, so I will support the rule and the bill. I think it is vital, important, and we need it.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

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

□ 1230

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to talk about where we

are going in this country. This rule is symptomatic of the problem that we face. There are two Members of the House who honestly agreed that we would not be able to live within the 1997 budget agreement with the President. Those two Members voted for a budget that would actually spend Social Security money. Everybody else that is a Member of this House voted for one budget or another that would preserve 100 percent of the Social Security surplus this year. This bill is the first among many bills that will do exactly the opposite of that. The Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies states that this bill is a cut. That is an untruthful statement. This bill actually increases spending around $250 million. That money will come from the Social Security surplus.

There will be those today in the debate on this bill that will deny that. They will say there is no way you can know that this money will be coming from Social Security because we have not considered the other bills. To me that is intellectually dishonest, because we realize that this is the first bill of 13 appropriations bills under which we will consider over the next several months. We have said with the budget that passed this House that we would preserve 100 percent of the Social Security surplus. My question to my colleagues is if we really do not intend to do that, it is time for us to be very, very honest with the American people. I put my colleagues on notice that I will vote for no appropriations bill and no rule that is intended to spend the first penny of Social Security surplus. The issue really is not Social Security. The issue really is are we going to regenerate faith of the American people in this body? We cannot in good conscience for our country, for our children and for our grandchildren do anything but be fully honest about what our intentions are.

On my side of the aisle, there is a great debate on how best to accomplish this. We are faced with an ag appropriations bill because of process time. We must get a bill to the floor. We must start passing appropriations bills. Consequently, we are going to put forth a bill today and a rule. There is no question in my mind it will pass. There is no question in my mind that this bill also will probably pass. But if it does in its present form, $250 million above last year, then what we are saying to the American people is we do not really mean what we say when we passed both a Democrat budget, which did not pass but when we voted on it, or the Republican budget which did pass and we voted on, that we really do not mean what we say about protecting Social Security money. That lies at the heart of the problems of our body. For America to thrive, for America to turn around from the tragedies that are facing us today, the same principles have to be beheld in this body, and that is a principle of truth.

If in fact this body intends to protect Social Security, if it intends to do that, if we are true with our votes about what we meant on the various budgets, then there is no way this rule should pass and there is no way if this rule passes that this bill should pass.

I come from an agricultural district. My district is farmers. It is rural. Everything in my district has lots to do with the appropriations coming from the Agricultural Department. But we can do better. We must do better. Because it is not about spending Social Security money. It is not about being true to our word. It is about the foundational structure of our country and whether or not we are going to operate on the principles that we want our children to have, that we are going to reinforce the positive aspects of honor, of commitment to your word. Are we going to set an example for our children in high school that we are going to do what we said we were going to do? Are we going to be true to the founding principles of this country?

I am in my last term, and I must say that I am very much discouraged as a Member of this body whether or not we have a great future when in fact we say one thing and mean another. I hope that you will check your heart, not just your mind, especially not your political mind, but that you will check your heart. Do we really mean it when we say we are going to protect Social Security, or do we not? I believe we do not mean it.

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I rise in strong support of this rule, and I congratulate the chairman and the ranking member for their work. I think there are a lot of very positive aspects to this bill.

I wanted to highlight, though, at this moment two amendments that I will be offering with support from different members from both political parties. Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that in the United States of America today, at a time when we are far and away the wealthiest country in the history of the world, hunger, h-u-n-g-e-r, remains a very serious problem for senior citizens and for children in this Nation. At a time when this Nation possesses so much wealth, there is absolutely no excuse, none at all, that one American citizen is hungry. And yet hospital administrators tell us that many of the senior citizens who come into their hospitals are suffering, if you can believe this, from malnutrition. Malnutrition. That is not what should be going on in the United States. I along with Democrats and Republicans will be offering an amendment to increase by $10 million funding for the Commodities Supplemental Food Program which comes close, therefore, to the level that the President had requested. This amendment will be offset by cutting the Agricultural Research Service which received a $50 million increase this year, bringing it up to $830 million. So they received a $50 million increase up to $830 million when we have large numbers of senior citizens in this country going hungry. And while agriculture research is important and there is much in that bill that is important, we should not be increasing funds to develop red snapper aquaculture when senior citizens and children in America are going hungry.

The second amendment that I will be introducing will be a very small amount of money which would go to help develop agritourism in the United States. It is no secret that all over this country, family farmers, whether it is dairy, whether it is in other commodities, are fighting for their lives, and there are States such as New Mexico and Massachusetts with an agritourism program, a program by which tourists could come visit family farms, perhaps to bed-and-breakfast or other types of activities and get cash into the pockets of family farms who are struggling. There are some very good programs all over this country that have been established in New Mexico, established in Massachusetts. I think it is important for a small sum of money to be appropriated at the Federal level to allow innovative programs to be developed throughout this country. I would hope that for those of us who are concerned about preserving the family farm, we support that amendment as well.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would simply request support for this rule. It is an open rule. Any concerns or opposition that Members may have with regard to the underlying legislation can be dealt with through amendments. If there are colleagues who believe there is too much spending, they can propose amendments to cut spending. All of that is permitted under a totally open rule. And so I would ask all of my colleagues to support this rule so that the process can go on and so precisely debate on the legislation, including any disagreements, may also go on and take place in this House today.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The question is on the resolution.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The Chair announces that proceedings will resume immediately following this first 15-minute vote on the three postponed suspension motions and that each of those will be 5-minute votes.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 10, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 147]

YEAS—402

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (FL)

NAYS—10

Bishop
Coburn
Edwards
Hilliard
Hostettler
McIntosh
McKinney
Miller, George
Sanford
Wu

NOT VOTING—21

Boucher
Brown (CA)
Buyer
Cox
Ewing
Graham
Hinojosa
Jackson-Lee (TX)
John
Kasich
Lucas (KY)
Millender-McDonald
Napolitano
Ortiz
Packard
Peterson (MN)
Reyes
Smith (TX)
Waxman
Whitfield
Young (AK)

□ 1301

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

S. 249, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 1833, by the yeas and nays; and

House Resolution 178, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for each vote in this series.

MISSING, EXPLOITED, AND RUNAWAY CHILDREN PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the Senate bill, S. 249, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 241, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 414, nays 1, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 148]

YEAS—414

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos

Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—18

Bachus
Boucher
Brown (CA)
Buyer
Davis (FL)
Ewing
Graham
Hinojosa
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Kasich
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Millender-McDonald
Napolitano
Ortiz
Reyes
Smith (TX)
Waxman

□ 1310

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRADE AGENCY AUTHORIZATIONS, DRUG-FREE BORDERS, AND PREVENTION OF ON-LINE CHILD PORNOGRAPHY ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1833, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1833, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 2, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 149]

YEAS—410

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—2

McHugh
Paul

NOT VOTING—21

Bereuter
Bilbray
Boucher
Brown (CA)
Buyer
Ewing
Gekas
Graham
Herger
Hinojosa
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Kasich
Lucas (OK)
Millender-McDonald
Moakley
Napolitano
Ortiz
Reyes
Sherwood
Smith (TX)
Woolsey

□ 1320

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 147, 148, and 149, I was unavoidably

detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "Yes" on each vote.

CONCERNING TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF TIANANMEN SQUARE MASSACRE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 178.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 178, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 0, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No 150]

YEAS—418

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—15

Boucher
Brown (CA)
Buyer
Ewing
Gekas
Graham
Hinojosa
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Kasich
Martinez
McCarthy (NY)
Millender-McDonald
Ortiz
Reyes
Smith (TX)

□ 1329

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 188) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 188

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Small Business: Ms. BERKLEY of Nevada; Mr. UDALL of Colorado

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT, DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE) laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable RICHARD A. GEPHARDT, Democratic leader:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER,
Washington, DC, May 25, 1999.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Title 44 of the U.S.C. 2702, I hereby appoint the following individual to the Advisory Committee on The Records of Congress:

Dr. Joseph Cooper of Baltimore, MD.

Yours Very Truly,

RICHARD A. GEPHARDT.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and that I may include tabular and extraneous materials on the bill (H.R. 1906) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 185 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1906.

□ 1333

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1906)

making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, with Mr. PEASE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) each will control 30 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, today I have the honor to present to the House the fiscal year 2000 bill appropriating funds for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies. The bill we are taking up today has a total discretionary budget authority of almost $13.99 billion. This is $296 million above the current level and $531 million below the request.

In mandatory spending, this bill has $47 billion for fiscal year 2000, about $4.8 billion over current levels and $890 million below the request. Almost two-thirds of the mandatory spending in this bill is for food stamps, child nutrition, and most of the rest goes to support basic farm programs. This bill is within the allocations required by the Committee on Appropriations.

This bill is truly a bipartisan product, Mr. Chairman, constructed from hearings that began on February 10 and ended on March 18. The Committee on Appropriations has produced seven volumes of hearing records containing thousands of pages of information on the hearings, the detailed budget requests, and the answers to questions asked by Members and the public as well.

The Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies and the Committee on Appropriations held markups on May 13 and May 19 respectively, and these were public meetings with which the Members participated actively in shaping the bill.

Many Members would like to spend more than is in the bill, and so would I. We have about 250 letters to date, many of them with multiple requests, but only a handful ask for reduced spending.

Once again this year the administration proposed to pay for requested increases, more than $780 million, with user fees that require legislation. Once again the administration has favored budget gimmicks over reality because the main component of this legislation, user fees on meat and poultry inspection, has been strongly opposed by consumer groups, industry, and the authorizing committee for several years.

This bill does a lot of good in many areas. Farm Service Agency salaries and expenses are increased by $80 million to improve delivery of farm programs; agricultural credit programs are increased by more than $700 million; and funds to protect our Nation's soils are increased by $13 million. Rural housing programs are increased over last year's level and rural telephone and electric loans are increased or held at last year's levels.

Once again, the Food Safety and Inspection Service gets the full request, a $36 million increase. FDA has an increase of $115 million. Funding for the Food Safety Initiative is provided throughout the bill.

Child nutrition programs have been increased by $370 million and WIC by $81 million. P.L. 480, Titles I and II, the two main food aid titles, are restored to last year's levels, and the full request is provided for the Foreign Agricultural Service.

I would also like to say to my colleagues that the bill so far does not have any significant provisions that would bring objections from authorizing committees, and I would strongly urge that we keep it that way.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Chairman Young) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. Kaptur), our even more distinguished ranking member on the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, for their help in putting this bill together.

I would also like to recognize the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON), the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY), the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD), our new subcommittee members who have brought a great deal of enthusiasm and creativity to this bill. I look forward to their participation on the floor today and in the conference.

Mr. Chairman, I say to all my colleagues that this is a bill that will benefit every one of our constituents every day of their lives, no matter where they live in this great country.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to acknowledge the hard work of the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, members of our subcommittee, as well as the staff for their leadership, including our new staff director, Hank Moore, who has worked so hard this year.

This bill makes a reasonable effort to apportion the limited resources available to our subcommittee to keep our Nation at the leading edge for food, fiber, new fuels, and forest production, as well as the counts relating to research, trade and food safety.

May I begin by reminding my colleagues that food is not produced at the local grocery store. There is no question that agriculture and food processing are America's leading industries. Our farmers and our agricultural sector remain the most productive on the face of the Earth. They well understand, as we do, how difficult it is to maintain our Nation's commitment to excellence in agriculture in tight budgetary times.

While on balance this bill seems like a reasonable effort to stretch a limited sum of money as far as possible, and I would encourage my colleagues to vote for this bill, we simply disagree on the levels of support needed for priority programs, including the Women, Infants and Children feeding program; the Natural Resource Conservation Service, the primary conservation operation in this country; and other programs like farmland protection which were not able to be funded at all in this bill, nor was the school breakfast pilot program that the administration requested.

We must also keep in mind that this bill simply does not do enough to address the Depression-level conditions affecting many sectors of rural America from coast to coast, whether we are talking about the Salinas Valley, cattle country in Florida, hog producing country in the Midwest, cotton fields in Texas, the list goes on and on.

This bill simply is an exceedingly limited response to an extremely serious situation afflicting many sectors of the farm economy across our Nation. As we consider this bill today, I would urge my colleagues to think about what is going on in rural America, as farmers continue to experience significant decreases in commodity prices. It started with wheat and with cattle, and it spread to the feed grains, to oil seeds, to cotton, to pork, and even now the dairy sectors.

At the same time, the costs of production are not decreasing. In fact, they are increasing. Total farm debt has risen now to over $170 billion at the end of last year, up nearly 9 percent over the last 2 years.

That means people are borrowing against their accumulated equity to make up for their lack of ability to receive a price for their product in the market. In fact, farmland values began declining in 1998, not a good sign.

We know that USDA, the Department of Agriculture predicts the greatest strain this year will be on field crops. We know that wheat, corn, soybean, upland cotton, and rice crops experienced about a 17 percent drop last year; and they project that this year, 27 percent, there will be a 27 percent drop in prices from prior year averages.

So we have a real tender situation here, which frankly this bill does not address. This bill puts blinders onto what is happening in rural America and basically says, well, we really do not have the money, so let us just continue like it was in years past, which will not solve the real situation out there.

Overall, this bill does a number of useful things, but it can hardly be considered adequate. It is moving in the right direction but falls far short of the mark. All I can say is that our Nation has a responsibility beyond this bill to help a sector of our economy so vital to our national security.

What is really happening in our country, as more bankruptcies occur in rural America, is the average age of farmers has now risen to 55. People are making live decisions out there about whether or not they are going to hold on to the farm or sell it off for another suburban development. This is not a good sign for America in the 21st Century. People really should not be selling off their seed corn for the future.

Let me just mention that in the discretionary appropriations, which in this bill total $13.9 billion for the next fiscal year, if we just take a look at the Farm Credit and the Farm Service Agency people, the people doing the work, administering the programs in our Farm Service Agency offices, and the loans and so forth that are being made, there is an increase of less than one-fifth of 1 percent over the prior year.

If we really take a look at what it is taking to hold agricultural America together today in this severely depressed economy in the rural countryside, we will find that the amounts in this bill are one-third below what was spent during this fiscal year and the last fiscal year as we attempted to prop up the disasters going on out there with the emergency bills that we were forced to pass outside the regular budget process.

So this a very lean bill that truly will not meet the needs of rural America. We may be forced again into one of these extra budgetary sessions to try to figure out how we are going to prop up rural America in the months ahead.

Let me also mention that the bill does try to meet the administration's request for the Food and Drug Administration to process additional drug approvals and to increase the safety of our food supply, with all the additional imports that are coming in here as well as pathogens found in food.

We increased funding for the Food Safety and Inspection Service, very important to the health of the American people, and to some rural housing and rural development accounts, as well as for agricultural research and pest and disease control through the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service as well as the Natural Resources Conservation Service.

But, more importantly, on the minus side there is no provision in this bill for any of the emergency assistance provided to rural America during this fiscal year. We do not continue any support for market support, nor any of the subsidies for the crop insurance premiums or the extra funds we provided to the Secretary of Agriculture to lift surplus commodities off the marketplace to try to get prices to rise in this country.

So the situation facing our farmers in this bill is that, well, we really do not take care of them. We sort of continue things the way they were, and we may be forced to come back later in the year in order to deal with the hemorrhage that is occurring across this country.

Let me also mention that in this bill we will probably be forced to reduce county office staff by another 650 staff positions. I think this is truly tragic, because we have got backlogs around the country of farmers waiting to receive payments after months and months because of disasters that have occurred from coast to coast.

□ 1345

So reducing these staffing levels really does not make much sense, and yet it is the truth that is buried inside this bill.

Further, the bill reduces funding for food aid programs, which are so important to support people around the world who live at the edge of hunger, but also to aid rural America. In fact, we lift surplus during this year that was sent to Russia; we have tried to assist the Kosovo refugees in the emergency supplemental that just passed, but there is nothing in this bill that continues that kind of additional surplus purchase. In fact, it will be reduced.

So the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) and our subcommittee have certainly tried to do what was best under the hand that we were dealt, but the bill falls far short of what is needed to address the urgent problems facing farmers across America.

One thing is certain, no matter what forum or legislative vehicle is chosen, it is essential that Congress act today at least to move this bill forward and to move the first appropriation bill through this session of Congress. We are now approaching Memorial Day.

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

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON).

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to take a moment to express my appreciation to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) for the hard work he has done in putting together this piece of legislation before us today.

Given the tight budget constraints that we face, the chairman has had to make difficult decisions and balance a lot of different needs. He knows, and I think all our subcommittee members know, that this bill will not, as the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) said, address all of the many urgent needs that are there out on the farm right now. Funds are desperately needed for farm programs because of the low prices and tough market conditions for farmers and ranchers all over the country.

However, I think the gentleman from New Mexico has worked with the numbers that he was given and done a tremendous job and the best job possible to meet the many needs of farmers and ranchers, and I just want to thank him for the outstanding job he has done.

Let me just take a minute too to highlight some of the aspects of this bill that are critically important to agriculture. Total dollars for agriculture research are up by $61 million. The bill rejects the cuts in Hatch Act and extension research funding that were proposed by the administration. Export programs, such as P.L. 480, Titles I and II, are funded at or near last year's levels, again rejecting large cuts by the administration.

Many farm State Members of Congress have expressed a concern, as I have, about increased concentration in agriculture markets, and I am pleased this bill includes a $636,000 increase for packer competition and industry concentration, as well as $750,000 strictly for poultry compliance activities. There is much needed oversight and enforcement money to ensure our beef, pork and poultry producers are treated fairly.

Now, I personally believe that we should do more and have mandatory price reporting for livestock, but this is a function of the authorizing committee, not the Committee on Appropriations, and I will look forward to working with my colleague from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) on this legislation later on this year.

Our bill also increases farm loan accounts, such as farm ownership, farm operating, and emergency loans from $2.3 billion to $3 billion. Not enough, and we will probably need more later, but because there is an increasing demand for these loans due to the hardships in the farm economy, we need the money now and, as I said, we will need more later.

For soybean producers in Missouri and around the country there is continued funding needed to fight the cyst nematode pest. Continued research will help develop soybean varieties that are resistant to the yield and profit endangering pest.

I would simply add this is an extremely tough time for our farmers and ranchers. As the gentlewoman from Ohio noted, this is an issue of national security. My farmers tell me that it is as bad as it has been in decades. Not years ago, but decades. And while this bill does not address all of the problems in the farm economy, particularly as it relates to the staffing in the Farm Services Agency and the National Resource Conservation Service, it is a positive step in the right direction and I would urge a strong ''yes'' on the bill.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, today I am disappointed and I am outraged. I am almost at a loss for words.

I am angry because this bill does not include the school breakfast pilot program. The school breakfast pilot program tests the benefits of making breakfast available at school to all children in early grades. It was authorized in the William F. Goodling Nutrition Reauthorization Act, and it is included in the President's budget.

As this Nation searches for ways to make our schools safer, surely, surely we want to consider all reasonable ways to improve students' behavior. Well, two studies have already shown that kids who eat breakfast improve both their grades and their behavior at school. So why are some of my colleagues opposed to an official study to evaluate what happens in a school when all the students start the day with a good breakfast?

I plan to fight this and I plan to keep working with the committee, but I want to talk about the whys on this. The answer may be because we already know that school breakfast should be offered by schools as a learning tool, just like a book, just like a computer. It may be that some of my colleagues are too concerned with keeping our schools just the way they have always been, so they fight against any proposals for change. Or it may be that children just do not count enough.

Mr. Chairman, as this Nation, as this body searches for ways to make our schools safer and better for our children, surely we want to consider all reasonable ways to improve students' behavior. The school breakfast program would help us with that, so I will continue to fight, I will continue to work with my colleagues in support of the school breakfast program on the appropriations committee.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. WOOLSEY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to thank the gentlewoman for fighting so hard for this school breakfast program and to say that with her leadership the members of the subcommittee and the full committee have attempted to do what was necessary.

Unfortunately, the administration did not provide us with some of the information that we were expecting. The gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) worked with us at the subcommittee and full committee levels, and it is our firm intention to try to take this issue into conference to see if we cannot do something to move this pilot project forward.

But I just want to say to the gentlewoman that without her interest and research and the deep dedication that she has shown, we would not be this far. I know we are not where the gentlewoman wants us to be yet, but without her leadership we would not be anywhere. We hope that as we move towards conference we might be able to accommodate some of this.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I stand in support of the agriculture appropriations bill. I serve on the subcommittee and can say on a firsthand basis that the staff, on a bipartisan basis, went through this legislation thoroughly to be sure that we have balanced the needs of the American farm, agricultural community, and the American grocery consuming public.

Last year's bill was $61.7 billion. This year the legislation is down to $60.8 billion. A lot of this goes back, Mr. Chairman, to the 1997 bipartisan budget agreement, which was pushed by Democrat and Republican leaders alike with the full support of the President. And to get back to that budget agreement, it had some good and it had some bad, as my colleagues can imagine in any huge piece of legislation which Democrats and Republicans come together on.

Now, unfortunately, we are seeing from both sides of the aisle people who are peeling away from the agreement, people who voted for the budget agreement that are now lamenting the fact that it actually does call for some belt tightening here and there and they are beginning to walk away from it.

But the staff on this subcommittee, and again on a bipartisan basis, tried to put together the actual requests of 280 Members asking for specific projects in their districts or of national scope. And it was quite a balancing act, because we do have a certain amount of institutional schizophrenia. We have, on one hand, people who say I want to cut the budget and I want it cut now, but oh, no, not in my district, not in the district that I happen to represent. And, by the way, I want to fund this particular project, which of course is not pork, it is just that it is economic development when it is in my district. So this bill, like all appropriation bills, is a balancing act.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the American farmer is facing probably unprecedented challenges. They have challenges getting credit. Businesses in America, small businesses to Fortune 500 companies, have to have credit. They have to borrow both short- and long-term money. Yet for farmers, they cannot get long-term money any more. Banks, and rightfully so, facing the realities of making a profit on the farm, they will not lend them money any more. So the farmers are scrambling, and that is one of the huge challenges that is facing farmers today.

A second challenge is international competition. I represent Milen, Georgia, little Jenkins County, Georgia, and farmers there can grow oats and do it very inexpensively and very efficiently. And yet at the end of the season, they can still go down to Brunswick, Georgia, and buy imported oats cheaper than they can grow it in America. And that is just one commodity.

That is the story with so many of our imports now. And one reason is that our foreign competitors are heavily, heavily subsidized in comparison to the American farmers, where we have about $3.9 billion of this $60 billion bill that is spent on actual commodity-type programs.

People say, oh, let us cut out the farm ''subsidies'', yet most of these are not true subsidies. But even so, it is impossible to compete against foreign competitors, even with the modern technology and all the farming techniques we know.

A third challenge that our farmers are facing is that simply of the weather. We do not get the rain that we need in every growing season. Last year Screven County, Georgia, town seat of Sylvania, lost $17 million because of the drought; $17 million in farm losses. Now, that is not much for a big country like America, but tell that to somebody in Sylvania, Georgia, and tell that to a third generation farmer who is going to lose his farm because of that drought.

Unfortunately, in Georgia this year, we are facing possibly another bad season because of the lack of rain. We need to help our farmers on all these challenges, Mr. Chairman, and this bill tries to do that. It is not going to do it all the way. It will not do it as well as we would like, but it takes a step in the right direction.

There are a lot of things in this bill, though. There is some money for water projects, there is money for conservation projects. One thing not in the bill, that I want to try to work with the minority and the majority representatives on, is giving some tax credit for precision agriculture. Because if we can move our farmers towards obtaining precision agriculture equipment, then they would know exactly how much fertilizer to apply, exactly how much water to use, and exactly what their profits are per acre so that they can make Ag production as absolutely efficient as possible.

I would also like to see more tax credits for farmers in other areas. I would like to see them taxed more on the use of their land rather than on the potential use of their land. I represent Coastal Georgia, it is a huge growth area. Bulloch County last year, 17 percent; Effingham County, 42 percent; Bryan County, 52 percent. All these are traditionally agricultural counties and now they are becoming urban or suburban counties. There are few family farms left, but they are being taxed out of existence.

□ 1400

I would like to see some tax help for farmers in that direction. I would like to see land taxed on its actual use and not its percentage use. And I of course, Mr. Chairman, would love to see some estate tax or death tax relief so that family farms can be passed from one generation or the other.

This is not going to happen in this bill but this bill takes us in the right direction. Right now, Mr. Chairman,

less than 2 percent of the American population is feeding 100 percent of the American population and a substantial portion of the world. Does our ag policy work? I would say yes, it does. Americans spend about 11 cents on the dollar earned on food and groceries. We spend more than that on entertainment, jet skis, CDs, movies, vacations. We are spending more on recreation than we do on food and groceries.

So the ag policy is working. It has a lot of good potential in it for improvements. We are going to continue to work on that on a bipartisan basis. I urge my Members to support the bill.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY), a distinguished member of the subcommittee who has put in long hours on this bill.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), the chairman of our subcommittee, for the care and craftsmanship with which he worked to put this bill together. It has been a pleasure to work with him as a member of the Subcommittee on Agriculture.

Unfortunately, the constraints within which we have had to operate, constraints imposed by the leadership here in the Congress and traceable directly back to the agriculture bill of 1996, the so-called Freedom to Farm bill, have made it impossible to put together an agriculture appropriations bill here that meets the needs of the agriculture community, the needs of our farmers and the needs of our consumers across the country.

As I said, this is directly attributable to the constraints that flow from the so-called Freedom to Farm bill, which is not in fact a Freedom to Farm bill, but in many cases it has been a freedom to fail bill, almost a guarantee of failure. Farm prices in the farm belts all across our country are at near-Depression prices. Farmers are finding themselves in situations that verge on the desperate and in many cases they are in fact desperate. Farmers are being forced out of business because they cannot sell their crops at a price that is higher than the cost that they had to incur for putting those crops in the ground. It is an absolutely impossible situation.

We cannot have an agriculture that is sustained in a global economy where other countries are subsidizing their agriculture and making certain creating circumstances within which agricultural people are going to prosper. We have failed to do that. In fact, we have taken all the safeguards that our agricultural community has had away from them. We did so in that Freedom to Farm bill in 1996. We need to go back and correct those mistakes, and we need to do so soon. The longer we wait, the more desperate the circumstances will become.

Are we committed to family farms, or do we want farms that are corporate in nature exclusively across this country? Do we want farmers to make a living, or do we want it all to be processors? Do we want to have an agricultural community that is healthy and strong and providing the food and fiber that our people need domestically here to sustain their lives?

These are the basic questions that are before us. And, unfortunately, this bill, not through any fault of the chairman or members of the subcommittee, but only because of the constraints imposed upon the subcommittee and constraints in the Freedom to Farm bill have made it impossible to meet these needs this year. We need to go back and meet them and we need to do so soon, intelligently, and thoroughly.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I would wish to engage in a colloquy with my good friend from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN).

Mr. SKEEN, I appreciate your willingness to discuss the Department of Agriculture Plant Protection Center located in Niles, Michigan. I know that you share my belief that this center has a very important mission, finding natural means to combat pests. The role of this facility among plant protection centers is important to American agriculture and is of enormous value to the agriculture industry throughout the Midwest.

The work the employees do in Niles is particularly important in light of the probable loss of pesticides as a result of the implementation of the Food Quality Protection Act. In fact, just this past year the Michigan Department of Agriculture and Michigan State University have formed partnerships with the laboratory at Niles aimed at promoting biological control options. This is a prime example of partnering and cost-sharing between State and Federal agriculture interests using the best strengths of both partners to benefit agriculture.

I am greatly troubled that within the past 2 years the budget of this facility has been cut by 26 percent, the staff reduced from 45 to 19 employees. Especially troubling is the fact that this facility receives its funding through the biocontrol line item, which tends to receive increased funding and is scheduled to get a 22 percent increase in fiscal year 2000. I firmly believe that any further reductions in the budget at this Niles facility would be a serious error and would jeopardize the strength of agriculture throughout the Midwest.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to my friend the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) for a response.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I share the gentleman's concern for the future of the critical work that is being done at the Niles Protection Center.

As I understand it, the USDA has not made a final decision. And, of course, we have a long way to go before we produce a conference report with a final number for APHIS. We have provided the account in question with a significant increase for fiscal year 2000 at a time of a very tight budget, and I hope the USDA will take note of our efforts and our concerns for the Niles facility.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his efforts, and I promise to continue working with him in conference on this matter.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the chairman of our subcommittee, and to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) that we so much support the efforts that he is making for this Niles Center, also on behalf of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER). We have that special situation where Michigan, Indiana, and Ohio all meet. And the services provided through the Center serve the entire country certainly, especially the Midwest. And I want to compliment the gentleman for drawing our attention to it and placing it in the debate today.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Salinas Valley, California (Mr. FARR), another member of our committee who represents the area that really feeds America, a hard working and dedicated member of our subcommittee.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

I rise as a new member of the Committee on Appropriations and of the Subcommittee of Agriculture, first of all to tell them how much I appreciated the leadership that was given in this markup by the chairman, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) and also by our ranking member, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

I represent a productive part of our country. We produce about 84 crops, which no other State in the United States produces that many as are produced in my district, about $2.5 billion in agricultural sales. And most of it does not receive any help from the Federal Government. But they are interested in research and they are interested in sort of cutting-edge issues.

I would just like to point out, for those that are interested in these budgetary issues, that this markup is about a 1.8 percent increase over last year's discretionary money. Now, remember, last year we had a lot of agricultural debate on the floor because we were putting money into supplementals, into emergency aid. If we take the total amount that was spent last year on agriculture and we look at the amount that was spent this year, we are $6.4 billion below what Congress spent last year, or about a 31 percent cut. So this is a very, very, very tight budget.

And I might add, as tight as it is, it still ranks number four of all the appropriation committees in the amount of spending it does. Why? Because in America we created the Department of

Agriculture when President Lincoln was here, and he indicated that we needed a department that essentially had a little bit for everybody in America, kind of a consumers department.

So the department has all the rural America issues, which are as true today as they were a hundred years ago. Rural America always needs more help. We have all the commodities programs. We have all the foreign sales programs, whether we are going to have commodities abroad. And I know there will be Members up here attacking the fact we put taxpayers' money into foreign sales.

But my colleagues, wake up and smell the coffee. Every day we have Juan Valdez telling us to drink Colombian coffee, and we do. Why? Because that country puts money in advertising in America and Americans buy it. So we do a little quid pro quo in the same way. We take money here and we take products and try to get them to sell abroad. Why? Because we export four times more than we import. Our balance of trade is in the plus in agriculture. We produce more agriculture in America than Americans can consume, so we need to export it, and people want it. And we ought to be proud of it, because it is a labor-intensive industry that is the heart of our country, and it has been the number one production in America historically and today more than ever.

So, with this tough budget that we have adopted, we also left many programs on the table, the conservation program, farm land protection. There is no money in here. We have got to get that before this is over. Also left on the table, we cut wetlands reserves. We left on the table environmental quality initiatives. We left on the table, more importantly, about $120 million to fully fund all the nutritional programs we need in America.

This is a very tight appropriation, too tight for many people and not tight enough for others. But I do not think we will ever find an appropriation that has had more bipartisan support than this one does, and I think that is attributable to both the leadership on the other side of the aisle and on our own side.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

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

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I want to say from the outset, I come from a farm district of rural northeastern Oklahoma that has a great deal of farmers. And I believe, overall, that the appropriators have done a good job on this bill. But they have not done good enough.

We passed two supplemental emergency bills for farmers in this last Congress, almost $12 billion, and I am not objecting to the fact that we did that. What I am objecting to is the fact that that money was paid for out of Social Security receipts. There is no question about it. And what I want to focus on is, where is the money going to come for the increase in this year over the true baseline last year? It is going to come from Social Security.

I want to spend a minute just showing everybody the kind of problems we have. Most young people under 35 believe in UFOs before they believe they are going to get their Social Security money. And do my colleagues know what? They are probably right. This is the Social Security 1999 Trust Report. And what we see in black is the amount of money that is coming into the government in excess of what is being paid out, and my colleagues will note as of 2014 that starts to turn red.

Last year we spent approximately $29 billion of that money. The Congress appropriated $29 billion of excess Social Security money for appropriation bills. Twenty-nine billion was taken out of the money that was coming in supposedly dedicated for Social Security.

The other thing that I would like to discuss is we do not have a real surplus. What we have is a Washington surplus, because if we exclude Social Security money, last year we ran a $29 billion deficit. The debt to our children and our grandchildren is rising at the rate, as we speak, of $275 million a day. So it is not about whether we should do the right things for our farmers. We should, and probably we should spend more money on our farmers than what we are spending. The question is, how do we spend that money?

If we look at what is about to happen this year, the surplus for the year 2000, as estimated by the Social Security Administration, is $141 billion. Based on the plans that we see, it is a conservative estimate that $45 billion of that will be spent. That is Social Security money that people are working every day putting into that, with the trust to think that that money is going to be there for them when they retire. And that does not come close to addressing the issue, can they live on their Social Security payment now?

In my practice in Muskogee, Oklahoma, when I see seniors, I have seniors who are totally dependent on Social Security. And do my colleagues know what they do? They do not buy their medicine because they do not have enough money. They buy food before they buy medicine.

□ 1415

So not only do we have a problem in taking the money that is supposed to be for Social Security, the benefit that we have out there in many instances is not enough for our seniors to live on, let alone live healthily on.

Finally, the point I would make is that we have 102,000 Agricultural Department employees. We have another 87,000 contract employees for the Department of Agriculture. That comes to 189,000 employees in the United States. If we take 260 million people, it is pretty quick you can come up, for every 1,500 people in the United States, we have at least one Agricultural Department employee. Do we need all those employees? What we have said is we cannot cut the number of employees in the Agriculture Department, we cannot have less employees, and we cannot get more money directly to the farmer, because we are chewing up a vast majority of the money trying to give them the money. It is not about not taking care of our farmers. If we expect to protect Social Security money, which on both sides of the aisle, save two Members of this body, voted for budgets that said they would protect 100 percent of Social Security, then we have to bring this bill back to the level of spending last year. What that requires is about $260 million worth of trimming amendments to be able to do that. I propose to offer offsetting amendments that will bring us down to last year's level. When we are at that level, then I will stop offering amendments. Until we get to that level, I plan on continuing to offer amendments. This is not done in any precocious fashion. My intention is to help us all do what we all voted, save two Members, to do, and, that is, to preserve Social Security. The best way I know of doing that is the first appropriation bill, to make a first start on that.

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

Mr. Chairman, the reason we have a 1-year appropriations bill is so that the Congress can look at the spending each year and adjust accordingly as the Constitution requires. We do not rubber stamp the administration's request and we do not automatically approve last year's level of spending. This bill has a modest increase in spending over fiscal year 1999, and it is about 30 percent of the increase requested by the administration. I have heard several hundred requests for more spending by my colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats. Frankly this bill does not come near to paying for all those requests. But we did the best we could and I certainly hope that no one who wrote us asking for spending will support this amendment.

In this bill, there is additional money for food safety, for conservation, for rural housing and for a lot of programs that benefit all our constituents. Our bill funds about 130 accounts with many more subaccounts and individual projects. It is always possible to find fault with individual items in the bill, but this bill is a cooperative effort. I believe it reflects the kind of legislation that a majority of our Members want to see for their constituents.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind all my colleagues that although we refer to this as the agricultural appropriations bill, the majority of funding goes to nonproduction agricultural programs. This bill pays for badly needed housing, water and sewer, and economic development in rural America. It pays for human nutrition programs

for children and the elderly. It pays for conservation programs that benefit watersheds in urban and rural areas. It pays for food safety and medical device inspection programs that are literally life and death matters. That is why I oppose this amendment and why I ask my colleagues to do the same.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I also wanted to make a couple of comments about the prior gentleman's remarks. No department percentagewise inside this government of the United States has been cut more than the U.S. Department of Agriculture. In 1993, there were 129,500 employees. Today the request of the department would fund 107,700. This is a reduction of over 21,800 positions. I would like any other department of the United States based on the amount of funds that it receives through the taxpayers to take this kind of cut. There have been over 35,000 positions cut in the U.S. Forest Service, battling forest fires. Look what has happened across this country over the last several years. In meat inspection, so vital to the health of this country, over 9,700 meat inspectors have been cut. I would say to the gentleman, we have had over a 30 percent cut in the staffing levels at the U.S. Department of Agriculture. So if you are looking for cuts, believe me, this agency is hemorrhaging. Part of the damage being caused in Oklahoma and other places in this country is because we are not paying attention to the production side of the equation inside the United States in rural America, and that is a true tragedy.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), a very respected member of the authorizing committee.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time. I rise in support of this bill. I commend the chairman and the ranking member for the hard work they have done under some very difficult circumstances.

We come here today with a situation in agriculture that is worse than it was a year ago. Farm income stress is only intensifying from last year. To those that are worried about the spending level on agriculture, let me make this point. In 1990, net farm income was $44.7 billion. In 1999 it is projected to be $43.6 billion, which includes all of the $12 billion in subsidies that have been written. At the same time look at what has happened to the Dow Jones average. It has gone up 230 percent. My colleague from Oklahoma that spoke, I want to commend him for his honesty and his forthrightness and his persistence. He voted for the Blue Dog budget. Had the Blue Dog budget passed, we would have been talking about increased funding for agriculture today. We would have been talking about meeting the needs of the cotton step-2 program, meeting the additional needs of research in agriculture, paying the $100 million the WIC program needs in order to meet all of the human need. The gentleman from Oklahoma voted for it of which I deeply appreciate. A majority of my colleagues on this side of the aisle voted for it. If we had only gotten a majority on both sides, we could have been doing a much more adequate job of meeting the true needs of agriculture.

Now, we have got a lot of problems that need to be solved. They should not be attempted to be solved on this bill. It needs to be done in the House Committee on Agriculture. We have got work to do on crop insurance, opening world markets. We are going to get an opportunity to do that. Coordinated policies, working together with USDA in this Congress. We really cannot afford to wait much longer. I hope and expect that this year under the leadership of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST), the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture and those on both sides of the aisle that we will be able to take up in an orderly fashion those things that need to be done in order to make sure that agriculture will continue to be for all of America what it is today.

Mr. Chairman, I submit the following correspondence for printing in the RECORD:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC, May 12, 1999.

Hon. DAN GLICKMAN,
Secretary, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We are writing to urge you to give careful consideration to the development of new programs to enhance the competitiveness of U.S. wheat exports by improving the cleanliness and uniformity of grain delivered to foreign buyers.

Over the past decade, competition in the wheat export trade has intensified. The domestic wheat industry believes that cleaner US wheat will be more competitive in foreign markets. We are writing to urge you to develop a program that would provide assistance to export elevators for the financing of high speed cleaning equipment.

In recent months, we have had some very strong reminders of just how important exports are to US agriculture, along with the recognition that we need to make our products as competitive as possible. We believe that improvement of the domestic cleaning infrastructure is a worthwhile investment that will help US wheat gain market share in the years to come. Capital investments made now will ensure the future competitiveness of the US grain industry.

Thank you for your consideration of this proposal, and we look forward to working with you in developing and implementing a program that will enhance US grain competitiveness in world markets.

Sincerely,

CHARLES W. STENHOLM.
JERRY MORAN.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the esteemed gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) who has spent so many hours and weeks working on this bill.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for their hard work in what has been a difficult feat to balance the important priorities of this bill given the budget constraints that the subcommittee faces. I am concerned that we could not do more to support vital programs, however, that improve the day-to-day lives of hard-working American families; providing a safety net for farmers in crisis, reducing smoking among young people, ensuring high quality nutrition for parents and their children. These are issues not receiving enough attention. First there is a crisis facing our farmers today. From low grocery store food prices to safe food on the dinner table, the benefits of U.S. agriculture are immeasurable to each and every American family. Farmers across this country are begging Congress to do something and, by God, we must do something.

This bill does not do enough to address the depression level prices our farmers face. A serious issue before this Nation is tobacco use among America's youth. Each day an astounding 3,000 teenagers take up the smoking habit. The loss to America equals 420,000 lives. This year the President requested a $30 million increase to expand the partnership between the FDA and States to enforce the laws prohibiting tobacco sales to minors. The additional funding would have enlarged this successful and business-friendly program that would have been expanded to 50 States. Sadly, this bill does not provide this important investment, made even more essential because States like Connecticut, my own State, are not investing their money from the tobacco settlement into educating the public about the dangers of smoking. I am concerned about the little over $4 billion allocated for the WIC program in that it may not be able to cover all of its participants. WIC guarantees that 7.4 million women and their children receive solid nutrition and health advice, preventing future illness and serious health problems. I am disappointed that funds could not be found to take the first steps toward a study of the benefits and the costs of a universal school breakfast program, a study that has already been authorized by the Goodling Act. Regional studies have linked school breakfast programs with higher test scores, better behavior and improved attendance. But a truly rigorous and a comprehensive study is necessary to nail down and to solidify the proof of that relationship.

This is an unfunded mandate. If the Congress is going to require this study, it must provide the funding. I again applaud my colleagues for facing these restrictions. These issues deserve our highest commitment.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD).

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from New Mexico

(Mr. SKEEN) for yielding me this time and for his leadership in putting this appropriations bill together, and also to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for her leadership with the gentleman from New Mexico.

As many of my colleagues know, Mr. Chairman, I have spent all of my productive life in agriculture and have followed these proceedings in Congress for many, many years as related to a national agricultural policy. In 1996, this Congress decided to write a new farm bill which my people back home called Freedom to Fail. Prior to that time, many of us came to Washington and asked the Congress to take a long, hard look before it changed national ag policy. We had a policy in this country that worked. Obviously there was a consolidation of farming over the years like there has been in every industry that weeded out some of the less efficient operators. But certainly if you were efficient and a good operator, under the policy that existed, you could make a living in agriculture. It established and kept a strong agricultural economy for our Nation. I stand today speaking in support of the bill that is brought to this floor by the gentleman from New Mexico and the gentlewoman from Ohio. They are working within the confines of the Balanced Budget Agreement that we put in place in 1997. Actually I think we were treated very well in these allocations, given the confines of the budget that we are working under. As the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) said earlier, had we passed the Blue Dog budget which many of the folks on both sides of the aisle voted for, we would have a few more bucks to play with here. But I think really the debate today is not about whether this appropriations bill is good or bad, because it is absolutely the best that we can do under the circumstances that we have been presented with. But it has to do with a larger picture, and, that is, what is the national agricultural policy of this Nation?

I just want to throw out a couple of things for Members' consideration. Number one is, in 1996 when that farm bill was written, the farmers were promised if they would give up their safety net, they were promised in exchange a loosening of regulations and, secondly, opening of world markets. Well, they gave up the safety net, but in both cases they did not get what they were promised. They did not get a loosening of regulations and they certainly have not gotten an opening of the world markets.

□ 1430

Now many people want to blame the administration. I do not think the administration is to be blamed here. It was the Congress that wrote this piece of legislation, and it is the Congress that ought to go revisit it.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that I would like to strongly encourage the Members to support this piece of legislation, and I want to thank the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for their work.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY), the hard-working member of the authorizing committee.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for yielding this time to me, and I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member of this committee for the hard work that they have done.

Mr. Chairman, America is the greatest Nation that has ever been today because of our ability to domestically produce safe, affordable and abundant agriculture commodities. The American farmer is the most productive ever anywhere in the world. The American farmer only asks for a chance. If we will just give him a chance, he will do the rest.

A combination of factors have contributed to historically low commodity prices that are being received by our American farmers today. We have got a crisis in rural America, and we need to face that crisis. This bill is a good effort to begin that. It a shame that we do not have more money in this bill for America's farmers, but I know that it is the best that the appropriators could do with what they had to work with.

Congress has an obligation to protect the food and fiber security of America. Current budget restrictions and resulting appropriations for agriculture do not allow for adequate devotion of financial resources to properly address the crisis that American agriculture faces today. We need to commit to America's farmers to protect the food and fiber security that our country has historically provided.

I firmly believe, Mr. Chairman, that the further we get from our rural agrarian roots that Thomas Jefferson envisioned, the more social problems we have, and it is something that is of great concern to me. But this is just another reason why we should do the best we can to fund the Department of Agriculture and support America's farmers.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM).

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, I rise in support of this bill and, first of all, would like to thank the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for their very hard work. The subcommittee enjoys a bipartisan cooperation, and I have really enjoyed working with all the colleagues to get this bill on the floor today.

This bill feeds our schoolchildren, ensures the safety of prescription drugs and medical devices, protects our environment to water and soil conservation, restores Congress' commitment to agricultural research and rejects the President's desire to cut ongoing science. It helps expand our increasingly important export markets, and most importantly, it protects the taxpayer.

Just as importantly, this bill does not include some of the President's proposals. Probably the most egregious is the fact that in the President's budget he had a $504 million new increase in fees on struggling livestock producers. These are the folks who have undergone some of the worst prices in history, and again, another increase in fee for grain farmers to the tune of $20 million that the President wanted to put on those farmers.

I would like to engage the gentleman from New Mexico in a colloquy, if I may.

Mr. Chairman, my intention is to clarify the committee to provide not less than $27,656,000 for the National Plant Germplasm System for Fiscal Year 2000. With this funding, our best and brightest scientists working throughout the Nation will continue to help farmers provide abundant, safe, nutritious and affordable supplies of food fiber.

Mr. Chairman, is it the committee's intention to name that funding level in the conference report?

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

Mr. LATHAM. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to tell the gentleman that the committee will work hard to meet that funding level.

Mr. LATHAM. I thank the gentleman, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) from the authorizing committee, who has worked with us every step of the way on this bill.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for the time, and I want to rise in support of this appropriation bill, and I want to commend both the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) and the ranking member of the subcommittee agriculture appropriations.

I rise in support of the bill because there are many things in this bill that is very much needed in agriculture. It provides obviously the money of more than $60 billion in agriculture programs including moneys for research, including moneys for farm service administration, including moneys for rural housing, including money for WIC and nutrition programs, agricultural research; so many parts of this program are essential for the infrastructure and ongoing agriculture and research program.

However I also raise issues that are deficits. There are still lack of funding of recognition in these program. One in particular I think, the ranking member from agriculture raised the issue about Cotton Step 2. Obviously that is very, very important to my district in terms

of having the opportunity to market in that area. I am sensitive to the cooperative research is $14.2 million below the request, and I know all the land grant schools throughout the United States are indeed in need of those monies, and the conservation program again is underfunded, and yet there are more requirements in requiring them to implement the programs. They do not have the resources to do that, and I just say to our colleagues that if they expect for a full implementation, they have to have the resources.

Again, the whole issue of disadvantaged farmers I know will be addressed, and I am appreciative of that, but I want to say now to both the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) and to the ranking member I will be glad to support that amendment. There are issues that I think we can still revisit, hopefully, from the amendment process, but I want to commend both of them and say to my colleagues who think that we are spending too much money that I think we have the unique position of being first out of the box and being most conservative so we get to be kind of whipping boy, whipping girl, and I think that is unfair to rural America, I think it is certainly unfair to the farmers that feed us and provide fiber for us.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT).

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me, and I want to congratulate him and the ranking member on this subcommittee, a subcommittee on which I am proud to serve, for their good work in trying to craft a bill that stays within the budget caps.

Agriculture has some very difficult challenges this year and next, and what I hope this bill will do is provide adequate resources for our farmers, not only in the area of agriculture research, but in other areas in which we think the free market system has a better chance to work.

One of the things I am disappointed that the bill does not contain, I am going to introduce an amendment later about it, is the issue of sanctions relief. I feel we need to be in a position to open world markets that are currently shut off from our farmers, and this may not be the vehicle, but we have to open those markets.

So open markets, adequate funding of agriculture research, and there will be some challenges to that today, but I think we have to resist those challenges to government-funded research. It is critically important to our farmers.

So, I urge support of this bill. I appreciate the good work of the gentleman from Mexico and the people of our subcommittee, and I urge its passage.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire about my remaining time?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) has 2 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) has 30 seconds remaining.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield our remaining time to the distinguished gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) who has fought for agriculture not only in Vermont, but throughout our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Vermont is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding this time to me, and I want to congratulate the chairman and the ranking member for the outstanding work they have done on this bill. I think, however, there is no disagreement that the committee is forced to operate under very severe budget constraints. There is no debate about that, and I would simply want to remind every Member of the U.S. House of Representatives that in this great country, in this country which is wealthier than any other country in the history of the world, today there are millions and millions of Americans who are hungry, who are hungry, and what does it say about our national priorities that we see a proliferation of millionaires and billionaires, that we see a situation when some want to provide over a trillion dollars in tax breaks over the next 15 years, and yet hospital administrators tell us that when senior citizens go to the hospital, they are finding many seniors who are suffering from malnutrition? What does it say about our country when school administrators tell us that when kids get to school in the morning many of these children come from families which do not have enough money to provide them with adequate breakfast or adequate lunches, that these kids are unable to do the school work that they otherwise would be able to do? They fall off the wagon, and they get into trouble.

Is that what America is about? I think not.

Now I understand the limitations that there are in this bill because of the overall budget, but I would hope that every Member of Congress understands that the day has got to come and come soon when this country wipes out the disgrace of having hungry people within our wonderful Nation.

Second of all, Mr. Chairman, within that context we must be aware of the plight that family farmers in rural America are suffering from one end of this country to the other. Other people have made this point, and I want to repeat it. If we do not stand up and protect the small family farmer, we are going to lose that important aspect of what makes this country great.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds, my last one-half minute, to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA).

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

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies for facing a very difficult task head on and doing the absolute best they could in dealing with our agriculture needs this year. With the falling commodity prices and drought, it was a very difficult task that we faced, and the gentleman from New Mexico has taken care of research activities, conservation funding, distance learning and tele-medicine programs, FSIS programs, and it is amazing actually that we were able to get through this as efficiently as possible and deal with these important problems.

I just hope that every Member of this body understands how important it is to support this bill as it is.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, this Member rises in support of H.R. 1906, the Agriculture Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2000.

This Member would like to commend the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), the Chairman of the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, and the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the ranking member of the Subcommittee for their hard work in bringing this bill to the Floor.

Mr. Chairman, this Member certainly recognizes the severe budget constraints under which the full Appropriations Committee and the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee operated. In light of these constraints, this Member is grateful and pleased that this legislation includes funding for several important projects of interest to the State of Nebraska.

First, this Member is pleased that H.R. 1906 provides $423,000 for the Midwest Advanced Food Manufacturing Alliance. The Alliance is an association of twelve leading research universities and corporate partners. Its purpose is to develop and facilitate the transfer of new food manufacturing and processing technologies.

The Alliance awards grants for research projects on a peer review basis. These awards must be supported by an industry partner willing to provide matching funds. During its fifth year of competition, the Alliance received 23 proposals requesting $892,374 but it was limited to funding 9 proposals for a total of $350,000. Matching funds from industry partners totaled $475,549 with an additional $82,000 from in-kind contributions. These figures convincingly demonstrate how successful the Alliance has been in leveraging support from the food manufacturing and processing industries.

Mr. Chairman, the future viability and competitiveness of the U.S. agricultural industry depends on its ability to adapt to increasing world-wide demands for U.S. exports of intermediate and consumer good exports. In order to meet these changing world-wide demands, agricultural research must also adapt to provide more emphasis on adding value to our basic farm commodities. The Midwest Advanced Food Manufacturing Alliance can provide the necessary cooperative link between universities and industries for the development of competitive food manufacturing and processing technologies. This will, in turn, ensure

that the United States agricultural industry remains competitive in a increasingly competitive global economy.

This Member is also pleased that this bill includes $200,000 to fund a drought mitigation project at the Agricultural Meteorology Department at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. This level of funding will greatly assist in the further development of a national drought mitigation center. Such a center is important to Nebraska and all arid and semi-arid states. Although drought is one of the most complex and least understood of all natural disasters, no centralized source of information currently exists on drought assessment, mitigation, response, and planning efforts. A national drought mitigation center would develop a comprehensive program designed to reduce vulnerability to drought by promoting the development and implementation of appropriate mitigation technologies.

Another important project funded by this bill is the Alliance for Food Protection, a joint project between the University of Nebraska and the University of Georgia. The mission of this Alliance is to assist the development and modification of food processing and preservation technologies. This technology will help ensure that Americans continue to receive the safest and highest quality food possible.

This Member is also pleased that the legislation has agreed to fund the following ongoing Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service (CSREES) projects at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln:

Food Processing Center	$42,000
Non-food agricultural products ...	64,000
Sustainable agricultural systems	59,000
Rural Policy Research Institute (RUPRI) (a joint effort with Iowa State University and the University of Missouri)	644,000

Also, this Member is pleased that H.R. 1906 includes $100 million for the Section 538, the rural rental multi-family housing loan guarantee program. The program provides a Federal guarantee on loans made to eligible persons by private lenders. Developers will bring ten percent of the cost of the project to the table, and private lenders will make loans for the balance. The lenders will be given a 100% Federal guarantee on the loans they make. Unlike the current Section 515 direct loan Program, where the full costs are borne by the Federal Government, the only costs to the Federal Government under the 538 Guarantee Program will be for administrative costs and potential defaults.

Mr. Chairman, this Member appreciates the Subcommittee's support for the Department of Agriculture's 502 Unsubsidized Loan Guarantee Program. The program has been very effective in rural communities by guaranteeing loans made by approved lenders to eligible income households in small communities of up to 20,000 residents in non-metropolitan areas and in rural areas. The program provides guarantees for 30-year fixed-rate mortgages for the purchase of an existing home or the construction of a new home.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, this Member supports H.R. 1906 and urges his colleagues to approve it.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1906, Agriculture Appropriations for FY 2000. In particular, I wish to draw my colleague's attention to the valuable work being done by the Ultraviolet-B (UV–B) Monitoring Program at Colorado State University.

This program provides information on the geographical distribution and temporal trends of UVB radiation in the United States. This information is critical to the assessment of the potential impacts of increasing ultraviolet radiation levels on agricultural crops and forests. Specifically, it provides information to the agricultural community and others about the climatological and geographical distribution of UVB irradiance.

In a broader sense, the monitoring program supports research that increases our understanding of the factors controlling surface UVB irradiance and provides the data necessary for assessing the impact of UVB radiation on human health, ecosystems and materials.

Beginning in 1992, Congress appropriated two million dollars per year in support of this research effort. At that level of funding, the program was able to get underway and to carry forward some money each year. Recently, appropriations have been at $1,000,000 annually, which, with the carry over amounts have been adequate. As of FY 1999, the carry-over funds have been exhausted. The President's budget calls for $1,750,000 to simply continue this program at current funding levels. H.R. 1906 appropriates $1,000,000 for this program, but I remain hopeful that the goal of $1,750,000 can be accommodated during the upcoming conference committee with the other body.

Mr. Chairman, since the discovery of the Antarctic ozone hole in 1985, I have been personally very concerned about the impact of UVB radiation on all of earth's living systems. This program is surely a step toward understanding and monitoring this significant threat to all of our ecosystems.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Chairman, after experiencing one weather-related disaster after another, the future of production agriculture and family farming in middle and south Georgia faces a threat of almost unprecedented proportions.

This is not a sudden, overnight crisis. Farmers, bankers, and communities dependent on production agriculture have been in a crisis mode for some time.

Our farmers have faced a threatening situation that has now become even more severe.

I have visited farms to meet with farmers all across the Second District and to see firsthand the destruction that has been wrought by the droughts and other disasters which have struck our area. Indeed, the University of Georgia has estimated farmgate value lost during the past crop year at over $767 million.

The bill contains many of the crucial programs which are needed to restore a vibrant farm economy.

It provides $2.3 billion for direct and guaranteed farm operating loans, $647 million more than the current fiscal year.

It contains $559 million for direct and guaranteed farm ownership loans, $49 million more than the current year.

Research is the backbone of ag production, and it would be irresponsible for the federal government to abdicate its role in this area. This is why we need to leave all this partisan bickering behind and get on with the business of providing the $836 million for the Agricultural Research Service that is in this bill.

For the extension service that is so important to our farmers, this bill has $916 million for Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service activities.

There is $71 million for USDA's Risk Management Agency, which manages the federal crop insurance program. How else will the Congress ensure that insurance products that can effectively protect against risk of loss are developed? How will we ever get to the point where farmers can adequately recover their costs of production following a disaster and pay premiums that are affordable?

The bill will fund the $654 million needed for operation of USDA's Natural Resource Conservation Service. This agency helps farmers conserve, improve, and sustain the soil and water on their land for future generations.

This bill includes a $300,000 allocation to expand research into ways to protect the few consumers who are allergic to peanuts, and thereby to prevent misguided efforts to ban or reduce peanut consumption.

Prices for southeast timber are at a record low, and it would be financially damaging to force growers facing thinning-out deadlines to sell their harvested timber on the current market. This is why this good bill includes language giving farmers an extension until January 1, 2003 for thinning out and selling their timber under the Conservation Reserve Program.

I ask my colleagues to let this House do the work expected of us by our farmers.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to address some language contained in the Committee report on the FY 2000 Agriculture Appropriations bill. The language ''directs'' that the FDA not proceed with a highly controversial rulemaking on ephedrine-containing products. The inclusion of this report language is an attempt to subvert regular order. The proper course for the proponents of the language to address this issue is to contact the Commerce Committee, which exercises primary jurisdiction over FDA matters. I therefore urge the House-Senate conferees to drop the language in conference. Further, I intend to closely monitor the regulatory proceeding at issue to ensure that FDA meets all of its legal obligations.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS

PRODUCTION, PROCESSING, AND MARKETING

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture, and not to exceed $75,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $2,836,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $11,000 of this amount, along with any unobligated balances of representation funds in the Foreign Agricultural Service, shall be available for official reception and representation expenses, not otherwise provided for, as determined by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel of the Department of Agriculture to carry out section 793(c)(1)(C) of Public Law 104–127: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce section 793(d) of Public Law 104–127.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to commend the chairman and the ranking member for their efforts in appropriations in this appropriation bill related to agriculture. Obviously a Member of Congress who comes from the district I come from is very concerned about the agriculture economy, and the impact of this appropriation bill upon my State is significant, and I commend the committee for its efforts.

□ 1445

I do want to raise a topic that is of great concern to me and to the many small businesses that I represent within the agribusiness community of Kansas. I have an amendment to be offered later today that would allow small meat processors with sales under $2.5 million and less than 10 employees to have an additional year before their compliance with USDA's HACCP, the Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Points Inspection System would take effect and impact them.

This amendment would apply only to the smallest local meat processors and would in no way change the inspection system in our large nationwide plants.

There are significant problems out there. In fact, the U.S. Small Business Administration has concluded in its letter to USDA that something must be done. Their conclusion in their letter to USDA, dated July 5 of 1995, says, ''The Office of Advocacy at the SBA remains deeply troubled by the failure of FSIS to analyze properly the impact of HACCP on small businesses.'' Requires, among other things, that an agency tailor its regulations to impose the least burden on businesses of differing sizes.

There are many alternatives which USDA could pursue which have been either rejected or overlooked by FSIS and which would reduce the compliance burden on our smallest businesses.

This is Sam's Locker across the country in the smallest communities of our Nation, and many of them are going out of business, really on a weekly basis. I pick up the paper and the local locker plant in one of my communities across Kansas is closing its doors because of the cost and burden of compliance with this rule which will take effect January 1 of the year 2000.

The Small Business Administration says that the smallest firms face the greatest burden in both absolute and per-unit costs and suggests that there are a number of alternatives which USDA has not explored. So I intend later today to offer an amendment that would delay the implementation for approximately 9 months of this last phase of HACCP regulations.

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

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his concern and his remarks. It is good to know that someone is looking out for the small businessperson.

As it happens, the committee has commissioned a GAO study of the HACCP process, and if possible, I will try to include the gentleman's concern in that study, or work with him during the conference on the issues that he has just raised.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the comments from the gentleman and I look forward to working with the gentleman from New Mexico on this issue. It is a significant one.

Mr. SKEEN. As they say in our country, igualmente, equally.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXECUTIVE OPERATIONS

CHIEF ECONOMIST

For necessary expenses of the Chief Economist, including economic analysis, risk assessment, cost-benefit analysis, energy and new uses, and the functions of the World Agricultural Outlook Board, as authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1622g), and including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed $5,000 is for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $5,620,000.

NATIONAL APPEALS DIVISION

For necessary expenses of the National Appeals Division, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed $25,000 is for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $11,718,000.

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND PROGRAM ANALYSIS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Budget and Program Analysis, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed $5,000 is for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $6,583,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COBURN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Coburn:

Page 3, line 23, after dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $463,000)''.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman reserves a point of order.

Ms. KAPTUR. We do not have the amendment on this side and have not seen it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will distribute copies of the amendment.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is that the $463,000 represents over a 7 percent increase for this department, Office of Budget and Program Analysis. Again, I will restate the obvious.

I believe that the money that we spend on agricultural programs ought to be going to our farmers, and I object to the fact that we are increasing overhead and bureaucratic expense, and that this money is not available to the farmers in my district. This money is not available to put the FSA offices back close to the farmers instead of having it 90 miles away from my farmers.

So what we have done by this increase over the baseline from last year is spend money in Washington and not spend money on our farmers.

The purpose of this amendment is to bring us back to last year.

I again want to go back. Any dollar that is spent that should not be spent is a dollar of Social Security money stolen from our seniors and our grandchildren. The Social Security Administration estimates that in the year 2020 to 2022, to stay even with Social Security, despite no other changes, that we will have an effective FICA tax rate, a Social Security tax rate of somewhere between 22 and 24 percent, somewhere double where we are today. So if we continue to have this kind of spending, which we know, if it is not absolutely necessary, will be taking money from our grandchildren, our grandchildren will repay this money. Any money that is spent in this bill for a service that is not absolutely necessary is a dollar stolen from our Social Security.

What does that mean? That means, number one, that the Social Security surplus is less. Number two, that means the debt, external debt that we hold today will not decrease by that amount, and that is what we have been doing with the excess Social Security money; we have been paying off bankers and foreign governments who own our Treasury notes and Treasury bills and putting an IOU in the Social Security system. So that also is a lost opportunity for savings on external debt.

Number three, it pretends to be a situation that rationalizes that in hard times, like we are in today spending money on a war in Yugoslavia, we can afford to have a 7-plus percent increase in bureaucratic overhead.

It is my feeling that the people in my district are best represented when the money that is spent for agriculture goes to our farmers, not to the bureaucratic administration of that aid to our farmers.

So, therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would make the point again that we are going to have close to $149 billion in excess

Social Security payments in the year 2000, and that this one small area, this one small amount of $463,000 is enough to supply Social Security in the future for several of our grandchildren, especially if it is not spent and compounded and earned.

Mr. Chairman, one of our colleagues, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) took 6 years, the years from 1944 to 1950, and took the amount of money that was put into Social Security. Had that money been saved and not spent and invested at a rate of 6 percent return, there would be $3 trillion from those 6 years in Social Security today. So by spending money, rather than saving money as it was initially intended, what we are doing is losing opportunity for our children.

Mr. Chairman, I plan on offering this amendment. I am in hopes that people will support the fact that we do not need to have this much of an increase to be able to accomplish this as the purpose of this budgetary office. It is my hope that we can have an acceptance of this amendment, that the chairman will look favorably on this amendment, knowing that the dollars to pay for this will come not only from the seniors who have trouble getting by today, will come from the commitment that we made not to touch one penny of Social Security.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentlewoman insist on her point of order?

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, we have been provided now with copies of this amendment, so I withdraw my point of order.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Coburn amendment because I just believe it is time to keep our promise, and this is one place we have to start. We have told the American people that we balanced the budget, and I really believe that now we need to stick to our word, because otherwise we are not being true to them.

I understand and sympathize with the American farmers; I understand the committee's concerns and problems. In fact, we just passed a supplemental bill that added additional dollars for farmers.

But since this year's budget resolution calls for $10 billion in discretionary spending cuts, we have to make the cuts to stick to the balanced budget agreement and protect and preserve Social Security, and the time to start is now.

There is never a good time. That is the difficult thing about this place, because it is always hard not to spend money in a culture that is set up to spend, spend, spend. That is what Washington does and does well.

It is always easy to stick pork in bills to spend more money; it happens every day. I think that is wrong.

Mr. Chairman, we have to stand up for our principles of lowering taxes and protecting 100 percent of Social Security for our children and our grandchildren. They are depending on that. They look to us to be responsible, and as we do our bills, as this whole appropriations process goes forward, we have to be really conscious of that.

It is time to put the good of the country ahead of personal ambition and tighten our belts. Without cuts now, and this is a relatively noncontroversial bill, if we cannot do it here, how in the world are we going to reduce spending in the other 12 appropriations bills?

Mr. Chairman, for years, Congress has raided Social Security and funded pork barrel spending, and I believe it needs to stop; and today is a good time to stop it. I support the Coburn amendment, and I support fiscal responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

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

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

A recorded vote was refused.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 6 of rule XVIII, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the pending question following the quorum call.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN: The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, is there a planned quorum call at this time? Can the Chair advise as to the planned quorum call?

The CHAIRMAN. There is a quorum call at the point of order request of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. And will that be granted?

The CHAIRMAN. It will be. It has been.

The call was taken by electronic device.

The following members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 151]

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—399

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Snyder
Souder

Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

☐ 1515

The CHAIRMAN. Three hundred and ninety-nine Members have answered to their name, a quorum is present, and the Committee will resume its business.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) for a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 133, noes 285, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 152]

AYES—133

Aderholt
Archer
Bachus
Ballenger
Barr
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Blunt
Boehner
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Camp
Campbell
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chenoweth
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Cox
Crane
Cubin
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Ehrlich
English
Foley
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Ganske
Gibbons
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hilleary
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kelly
Lazio
Leach
Linder
Lofgren
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Manzullo
Martinez
McCollum
McInnis
McIntosh
Meehan
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Myrick
Northup
Norwood
Paul
Pease
Petri
Pitts
Pombo
Portman
Ramstad
Riley
Rogan
Rohrabacher
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanford
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Smith (MI)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Toomey
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weller

NOES—285

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Callahan
Calvert
Canady
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doyle
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Forbes
Ford
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hyde
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reynolds
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thune
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Weygand
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—15

Baker
Brown (CA)
Graham
Granger
Hinojosa
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Kasich
Largent
Millender-McDonald
Nadler
Ortiz
Reyes
Rothman
Smith (TX)
Whitfield

☐ 1523

Mr. EHRLICH and Mr. SESSIONS changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COBURN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Coburn:

Page 3, line 23, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $231,000)''.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that the House did not concur with the last amendment to hold the Office of Budget and Program Analysis at last year's level.

The above-intended amendment is designed to cut the increase in that office in half. Instead of having an almost 8 percent increase, this will offer the employees and administrators in that office a 4 percent increase.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry regarding the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield for an inquiry?

Mr. COBURN. Yes, I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, is this a new amendment that the gentleman from Oklahoma is proposing?

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment under the same section at the same line item to cut the rate of increase in one-half of what the committee has recommended for the Office of Budget and Program Analysis within the Department of Agriculture.

☐ 1530

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman if we have a copy of this amendment?

Mr. COBURN. It is my understanding that this amendment was given to the Chair, and I will be happy to supply the gentlewoman with a copy of it at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will distribute copies of the amendment.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma may proceed.

Mr. COBURN. So the purpose of this amendment, Mr. Chairman, having the House, with 137 Members, I believe, agree that we should freeze this spending, given the fact that the increase in spending is going to be above this last year's fiscal year and will come from Social Security surpluses, the purpose of this amendment is to decrease by one-half the amount of increase in the Department at this level.

I have before me a sample of what most seniors probably think is going on right now, a check from the Social Security Trust Fund for $231,000. This still gives that department in that area an increase two-and-a-half times the rate of inflation. Very few people within our districts and within the private

sector are seeing increases in their operating and overhead or their expense or their salaries going up at two-and-a-half times the rate of inflation.

It is estimated by the Congressional Budget Office and the Office of Management and Budget that the Social Security surplus this year will be $149 billion. On track, the first appropriation bill to meet this House, has an increase over last year. The budget agreement that we agreed to with the President in terms of meeting the targeted spending in 1997, the budget that passed this House, the minority-sponsored budget, all had provisions to protect Social Security 100 percent. The purpose of this amendment is to try to keep us at our word, to protect Social Security dollars. It is my feeling and my conviction that we do that best by, with the first bill, setting an example on how we are going to spend money.

I recently had a Member come up and say that I was a good reason to vote against term limits, because I was offering amendments to decrease the spending in Washington and that I felt we should not spend any money that comes from Social Security. Well, I would portend just the opposite of that. I think that is a good reason to vote for people with term limits.

The fact is that we are spending $260 million more in this appropriation bill than we did last year. The purpose of this amendment is to trim some of that. It is not to inhibit what we do with our farmers, it is to make sure that the money that we put into the Department of Agriculture gets to the very people that we want it to. By having an 8 percent increase in this office, a portion of that money could be saved, could be preserved in Social Security, could be used to lower the FICA taxes that our children and grandchildren are going to have to pay so they will be able to have Social Security.

It is not anything but incumbent on Members of this body to try to spend the taxpayers' money in the way that they believe is in the best interest of the country and in the best interest of the long-term security for this Nation. I want to be measured by how I left our country. I want to be measured when my grandchildren, who are now 3 and 1, look at their income tax statements and look at their payroll slips and know that we were not responsible for raising the FICA payments from 12 percent to 25 percent. And that is the estimate from the Social Security Administration that is going to be required by the year 2022.

We can change what happens in Washington. We do not have to spend more money.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 146, noes 267, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 153]

AYES—146

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Ballenger
Barr
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Biggert
Bilirakis
Blunt
Boehner
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Camp
Campbell
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chenoweth
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Cox
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
English
Foley
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Ganske
Gibbons
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kelly
Klink
Largent
Lazio
Leach
Linder
Lofgren
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Manzullo
McCollum
McInnis
McIntosh
Meehan
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moran (VA)
Myrick
Northup
Norwood
Ose
Paul
Pease
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Pryce (OH)
Ramstad
Rogan
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanford
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Smith (MI)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Toomey
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weller

NOES—267

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Callahan
Calvert
Canady
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Ford
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Hall (OH)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inslee
Isakson
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Morella
Murtha
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Phelps
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reynolds
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thune
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—20

Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Dixon
Fletcher
Gekas
Graham
Gutierrez
Hinojosa
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Kasich
Martinez
Millender-McDonald
Nadler
Ortiz
Portman
Reyes
Riley
Rothman
Smith (TX)
Young (AK)

□ 1558

Mr. COOK and Mr. JOHN changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. GEORGE MILLER of California, MORAN of Virginia, DAVIS of Virginia, and KLINK changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Chairman, because of a previously scheduled commitment, I missed rollcall vote No. 153 during consideration of H.R. 1906, the Fiscal Year Agriculture Appropriations Act.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea".

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Chief Information Officer, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed $10,000 is for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $6,051,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COBURN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COBURN:

Page 4, line 3, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $500,000)''.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to address the increase that was given to the Office of the Chief Information Officer. What we have heard through the general debate on this bill is that this is a fairly tight bill, and I agree that it is a fairly tight bill. I also agree that there is also an area where if we spend a certain amount, $61 billion, that we ought to make sure that that money that is allocated, that belongs to the taxpayers, actually gets to the end people that we want it to get to, i.e., the farmers, i.e., the people that are going to be dependent on it.

The Office of the Chief Information Officer under this appropriation request received a 9 percent increase. Now, of that $500,000 increase, what we will see, if we are honest about where the money is going to come, is it is all going to come from Social Security. We are going to take surplus Social Security money and we are going to spend it to give a 9 percent increase. For us to keep the agreement not to spend Social Security money, to keep the agreement that the President and the Congress signed off on in 1997, that we have to cut spending $10 billion, not increase it a quarter of a billion as this bill does, we have to make some trims back in these appropriation bills.

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

Mr. COBURN. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

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

I am informed that the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies has brought this bill to the floor within their 302(b) allocation and therefore am of the opinion that it is funded by general fund revenues and has nothing to do with the Social Security funds the gentleman is speaking to.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, that is a literal statement that in fact at the end of the day will not be true. Because by saying that this is within the 302(b) means that you also would agree that Labor HHS could be cut $4.9 billion which is also in the 302(b) for Labor HHS. I assure you that neither you nor I would vote for an appropriation bill at that level. So what I would tell the gentleman is that the 302(b)s really are not applicable to the process that we are seeing going on right now because the end game is we are going to spend Social Security money and we are not going to be below the $10 billion. I understand how that works, you understand how that works, and although technically this committee is within the 302(b) allocation, the 302(b) allocations are designed so that in the long run we will spend Social Security money.

Mr. POMEROY. If the gentleman will yield further, this House passed a budget. These are the early appropriation bills coming to the floor under that budget. Much was made by the majority in consideration of the budget that it was protecting Social Security. Here we have the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture bringing his bill up within the allocation he had.

Mr. COBURN. Reclaiming my time, if the gentleman would agree to vote for this bill under its 302(b) and agree to vote for the Labor HHS bill under its 302(b), I will be happy to buy his discussion of this argument. But I would portray that I will not vote for a Labor HHS bill that is cut by $4.9 billion and I would surmise that he probably would not do that under the same argument. The fact is that the 302(b)s are not an accurate reflection of where we are going with the budget process this year. They are in terms of total dollars, and I would agree with the gentleman in terms of total dollars, but what they are is front-end-loaded and at the tail end is the very things that most people are going to need besides our farmers, those that are most dependent on us, the veterans, those that do not have housing, those that are needy in terms of Medicaid, Medicare and the supplemental things that we do to help those people, those dollars are not going to be available. So what we are going to do is we are either going to pass a bill that cuts those severely, which neither of us I would surmise would vote for, or we are going to go into a negotiation again with the President and bust the budget caps and in fact spend Social Security money. So I will stick with my argument that this bill, because it is above last year and is not below last year, will in the end ultimately spend seniors' money.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want us to look very closely at what is going on here. This is an appropriations bill brought up pursuant to the budget plan passed by this House. The chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies was given a 302(b) allocation and he has brought his bill forward under that allocation. This is not about emergency spending. This is not about extra allocation spending. This is a chairman that has done everything right, operating under the 302(b) allocation the Committee on Appropriations received under the budget plan passed by the majority. So I simply do not believe that it is rooted in fact that we need to look at this for other than it is, spending for agriculture.

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

Mr. POMEROY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I guess if we were to ask the seniors who are on Social Security in Oklahoma and those from your State if they believe it is appropriate that this office get a 9 percent increase this year and what did they get in terms of their Social Security increase, I think most of them would object to the fact that we cannot be more efficient. That is the point I am making.

Mr. POMEROY. Reclaiming my time, I was respectful to the gentleman in his 5 minutes and I want to make a couple of points. The farmers of this country are in a world of hurt. I have lived all my life in North Dakota and I have never seen it as bad as it is today. We have prices that do not cover the cost of production. This body made a decision that we were not going to protect farmers when prices collapsed and prices have collapsed below the cost of production. As a result, we have got farmers going bankrupt all over the country. We have got auction sales in North Dakota that do not quit. Now, this Congress because we have got a farm bill that is not working has tried to do a lot of things. Members will remember last year, we passed increasing the AMTA payments, we passed accelerating the AMTA payments, more money to farmers to somehow tide them through this situation. We passed a disaster bill that has proven to be the most confusing disaster bill ever passed and the U.S. Department of Agriculture did not even get it all fully available until June of this year. Now, through this all, the farmer understands one thing. He is losing money, and he is about out of time. He does not understand all these relief measures that we are trying to pass because they are confusing, they are haphazard, they have been passed in a happenstance way and in an ad hoc way. The Public Information Office of the U.S. Department of Agriculture has never been more important. And if you think everyone gets it in terms of what is available for them, you just call one of your farmers right this afternoon and ask them. It is chaos out there and confusion. They do not know what is available. The U.S. Department of Agriculture needs to do a better job. Secondly, it needs the resources so that it can do the job we expect them to do. We have changed the farm program. We have ended the price support that has been part of farm policy for four decades. We are now operating under ad hoc, give them some money here, get them some money there, build a program, try to tide us through, and all of that is very confusing. This public information function is vital. When we pass a response to farmers, that just does not mean that money appears in the bank account. You have got to run the program. That means have the people understand it, have them come in, have it administered in the field offices and get the checks out. This is an essential part of that bargain. This is under the absolute legitimate function of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture operating under their allocation bringing this money to the floor.

I notice that all of the Republican leadership voted for the last Coburn

amendment. Does the Republican leadership not understand the crisis that we have in farm country? We have an absolutely deadly threat to our farmers. We are going to lose family farming as we know it today without responding. And so I do not want this to be a Republican or Democrat majority-minority thing. This is a bill for farmers at a time when they have never ever needed it more. So let us save those arguments about these unrelated matters, make them in special orders, make them another time, but let us today, this afternoon, stand for our farmers. They desperately need the help.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the gentleman from Oklahoma. While I know that the debate, as we go forward, might get just a little bit convoluted, we might begin that old discussion of apples and oranges, the fact is, the gentleman from Oklahoma recognizes this, that last year we made a solid, ironclad promise to the seniors in this country; and that was that we, as a Congress, would do everything within our power in a bipartisan way, both Republicans and Democrats, to protect the solvency of Social Security.

The fact is, the gentleman from Oklahoma has recognized, I think, as many of us do, that within this total budgetary process, he sees that train wreck coming. The fact is, at the end of the day, after it is all done, if we fund government, if we fund the bureaucracies at the level that all of these proposals are coming in at, we will end up having to rob Social Security to cover up the difference. Frankly, I am not going to be a party to that.

I know the gentleman has risked a lot to put forth, what, close to 100 amendments today because he believes so strongly in the sanctity, the sacredness of making that promise to the seniors in our country, the seniors in this land. Every amendment that he offers, you are going to hear arguments why the bureaucracy that they are defending is more important than the promise and the commitment, the sacred commitment, that we made to our senior citizens. Frankly, I am going to side with the gentleman from Oklahoma on this one.

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

I have listened to well-meaning people here today. The sponsor of the amendment certainly is, and the last speaker certainly was; my friend from North Dakota certainly is. But let us make sure we understand what we are really talking about here.

All this discussion about senior citizens being hurt by something that we might or might not do relative to emergency spending or busting the budget caps or whatever the spending argument might be is just false. Nobody is going to hurt any senior citizens. Senior citizens are not going to be touched in this debate on Social Security.

It is my generation that is going to be hurt. And the younger people who are baby boomers are going to have to face this Social Security issue. It is not going to affect senior citizens. We are not going to cut Social Security that affects their lives. We are talking about out to 2032, for goodness sakes. So I think that is a false argument as we talk about agriculture.

My friend from North Dakota, as a strong advocate of agriculture and rural agriculture, like I am because I come from a district that depends on it, is mistaken relative to the farm bill of 1996 somehow causing the low prices around the world. That is nonsense in my judgment.

What is happening is, we are in a world market economy that has some price depressions. It is not the farm bill that has caused problems for our farmers; it is the fact that we do not have markets, for crying out loud.

My argument is, we ought to be lifting sanctions on those countries which we have previously traded with that have been good customers of our farmers, in a free market system, not more government control or more government regulation or more command and control farming for the government in our system. This free market system is a good one.

□ 1615

Ask farmers. I have asked them, and they have told me: We like the system, but we have to have freedom to market our products overseas, and we do not have it right now, and we need less regulation at the Federal level, at the USDA level. That is what is going to save and help our farmers.

So I am all in favor of making cuts wherever we can, but as my colleagues know, the chairman here has worked hard within our budget allocation to do what is right for agriculture. Most of this money in this ag budget goes for food stamps, WIC programs, as my colleagues know, food safety and other social sides of spending relative to agriculture. It is not the farmers that are getting some great windfall. The farmers are hurting. So the biggest part of this budget goes to the social spending side of agriculture which is lumped into the ag appropriations bill.

So we are not going to hurt senior citizens in this process where certainly our farmers are needing help, but I think it can be done better in the market economy rather than in more government control. As my colleagues know, more regulations and rules at the Federal level are going to hurt our farmers and restrict them even more.

So, Mr. Chairman, let us make sure we understand what we are talking here, and I understand the motivation of my friend from Oklahoma. He has got good motivation, but this bill is within our budget targets, and we are trying to do all we can for farmers as well as the WIC program and food safety and all the rest that is lumped into this very difficult challenge of trying to make the ag budget work and be balanced.

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

Mr. NETHERCUTT. I do not have much time, but I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's discussion.

One question that the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. Pomeroy) really refused to answer was whether he would be able to support the later appropriation bills with as much as $3 to $5 billion in reductions so that we could stay within the overall cap and stop using the Social Security surplus. I know the gentleman has worked with us in the past to make sure that we could do that, but I just wanted to ask for the record, would he anticipate being able to support those types of bills with the lower spending in the later part of the process?

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I think that is what we have to do one at a time. I think we have to make that judgment based on what we have before us. I have got an interest, a strong interest, in biomedical research, which is part of the Labor-HHS bill. That is extremely important to me. But I think we have to make tough choices, and so we are trying to make tough choices. The chairman has in this ag bill in staying within our caps, but as my colleagues know, we have got to get them passed, too.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot just not pass something. This, as my colleagues know, we can fight this bill until the cows come home, but we got to get something passed, and that is the chairman's motivation, the chairman of the big committee, the full Committee on Appropriations' motivation, and as my colleagues know, we can look downstream and figure out what we are going to have to face. But let us face it, but let us pass these bills or else we are going to have nothing to pass until the end of the day.

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

It has been an interesting discussion going on here, and it does not take really a rocket scientist to figure out what is going on when we see this many amendments on this particular bill, and if we want to do something about Social Security, let us bring it out here and get on with it. But if we are going to talk about agriculture, let us say it like it really is.

Agriculture is in a world of hurt. The last speaker, the previous speaker, and I just met in the Rayburn Room with some of my bankers from rural Iowa, and they are talking about the foreclosures that are starting to take place. It is really happening, it is really happening; reflections for me, having come out of the State legislature,

of what went on in the 1980s, and it is not a very pretty sight and it is not good for our country.

Now we might ought to reflect on this a little bit. As my colleagues know, we are pretty unusual in the world of things at 14, 15 percent, Mr. Chairman, of disposable income spent on food compared to anywhere else in the world, modern countries, wherever, 25 or whatever, to undeveloped countries that take everything, and we have got the most plentiful, safest food and the least expensive. Now we do not feel that way when we go to the grocery store, but the truth of it is it is that way. Now we are messing with our machinery, if my colleagues will, with our factory, if my colleagues will, that produces this food and fiber.

Now some of these things said need to be expanded on a little bit. The secretary told us in our Committee on Agriculture here 3 months ago, something like that, unprecedented, unprecedented worldwide, that we have got overproduction. So when we go somewhere else to make a trade or to want to sell, they say: ''Excuse me. We want to sell to you.''

So, Mr. Chairman, we got a tough situation, and to get the word out and to make sure that, as my colleagues know, those of them that are aware of what is going on in the Farm Service Agency offices and so on, to be able to get the word out as to what is there for them, we need this to be done. We probably need it more than what we are appropriating.

And I want to compliment the chairman, too, and I want to compliment the ranking member for the work they have done within these targets that were established. Pretty tough. I know they have had a tough assignment, but they worked hard and put the hours in, and we thank them for it, and we appreciate it. But we need to pass an ag bill. We need to tell the farmers out there that provide the food and fiber for all of us that we know what is going on and that we want to help them and we want to pass this bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take the time first to compliment my friend and colleague from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) for speaking out so strongly for those who rely on Social Security, because I have the great privilege of representing more Social Security recipients than almost every Member of this House of Representatives, and so I really appreciate the strong work and the strong message, and I am glad that Congress recognizes that it is important to keep our commitment to those on Social Security. And to do that we did adopt a budget resolution that provided the appropriators with a certain amount of money for discretionary spending.

Now in that amount of money, we suballocated that money based on what we refer to as section 302(b) suballocations. Now this is the first of the 13 regular appropriation bills to come before the House. We have already done two supplemental bills, one conference report on the supplemental bills, and now this is the fourth appropriations vehicle that we have seen for the year. It is within the section 302(b) suballocation, and the section 302(b) suballocations are within the budget numbers set by the budget resolution and also within the budget caps established in 1997.

As a matter of fact, during the work of the full committee there were numerous amendments that were offered to dramatically increase the amount of money in this bill, and the Committee on Appropriations, determined to stay within the suballocation, the budget ceiling number, resisted those amendments.

So, Mr. Chairman, we bring to our colleagues a bill that has been looked at extremely closely by both sides of the House, both parties, and we came to a workable bill that will meet the requirements of America's farmers for this fiscal year, and as has been pointed out, that is important. It is important that America's farmers stay alive and stay well because while we do import some food, 75 percent of our nutrition comes from what the American farmer produces.

So again, Mr. Chairman, to my colleagues I would say this bill is within the section 302(b) suballocations, which are within the budget resolution number, which are within the 1997 budget caps that all of the leaders of both political parties in the House, both political parties in the Senate and the President in the White House have all said we are going to live within. This bill lives within those budget caps and within its section 302(b) suballocation, and I would hope that we could resist these amendments and get on to passing this bill, and get to conference with the other body and get the funding to the agriculture community where it is really needed.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have the utmost respect for the gentleman. I believe his heart is right.

As my colleagues know, when 1997 was agreed to, we did not have a war in Bosnia, we did not have $13 billion that we are going to spend on an action over there. Where are we going to get the money to pay for that? Where did that money come from? That money comes from Social Security.

So the debate really is, is the climate in Washington going to change? Are we going to talk to the President? Are we going to bring things down and say: We are spending this $13 billion because we got to fight a war, and there is probably going to be more where that comes from. We want to plus up defense. I agree with that, but are we going to live within those budget caps as we do that?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would respond to the gentleman that that is a decision that neither he nor I will make. That is a decision that will be made by the leadership of the House and the leadership of the Senate. Then the Congress will work its will and decide if they want to agree or disagree with the decision made by the leadership.

But I would also respond to the gentleman that for the last 4 years I had the privilege of chairing the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations. Now last year alone, from the time that I submitted the bill to the subcommittee to the time that it came to the floor and to the time it went to conference with the Senate, I had my section 302(b) suballocation, it was section 602(b) back then, but now it is section 302(b), I had my suballocation changed three times during that process.

So it is certainly possible that, as we go through the consideration of the 13 appropriations bills, we will re-look at adjustments under the section 302(b)s. But the section 302(b) suballocations that we have before us today are the best job that we could do based on where we are and what the budget resolution provides for and what moneys are available and identifying those important items that need to be identified.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has expired.

(On request of MR. MCINTOSH, and by unanimous consent, Mr. YOUNG of Florida was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. McINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I want to say I also appreciate the chairman's hard work in this area. It cannot be emphasized enough how difficult the task is.

I think the real question that the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) was asking and I would be interested in knowing and I think frames this debate is: ''Do you think, as chairman of the committee, when we are finished with all 134 bills we will have met the overall cap, the 132(a), and not have had to go above that?''

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I would respond to the gentleman that we will probably spend every nickel and every dime that is provided for in that budget resolution because, as the gentleman knows because I have told him this many, many times, if we just froze every account at last year's level we would be $17 billion over those '97 budget caps, and that tragedy that we experienced last year, the end of the year so-called omnibus appropriations bill, if we did everything that that bill committed us to do, we would be $30 billion over those budget caps that the gentleman is talking about.

But let me close out this conversation on this subject because Social Security was Mr. Coburn's original discussion. No one will fail to receive

their Social Security check if this bill passes. No one Social Security check will be late unless the Y2K problem does not get solved, and that is something else that we have to worry about.

And I have heard these arguments in this Congress for many years in an attempt to, whatever the attempt was, and I will not suggest what the attempt was, to frighten people into thinking that if we did not do this or did not do that, their Social Security check would not be coming. That did not happen. The Social Security checks go out, they go on time, they are deposited electronically on time, and this bill's passage is not going to affect the outcome of anyone's Social Security check 1 hour, 1 minute or 1 second or $1.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have had difficulty figuring out where I am today. When I came over here, I thought that I was attending a session of the House of Representatives. I did not know that I was really attending a session of the Republican Caucus.

□ 1630

It has been very interesting. I am not quite sure what to say about it. Let me simply suggest that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has, on three occasions, tried to produce legislation which would meet with bipartisan approval in this House. Each time, it is interesting to note that he has run into a roadblock.

That roadblock has not been constructed by members of our party, the minority; that roadblock has been placed in his way by members of the majority party, the Committee on Appropriations chairman's own party.

I think all of us know that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) is trying to do the right thing both for his party and for this institution, and for this country. And I, for one, make no apology, and I do not think he does either, for the level at which this bill is funded.

I know of no group in the country that has suffered a larger erosion of income over the past decade or two decades than have American farmers. I know that we hear a lot about urban poverty, but the fact is, I can take my colleagues into communities where poverty is just as excruciating in rural areas. It is just a little bit more anonymous and it is a little bit further away from the television reporters who are located in the urban centers of this country.

So I think, given that fact and given the fact that American farmers are now being exposed to the crunch of world markets as never before, I do not think we have to apologize for the high funding level in this bill. This bill, if we compare it to what we appropriated last year, out of all spigots including emergency appropriations and the famous Omnibus Appropriations bill, this bill represents a 31 percent cut from last year.

Now, I would simply say this: We have tried on this side of the aisle. I did not vote for the budget 2 years ago. I thought that it was ill-conceived for this Congress to pass it; I thought it was ill-conceived for this President to sign it.

There are a lot of things that this Congress and this President have done that I think are ill-conceived. That was the most spectacular, in my view. But nonetheless, even though I have disagreed with that budget, I tried to cooperate with the committee, because that is our institutional responsibility. But sooner or later, we are going to have to face the fact that we either make some compromises or nothing further will get done this year.

This is, as I say, the third time that we have seen a different play called after the committee brought its legislation, or tried to bring its legislation, out of subcommittee.

On the last vote, I understand virtually all of the Republican leadership voted for the amendment that eliminated the funds contained in the original committee bill. I make no apology for supporting this bill, but I want to say this to those on my side of the aisle. I do not believe that we have any greater obligation to stick to the committee product than does the majority party. And if the leadership of the majority party is going to vote for amendments which are admitted by the author to be part of a tactical filibuster, then I would say the leadership of the House on the Republican side is cooperating in the destruction of its own ability to produce any progress on appropriation bills for the rest of the year.

Now, if they want to do that, that is up to them, but I do not think that is going to be healthy for the House or, in the end, healthy for their record come October.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to tell the gentleman from Wisconsin just my perspective on roadblocks by one member or another member. My perspective is that we do not have roadblocks, we do not have partisan politics. Basically, we have differences of opinions. We come here as Members of Congress to exchange information, for the most part, have a sense of tolerance for somebody else's opinion, and then we vote. And what I see here from the gentleman from Oklahoma and those who support his position, they have a strongly held conviction that we need to reduce various budget items for the purpose of saving Social Security, all of which we would agree with.

I would also say that this is not the Republican Caucus on the House floor right now; this is the Congress, and we are speaking to various issues. I know the gentleman from Massachusetts is going to strike some very humorous comment about that, and I am going to wait around to listen, because I would appreciate it.

What I do want to say, however, is that I strongly disagree with the gentleman from Oklahoma on this issue; and what I would like to do is to read part of the committee bill and then give my opinion on the need to enhance and preserve and save agriculture and not talk about agriculture like it is General Motors and we are producing cars out there, or Westinghouse producing light bulbs.

This is an industry that produces life-needed food for this country, and we are, for the most part, the warehouse for foodstuffs for the world. They are doing this on less and less land.

This is what the committee bill says. This bill ''provides funding for research to strengthen our Nation's food supply to make American exports competitive in world markets, to improve human nutrition, and to help ensure food safety. Funds in this bill make it possible for less than 2 percent of the population to provide a wide variety of safe, nutritious and affordable food for more than 272 million Americans and many more people overseas.''

What we are seeing in agriculture is, we are losing 1 million acres of ag land a year. That is not a million acres of ag land 10 years ago or over the decade, that is every single year we lose 1 million acres or more of agricultural land for a variety of reasons, but we are losing it.

So that means, because the population continues to increase, we need to produce more poultry on less land. We need to produce more milk on less land. We need to produce more vegetables and more agricultural products on less land with fewer farmers, and in order to do that, we need the best technology.

There is all kinds of technology out there, but not all of it is the best, and not all of it is environmentally safe. Not all of it is going to work within the confines of what we understand to be the mechanics of natural processes.

One might be able to create genetically safe corn from the southern boll weevil, but what other forms of life are going to be damaged in the process? This is an intricate, very complex, scientific undertaking that we are doing here today.

Now, I would say that Social Security is safe. This has nothing to do with Social Security. We are going to preserve Social Security not only for seniors today, but for future generations.

This bill is about how we, as people, will understand how we are going to provide food for a growing population on less land; and I would urge my colleagues to vote for the bill of the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN). It is a good one.

Also for the bill of the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

In conclusion, on the House floor, we have various differences of opinions. We do not see these arguments in Cuba

or North Korea or Iraq. This is the way we do business in this country. We come down here, sometimes in a very volatile atmosphere, but we discuss, debate, argue, disagree. We have a sense of tolerance of someone else's opinion, and then we vote. And that is the final say.

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

That is the hope, Mr. Chairman, that we will have a chance to vote.

Mr. Chairman, I serve on the Committee on the Budget, and as I recall, the Committee on the Budget set certain limits, and my understanding is that agriculture being the first out is under its 302(b) allocation. So the issue about spending more monies than allocated that are out of compliance of the budget resolution is not directed at appropriations of agriculture. It is only directed because it is a convenient model to discuss this issue.

So although this may be a worthy issue to talk about, saving Social Security, not spending it, and I would entertain the gentleman's argument that it is a worthy issue, it is misdirected. It should not be directed here. We should not make agriculture the scapegoat for the gentleman's worthy discussion. I think it is misplaced.

I do not know what the issue is with agriculture. The gentleman says he is from an agriculture community. Oklahoma, the last time I heard, has a lot of issues that are equally as pressing as Social Security. This agriculture bill takes no more from Social Security than if it had not passed. It will take a lot from Oklahoma farmers, however, if it does not pass.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. CLAYTON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, we just heard the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations say that if we come through with last year's spending, just if we came through with last year's spending, we would bust the caps from 1997 by $17 billion.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, that is my point, if we came through the whole process.

We are just starting this process, and the gentleman is attacking the beginning of the process as if we were the culprit in making that happen. We are not. So why not apply this theory to the whole?

It is inappropriate to say, if we go through 13 appropriations bills, the likelihood is that we will bust the caps, that may happen. That is not the case; it is inappropriate.

So I would just urge my colleagues, and I know the gentleman's strategy is indeed to prolong this. If, indeed, he wants to have this discussion, this discussion is an appropriate discussion, but it is ill-placed directed at the agriculture appropriation.

In fact, I would suggest that it may be better when we talk about the lockbox. We are going to have that opportunity. I do not see the gentleman planning to do that.

We are talking about the subject of Social Security. Here the gentleman is applying Social Security safety on an agriculture appropriation as if they are in conflict with each other, and they are not. The gentleman is making the conflict. The gentleman is placing it as if the appropriation for agriculture is breaking the caps. It is not doing that. The whole process may do that, but why make us the scapegoat for what the gentleman thinks may be an eventuality in that process.

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

Mr. Chairman, I had understood that the leadership on the other side had brought this bill up because this was the easy appropriations bill. I know we are not supposed to address the audience watching this on television, but my guess is that some of them may be eagerly anticipating the fun they will have watching the hard appropriations bills if this is what we do with the easy one. Were it possible to sell tickets to this circus, we could probably do something about the revenues, but of course we cannot.

But what I want to talk about is what I think is, in fact, the real issue here. The real issue is that one of the signal achievements of the Republican Party, the 1997 Balanced Budget Act, is an unmitigated disaster. Now, there are efforts going on to mitigate it. But let us be very clear. That is the unspoken premise of this whole debate.

What a terrible mistake this House made with the acquiescence of the other body and the President in 1997. Everybody gets up and says, oh, those budget caps, what a terrible thing they were, sort of. Some people are saying, we are going to hold you to them, and the suggestion that we are being held to them is considered to be an unfortunate one.

But everybody acts as if the budget caps fell down from the heavens like the rains or the hail. People have forgotten. Those budget caps are not a force of nature. They were the vote of this House, and they were, as I understand it, one of the great achievements of the Republican Party.

I also agree, by the way, that Social Security is not at risk here. What is at risk is Medicare. Because that same wonderful 1997 Balanced Budget Act, which is the greatest orphan in history since it does not appear to have any parent left, that 1997 Budget Act cut Medicare very substantially. It cut home health care, it cut prescription drugs in my State; it has cut hospital reimbursements.

And what do we have now? Surprise, surprise, the 1997 budget caps which said spending would be the same in 2002 as in 1997. People are shocked that it is inadequate.

□ 1645

People are shocked at having voted to cut $115 billion out of Medicare to pay for a capital gains tax cut, and Medicare is suffering. What is all the shock coming from? Were Members in a coma when they voted for the 1997 budget act? Did people not think that voting to keep spending at the exact level 5 years later was going to cause problems? Did people think cutting $115 billion out of Medicare would have meant there would be a shortage of monopoly money the next time they sat down at the game?

Never in the history of humanity have so many people professed surprise at the foreseeable consequences of their own actions. Members ran for office on this budget in 1998. They bragged about it. Now they are acting as if it was some terrible act of God that we have to live with.

Everybody in here is Job; Oh, look what has happened to us, and we will have to live with it.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

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

Mr. Chairman, I disagree that that is what the issue is. I believe the issue is, did the Congress speak and say something, and are they willing to have the American people believe that they are going to do what they told them they would do.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I will respond to the gentleman, when the gentleman says ''do what they say they were going to do,'' that is what we said we were going to do in 1997, is that correct? The issue is whether we are going to live up to the Act of 1997.

I would ask the gentleman, is that right?

Mr. COBURN. I will answer when I have my own time, because I am not sure I am going to get to answer the way I want to.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Yes, the gentleman can. I just wanted to make sure I understood it.

Mr. COBURN. Wonderful.

Mr. Chairman, what the American people are looking for from this body is honesty, integrity, and truthfulness about what our situation is. We can have wonderful debates about where our priorities should be, but the fact is that we did have an agreement. I did not happen to vote for the 1997 budget agreement, but we did have an agreement with this President, with the Congress of the United States, that said we are going to live within this agreement.

What the American people are wondering is are we really going to do it, or is Washington going to continue to do what it has done the last 40 years, to say one thing and do something completely other, and at the same time spend their pension money?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I will take back my time.

I would only make one edit. When the gentleman said ''Washington,'' read

for that, ''The Republican Congress.'' That is what he means by ''Washington,'' because the Republicans control the House and control the Senate.

So my friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma, says the issue is, is this Republican-controlled Congress going to live up to this Republican accomplishment of 1997. And I think the answer is, they are looking for a way not to. He may not like the implications of what he said, but that is what he said.

He said, here is the issue, is this Republican Congress willing to live up to this Republican 1997 budget act. And I think here is the problem with the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) has expired.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my objection.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I have been here too long to be proud. I will accept second chances.

Mr. Chairman, I would just say I think the issue is in fact, and I am not as sure as the gentleman as to what the American people think, but I think the American people may be conflicted.

I think they may have a preference, on the one hand, for a low level of overall spending, and on the other hand, for particular spending programs that add up to more than the overall level. That is, I think the American people may be in a position where they favor a whole that is smaller than the sum of the parts they favor, and that is what we have to grapple with.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a comment about the first Republican President, Abraham Lincoln, and this is with regard to the caps, and I say this with all sincerity.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I knew Lincoln was a pretty smart fellow, but if the guy that was around in 1865 has made a comment about 1997, he was even smarter than I thought. But go ahead.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, here is what I think he would say, that he would restate his comment that the foolish and the dead alone never change their minds.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I guess he would say that, but I do not know why.

If the gentleman is saying, ''change your mind,'' okay, but let us be clear what ''change your mind'' means. If it means he admits that this great accomplishment of 1997, this Balanced Budget Act that has been the basis for so much that they have taken credit for, they are really ready to throw it over the side, I do not blame the Members. I never liked it in the first place.

The one thing the Members are not entitled to do is to express surprise at the entirely foreseeable consequences of their action. They are not entitled, having done it in 1997 and taken credit for it in the 1998 election, to throw it over the side and say, what do you guys think this is, term limits, a promise one makes and then forgets about?

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

Mr. Chairman, agriculture is very important to me. I am a farmer. Agriculture has been shortchanged. We need to pay attention to agriculture and the survival of the family farm as other countries protect and subsidize their farmers.

But I think that is one reason that this is the first of the appropriation bills where we are faced with the decision of overspending. Are we going to start inching our way into a situation where we have to break our word on keeping our commitment on the caps that we set in 1997.

Just to make it clear, synonymous with sticking to the caps under the current CBO projections is whether or not we spend the social security trust fund surpluses to accommodate that extra spending.

For most every year in the last 40 years, we have used the social security surpluses to mask the deficit; in other words, we have spent the social security surpluses for other government programs. A lot of people here say, well, do not worry about it, somehow social security is going to take care of itself.

I disagree. The easy step, the easiest possible thing that we can do, is say that we are going to stop spending the social security surpluses for other government programs. That is a baby step. That is so easy compared to the program changes that are going to have to be implemented to change social security so it can stay solvent.

So when we are faced with a situation that we inch our way into overspending and using Social Security surpluses on this important Agricultural budget, which is so difficult for so many of us to vote against, we set the pattern. Then the next budget that is also important, we are faced with more overspending. Then a situation at the end is that we cannot possibly stay within our caps and not spend the social security surpluses.

Look, if the spending is so important, have the guts, the fortitude, to say, we are going to increase taxes to accommodate this kind of spending. Do not say, we are simply going to reach under the table, take the social security surpluses that are coming in because current workers are being overtaxed, and use that money, because few will notice the abuse. Nobody is going to see it or realize it until it runs out of money.

We have ground this country into a $5.5 trillion debt. We are increasing that debt on a daily basis. Sometime we are going to have to face up to the fact that we are transferring our shortsighted desire for more overspending to our kids and our grandkids and future generations.

Not only will they be asked to come up with additional income taxes but also social security taxes to pay for our overindulgence. I just give the Members a couple of situations. Germany did not pay attention to this early on, and now they are spending almost 50 percent of their wages in taxes to accommodate their senior retirement program.

I am very concerned that we are going down, if you will, the primrose path of thinking all of these expenditures are necessary and important.

I would just like to encourage my colleagues to face up to the consequences. If spending is so important, let us increase taxes to accommodate that spending. Let us reduce other expenditures to accommodate that spending. But let us keep our promise and not spend social security surpluses.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to remind my colleagues that we are actually debating an amendment. Now, we have heard speeches here on social security, we have gotten into Abraham Lincoln's life, and everything else. But I become increasingly angered as I see the irresponsibility of the majority party inside this institution.

I am a loyal Member of this House, and I am rarely as partisan as some of my colleagues on this side of the aisle. But I am going to get partisan now, because a bill that I have major responsibility for is being held up on this floor because of disarray inside the Republican Party. Who it is hurting is the farmers across this country.

Mr. Chairman, I will not yield until I finish my statement to any Member on the other side of the aisle, since they are the reason for the continuing delay here today.

I have served in this Congress now for 9 terms and I have the highest respect for the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), who has worked under enormous pressures of various types as we have moved this bill to the floor, the first appropriation bill to arrive on the floor, and rightly so for rural America, because no sector of this country is hurting more than rural America today.

But as I look at the record of the Republican Congress during my tenure over the last several years, last year they could not clear a bill to assist rural America. We had to end up with

that omnibus atrocity at the end of the year where we threw in some help for rural America, because they could not deal with their appropriation bills on time.

And then just last week, 6 months late, they appropriated more money under an emergency basis to try to help rural America, as well as defense and Kosovo and Hurricane Mitch victims and all of the rest. They did not do it under regular order. The only part of the bill that they required to be offset for budget purposes was the agriculture piece, the part that affected citizens of the United States of America who have paid taxes.

Now today I come down here, and what do I see? I see delay by a Member who is not up for reelection, let us put the cards right on the table; who has, according to what we have been told, between 100 and 200 amendments to an agriculture bill which is very important to rural America. So what I see today are delay tactics.

I do not understand what is going on on the Republican side of the aisle. They can check my whole career, I probably have not used the word ''Republican'' in speeches on the floor 10 times in 17 years, but I am sick of it and what they are doing on agriculture. They are holding up our bill.

I would just beg of the leadership, I will say to the leadership of their side of the aisle who voted with the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), if this is any indication of what is about to happen over the next several days as we string this agony out and they make rural America wait again, I would just say, why do they not go back into their own little caucus and figure out what they are really for, because we have worked very hard for several months to produce this bill, and the people of America, particularly rural America, are waiting, and they are continuing to delay.

I will specifically say to their leadership, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), those who voted with the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), why are they doing this? There are over 100 to 200 more amendments yet to come, and they are going to delay this bill?

If these Members want a vote on social security, bring up a social security bill. They are in the majority. They can do anything they want. But why do they continue to take it out of the hide of rural America?

I have a real problem here. I would just beg of the leadership to treat their committee chairs with respect, bring their bills to the floor in regular order, and do not nitpick us to death.

Thank God we are not the other body. We are not supposed to have filibusters here. We are supposed to move the people's business. I am here to do that as a Democrat, and I wish they were here to do that as Republicans.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Members are reminded that their remarks are to be directed to the Chair, not to other persons.

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

I would like to say that I have tremendous respect for the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) who just spoke. I would like to think that later she will regret some of the intensity that she feels, because this is the first day of a debate on the agriculture appropriations bill.

We have a right, even in the majority, to amend majority bills, just as the minority has a right to offer amendments to these bills. That is what we are doing, and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) in my judgment, is showing a lot of courage and integrity.

I was sitting in my office and I was thinking, he is speaking the truth. We all need to have this dialogue, and if Members disagree with it, they disagree with it.

The fact is, when we set the 302(b) allocations, we decided to give more to agriculture; we decided to give a lot more to defense; and, obviously, we decided to give less to Labor and Health and Human Services. These departments are going to receive a $10.7 billion cut. We also decided to give less to HUD. That department is also going to receive a significant cut.

What we are saying is that when we increase agriculture spending, the only way we can do this is by cutting other departments. And we do not want that.

What I am saying is that I will vote for appropriations bills that do not increase spending and that stay within the caps.

□ 1700

I understand that the chairman can say we are staying within the cap, because we could triple the agriculture budget. It is the first budget, and we could spend all the 302(b) allocation on agriculture and still not be above the cap.

But we have to recognize that this budget is going to affect all the other budgets that follow. That is why I am on the floor to say I will vote against this budget, not because I dislike farmers, but because I do not like the bureaucracy in the Agriculture Department.

I have a hard time understanding why we need over 95,000 employees in the Agriculture Department and less than 10,000 in HUD. I have a hard time understanding why we have over 85,000 contract employees working in the Agriculture Department.

I do not think they help farmers as much as some of the other things we do. We have a gigantic department that, in my judgment, makes HUD look efficient.

As a Member of Congress, I think I have a right to come here, speak on the amendment that the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) has offered, and vote for it with pride.

I would gladly take credit for the balanced budget agreement, but I cannot take credit because a lot of people share in that credit. That agreement is one of the reasons why I think our country is doing as well as it is today.

Our challenge is we have a gigantic surplus, and we simply do not know how to deal with the surplus, so we want to spend it and make government bigger and bigger and bigger.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding to me.

Everybody said what my intention was, but they never asked me exactly what my intention was. The reason for the number of amendments that have been offered is because the real debate is about what we are going to do with all this money that we are spending.

As a Member of this body, I think, and I think the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) will agree, that I was just as obstructive in my desire to not spend wasteful money last year and the year before and the year before and the year before. I have not changed at all. I have been this independent ever since I have been up here, because I believe that we have an obligation to not spend one additional dollar that we do not have to.

What I hear throughout the whole body is that we cannot. We cannot be better. We cannot get better. We cannot be more efficient. That the product of the appropriation process is the best that it can be.

We all have an equal vote in here in terms of what we think and how we get a vote on certain issues. I, quite frankly, think that there are a lot of areas in this appropriation bill that we can trim spending, that will help us have money for Labor-HHS, Commerce, Justice and State, that will not have one effect on our farmers. Do my colleagues know what? Most of my farmers think so, too.

So it is not a matter of just obstructing the process, it is a matter of reestablishing confidence within this body with the American people that we said we were going to hold spending down, that we were not going to waste money, and that in fact it is really true that, if we spend $1 that we do not need to, we are stealing the future from our children.

So the debate is about Social Security because the money that we are going to end up spending is going to come from the Social Security surplus that, guess what, our children are going to have to pay back.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to, if I could, see if we cannot back out of the trees and look at the forest a little bit. I appreciate the comments earlier by the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I think that he had it exactly right.

One of my favorite movies is ''Indiana Jones.'' In the movie, his father is

killed, and they are drinking from the silver chalice. If Indiana Jones picks the right chalice to drink from, his father will live. If he picks the wrong one, he will die.

In one of the moving lines of the movie, the bad guy says to Indiana Jones, ''Indiana Jones, it is time for you to decide what you believe.''

I think what the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) is trying to do is to force that question on this party, the Republicans, to decide what we believe. The gentleman from Massachusetts had it exactly right.

I will tell my colleagues that, as one Republican, I am not ashamed of what we did in the 1997 balanced budget agreement. It is the best thing we have done since I have been here, and I am proud of that and will gladly defend it to my dying day. But are we all willing to do that?

What we have really is a logjam of ideals that are coming together in this first appropriation bill. The ideals are saving Social Security and the surplus, balancing the budget, and spending more money.

I would have bet my last dollar that several years ago, had my colleagues asked me a question, if we had a logjam of those three ideals, which one would win, I would have bet my last dollar that Social Security would trump all the others. But what we are finding evident in this process is that is not true. Spending trumps everything else in this body. Big spending trumps everything, including Social Security.

Again, let us back out of the woods and look at the forest. What we have here is the first of 13 bills, checks that the Congress writes to fund all the discretionary spending in the budget, about $600 billion. It may be a little bit more than that. This is the first one.

What the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) has had the nerve and the courage to do is take the high ground and try to see if we can figure out where the end of this road is going to be.

I will tell my colleagues where the end of the road is. It is a box canyon. It is a dead end. That is where we are headed.

An old Chinese proverb says, ''The longest journey begins with the first step.'' This is the first step, and it is a step in the wrong direction. If we continue down this path, we will end up with another disaster like we had at the end of the last Congress.

So what the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) is doing, he is not railing against agriculture, he is railing against this process. Sure, my colleagues are right, this is a problem within the Republican conference; and leadership is what is needed.

We need to talk about what is the end game, not agriculture. What is the end game? Where are we going? Are we going to end up with the same disaster that we had last year, where we end up spending billions of dollars above the budget caps, $17 billion if we freeze all spending right now? That is the point that the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) is trying to make.

I was always taught, say what you mean and mean what you say. Now say what you mean is a communication issue; and I hear that wherever I go, speaking across the country on behalf of the Republican Party: What is the problem with your communication?

One of the problems is we do not say what we mean. We are trying to do a better job of that. Do my colleagues know what we are saying? We are the party that wants to save Social Security first, not 62 percent of the surplus, as the President said from that lectern not long ago, but 100 percent.

Mean what you say is an integrity issue. That is what this issue is about. It is an integrity issue of this party. Because if my colleagues are going to ask me to go around the country and hail the Republican Party and say we are the party that is to save Social Security first, then my colleagues better mean what they say, because I want to mean what I say. If we do not mean what we say, then I am going to quit saying it.

That is the issue, are we going to mean what we say when we say we are going to save Social Security first? This bill is the first test on that issue.

Again, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) has had the foresight and the courage to take the high ground and look ahead and say, if we continue down this path, we have a disaster coming in the form of VA–HUD and Labor-HHS that none of my colleagues will vote for under the 302(b) allocations. Not one of my colleagues will vote for a $4 billion cut in VA–HUD and $5 billion cut in Labor-HHS. Not one of my colleagues will vote for it, not one.

So that is the problem. It is a leadership issue. I agree with the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR). It is a leadership issue that we need to deal with. I will tell my colleagues that this was our last resort, was to come to the House floor, because we hit dead end after dead end in trying to carry on this family discussion inside our own house.

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

Mr. Chairman, I had not planned to come and speak on this bill today. As I was over in my office and watching it, I was thinking I am sure my farmers are out in the field this afternoon, and I hope they are, working, and not seeing what was going on that would have such a dramatic impact on their lives.

We are here in an air conditioned building and, as my friend the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LARGENT) said who just spoke from the majority side, we are in an air-conditioned building, well-lighted and comfortable; and they are out in hot fields, their lives on the line. As he said, and he put it correctly, we are having a family fight.

I am not going to get in the middle of this family fight. I am going to let my colleagues all fight it out. But I hope my colleagues will settle it, because this bill has a significant impact on the farmers in my State and the farmers all across this country.

Yes, there are other bills to come that will affect the children. But this bill does, too, because it affects the quality of family life.

I am proud to be a Member of the United States Congress. I am not proud when we bring our dirty laundry to the floor. There is nothing wrong with offering amendments. I have no problem with that. I will stay here all night and tomorrow morning, all day tomorrow. But we ought to know where we want to get to. It ought to be about getting to a destination. It ought to be about making it better rather than just to stop the process, to make a point. That is not what legislation is all about.

I am only in my second term in Congress. I served 10 years in the General Assembly in my State. I understood stalling tactics, but it ought not to be about that. It ought to be about making it better and providing a better opportunity for people in America and specifically about our family farmers, because they are hurting.

Our small farmers are going out of business. They are going broke. I have had farmers tell me, and I met with bankers, I met with someone earlier today and they said to me, ''If you do not have crop insurance, I will not make a loan. If you do not get a program in place, we are going to quit lending money.''

If that should happen, I pray to God it does not, but if that should happen, it will not happen with my vote. I trust the majority party will come to their senses and make sure it does not happen with their vote either, because we have been fortunate in America, we have been blessed, as no other country in the world, to have a bountiful food supply.

Oh, sure, there are children that do not have as much food as they should have; but over the years we have tried to do a good job. We have not done as much as we should to make sure that they are fed with the child nutrition program and other programs like that.

But, Mr. Chairman, we have a job to do. We are paid to do it. So let us get on and pass this bill and get on to the other appropriations bills and get the people's business done.

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

Mr. Chairman, I wrote down a few different thoughts here that we have all heard. Rome was not built in a day. The first step is the hardest step. The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LARGENT) just mentioned the Chinese proverb, which was the longest journey begins with the first step. Do not do tomorrow what you can do today. To me, this is what the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) is all about.

As has already been stated numerous times on the House floor, we have a train wreck coming unless we go out and basically reroute this little train. So it is a family fight. It is an internal discussion. But it is a conversation that really has to take place now because the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) mentioned the 302(b) numbers. There is no way we are going to cut $3 billion from VA–HUD. There is no way we are going to cut $5 billion from Labor-HHS. If we are going to get ahead of this curve, we have simply got to do it now.

So I would just commend the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN). I would say that farmers that I talk to are the most straightforward people in the world. What we are dealing with, again, goes back to what the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LARGENT) was talking about in terms of the word ''integrity''. What we have is a budget plan that cannot work.

When we talk about this idea of a surplus, last year we borrowed $100 billion from Social Security to give us a surplus of about $70 billion. Most folks I talk to say basically we are still $30 billion in the hole if that is the math.

A family, if one had to go out and borrow against one's retirement reserves to put gas in the car and food on the table, one would say that family was not running a surplus. In the business world, if one borrowed against one's pension fund assets to pay for the current operation of the company, one would go to jail. That is how we are getting to this surplus.

So we are building on very shaky ground. That is what the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) is trying to get us away from with this particular amendment.

□ 1715

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

Mr. SANFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I want to go back and make a couple of points. This amendment is about cutting a 9 percent increase in an office that is full of computers for an Office of Public Information for the Department of Agriculture. And here we have people saying that we have to have 9 percent when every other aspect of our economy is not seeing any kind of increases near that.

It is sacrosanct because of what has to continue; the way we used to do it, we always have to do it that way in the future. It is a process that needs to be shaken up.

I would love to have been in a room with our Founding Fathers, because while we talk about majority-minority parties, I am sure they did not talk about majority-minority parties. They talked about doing what was best for this country regardless of what an individual's party says.

It should be what is best for our districts, not what is good for our party. The Founding Fathers never once rationalized getting in power and having control so they could stay in power. What they said was, we are going to put this Union together and we are going to make it work because the people are going to have the integrity to do what is best for their constituents and they are going to have the vision to make sure that they do not make a short-run choice that sacrifices the long-run choice.

These amendments are about sacrificing the short run so we secure a future for our children in the long run. It is not about which party controls. It is a matter of living up to our responsibility to secure a future for our children. And, quite frankly, I am not sure this body is up to it, because I think the body is more interested in power politics than principle. I find that evident as we have had the debate today.

So I would yield back to the gentleman and thank him for the additional time, and I would reemphasize that this is a debate about cutting a 9 percent increase out of the Office of Information for the Department of Agriculture, and that will not impact one farmer.

I would rather see this same money moved and go to our farmers.

It is not about not having enough money for our farmers; it is about having way too much bureaucracy and not having the guts to change it.

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

First off, I think it is important that we know just exactly what the proposed increased spending is for. And I have great respect for the gentleman from Oklahoma, I do not believe he intends to misspeak, but this is an attempt to do something that many of us have been attempting to do since 1992, and that is bring the USDA into the next century technologically. And that is what these computers are all about. It is to allow our farmers to be served better by less people.

And that is what the cuts that are being proposed are all about, and that is why some of us have opposed these cuts.

But let me make a couple of other observations. If we want to save Social Security, let us bring a Social Security bill to the floor of the House from the Committee on Ways and Means.

Now, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH), on this side of the aisle, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) have brought bills and ideals but not to the floor. This is the wrong time for us to be picking on an agricultural bill, particularly making cuts that do just the opposite of what the gentleman from Oklahoma wants to do, in my opinion.

But the gentleman is correct in many of the observations that he makes with his amendments today. We have no appropriations strategy, ''we'' meaning this body, unless those who voted for the majority's budget are prepared to cut $6 billion from the Veterans Administration and HUD, unless they are willing to cut $11 billion in Labor HHS, unless they are willing to cut 8 percent in Commerce, State, Justice, and the energy and water bills, and unless they are willing to cut 20 percent from the Interior and Foreign Operations.

Now, I did not vote for that budget, because I am not willing to make those kinds of cuts in those areas, because I believe it would be counterproductive, and I am perfectly willing to say what I mean. But I did vote for the Blue Dog budget, and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) did also, which suggested that in the areas of agriculture, defense, education, health and veterans we might need to spend a little bit more on those areas, subject to the scrutiny of this body, which is perfectly okay for any Member in this body to challenge the Committee on Appropriations at any time on anything we are doing, and I do not begrudge the gentleman for doing that.

We also, in our amendment, saved Social Security, and I would submit we did it really, and the gentleman agrees because he voted for it. We also provided for a 25 percent tax cut, or using 25 percent of the on-budget for cutting taxes. But we also recognized there was going to be a need for additional spending, and we are proving it today. And this is an area in which when I say ''we,'' the leadership of this House needs to look at the train wreck that they are leading us down by the proposed 302(b) allocations.

The gentleman from New Mexico and the gentlewoman from Ohio are doing what they were told to do. They were given a mark in the budget. This budget passed by a majority vote of this body. Therefore, that means a majority must support it.

Well, if it means a majority do not wish to spend that which has been designated for agriculture, vote against it. Cut the agriculture bill. Vote to adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma, in which he will cut the very technology that we need in order to make the efficiencies to do more work with less people. That is what this is all about.

I know the gentleman has not looked into it. I have spent since 1992. I was the chairman of the Subcommittee on Department Operations, Oversight, Nutrition, and Forestry that started us down the road of USDA reorganization, and I have been fought every step of the way by the bureaucracy. We have made some substantial improvements and changes, and one of the things that we must do now is provide our people with the technology that they need in order that they might do that which they are criticized every day for doing.

Secretary Glickman has been criticized day after day after day because he has not been able to deliver that which our farmers expect. Part of the reason he has been criticized is we have

not given him the tools to use. So before we start blindly making amendments and trying to make points, let me just say this agricultural function is within the budget that passed by a majority of this House.

It does not meet the criteria of the Blue Dogs. Those who supported us, which was a majority on my side of the aisle and 26 on that side of the aisle, said, no, we cannot do that, we have some other needs, and we are willing to stand up and be counted for those needs in a very responsible way.

But if we truly want to save Social Security, let us bring a Social Security bill to this floor and do it tomorrow. Then we will have an honest debate about how we can best do it, not on an agricultural bill.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. Mr. Chairman, I will not take the full 5 minutes. I would just like to make two points.

One is that for those who have mentioned in the debate that the farmers are waiting in the fields for us to resolve this issue, I would remind them that this bill does not become law for at least 4 months, regardless of how long this debate goes on. So no one is going to be harmed by this debate except perhaps the patience of the Members who are participating in it or whose constituents are listening to it back home.

So this is not going to cause any breakdown in USDA or in the delivery of services or anything else. This is next year's appropriations bill.

The second thing is, the gentleman from Oklahoma has every right to offer these amendments, but that does not mean we have to debate every one of them. This could go on for a long, long time. Why do we not just agree that he has his right to bring the amendments and let us vote them down?

The committee, the subcommittee, went through the process according to Hoyle. We did the right thing. Let us just vote these amendments down. If we debate every amendment, it could be 4 months before we complete.

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

Mr. Chairman, I will not take 5 minutes, but I think it is wonderful that we can be in this position. When I was running for Congress in 1996, the major theme was that the Congress ought to live within its own means, it ought not to spend more money than it takes in. And I am proud of the U.S. Congress for what they have done in the past few years to get us there.

I know the gentleman from Oklahoma played an integral role in that, and I respect his right to bring these amendments. But I want to tell the gentleman that we have to live within these budget caps that we have imposed upon ourselves, or we are going to have a train wreck.

Now, I did not happen to vote for the budget that we are operating under right now. Like the gentleman from Texas, I voted for the Blue Dog budget, as did the gentleman from Oklahoma. And I think the major difference between the two was that we recognized, as Blue Dogs, that we could not do the cuts quite as deeply as were shown in the budget that came out of the majority of this House.

So, obviously, that Blue Dog budget went down, and now we are living within the constraints of the one that we have. And as my colleagues know, the main difference in those was the depth of the tax cuts.

So I just wanted to remind the gentleman from Oklahoma that, as I have listened to this discussion today, much of it has focused on senior citizens and the issue of Social Security. What has not been mentioned today is the fact that much of this bill that we are debating right now is of direct benefit to senior citizens. Actually, only 12 or 13 billion goes directly into the farm programs, the balance goes into WIC and some other programs that are directed at senior citizens.

Our rural housing programs, particularly the multifamily housing and rental assistance programs are heavily oriented towards seniors. We have housing repair loans and grants that help senior citizens fix their homes and rentals and repair handicapped access. Our community facility loans and grants build community centers that are used by all age groups in rural America.

A significant part of our research in this bill has gone for the elderly nutrition. This bill supports several feeding programs for senior citizens in urban and rural areas. This bill also supports people, the computers, the buildings and all other things necessary to make these programs work.

Now, I have spent most of my life in agriculture, and I go in and out of the FSA office regularly; and we have cut the staff in those offices, we have consolidated those offices to the point where we are doing a disservice to our farmers now all across this Nation. And the only way for us to be able to continue to sustain that is with technology. I am embarrassed when I go in and see some of the computers that they are using.

So I strongly urge the defeat of this amendment, and I certainly am thankful to the gentleman from Oklahoma for continuing this debate.

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

Mr. Chairman, I thought one of the most interesting talks was given by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LARGENT). This is not about agriculture today, as far as what the gentleman is doing. It is about spending and it is about the future and, in the long run, farmers are going to be better.

I grew up in a little town called Shelbina, Missouri, which had a population of 2,113 folk, and I want to tell my colleagues that most of my friends were farmers, and most of them are having to have second and third jobs just to hang on to their farms. And I understand that. But when I look at this body and the argument, not just with our party, but with the other party as well, on total spending for the future, it is important.

Most of us could live within the budget caps, even national security. We could live under the budget caps set with national security if we did not have the Somalia extension, which cost billions; Haiti cost billions; Bosnia has cost $16 billion so far, and that is not even next year; Kosovo has already cost $15 billion; going to Iraq four times cost billions of dollars.

And all of this money, every penny of this, we could put in farms, we could put in Social Security, and we could do all the other things we want to. But this White House has got us in folly all over this planet, costing billions of dollars. So there is spending there.

I also look at the different things that we fight, and not just agriculture. Take a look at the balanced budget process. If I had my way I would do away with the budget process, and I think the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) would too, and I would just go with an appropriations bill.

I would get rid of the authorization, and I would reduce the entire size of government so that we do not have to tax farmers so much, so that neither a State nor local nor Federal tax means more than 25 percent. That would help farmers.

□ 1730

Look at the Endangered Species Act. Look at how that hurts farmers. Increased taxes hurt farmers. All of these things that we talk about on this floor on almost all the bills, whether it is defense or environment or other things, affect farmers negatively.

The supplemental we passed, we passed a pretty good bill out of the House. It was clean but it went to the other body and it was a disaster coming back here. And that took money out from the things that we are trying to do in medical research and all the other things.

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

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

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas talked about this office and this amendment. I want to get back to it for a minute.

I just want the American people to know, in 1964 there were 3.2 million farms in this country and there were 108,000 agricultural employees working for the U.S. Government. In 1997 there were 40 percent fewer farms, 1.9 million, and there were 107,000 Department of Agriculture employees plus 82,000 contract employees that did not exist in 1964.

So the question that I am wanting to raise, the philosophical question is why

can we not get the government smaller if we have fewer farmers, they are more efficient, they are doing better, and send more of the money that we have for agriculture to the farmers? How is it that we cannot do that? We can do that. It is that we choose not to do it.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I appreciate focusing, as the gentleman did, on the fundamental issue here. And I think we do have a question as to the adequacy of the caps. The gentleman from California said we could live under the cap, even for national security, and he said if it were not for Somalia, Haiti, Bosnia, Kosovo and Iraq.

My point to the gentleman is this: Kosovo came after, but the other military efforts he mentioned all preceded the cap. The cap was 1997. So if the gentleman says we could have lived under the cap except for Haiti, Somalia, Bosnia and Iraq, then he must be saying, seriously, that the cap was too low. Because those four items which he said make it impossible to live under the cap, four of the five predate the cap.

So I ask the gentleman, does he still say the cap was adequate in 1997?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CUNNINGHAM was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, what I would say to the gentleman is this. The Joint Chiefs, for example, in defense said that we need $150 billion, that is an additional $22 billion a year just to pay for defense, and that is because of all of those deployments that have happened.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue, I understand that. But my point to the gentleman is we can differ about that, although I hope we can work together to reduce some of these excessive commitments. But I would say to the gentleman this: Most of those things happened before my colleagues voted for the cap. So I am simply saying it is impossible logically to say both that these interventions make the cap unrealistic and to have voted for the cap, because the cap came after most of those interventions.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I think the gentleman is missing the point. Even though the cap came afterwards, those other events preceded it and all of those bills were carried on down the line.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, yes. Then why did my colleague vote for the cap? I agree that because the events preceded it, the cap came after it. That I agree to.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, again it is about spending. And I would say, look at www.dsausa.Org. That is the Democrat Socialists of America. And under that are 58 of the members in this body.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, would he tell me what that remotely has to do with anything?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. They want increased spending. They want increased government control. They want increased taxes. They want to cut defense by 50 percent. And every single one of those hurts farmers.

So this is about spending. And they in the minority want to increase spending. They want to increase taxes. They want to increase government control. All of those things hurt farmers.

So this bill and this debate is good, because it is not about agriculture. It is about a principle of spending and taxes and whether Congress is putting us in the hole for future generations or not.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Members are reminded that they are to refrain from characterizing the actions of the other body.

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

Mr. Chairman, last Sunday afternoon I spent 3 hours at the Emmanuel American Lutheran Church in rural Fulda in Minnesota. The Fulda Ministerium had organized a service to minister to the anguish of the farm community. The local Catholic priest and several ministers participated.

Farm families are struggling to decide if they can continue to farm. Business families are wondering if their businesses will survive. Churches are wondering if they will survive. Teachers are wondering if their schools will stay open in the small communities in rural America.

As I sat in the service, I looked up at the wall in the front of the sanctuary and I noticed that the Ten Commandments were there. The Seventh Commandment states, ''Thou shalt not steal.'' The Seventh Commandment, which states, ''Thou shalt not steal,'' had a very strange and eerie relevance to the meeting that afternoon.

What is happening is this country has a cheap food policy and we have been stealing from America's farm families for decades. We are driving, by our national cheap food policy, thousands of families from the farms of America every year.

This year we are struggling with the first appropriations bill, Agriculture Appropriations. It is a humble bill. From my reading of the approach that we are taking, there is no real policy in this bill. We are not making progress. And I fear that the American farmers are getting rolled again in fiscal 2000. Their bill comes up first, and there is all this debate about whether their bill is too high.

Well, I can assure my friend from Oklahoma that we are not investing enough in agriculture. It is far from the truth. And the 100,000 employees he is talking about at the U.S. Department of Agriculture, they are not dealing with our agricultural programs. Almost all of them are dealing with nutrition and Forest Service and other programs. It is not agriculture.

Let us quit treating our farmers like dirt. We expect them to farm in the dirt, but they deserve to be treated with dignity. I do not see any progress in this series of amendments. We are squandering hours of floor time on a frivolous debate over these amendments.

What we need to do, Mr. Chairman, we need to recognize the fact that, as we move through this appropriations process, one appropriations bill after another is going to exceed the caps. The Agriculture Appropriations bill is probably the one that is considered easiest to pass without protracted debate over whether we should not be spending more.

Tragically, when the end of the year comes and we have the new CBO budget baseline and the pressure is there for other programs, we will start to find ways to explode the caps. I think all of us know that. But for agriculture, no, there is no new program. There is no crop insurance reform for fiscal year 2000. We are not increasing the loan rates for fiscal 2000. We are not providing additional money for new and beginning farmers in fiscal 2000. We are not investing in our rural communities for fiscal 2000 to a greater degree.

We have a static program. We are regressing for America's rural communities in fiscal 2000. And I think to blame the White House, to blame this and to blame that, is absolutely wrong. It is asinine. We need to look at ourselves and blame ourselves for the fact we are not doing justice to America's farm families.

I urge that we defeat this amendment and that we move on to consider the substance of this bill so that we no longer are insulting rural America.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 239, noes 177, answered ''present'' 3, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 154]

AYES—239

Aderholt	Barrett (WI)	Bilbray
Andrews	Bartlett	Blagojevich
Archer	Barton	Bliley
Armey	Bass	Blumenauer
Bachus	Becerra	Blunt
Baird	Bentsen	Boehner
Baker	Bereuter	Borski
Baldwin	Berkley	Brady (PA)
Ballenger	Berman	Brady (TX)
Barr	Biggert	Brown (OH)

Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cannon
Capuano
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chenoweth
Clement
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Conyers
Cook
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
English
Eshoo
Evans
Fattah
Filner
Foley
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gillmor
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holt
Hostettler
Hutchinson
Inslee
Istook
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kelly
Kennedy
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McInnis
McIntosh
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Metcalf
Mica
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mink
Moakley
Moore
Murtha
Myrick
Neal
Northup
Norwood
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Pease
Pelosi
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rogan
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanford
Sawyer
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Snyder
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Walden
Wamp
Waters
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Woolsey
Wu

NOES—177

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Bateman
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brown (FL)
Callahan
Canady
Capps
Carson
Chambliss
Clayton
Clyburn
Combest
Condit
Cooksey
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Edwards
Emerson
Engel
Etheridge
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fletcher
Forbes
Ford
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kildee
Kilpatrick
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaFalce
Lampson
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Markey
Mascara
McCarthy (MO)
McCrery
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Meek (FL)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Payne
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Quinn
Radanovich
Regula
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sandlin
Saxton
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (WA)
Spence
Stabenow
Stenholm
Strickland
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Wexler
Wilson
Wolf
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—3

Kaptur
Kucinich
Menendez

NOT VOTING—14

Brown (CA)
Clay
Graham
Hinojosa
Holden
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Kasich
Millender-McDonald
Nadler
Ortiz
Pallone
Reyes
Rothman
Smith (TX)

□ 1800

Mr. ROEMER and Mr. STRICKLAND changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. BAIRD, Ms. SANCHEZ, Ms. VELAZQUEZ and Messrs. MOAKLEY, NEAL of Massachusetts, DEUTSCH and GREEN of Texas changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I will not take the 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I had planned on offering an amendment that would have attempted to strike funding for the Office of the Secretary as well as other offices and programs within USDA in an attempt to provide some $40 million for onion and apple farmers in the State of New York that were severely struck by bad weather, a disaster-type of problem that they had last year.

We, our good Committee on Agriculture, adopted a $5.9 billion emergency relief measure. Our farmers still have yet to see one dollar of that, and I wanted to mention as we are considering this major agriculture measure, I wanted to make my colleagues aware of the poor manner in which the United States Department of Agriculture has addressed emergency relief for our farmers at a time when this Congress passed a $5.9 billion emergency relief measure last October, and yet very few of our farmers have received the kind of relief they are entitled to. Moreover, when they go to seek relief, they find that the crop insurance program leaves a lot to be desired.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture in the House and the Senate for taking a hard look at revising that program.

So again I just wanted to take this opportunity to remind our colleagues that while the USDA speaks highly of trying to do something for the farmers, their programs leave a lot to be desired.

Mr. Chairman, I had planned on offering an amendment that would have attempted to strike funding for the Office of the Secretary as well as other offices and programs within the USDA in an attempt to provide $40 million for onion and apple farmers from New York.

However, in observance of comity as well as in recognition that such amendment would not pass, I will not offer such an amendment.

Moreover, along with my colleague the gentleman from New York, Mr. WALSH, we attempted to add $30 million to the recently approved emergency supplemental for emergency assistance for our apple and onion producers, but we were denied such relief.

However, the manner in which the Secretary of Agriculture and the USDA has chosen to handle the current crisis which continues to plague our onion producers from my congressional district in Orange County, New York is wholly unsatisfactory.

One year ago this month, a devastating hail storm swept through the Orange County region causing severe damage to vegetable crops and adversely affected the production of our onion crops. When our farmers went to their Federal crop insurance for assistance, they encountered a system that hindered them, rather than helping them.

In the year that has followed since the last disaster, the United States Department of Agriculture has utterly failed to act within their mandate to secure and protect the interests of our nations farmers. Many of our farmers face bankruptcy as a result of multi-year losses and absolutely no assistance from USDA. In Orange County, our farmers began planting for the new season, despite receiving no indemnities on their claims. They could not afford to buy the seed and supplies needed to ensure a bountiful growing season and many are struggling to keep themselves afloat in the midst of the maelstrom that the Department has unleashed upon them. We called upon the Secretary of Agriculture, noting that unless the emergency funds so desperately needed were released immediately, a number of them may not be able to survive.

Despite numerous pleas from a number of us in the Congress, the Department has continued to follow a course of action that puts the best interests of our farmers at risk. This bureaucratic blockade of emergency funding stands in stark contract to the mission of the Department of Agriculture and has succeeded only in prolonging the suffering of our farmers, rather than assuaging it.

Once again, I renew my call to the Secretary to take every appropriate action to ensure that these emergency disaster funds that were appropriated by Congress back in October of last year are promptly disbursed and I urge the Secretary to take whatever steps are necessary to thoroughly revise the Federal

Crop Insurance Program. We should not continue programs that provide no substantive relief to those who look to them for assistance. The time is now for the Secretary to begin such a revision process.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman will state her parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to perhaps have the gentleman from Florida on the other side talk about the schedule at this point, or the Chair, whomever knows what the schedule is for this evening. We understand that votes may be being rolled. If someone could clarify it for us, what is happening here now?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Ohio could move to strike the last word and yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word and would yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of our full committee.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the plan is as follows:

The freshmen have a commitment between now and 8 o'clock at the Holocaust Museum, and we will continue the debate, but we will roll the votes that occur between now and 8 o'clock. Then at 8 o'clock we will take the votes that have been postponed, and then after we have completed that, a decision will be made whether to proceed further into the evening and take votes or to proceed further into the evening and roll the votes until tomorrow or to rise.

Mr. Chairman, one of those three options will be announced after the votes at 8 o'clock.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

So, there will be no votes between now and approximately 8 p.m., but debate will continue.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. That is correct.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the clarification.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Chief Financial Officer, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed $10,000 is for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $4,283,000.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ADMINISTRATION

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration to carry out the programs funded by this Act, $613,000.

AGRICULTURE BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES AND RENTAL PAYMENTS

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For payment of space rental and related costs pursuant to Public Law 92–313, including authorities pursuant to the 1984 delegation of authority from the Administrator of General Services to the Department of Agriculture under 40 U.S.C. 486, for programs and activities of the Department which are included in this Act, and for the operation, maintenance, and repair of Agriculture buildings, $140,364,000: *Provided*, That in the event an agency within the Department should require modification of space needs, the Secretary of Agriculture may transfer a share of that agency's appropriation made available by this Act to this appropriation, or may transfer a share of this appropriation to that agency's appropriation, but such transfers shall not exceed 5 percent of the funds made available for space rental and related costs to or from this account. In addition, for construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities as necessary to carry out the programs of the Department, where not otherwise provided, $26,000,000, to remain available until expended; making a total appropriation of $166,364,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SANFORD

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Sanford:

Page 4, line 25, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $21,695,000)''.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a very slight and modest change within the whole of the $13-plus billion that will go to agriculture. It deals specifically with the agricultural buildings and facilities rental payments section, and what it does is it deceases by a little over $21 million the specific agricultural buildings and facilities rental payment section.

Now what this really gets at is, there is what they call the space plan within the Department of Agriculture, and there are numerous Department of Agriculture buildings throughout the country, and what we do not have in schools across this country where we have actually students in trailers is this kind of money being spent.

So this is to take out $21 million which seems to me to be a Washington phenomenon, to go simply on planning on where buildings may or may not be, where leases will or will not go next, and so this is a 420 percent increase in this one category of expenditure, and again it is something that we do not see in the private sector. We do not see somebody in the private sector spending $21 million planning on where they are going to lease or sublease next, we do not see $21 billion additional being spent on planning when it could go into real buildings.

One of the choices that we will be having later this year is do we spend this $21 million on planning, or do we put the money, for instance, into education? This could actually buy books for the classroom, it could actual buy computers for the classroom, it could actually take people out of trailers.

In South Carolina we see trailers that actually house students. It could take them out of those facilities and put them in a real facility.

There is, for instance, if the choice right now is between this $21 million and, for instance, VA-HUD, would we rather spend the $21 million on veterans or would we rather spend the money, the $21 million, deciding where we are going to put bureaucrats in and around Washington, D.C.?

That is all this amendment does. It is part of a much greater context, and that is the context of what comes next. If we do not get ahead of the curve on where Washington is spending money, we have a train wreck coming this fall. There is no way this institution will cut $5-plus billion out of Labor-HHS, there is no way this institution will cut $3-plus billion out of VA-HUD, and the simple question before us is:

Can we save this $21 million to go toward planning where bureaucrats will be housed in Washington, or would we rather save that for these greater purposes later on?

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

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might inquire of the gentleman?

My understanding of this is that last year we spent $5 million in this area and that we are increasing it to 21 million 600 and some odd thousand dollars, and I profess to not understand the rationale behind that, and I would like to know where this $16 million, how it is actually going to be spent. Is that a contract with some outside firm to help the Department of Agriculture better utilize its space or to give them a strategic plan? Where is the $16 million going to be spent over this next year, and how is it that we have a 420 percent increase?

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

Mr. COBURN. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate it.

The gentleman is talking about the wrong section of the bill, because it is not the building account his amendment goes after. His amendment goes after the repairs and the rental accounts. These are contracts that have been made by the Department of Agriculture in renovating some of the older buildings that they own.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Mexico for that explanation.

I would like to read from the committee print.

The Department's headquarters staff is presently housed in a four-building, government-owned complex in downtown Washington and in leased buildings in the metropolitan Washington area. In 1995, the USDA initiated a plan to improve the delivery of USDA programs to American people, including streamlining the USDA organization. A high priority goal in the Secretary's plan is to improve the operation and effectiveness of the USDA headquarters in Washington.

To implement this goal, a strategy for efficient reallocation of space to house the restructured headquarters agencies in modern and safe facilities has been proposed. This USDA strategic plan will correct serious problems which USDA has faced in its facility program, including inefficiencies of operating out of scattered lease facilities

and serious safety hazards which exist in the huge Agriculture South Building.

During Fiscal 1998, the Beltsville office facility was completed. This facility was constructed with funds appropriated to the departments located on government-owned land in Beltsville, Maryland. Occupancy by USDA agencies began in 1998 and will be completed in 1999.

I guess my point is the same point that the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) had, is we are going to be trading classrooms for children, we are going to be using Social Security money to facilitate new buildings, new headquarters and new facilities for the USDA, and that does not help farmers one bit that I can figure out. It does help the people who work for the Department of Agriculture, but it does not help the farmers, and it is my hope with this kind of increase that we could take a look at that and perhaps trim that down or eliminate it, or bring it down to something realistic because, in fact, we do have a war that is costing $15 billion thus far, and we are going to have to make some choices.

Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman like to respond to that?

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is still in the wrong account. That is an operations and maintenance account that we are talking about for buildings that are in use by the Department of Agriculture, and it is not planning money at all.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I would again thank the gentleman for responding to that. Again, I would stand by what I just read in the committee print, which is how this money was labeled in terms of the strategic space plan, and I guess I will just have to be satisfied.

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

Mr. COBURN. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. It is still the wrong number. We will be happy to show the gentleman where it is.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I will be happy to wait on the gentleman.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. He should not hold his breath.

Mr. COBURN. Okay, again I would make the point.

The point is this: There is a significant increase in this section of the bill.

□ 1815

It is $21 million in a time when we are spending money on a war, where we have made a commitment not to spend Social Security dollars to run this government, and in an area that offers nothing for our farmers.

Now, there is no question that I want more dollars to go to our farmers. That is why we spent almost $12 billion in emergency supplemental dollars last year for our farmers. That is why we advanced the Freedom to Farm payment of $5 billion last year. That is why the baseline for the agricultural bill was up $5 billion over last year, because what was appropriated in the initial appropriations was $55 billion, almost $56 billion; and when we adjust that for the emergency spending that raises the baseline, we come to $61 billion.

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

Mr. COBURN. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I would just ask the gentleman this question.

How would this strategic space plan in fact help a farmer?

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, that was the question I asked.

Mr. SANFORD. In other words, Mr. Chairman, I think it is a question that goes straight to the heart of the matter of do we really need to spend this additional $21 million.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise reluctantly in support of this amendment. My good friend from New Mexico, I know has worked very hard on this legislation, and I know him to be a talented Member who works very hard. He is from my neighboring State of New Mexico, and I applaud him for his efforts. Indeed, I applaud him for his efforts throughout this legislation because I think he does a good job for the agricultural community, and this is an important piece of legislation which we are considering here today.

I certainly support all of his efforts and all that he has done to support the ag community.

However, I must rise in support of the amendment itself because of the circumstances in which we find ourselves. It seems to me that there is a proper time in the course of events when one can look at, how could we improve the situation at the Department of Agriculture buildings; how can we ensure their proper maintenance, how can we indeed perhaps strategically plan their use of space; and there is a time in the course of events when one can afford to do those kinds of things.

But my belief is that at this particular moment, this particular allocation of $21 million, a little over $21.5 million, comes at a moment in time when we face some very, very difficult challenges, challenges having to do with the confrontation we face in the Balkans, the challenge we face in meeting our commitment to the American people in other spending priorities, and particularly with regard to our overall spending plan.

It seems to me what we have done is, we have placed individual subcommittee chairmen, individual cardinals such as my good friend, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) in a difficult position, because right now, what we have done is, we have come to the floor to debate one of the 13 appropriations bills which we need to debate and which I agree we must, in fact, pass as we move forward; and I think we must pass them as expeditiously and as quickly as possible because it is our obligation to fund the government and it is our obligation to do that in a timely fashion.

However, when we engage in that debate, we need to put it in a context in which we look at the entire spending pattern of the government.

I am now beginning to serve my fifth year in the Congress and to look at our spending priorities, and I know that when I look back at how we have handled the appropriations process in the last few years, the commitments we made to the American people when we came here and the way we have on, quite frankly, too many occasions allowed the process to spin out of control and gotten ourselves in a position where late in the game, late in the appropriations process, we cannot come to agreement, and we wind up breaking our commitment as to how much money we should spend to fund the government. We come back and we break our word to the American people about what we are going to do in terms of putting a tax burden on them.

I think we do not engage in this overall debate and have a plan and have each bill come with a measured response that will fit into an overall plan, and what we instead do, as it appears we are doing this year, is we bank on the future, bank on a windfall, bank on extra monies coming in and kind of put off to the side the financial commitments we have made to live within our means or to put off until a later date that debate; and all we do is create problems.

Mr. Chairman, I stood on this floor and watched us year after year get into a confrontation with the President where he demands higher spending and higher spending and higher spending, but we have put ourselves in a crunch at the end of the legislative process where we have, in the end, absolutely no choice but to agree with that. I, for one, am very reluctant to ever again come to this floor, vote for a spending bill which puts us in that position at the end of the year, and then I have to go home and look my constituents in the eye and say, yes, we did not live up to our word.

So I rise in reluctant support of the gentleman's amendment and in reluctant opposition to my good friend from New Mexico on the bill, because I think, on balance, he has done a good job on this bill. But the bill is a part of a larger mosaic, it is a part of a 13-piece puzzle.

Earlier in the day, I raised the question of how does this bill fit into our overall commitment to the American people, because I simply think we cannot break faith with the American people yet one more time, on spending.

Mr. Chairman, we have all kinds of rules back here. We live within these

budget caps and we get to talking about caps and we get to talking about the 1997 Budget Act. Quite frankly, the people back home in my district say that discussion of budget caps is a lot of inside-the-Beltway gobbledegook that they quite frankly do not understand.

However, they understand one thing. They understand fundamental principles and they understand hypocrisy. And we have put out a commitment to the American people that we will not break our word and spend one penny of the Social Security surplus. We have laid that marker down.

Now, that is not some big notion of budget caps, that is not some law dictated by something we did 5 years ago; that is a very clearly enunciated principle that says, we will not this year, once again, raid Social Security. And yet I see us, because we have all 13 pieces of this puzzle put into place, risking that commitment.

So I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) has expired.

(On request of Mr. COBURN, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SHADEGG was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. SHADEGG. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Chairman, I think one of the important things, and I have discovered, thanks to the chairman and his committee staff, that we do in fact have a drafting error on this amendment; and I am going to in a minute ask for unanimous consent for that drafting error to be changed. If it is not agreed to, then I will withdraw the amendment.

But I think the real question is, if we took a poll of farmers out there on whether or not we ought to have a 420 percent increase in this area, what would they say right now? They would not just say no; they would be screaming up and down, saying no, because they know not one penny of this money are they ever going to see, and they know it is going to be spent in Washington.

I mean, that is what the committee print talks about, about space needs and organizing the space for the bureaucracy that is in the Department of Agriculture. So I think it would be an interesting question as to what farmers who are actually out there struggling, what cattlemen would say about a 420 percent increase for this area in the Department of Agriculture.

It would be my hope that we would agree with what the farmers would say. I know what the farmers from my district would say and I know what the ranchers would say.

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

Mr. SHADEGG. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, on that very point, the back of the envelope, what we are really looking at here, if the gentleman figures he can get a good used tractor for about $20,000, we could just go out and buy 1,000 tractors for farmers across this country rather than spending the $20 million on space needs in Washington, D.C.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I applaud the gentleman for being willing to withdraw the amendment if he cannot get permission to fix the drafting error.

Again, I want to make my point, and that is the subcommittee chairman, my colleague from New Mexico, my neighboring State, did do a good job of trying to craft this legislation. I think the bigger question is, how does it fit into a larger puzzle. That is the concern I wanted to raise.

I would agree with the gentleman that I think the cattlemen in Arizona and the farmers in Arizona, they are in dire shape and they do need help. The least thing they are concerned about is space planning in the Department of Agriculture, and they are more concerned about the dollars we can get to them that would help them very much.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to mention in regard to this amendment, which apparently has been withdrawn, it is just another example of misfeasance on the other side of the aisle trying to write legislation on the floor, not carefully thought through, never brought before the committee, account numbers even wrong on the amendment that is proposed.

Now, I think the gentleman in his heart probably is trying to do what is right for the country, but again, the people that suffer from these kinds of ill-advised amendments are the people in rural America; and if the gentleman is not running for office again, that means the gentleman is really not accountable to them for his actions here today. This is just another example where we have been subjected to using our time as we watch the gentleman try to rewrite and correct this amendment on the floor.

At the same time, we have had more bankruptcies today across this country. Some of the people that the gentleman really derides, that the gentleman says work in these buildings, they are the people that administer the programs that are trying to serve the farmers and the ranchers of this country, and I have great respect for them. A lot of them have given their lives over to the service of the American people. They are the finest, most educated, most dedicated employees anywhere in the world.

As I have traveled the world and I have looked at agriculture in other places, and I have seen the faces of hungry people, and I have watched nations unable to take the best information available to humankind and make it available to those in the field, I understand how important these people are to America. We not only feed our own country, we feed the world. That does not happen by accident.

Frankly, I do not want people to have to work in dilapidated circumstances with bad air-conditioning and bad heating systems and bad ventilation. I want the best for America. I want the best for our people to be able to serve the public, which is what we are here to do.

I really think that whoever advised the gentleman on this amendment obviously was not studying the legislation very carefully, and I wish the gentleman had come before our subcommittee. We have a fine chairman. We have never had a better subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations than the Subcommittee on Agriculture. We would have been open. We would have worked with the gentleman. The gentleman never did that; the gentleman never made an appearance. I do not think he ever sent us a letter.

I just want to put that on the Record.

REQUEST FOR MODIFICATION OFFERED BY MR. COBURN TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SANFORD

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Sanford amendment be changed from page 4, line 25, to page 5, line 11.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification offered by Mr. COBURN to the amendment offered by Mr. SANFORD:

Change the page and line numbers from ''Page 4, line 25'' to ''page 5, line 11''.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I do so to try to get an indication of how many amendments we might be considering here tonight. I have heard that there might be as many as 130 amendments offered just to filibuster this bill. If that is the case, we are just going to rise and move on to other business.

So I wonder if we can get an idea from any of the Members that are present if we are going to consider 130 amendments tonight, or whether we are going to consider 20. I would like to know where we are, because if we are going to have to go all night long, I am going to object to every opportunity that would slow down the process.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, it is my intention, as I stated during the general debate and during the rule, to do everything I can to bring this bill back in line with last year's spending and do it in such a way that will not affect farmers, but will affect the overhead costs that are oftentimes markedly inefficient.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, that does not respond to my question. Is the gentleman going to offer the 135 amendments that he advertised?

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, we are $500,000 closer to that after the last amendment that the House agreed to in terms of trimming. That means we only have $249,500,000 to go. Some of those amendments are $60 and $70 million, some of them are $200,000. When we achieve last year's freeze level, then I will stop offering amendments.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for reserving the right to object, and I wanted to state that to our knowledge, we have been given a minimum of 20 amendments by the Clerk. We have been told there are an additional 80 amendments that have been filed, and there may be more of which we are not aware.

As the gentleman may know, we have been on the floor this afternoon having to consider amendments we have never seen. In fact, on this current amendment, it is unclear to us whether line 12 of page 5 is included in the amendment or not.

So I would support the gentleman in his efforts to try to put some rational process in place here. I realize we are in the minority, but I think our Members have a right to be informed as to what is going on, because they are coming up to me, and I would prefer to have a more orderly process.

□ 1830

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, for the other gentleman who was talking about trying to bring us back to last year's budget, as we told him in the initial discussions, there have been $6.4 billion below what we spent in agriculture last year. This bill is way under. In fact, it is 31 percent less than what was spent on agriculture last year.

I think that we met the mark, and these amendments are essentially a filibuster tactic that are frivolous.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, let me say, I will not object to allowing the gentlemen to correct their error in drafting their amendment. However, I will object to any extensions of time or anything that would delay the process.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I just wanted to ask, in the way of a parliamentary inquiry, when the gentleman intends to amend his amendment, does he intend to also amend the $166,364,000 figure in line 12 on page 5? Is that part of his amendment?

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. That is not part of the amendment. It is intended that the conference could make that adjustment as a technical correction, and we amended exactly what we intended to amend in this change.

Ms. KAPTUR. Then, if I might just state for the RECORD, then the amendment is a frivolous amendment because it does not change the total amount of dollars in the account.

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

Mr. POMEROY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I must say that I am profoundly surprised by what is occurring on the floor. I represent farmers, and these farmers are in a world of hurt.

A bill comes to the floor, the agriculture appropriations bill, prepared and reported out of the committee with a bipartisan vote within the appropriations allocation assigned to that committee, and we begin to see a slew of amendments, amendments that would eviscerate the help my farmers need.

Now we see, with the unanimous consent request before this body, just what haphazard nonsense these amendments are. They have not been printed, they have not been distributed. We have had no notice. They are not even accurate.

Now the Member seeks unanimous consent to correct his amendment on the floor as we meet as a Committee of the Whole, because he did not even go to the preparation of getting it in proper form before bringing it to us. We have also heard in the preceding discussion that we can expect more than 100 similar amendments to be offered from this Member.

Back in North Dakota, just like all across this country, farmers are trying to get their spring financing together. They are trying to get their crop in. They are trying to figure out how they are going to make it another year, in light of the financial trouble they are under.

Here in Congress, we cannot even get an agriculture appropriations bill out of this Chamber without having Members of this body attack this bill in this fashion. It is shameful.

The only thing that is more shameful than the amendments themselves is the fact that they have had the support of the majority leadership, leadership which we are led to believe gave no notice to the subcommittee chairman that his budget was going to come under attack in this fashion.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the majority leader, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) owe it to the farmers of this country to stop these amendments and get this bill out.

Mr. Chairman, I object to the Member trying to correct his amendment. If he wanted to have this amendment considered, he should have had it in proper form the first time.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The unanimous consent request is not granted.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise, and not on a specific amendment, but on this process that we are following under.

As I said earlier in the debate, I respect the gentleman's right to offer amendments. I respect the principle that he is trying to uphold by reducing the size of this budget. I do not think he is trying to gut the services and the programs that the U.S. Department of Agriculture provides to our constituents.

I would remind my colleagues that this bill does not become law for at least 4 months, so there is nothing wrong with debate. However, there is something wrong with dilatory tactics. That is exactly what this seems to be. But I am going to offer the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) who is offering these amendments a chance to prove me wrong.

What I would ask him is, if the purpose of this is to reduce the bill to last year's level, or to get to the level that he would like to see us at with this bill, would the gentleman agree to take all these amendments, make them en bloc, and present them as one amendment so that we can deal with this issue right now, and get the work of this bill done?

Would the gentleman take all these amendments and roll them into one, offer them en bloc, $249 million, and give the body the opportunity to vote up or down? If that is the gentleman's point, then I would ask the gentleman to please respect the Congress, respect the House, respect this debate process, respect the chairman, certainly, who has worked endlessly on this, and give us the opportunity to vote on this up or down, one vote.

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

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Not speaking for the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. Chairman, but it seems to me the problem in that strategy would be well witnessed by the last vote.

The last vote succeeded and saved the taxpayers a number of dollars. There are some things that clearly will work and some that will not, and therefore, the idea of going en bloc might guarantee a defeat of what the gentleman is trying to do, which is save money.

Mr. WALSH. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, and I would be happy to carry this on, the gentleman has already conceded that they cannot win all of these, so if there are some amendments that the Members think

they can, why do not Members offer those en bloc and not offer the ones that they do not think will pass?

Let us try to be a little bit pragmatic here. If Members want to accomplish their goal, then work within the normal constraints of the body and give us an opportunity to move forward on the bill.

I would like to offer, again, the opportunity to the gentleman who has put these 100-some-odd amendments forward, the opportunity to enter into a colloquy to determine whether or not he is willing to end this what I perceive as a dilatory tactic, offer this en bloc, and give us one vote up or down.

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

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, first of all, the reason I was hesitating responding to the gentleman is I do not think I can respond to the gentleman in the time that is remaining. I am going to ask for unanimous consent for additional time.

This is not about dilatory tactics, in spite of everything the gentleman hears. I do not say things I do not mean, and I mean exactly what I say. That is something different than what this body is known for, unfortunately, over the last 40 years, as we have confiscated and put $5.6 trillion on the books owing by our children.

My purpose is to reduce this and to have a discussion, as is my right in this body, so that the people of this country can hear the people's business.

I want to tell the Members, there are some farmers out there right now talking about the 420 percent increase. They had no idea the money was spent that way. I guarantee a lot of us will hear about it tomorrow in terms of strategic planning.

Mr. WALSH. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I would again offer the gentleman the opportunity to, with the help of the Parliamentarian, roll all these amendments into one to accomplish his goal, which is, I think, an honest goal, something he believes in; roll them into one, give us an en bloc amendment, let us vote up or down on this, and then move forward on the really additionally important aspects of this bill, which is the agriculture policies and feeding policies of the Nation.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, it would seem to me that the problem with that logic would be that that assumes that all things are equal within the Department of Agriculture funding, which I do not think are.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the problem with that logic assumes that all things are equal within this category of expenditure. I do not think that to be the case, which is why I would think that the proposal of gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) does make sense, because some things we will like, some things we will not.

By going through the debate process amendment by amendment, we find where the good is and where the bad is.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I listened with great interest to the gentleman from New York as he made his comment about dilatory tactics, and the comments that I have made earlier about an apparent filibuster.

I am looking at a Dear Republican Colleague letter here, I guess it was an e-mail, that was forwarded through several people and finally was sent to the Committee on Appropriations staff.

It says, ''I just submitted 115 amendments to the Agriculture Appropriations bill. It is my intent to first oppose the Rule for the Agriculture Appropriations bill and should the rule be adopted, then proceed to filibuster the bill with amendments.'' The signature line is the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

So the fact of the matter is he has admitted this is a filibuster. We ought to get to the business of the House. We do not have filibuster rules in the House. They do in the other body. Here, we deal with important legislation that has merit and that has some substance.

The gentleman himself has admitted this is a filibuster. If the Members of the House want to go along with a filibuster, then we will stay here until the wee hours of the morning, but if they really are not pleased with sitting here just spinning our wheels on a filibuster, then we will proceed to vote these down, and we will not extend anybody's time limit.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, it would seem to me that a lot of those farmers, whether in Oklahoma or Texas or in South Carolina, for that matter, a lot of them did not send in $500,000 worth of taxes. The gentleman's last amendment saved $500,000. I think that is the core of what he is getting at, not filibuster, but $500,000 that they would have had to send to Washington that now they do not.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. If the gentleman would make substantial amendments to this bill, then I think we might remove the suspicion that this is simply a filibuster.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma, with whom I am normally on the same side of the issue.

Mr. COBURN. We are on the same side, we are just maybe talking past each other. Mr. Chairman, $500,000 in Florida, in South Carolina, and Oklahoma is substantial money. This last amendment was $15 million difference, bringing it back down. That is substantial money.

If we do that at $15 million a clip, it is not going to be long until we have the $250-some million that we are trying to get to get back down to last year's level.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. The way the gentleman is proceeding, an inch at a time, is a filibuster. These amendments could have been put together. They could have been done en bloc. They could have been several major amendments that we could have had a substantial debate, and we have wasted a lot of time here talking about philosophy that should have been discussed on the budget bill, when the budget resolution was here. That is the time these arguments should have been made.

I would say to my friend that this bill and all of the other bills that we will present to this floor are under the freeze and are within the budget caps of 1997, and meet the section 302(b) suballocation as provided for by the budget resolution.

So try to cut the money if the gentleman wants, and believe me, I have been here to vote for a lot of amendments to cut a lot of money out of spending bills, but let us do it in a reasonable, responsible way. Let us combine the amendments so they have some substance to them, and so that we do not spend the next 3 or 4 or 5 days here going over 115 amendments that the introducer admits is a filibuster.

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

□ 1845

Mr. Chairman, I just want to admonish everybody, first of all, that it is a violation of House rules to question the motives of other Members. I just want to make it clear, whether one agrees with these amendments or one disagrees with the amendments, clearly the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) has every right to offer these amendments.

Also, I want to say something else. I have been listening to the debate and watching on C–SPAN back in my office. It bothers me a little bit right now. I represent a farm State, and my farmers are hurting, and that is the truth, and all of my colleagues should know that.

But I will tell my colleagues something else, my farmers do not want to steal from the Social Security Trust Fund either. Frankly, they feel a bit abused sometimes when people say things like, well, we have to do this because of the farmers. They do not want this huge bureaucracy that we have here in Washington.

I mean, this amendment, as far as I know, deals with $21 million for new buildings. I will tell my colleagues, on behalf of most of my farmers, if one asks them, ''Do you think we ought to build $21 million worth of new buildings for more bureaucracy in Washington, and at the end of the day be

forced to take that money out of Social Security Trust Funds or to borrow it from our grandchildren for one more generation,'' the answer to that question is no.

I mean, this idea that we have to patronize farmers, farmers are Americans, too, and they care about their future. They care about their kids' future. They care about the future of the Social Security Trust Fund. They care about these things, too. So I care about what is happening to farmers.

But I think the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) is raising some very, very good points. For too long in this Congress, every year, we did what I call ''manana'' budgeting. We will make the tough decisions ''manana''. We will make the tough decisions next year. Well next year is here and we have got to make some of those tough decisions.

I supported that budget resolution. Frankly, a couple of weeks ago we had that vote on the emergency supplemental. I voted against it because I thought that was the first crack in the wall. We are going to see this happening on every single appropriation bill.

Let me just remind Members, the people of this country did not send us here to do what was easy. This is tough. Balancing this budget is not going to be easy this year. In fact, in some respects it is harder now because we, quote, have a surplus, and everybody, every group that I can imagine has been in my office saying ''We just want a little bit of an increase here. If we could, just squeeze out a little more money for my program.'' Do my colleagues know what happens when we do that? We never balance the budget. We continue to steal from Social Security.

I care about my farmers. Let me tell my colleagues something. My farmers care about this budget. They care about the future of this country. They care about Social Security. I admire the gentleman for bringing this amendment.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's objective of trying to deal with the budget is a worthy objective. Can I ask the gentleman, since he is in the majority party and we, as the appropriators, and I particularly in the minority, have had to abide by the budget caps they gave us, and we have done that on this Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, why do my colleagues not go back and redo the budget rather than put our subcommittees through this agony on the floor? I am missing something here.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, if my colleagues ask the average American, whether they are a farmer or a machinist, whether they live in Ohio or Minnesota, if my colleagues ask them, ''Do you think the Federal Government can meet the legitimate needs of the people of this country, of the national defense, and of all the people who depend upon the Federal Government, do you believe that the Federal Government can live with spending only $1,700 billion, do my colleagues know what? If they ask that question, whether it is in Ohio or Minnesota or Oklahoma, if my colleagues ask people, ''Do you think we can meet the legitimate needs of the United States of America, spending only $1,700 billion?'' they will say, ''You betcha.'' Seventeen hundred billion dollars is a lot of money.

That is what the spending cap is all about, saying that is all we are going to spend. We are going to have an argument and a fight about how much is going to go to defense, how much is going to go to agriculture, how much is going to go to transportation, all the other departments; but at the end of the day, we ought to live by these spending caps.

I believe in the spending caps. In fact, I have heard leadership on the other side, I have heard leadership in the Senate, I have even heard the President of the United States say we are going to live by the spending caps. Well, this is the first installment to find out if we really mean it.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, but did the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies not abide by the caps that were given to us from the Committee on the Budget, the budget under the 302(b) allocation?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, it is my understanding that, no, the subcommittee did not. The subcommittee overspent it by the smallest amount. Listen. According to what I have been told by my staff, this bill actually does overspend the budget allocation by two-tenths of 1 percent.

Admittedly, the gentleman from New Mexico (Chairman SKEEN) has done a fabulous job. I am not here to criticize the subcommittee. But when I hear people criticizing the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and criticizing his motives in this debate, I think that is wrong, and my colleagues have overstepped their bounds.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, if I am not incorrect, and I will be happy to be corrected on this, we still have the amendment before us that was rejected in terms of it; and if we have spoken, we can not speak again. I am not sure I recall whether the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) has spoken or not.

The CHAIRMAN. As the gentleman will note, the Chair said, without objection, the gentlewoman is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. COBURN. I do not object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, in terms of how the Members of our side of the aisle functioned, we accepted the budget numbers that were given us and we acted in good faith on our subcommittee.

We have produced a bill that meets the budget mark that we were given. So, therefore, to rip apart the bill because maybe my colleagues do not like some provision in the bill, they want to do something else with it, well, I think most Members come to the floor but they do not come with 150 or 200 amendments. We operated in good faith here.

I will tell my colleagues it is a little hard to maintain it as the hours go on here today, but the point is, if my colleagues do not like the budget, go back and redo the budget. Do not pick apart every appropriation bill that comes to the floor.

We have lived within our budget. Let our committee function. Frankly, my colleagues really risk great damage to this Republic, because we could end up where we were last year when the majority here rammed that big bill through here at the end of the year because we could not complete our appropriation bills on time and on schedule.

Here we are here in the Committee on Agriculture, because of the crisis in rural America, on time with our bill, within the allocation we are given; and now my colleagues are holding us up again. I fear that the very same mess that was created last year is going to repeat itself this year.

So if my colleagues have a problem with the allocation, go back to their budgeteers; work the problem out there. But when we have subcommittees acting in good faith and doing their job, do not disenfranchise them. I think that is the height of my colleagues' responsibility inside the Chamber.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am probably not going to take the full 5 minutes, but I heard the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) a little while ago saying he did not want to do anything to hurt farmers. Well, I have to tell my colleagues I have the greatest respect for the gentleman, but the last amendment hurt farmers a lot.

When my colleagues look at the services that they are trying to provide to farmers in the FSA offices, NRCS offices, with the computer systems that

today cannot work together, and the whole purpose of that funding is to finally get some coordination at USDA, now this is an area that I have worked in in the last 3 years trying to fix this problem so that we can actually deliver services to our farmers, and cutting this money out of that is wrong.

I did not enter into the debate before because I thought it was silly, but to make a statement like that simply is wrong. The gentleman should be aware that many Members who have voted for some of these amendments have actually come to us and asked for little research projects. Maybe the two-tenths of 1 percent that is overspent in this budget may be some of that that is going to different parts of the country for folk who today are voting to cut in this budget.

I mean, I have heard of rice studies, wild rice, things like that. There are projects that people have asked all over to be included in this bill and now are voting against this bill.

We are in the budget caps. If my colleagues do not think that this is going to hurt farmers, what they are doing, they are wrong. I will tell my colleagues directly, it may be fine to stand up and talk about protecting Social Security. The fact of the matter is we do not know what the budget surplus is going to be at the end of the year. We may in fact have surplus beyond what Social Security is this year. Then my colleagues' argument is not correct. Then we are not taking money out of Social Security.

The fact of the matter is, I agree with my colleagues, we have got to balance the budget, but the fact of the matter is my colleagues are hurting farmers. If this is some filibuster today just to take advantage of an opportunity from very well-meaning people here who have worked their tails off on a bill, trying to accomplish a bill that helps a lot of Members around here with very important research projects that having a lot of them put us over maybe slightly, if in fact that is the case, but to talk about how this is not hurting farmers here is simply wrong.

What we are doing here, it makes this House, it really is not the bright point of the day around here, let me just say that. Because in fact we have done the hard work of staying within the caps. We have done what we have been given as far as staying inside our allotments. But I just take very strong exception to the fact that we are not hurting farmers here today.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I take the gentleman's admonition. But I also would point out that in the last supplemental we gave $47 million to the Department of Agriculture for Y2K, if I would be allowed to continue, for Y2K just upgrades, just for that one segment.

I would point out that, in fact, by taking the whole assumption of the gentleman's argument is that this is the only way we can get there. My objection to being above what we spent last year is that it is not the only way. I am not saying my way is the best way, but I am wanting the people of this country to hear the debate on all of the areas.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I will tell the gentleman we have heard the debate this afternoon. But why does the gentleman not talk to somebody who has been involved in an issue like this for 3 years now, trying to get the chief information officer to straighten out the travesty that is going on at USDA, where we have got 29 agencies down there, smokestacks, which each have their own computer system, cannot talk to each other, they cannot even e-mail from the north building to the south building. We are trying to fix that.

Five hundred thousand dollars, maybe my colleagues do not think that is a big deal, but it is in a nonfunctional agency that is trying to straighten itself out. It will hurt our farmers, and I just want the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) to know that. That amendment that passed hurts his farmers at home and hurts the services that USDA provides them as far as the FSA offices and NRC offices.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to first associate myself with the comments of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM) a moment ago. Indeed, that last amendment did hurt farmers.

If my colleagues had been following, as he has for the last 3 years and I have for the last 6 years, what we are trying to do at USDA, they would understand there was a little wisdom in the money that was proposed to be spent.

Let me speak specifically to the amendment the gentleman proposes to cut now, a $21 million increase, which the gentleman said a 420 percent increase, which sounds like a whole bunch of money, and it is a whole bunch of money, but this is to implement the strategic space plan, which includes the new USDA office facility on Federal land at Beltsville. The construction of the Beltsville office facility started in June 1996, was substantially completed in 1997, and we are completing the occupancy this year in 1999.

The 2 million gross square feet south building is over 60 years old, eligible for listing in the National Register. The required renovation work includes fire protection, abatement of hazardous materials, such as asbestos, PCB light fixtures, and lead paint, replacement of old, inefficient heating, ventilation, and all conducting air conditioning systems for improved energy conservation.

The construction contract for phase one of the modernization was awarded in July of 1998 but has been tied up in a legal suit, and is now being proposed to be funded. The fiscal 1999 appropriation of $5 million included funds necessary to continue the south building modernization.

One of the problems we have got with delivering services to our farmers, we have not kept up with the technology. We are doing it in our offices. Notice what happens when we improve the computer technology here, there is a lot of wires get run. We have to go back and do things. They are very expensive.

When we are trying to do that to our USDA headquarters so that we will be able to coordinate our services, it requires spending of some money. This was a plan that was proposed and is being implemented.

We can cut this money, very easily cut it. But then do not stand up and criticize USDA for not being able to deliver the services to our farmers and ranchers as we have been doing, many have been doing, blaming it all on the Secretary of Agriculture because the disaster payments were not delivered on time.

□ 1900

Part of that we are dealing with in this first few lines of the bill. It is what the gentleman from New Mexico and the gentlewoman from Ohio have been supporting and trying to do.

I know the gentleman's intentions are very honorable. I do not question those at all. And I am certainly one that would never stand up and suggest the gentleman does not have a right to do it. But it would be helpful if the gentleman's staff would spend a little bit of time talking specifically about what the gentleman is doing before he stands up and talks about how he is not doing harm to farmers, because the gentleman from Iowa stated it very, very accurately and succinctly.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. The gentleman makes some good points. However, Mr. Chairman, there is one underlying point that I disagree with, and the underlying assumption with his statement is that the Department of Agriculture is efficient now and that the money used, and just let me finish my point, the money that is going to be appropriated above last year to accomplish these things, that there is no way it could be found anywhere else.

That is my objection. It is not what the gentleman is doing or how he is doing it, it is where the money comes from.

The fact is, we do not have the courage to say the Department of Agriculture has to do this and we are going to write it into the bill and they will find the money there and they will have to make sure it gets done because we will have the oversight to make sure that the Department does do it.

My objection is that this is an inefficient organization. That is not a slam

on the employees, it is a slam on the organizational structure that we have piecemealed together through the last 40 years or so.

Mr. STENHOLM. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I doubt any other Member has been more critical of the Department of Agriculture since 1992 in not doing what the gentleman is talking about. But I find it rather ironic that at the moment we are actually beginning to propose to put the money into doing what I have been criticizing them for, we are now going to cut it out and say we want them to do a better job without it. That is my problem.

And again, fundamentally, the chairman of the committee a moment ago stated the absolute fact: This bill is within the caps according to the budget that passed this House, period. So let us not keep talking about we are doing all of this to save Social Security.

If the gentleman wants to save Social Security, bring a Social Security bill to the floor and let us talk about Social Security. If he wants to make points on the agricultural bill, let us debate them. We can stay and debate them until the cows come home, but we will be talking specifically about what the gentleman is doing, and again, the gentleman is hurting farmers in these amendments when he passes them.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 185, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Department of Agriculture, to comply with the requirement of section 107(g) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, 42 U.S.C. 9607(g), and section 6001 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, 42 U.S.C. 6961, $15,700,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That appropriations and funds available herein to the Department for Hazardous Waste Management may be transferred to any agency of the Department for its use in meeting all requirements pursuant to the above Acts on Federal and non-Federal lands.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For Departmental Administration, $36,117,000, to provide for necessary expenses for management support services to offices of the Department and for general administration and disaster management of the Department, repairs and alterations, and other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for and necessary for the practical and efficient work of the Department, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed $10,000 is for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be reimbursed from applicable appropriations in this Act for travel expenses incident to the holding of hearings as required by 5 U.S.C. 551–558.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COBURN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Coburn:

Page 6, line 3, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $3,049,000)''.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to talk about the 12 percent increase in the Department of Agriculture administration budget. The increase is from the fiscal 1999 level of $32 million, increasing it by $3,949,000.

According to the committee print, departmental administration is comprised of activities that provide staff support to top policy officials and overall direction and coordination within the Department.

These activities include department-wide programs for human resource management, I believe we have talked about that in a couple of the amendments; management improvement, we have talked about that; occupational safety and health management, we have talked about that; real and personal property management, we just talked about that in the previous amendment; procurement, contracting, motor vehicle and aircraft management, supply management, civil rights, equal opportunity and ethics, participation of small and disadvantaged businesses and socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers in the departmental programs activities, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

Again, I would raise the point, I do not have an objection with any member of this committee. I know that they have done good work. I do not disagree that they have met the targeted caps.

What I am saying is, when was the last time an appropriation bill came to the floor that was below the caps? What a novel idea, if we are, in fact, going to not spend money that does not belong to us.

Now, I understand why other Members do not want to talk about the Social Security issue, and I agree with the members of the committee who say we have met our 302(b) allocation. I agree with that. They have. My purpose in offering the amendments is to drive efficiency in the Federal Government, to ask the question, why, when we spend a 12 percent increase in administrative overhead within a department. I would say that if this is truly the people's House, a debate on those issues ought to be heard by one and all.

The other thing that I would object to is the reference to this bill being the committee's bill. This bill is all of ours. It is not just the committee's bill, it is the House's bill. And to say that one of us has more priority over this bill than any others is wrong.

The other thing I want to do is to take a minute and perhaps defend my motives. And I am somewhat discouraged that the gentlewoman from Ohio has not recognized my persistence in the past 5 years. Because three times today she said that my motivation is based on the fact that I am not running for reelection.

I never was running for reelection when I came up here on this this year. And I would ask, if the gentlewoman were to look at my voting record and at my challenges in terms of the appropriations process, she would see that I did this same thing last year and the year before and the year before.

So this does not have anything to do with running for reelection, this has to do with questioning why we would have a 12 percent increase in administrative overhead. And if we have to do that, and that is the only way we can do it, and there is no waste in the other $32 million and it cannot be done better and it cannot be done more efficiently and the American people can be convinced of that and I can be convinced of that, I will be happy to withdraw this amendment.

But as I look at what I read in the committee print, and having been through five of these appropriation bills in the past, I do not believe that that is true. I think they can do better. And I believe that it is wrong for us not to ask the administration within the Department of Agriculture to do better.

Most of the Members of this body would like to see a 12 percent increase in their staff and their capability of running their offices, but the fact is, we are not going to pass that for ourselves, are we? But we are going to say that the Department of Agriculture is underfunded in terms of its administrative capability, does not have the dollars to do what it needs to do and must have a 12 percent increase, when the true cost of living associated with government-run programs in this area, and the area where the vast concentration of these employees are, rose by less than 1.7 percent last year.

So what we did in terms of the computers in the Office of Information was true, and we cannot take it out of this money, or not because it is not that there is not enough money. There is money running all over this bill. And I again would say, ask the farmers.

A $3,949,000 increase from $32 million; that is 12 percent. How many of them are going to see 12 percent handed to them? They are not. And how many of them want to see this money spent up here? They want to see it spent on them, not up here. And they want to make sure that we are supporting them with their ability to continue to feed us and that we give them a constant program.

So I do not object to what the committee has done. I said when we talked about the rule that this was a good bill

and that it was probably going to pass. What I said was that I did not think it was good enough and it needed to get better.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

When the gentleman said that he really is looking for ways for efficiency, I think if he was an astute politician he would know that merely cutting is not necessarily the way to efficiency. Efficiency includes more than dollar amounts.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. CLAYTON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentlewoman that we have not proposed a cut. What we have proposed is leaving it at last year's level.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, the assumption is that the gentleman is looking for efficiency, and therefore, if we leave it at that level, meaning less expenditure, then by that definition, we would have more efficiency.

But let me tell the gentleman what these particular funds he proposes that are not needed will be used for: one, for the Office of Civil Rights. And that may not be important to the gentleman from Oklahoma, but I can tell him it is important to a large number of farmers who felt that this USDA, who the gentleman says is inefficient, had also not been fair, and in fact had to file a lawsuit as a result of their discriminatory actions.

This now allows them to more efficiently respond to those complaints rather than have the U.S. Government to pay out a large settlement because of the failure of their accountability and responsibility. $1.6 million of the $3.6 goes to the Office of Civil Rights.

Even more important to socially disadvantaged farmers is the $931 million that affords the opportunity for small farmers, not just necessarily minority farmers, but small, disadvantaged farmers who will have outreach and technical assistance. This may not be big to the gentleman from Oklahoma, but it is efficiency in their way of thinking to have the kinds of services explained to them, to have the technical assistance so they can more efficiently produce their products with the kind of expectation that they will be profitable in their livelihood.

So the $3.9 million which is being offered here already is insufficient to meet all of the needs.

If the gentleman's definition were applied, I think he actually would need to add to this, if the gentleman is truly about putting the money where it is most needed and making sure it is implemented. I would think by the gentleman's definition, and I disagree with the gentleman's premise, it would say this is insufficient.

If the gentleman understood what this is doing, he would say they should have been doing this. They should do it better. There should be more outreach programs, not less. The Office of Civil Rights should have been there before. These farmers should not have had to sue.

Now we are putting a structure there so that there can be the kind of investigation that needs to be there.

So I would think the gentleman would want to be on the side of, not anticivil rights, but the gentleman would want to be on the side of, there should be fairness and there should be a structure there to deal with this. And the gentleman's amendment, in his zeal for his fiscal philosophy denies the very premise of efficiency of this department serving the people who need it most.

So I would urge that this amendment on its merit, not on the philosophy, just on its merit, should be defeated.

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

My colleagues, the Department of Agriculture has been dealing with serious civil rights issues for the last several years. Minority farmers and employees at USDA have filed discrimination litigation, and the increase provided in this account would go a long way towards addressing some of those civil rights issues.

I would like to have that entered in the discussion because I think the gentlewoman from North Carolina had a very pertinent point.

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

My colleague is not on the floor at this time, the maker of the motion, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), but I was rising to appeal to him to allow at least some of us who have some expertise in this area to speak to him, as I would if he were discussing medical issues. I really do believe that he knows a lot more about that than I do.

Now he has dipped over into the legal arena, and I think I know a little bit more about that than he does.

With that in mind, I would offer to him that the status quo would create backlogs, and the creating of backlogs is what this particular 12 percent is intended to try to get rid of. When backlogs occur in any structural system, and it does not matter whether or not it is employment discrimination or if it is in the criminal arena or if it is in the civil arena, it impacts the whole process.

It is not just one thing that is impacted, it is not just this particular office of departmental administration, it is all of what they do in trying to clear up the number of cases that they have.

□ 1915

Over the years, there have been a number of legitimate complaints that have been brought and those people have to sit and wait. Let me see if I can get my colleague to understand the analogy.

In South Florida, at one time we had to try nothing but drug cases. By trying drug cases, we forced civil litigants to have to seek redress elsewhere, and people who needed remedies in the Federal court system were unable to get them because we were busying ourselves with one side of the system, which was mandated that we do.

We need to be very, very careful in expecting in every instance that people can do more with less. What they are asking for is 17 staff years, $1.6 million, and 11 staff dollars for 931 in the Office of Outreach which, incidentally, also deals with the National Commission on Small Farms, yet another area totally unrelated to anything having to do with civil rights per se, but an initiative that is important so that small farmers have a chance to survive in this system.

I do not know what it will take in order for us to understand this particular dynamic, but I will take it up with the maker of the motion so as he understands that it is not just going to, if his motion were to pass, impact this one arena, it would impact the whole.

And in this particular instance they have not been able to do the job efficiently and effectively with what they have, and there is no need to expect if they leave them in the status quo that they are going to be able to do more.

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

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues, right over there is a dictionary; and if we look up the word ''efficient,'' here is what it says: ''ability to accomplish a job with a minimum expenditure of time and effort.''

My colleagues, there is a lot of discussion about this amendment, but I think we ought to get back to what it really does. In fact, let us use a little bit of analogy. Let us take a major corporation, and my colleagues fill in the blank. They can say AT&T. They can say Chrysler. They can say IBM, whatever. And let us say this company thinks that they have had a problem with efficiency.

Now, this company has 107,000 employees. They have another 80,000 contract employees. In fact, it works out to about one employee or contract employee for every 10 customers. This is a mythical corporation. And we are the board of directors and we are sitting around saying what can we do to make this thing a little more efficient.

Now, how many of my colleagues think they would raise their hands and say, you know what we ought to do? We ought to increase administration by 12 percent. That is crazy. That would not happen at Chrysler. That would not happen at AT&T. That would not happen at IBM. But, my colleagues, that is what is happening in this bill. We have one employee or contract employee for every 10 farmers in this USDA.

Now, again, I come back, if we ask most farmers do they think that is an appropriate level, they would say that is ridiculous. And so would most voters. And so before we dismiss this

amendment out of hand, this is not an anti-farmer amendment. This is about the board of directors saying we have a terribly inefficient administration right now in the USDA and throwing more money at it is not going to make it more efficient.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. First of all, let me say that if the offerors of the amendment want efficiency, then surely the bill that our subcommittee has brought to the floor is efficient.

In fact, the author of the amendment stated in his last comments on the floor that we were in fact within the budget allocation. So we have a very efficient bill, without question.

Now, this particular amendment is one that goes after one particular function at the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and the proponents claim that it is efficient. Let me say that overall, our bill is efficient. But in making decisions in the public realm, one has to not only be efficient, one has to be equitable, and I would oppose the gentleman's amendment on the basis that it is not equitable.

Why? What are these funds dedicated to? They are dedicated to redressing wrongs inside USDA and an inability, because of discrimination in past years, for that department to deal with all of America, all of America's farmers, regardless of color, regardless of creed, regardless of sex, whatever.

The funding that is provided, and even the Wall Street Journal has done front page stories on this, my colleagues do not have to listen to this Member, they just need to call it up on their web site, is to redress past wrongs.

The inability of this department in past years to serve all of America's farmers, to make sure that the credit programs were open to all farmers, to make sure that when people worked hard, just because they might have had low equity did not mean that their work did not have a value, and that in fact they perhaps should not have been ignored for decades and in fact perhaps for a century and a half.

And so I would say to those who offer this amendment, I would hope they would withdraw this. I think to try to cut funds, for example, for the Office of Outreach, and again our bill is within the budget allocation, means that they will continue the historic discrimination that has characterized so much of the behavior of our Government and our people in this century and the last.

This is the first time we have had a chance to do what is both efficient and equitable. And I would ask my colleagues and those who are offering this amendment to really seriously consider what they are about to do. I really do not think they want to do this. I think they want to do what is right for America, right for all of its people, and right for the future.

I would encourage my colleagues to vote a strong ''no'' on this Coburn amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I understand the concern of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN). I think it is a concern for this bill as well as the other appropriations bill, and I join in that concern. And I know he had a concern about the supplemental, and I did too, about it running wild, about us missing the point as far as what ''emergency'' was and what ''emergency'' was not.

But I serve on this subcommittee, this Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations, and I know the balance that we have to give, so I stand here sort of split and yet not split on this particular issue.

To bring this within the caps, I think the chairman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) did a wonderful job. It has been easy over the years when we could just borrow money and say, well, the heck with it. We do not care about this or that. But we gave our word and we kept our word.

Now, what the problem is, is that I think that the position of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) is lessened somewhat about this accusation of filibuster. And I hope he can hear me and he will come and talk about it. But I know that we have had this before in past years. I would like for the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), if he can, to come and defend that position of filibustering because I think it was his words, from what I understand, and it is going to undermine those elements, that we need to push down the expenses that we have in the appropriations bill.

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

Mr. DICKEY. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to go to this notion that the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) is somehow filibustering. Because just on the back of the envelope, I grabbed my calculator, and if my colleagues look at the amount of money that this particular amendment would save, it would save $3,900,000. Now, if we take people earning average income, it would take 1,974 taxpayers earning a whole year's worth of income to pay the taxes on $3,900,000.

So what we are really talking about is, again, 1,900 people paying taxes for a year. That seems to me to be anything but a filibuster but something very real, because what we are talking about are people's lives and where are they sending money.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, one thing I want to add is this applies to almost all the bills, the same type of thing. And what I would like to ask is for us to have a better way, and I am frustrated too, I would say to the gentleman from Oklahoma, a better way for us to express our frustration and to hope to bring constructive change than this way of doing things.

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

Mr. DICKEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I would disagree. I think that the American people benefit from seeing the debates on how we spend money; and the closer that we put the magnifying glass to it, the better we are as a country.

And I understand the pride of ownership of the Committee on Appropriations as they work hard to bring these bills up. And I am going to remind my colleagues again, when we talked about the rule, I said when we talked on the general debate hour that this was a good bill. I want to try to make it better, and I also want us to not be in a position where we are going to spend the first dollar of Social Security surplus.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, here is another question: Are we going to do this on each one of the appropriation bills? If we are, we are going to lessen the effect of the conservative concerns of my colleague about spending outside the caps.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, I have no intentions to do it on anything other than what I think will not lead us to the commitment that we have made to the American people.

The minority offered a budget and it had some good things in there, but the one common thing it had is they were going to take some of the money and make sure we did not spend any money of Social Security on anything except Social Security and Medicare.

The Blue Dogs had a budget. Same thing. The Republicans had a budget that ultimately passed the House. Everybody agrees, with the exception of two Members of this House who voted for President Clinton's budget which said I am going to spend 38 percent of Social Security money. At least he admitted it.

We either need to say we do not have the courage to trim the spending in the Federal Government and that we are going to take 38 percent, the seniors' money, or we need to say, the President was wrong, we do have the courage to spend less money up here.

I want to make the point again. The 302(b) allocations that my colleagues all have met, they have met the requirement of the budget numbers and the number that was given to them. I am not objecting to that. What I am objecting to is, number one, the 302(b)'s this year are not an adequate representation of what is going to happen. And there is not a person in this body that does not know that. And that is a sham to the American public to say this is one 302(b) but the rest of them are not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. DICKEY) has expired.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas be given 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

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

To take the 302(b) allocations that we all know on the four big bills are not an accurate reflection of what is going to happen, and their claim to use that as a designation for why we should not trim this bill additionally is not fair to the American people.

I have no fight to pick with the appropriators on this committee, and I have no desire to harm farmers. I say that they can do it better. What we hear in this body all the time is it cannot be done, we cannot do it. Well, I come from a group of people that says we can do it. We can do better. We cannot spend all the money allocated to us. We can get efficiencies without adding money to the Department of Agriculture. We can demand innovation, insight, and new ideas. We can promote efficiency.

The VA Regional Office in Muskogee, Oklahoma, is a great example of that where they cut their costs like crazy and they did not spend any additional money. So if they can do it, why cannot the Department of Agriculture do it? Why cannot the administration and the Department of Agriculture do it? They can do it, but they are never going to do it until we make them do it. We have to demand that they do it.

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

Mr. MANZULLO. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman from Oklahoma, are we doing the right thing by doing it by filibustering? That is my question.

It seems to me that he has got a better argument than to use something that is indirect.

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

Mr. MANZULLO. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, ''filibuster'' is not my word. My word is let us bring it back to the freeze level of where we were last year and ask for efficiency, and I am willing to do that. And I have said here on this floor, as soon as we are back to the level in terms of cuts, I am through.

I am looking for dollars. The term to ''filibuster,'' it is a filibuster in terms of taking time, but that is not my intention. My intention is to get us back down to where we were last year. My colleagues will see me walk right out of here as soon as we have done it. But to resist calls for efficiency, to resist debate on issues is not fair to the American public.

And to impugn my motivations. I want to tell my colleagues something. My motivations are pure. I think about my grandkids and I think about the grandkids of all of those patients that I take care of. Every baby, three babies this weekend, I spank the bottom of. I delivered three new babies into this world. Every one of them owes $21,000, and it is growing at $500 a year, what they owe.

□ 1930

They will never see the first penny of Social Security unless we have the courage to step up to the plate and demand change in Washington and demand it of ourselves. I am not talking about not having the right priorities. I do not want to punish our farmers. But I want us to create an environment of change that says we are not going to spend more, we can do better, we can spend less.

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

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

Mr. FARR of California. I would just like to ask the gentleman, did he charge for delivering those babies?

Mr. COBURN. I am a Member of Congress. I can make no money as a doctor.

Mr. FARR of California. I am glad to hear that.

I want to ask one question of the gentleman. I sit on the Committee on Appropriations. I have not sat on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies before.

We had dozens and dozens of hearings. We asked Members to come before the committee. We debated these items because that is the way you put together a budget. To my recollection, the gentleman never came to one of the committee hearings. He never suggested in a letter to the committee that we cut any of these programs. This is the first instance of his litany of cuts that we are faced with.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, I reclaim my time and yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. The gentleman makes the point that I was not before his committee on the cuts. That is a valid criticism, but that does not deny me the right to raise the issue on this floor and to say that I do not have the right to raise the issue on this floor because I was not before his committee. Simply because of the way the House operates, as the gentleman well knows, you cannot be at all those at one time and fulfill the rest of your duties.

The point is, do you agree or do you not agree that we should trim some of the administrative overhead out of this budget? If you do not agree, then, fine, that is what our debate is all about. We are in the Committee of the Whole. That is what this is. That is why we are doing it in the Committee.

Mr. FARR of California. If the gentleman will yield further, there is a process here, and I think what is disturbing the House is that we try to honor that process. I do not think by bringing 114, as you have stated, amendments to the floor is a process that we use very often, if ever, and certainly I have been here a short while and I have never seen it used before.

Mr. MANZULLO. Reclaiming my time, one of the Coburn amendments saves the taxpayers $500,000.

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

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

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, discussion has taken place with regard to the motives and the application of the process. I would just like to remind the Members and talk very briefly about an incident that happened on the floor just a couple of hours ago.

That was, I opposed the rule for the consideration of this bill because the bill spends more money than it did last year. The discretionary amount is more than what we passed out of this House last year.

I was asked why I would oppose an open rule, and I think that was a good question. I think that was a good question because the Committee on Rules, I believe, relinquishes a great deal of power whenever they decide to give an open rule, and it was a good question. The reason was not because we had the freedom of an open rule, but merely because the rule allowed for the deliberation on this floor of a bill that spent more money last year, the very first bill in the appropriations process that we deal with is going to spend more money than we spent on this bill before.

And so the reason that the gentleman is offering so many amendments is not for the sake of a filibuster, but for the simple fact that we have an open rule.

I was led to believe that an open rule would allow for free debate. Now we hear that the debate should in fact be reduced, should be cut off by the gentleman from Oklahoma. I think in fact if we are going to have an open rule and a gentleman will go to the hardship of having many of these amendments preprinted in the RECORD and offering them himself, we should at least recognize the Rules of the House.

Secondly, with regard to hurting America's farmers, I do not know, maybe southwest Indiana farmers are different from other farmers, but whenever I ask farmers in southwest Indiana what they would like to see coming from the Federal Government, the first thing they always tell me is tax relief. I tell them we can cut taxes, but if we continue to increase spending

across the board, even in the Agriculture Department, somebody is going to have to pay for that.

And so when I say we can either give you tax relief or we can take more of your tax dollars to allow the various bureaucracies to spend that money in order to help you, they realize in fact that Washington, D.C. is probably not the best source of their help.

Secondly, they ask for regulatory relief. If individuals really want to help farmers, they will indeed support regulatory relief, and for a little bit of commercial activity, I will merely tout the virtues of H.R. 1578, my Protect American Agricultural Lands Act of 1999, which will allow for that land which has been in production 5 of the last 10 years to be exempt from clean water permitting, because in fact it has been used for farming.

Thirdly, the agriculture community wants open markets, places where they can sell their product. But they do not want open market agreements for the sake of merely signing an agreement. They want agreements that can be enforced, enforced by this administration which they see dreadfully lacking.

Finally, I will simply say that this is the opportunity that many of us that do not necessarily serve on the House Committee on Appropriations have to offer amendments in this fashion. When we look at all the various constituencies of all of these provisions, we realize that in fact there is the potential in the future to not cut $5 billion from the Labor, Health and Human Services and Education Department. There will not be the opportunity to cut almost $4 billion from the Veterans' Administration and the Housing and Urban Development bill that is going to come up later, that in fact if we are not diligent from the very outset of this whole appropriations process, that in fact it will whirl out of control; and when we get to the end of the appropriations season later this year, that we will in fact be busting the caps and having to reduce our commitment to cutting taxes, our commitment to stopping the raids on the Social Security trust fund; and we will in fact tell America that indeed Washington D.C. knows best, and if you simply give us more of your money, we will prove it to you.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the gentleman's amendment and ask that the Committee do likewise.

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

Again, I think it is important that we focus on the process which we are discussing today. Again, I quarrel not with the motives of the gentleman from Oklahoma. He has every right, as others have said, to bring the amendments before this body that he has brought today; and I have opposed them because I disagree with them.

I think it is important, though, for everyone to understand the real quarrel apparently is with the leadership on the other side of the aisle. That is where the quarrel is. Because we are disagreeing with the numbers that have been given to the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies. That was given as a leadership decision.

I happen to have supported a budget that protected Social Security, that paid off $88 billion more debt over the next 5 years than the budget we are talking about, provided a reasonable tax cut and improved the funding of five priority areas, one of which was agriculture of which I am prepared to say we are $450 million under what we need to be spending for American agriculture.

Why do I say that? Because I am proud of our American agricultural system, from our farmers on up and down. We have the most abundant food supply in this Nation, we have the best quality of food, we have the safest food supply to our consumers of any country in the world, and we do it at the lowest cost, including all of this, quote, ''wasteful spending'' we are talking about today.

Now, do I make this argument in saying that we cannot do better? Obviously we could do better. But we have ways of doing it better. It is called the House Committee on Agriculture and it is called the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies that spend the hours looking at these details and making those decisions. I put my trust in them, on the first part because I am one, but I do not quarrel at all with the gentleman who chooses to say that we have not done our jobs properly.

Let me read this letter:

> The American Farm Bureau Federation is aware of a long list of amendments to be offered to H.R. 1906. In addition to the letter sent this morning, we are deeply concerned about these amendments and the approach being taken against general agriculture programs.
>
> Specifically, we are opposed to amendments that would prohibit funding to promote the sale or export of tobacco, decrease spending for the APHIS Boll Weevil Program and effectively eliminate the Boll Weevil Eradication Program. We oppose any cut in funding for agricultural research programs for wool, cotton, shrimp aquaculture, blueberries, specialty crops or precision agriculture. We oppose any attempts to decrease funding for agriculture market analysis, promotion and rural development.
>
> Further, we oppose cuts in funding for conservation programs, the peanut price support loan rate and any reductions in research or other cuts to peanut support programs. We also oppose any attempts to effectively eliminate any international or domestic marketing programs.
>
> Farm Bureau has worked closely with the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee and supports the bill as reported by the committee.

This is our largest farm organization that has looked at the work of the gentlewoman and the gentleman and others in saying, in their judgment, we cannot make these cuts without doing harm. Again, I specifically have objected to the previous two amendments and to this amendment for the reasons that were specified before, in pointing out that if we are going to be critical of inefficient operation in USDA, if we are going to be critical of those ''who have not been able to do their job,'' quote-unquote, then how do we justify coming in and saying we are going to deny them the tools to bring them into the modern century of technology which is what the committee suggested be done?

That is the simple question. It deserves a simple ''no'' vote on the amendment.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Again, I want to be clear about what we are doing. We are cutting nothing. What we are saying is we are holding to last year's level.

I understand the Farm Bureau. I have worked with them a great amount. A large number of the people who supported me to come here are from that organization.

But I would also say that there probably would not be anything that they would probably say was a good idea to cut out of this bill, because that is not what they are set up to do. They are set up to make sure that their members are protected in this bill.

I just wanted to state, and I thank the gentleman for being so kind as to yield to me, there is not a cut in the bill. It is the old Medicare scam cut, hold spending or cut. What we are saying is, let us not increase the administrative overhead that has been proposed in the bill.

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

I would follow up on the remarks of the gentleman from Texas, specifically the letter, because it seems to me, as the gentleman from Oklahoma just suggested, that naturally they are in the business of protecting the status quo.

What the gentleman from Oklahoma is trying to do is anything but the status quo, and that is, on a line-by-line basis, to walk through money, where it is going, where it is being spent and asking, is the taxpayer getting the best bang for his buck.

I would disagree with the letter on a whole number of fronts. I mean, for instance, the gentleman from Oklahoma's amendments, for instance, do not touch the sugar subsidy program. That letter has basically said the sugar subsidy is right.

I know we would disagree on this, but I have problems with any system wherein you have got the Fanjul family out of Palm Beach who are worth over $400 million, who get $60 million a year as a result of a program that is part of this bill. That is not even being challenged by what the gentleman

from Oklahoma is doing. So I think I would have a number of objections to that letter.

But I want to go back to the original content of what he is getting at, which is, line by line, looking at where the money is being spent and simply asking, is the taxpayer getting a good return on his investment. I would say no, because going back to, I guess the comments of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT), if you had any corporation out there in America that had 100,000 employees, had 80,000 contract employees and said, how can we make it better, their solution would not be to increase administration by 12 percent. Yet that is what this does.

All this amendment would do would be to knock out that increase. That is worth doing, it seems to me, for a couple of reasons. If you took out this $3.9 million that we are talking about at $20,000 a pop, that would buy tractors for 200 farmers. I would rather put the money into tractors.

It would pay taxes for 2,600 farmers if you figured the taxes on a small farm were $1,500. It would take 1,900 farmers earning an average income to pay the money for this increase; or turned around a different way, it would take one farmer 1,900 years to pay for the increase that this amendment gets at.

□ 1945

It is a sensible amendment. It gets at where is the money going.

Most farmers I talk to, talk to somebody down at the stockyard or talk to somebody at FTX, these are reasonable, commonsense folks, and the idea of plussing up the administration, and in fact I saw one thing here in the administration portion, and I would have a question for the staff on this, talking about aircraft management.

I mean how many aircraft does the Department of Agriculture own?

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

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I just want to ask the gentleman one simple question.

He mentioned that there is nothing wrong with going over this line by line, dollar by dollar, and that is not bad.

Would the gentleman move now to abolish the committee system of the United States House of Representatives?

Why are we wasting our time with 13 committees?

They hold hearings, and they have all these experts coming together, and let me finish.

Mr. SANFORD. No. Reclaiming my time, of all people, the gentleman from Vermont has been consistently independent in the way he votes. To suggest that he takes anything lock-step from the committee as it comes, I mean the gentleman would be the furthest person from that. He is the one independent that is here.

Mr. SANDERS. True. But I have never offered 125 amendments, and as independent as I am, I think the committee process is a reasonable process. We have got 435 people. In all fairness, in all fairness, the gentleman does not think he knows all aspects of that bill.

The gentleman never sat on the committee, nor have I, and I think it is totally reasonable.

I have two amendments that I am offering. The gentleman may have some amendments. But basically really what he is saying is, ''If you're supporting the concept of bringing 125 amendments up,'' what the gentleman is saying is, ''Let's junk the committee.''

Mr. SANFORD. Absolutely. Reclaiming my time, this is part of a much larger conversation, as the gentleman from Oklahoma has already suggested, and that is, as we all know, if we wait until the end when we run into Labor-HHS, when we run into VA-HUD, we are running into a train wreck, and so I mean unless we address this larger issue; which is, as my colleagues know, we can cherry pick the easy bills, supposedly ag was going to be one of those; do those first, and then wait for the really difficult bills later on. If so, we are in real trouble, and it means we will be taking the money from Social Security, which is why I go back to the simple point: would we rather spend money on this, as my colleague knows, administration here within the Department of Ag, or would we rather save it for Social Security?

I would rather save it for Social Security.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 185, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR CONGRESSIONAL RELATIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations to carry out the programs funded by this Act, including programs involving intergovernmental affairs and liaison within the executive branch, $3,668,000: *Provided,* That no other funds appropriated to the Department by this Act shall be available to the Department for support of activities of congressional relations: *Provided further,* That not less than $2,241,000 shall be transferred to agencies funded by this Act to maintain personnel at the agency level.

OFFICE OF COMMUNICATIONS

For necessary expenses to carry on services relating to the coordination of programs involving public affairs, for the dissemination of agricultural information, and the coordination of information, work, and programs authorized by Congress in the Department, $8,138,000, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed $10,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, and not to exceed $2,000,000 may be used for farmers' bulletins.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Inspector General, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and the Inspector General Act of 1978, $65,128,000, including such sums as may be necessary for contracting and other arrangements with public agencies and private persons pursuant to section 6(a)(9) of the Inspector General Act of 1978, including not to exceed $50,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109; and including not to exceed $125,000 for certain confidential operational expenses, including the payment of informants, to be expended under the direction of the Inspector General pursuant to Public Law 95–452 and section 1337 of Public Law 97–98.

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

For necessary expenses of the Office of the General Counsel, $29,194,000.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR RESEARCH, EDUCATION AND ECONOMICS

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education and Economics to administer the laws enacted by the Congress for the Economic Research Service, the National Agricultural Statistics Service, the Agricultural Research Service, and the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service, $940,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COBURN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COBURN:

Page 9, line 3, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $400,000)''.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, this again is an area that has a 75 percent increase, and the first thing I would like to do with my time, if I may, is inquire of the committee the thinking behind this increase of 75 percent in this account so that we can have an understanding of it, and actually I would, if the gentleman from Texas knows the reason for that, I would even respond if he could give us the answer for that.

The fact is, this is a significant increase for just the Office of the Under Secretary. We are not talking about research, we are talking about the Office of the Under Secretary for Research, by increasing it by $400,000, and I just would like an explanation.

Mr. Chairman, it was $140,000, and it is going to be $540,000, and I believe that people would like to know why we are increasing that spending, and we ought to have a good explanation of why we are expending. If there is a great one and we should not be trimming this money out, then I will be happy to defer to the chairman, but to me it seems this 75 percent increase, from $400,000 to $540,000, is a significant increase.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 185, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE

For necessary expenses of the Economic Research Service in conducting economic research and analysis, as authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621–1627) and other laws, $70,266,000: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7. U.S.C. 2225).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COBURN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COBURN:

Page 9, line 8, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $4,509,000)''.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, again this is an increase of $4,509,000 on a budget. Last year was at $65,000. What we are seeing is a 6.8 percent increase, and the question that I would ask again is if we are going to increase this $4,509,000, and ultimately when it is all said and done the money is going to come out of the Social Security surplus, that we ought to have a great explanation.

If my colleagues read the committee print on this, and I will take the time to read it, there is not a valid explanation of what we are doing here, and again I would query the members of the committee. Maybe we are supposed to be doing this just to give us a good answer, and I will try to withdraw this amendment. But the fact is that we have silence on the issue.

Let me read what the committee print says.

''For the Economic Research Service the committee provides an appropriation of $70 million, an increase of $4,509,000 above 1999 and an increase of $14 million above the budget we have. The committee has provided $17,495,000, an increase of 300 above the budget request, for studies and evaluations of work under the Food and Nutrition Service.''

Now I am for our elderly food nutrition programs, I am for our WIC programs, but I want to know how we are going to spend this money, and I want to know why we are spending it in the direction and the increase, if, in fact, the committee expects ERS to consult and work with the staff of the Food and Nutrition Service as well as other agencies to assure that all the studies and evaluations are meeting the needs of the department. Is there an area where we are not supplying that need with the $65 million that we had last year? Is there money that could go to our farmers that are out there starving? Could some of this $4,509,000 go directly to farmers?

As my colleagues know, we say we want to help farmers, and some gentlemen have said today that some of our amendments have hurt farmers. Well, if they have, help us take this and change this and move it to the farmers instead of spending it on bureaucracies.

Again, we are going to have a process by which at the end of the appropriation day this $4,509,000, whether we want to hear it or not, is going to be taken from the Social Security surplus. Most people in this room know that. It is apparent that that is what is going to happen, regardless of whether we have another omni-terrible bill or not. The money on increased spending is going to be taken from the Social Security surplus, and I believe that it is the honorable thing for us to do to stand up and admit that, and then say I believe we ought to take from the Social Security surplus an additional $4,509,000 to run this branch of the Department of Agriculture.

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

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment, and we have been hearing talk of efficiency, and this is one area where the committee strongly believes that we have been very efficient.

The funding in this account is made up of two parts. One is the base economic research program for USDA, and the other is in the studies and evaluation for the feeding programs in this bill. By consolidating the studies and evaluations funding in this account, we have found that the program can be managed more efficiently.

The increase to this account is made up by corresponding increases in the child nutrition, food stamp and WIC accounts, and if we cut this account there will be no way of determining whether or not the $36 billion that we are spending on feeding programs in this bill are meeting their goals.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma, and I just wish to state for the record that the Food and Nutrition Service, which is in another account, was conducting some of its own evaluations for a number of years, and the committee felt that a more objective set of evaluations could be done through the Economic Research Service. That is the reason that these funds are in this account, because essentially we have transferred responsibilities from the Food and Nutrition Service to the Economic Research Service.

This is a new function, in a sense, for the Economic Research Service, but we believe with their objectivity they could do a good job of evaluating the two-thirds to three-quarters, actually three-quarters of this budget that is in the mandatory programs, including our major food and nutrition programs.

So I think the gentleman expressed some concern that there were funds in here providing for research, but the point is they are not being provided in the Food and Nutrition Service any more. These responsibilities have been shifted to the Economic Research Service.

So I wanted to state that for the record and to state that we hope that the Economic Research Service will do their job well. We certainly have had waste, fraud and abuse in many of the food and nutrition programs, and we have been going after that through the Inspector General, I think who is doing a tremendous job at USDA in particular, and I would hope that the evaluations that would be done would continue to show progress.

So I would not support the gentleman's amendment because I think it is a rather arbitrary and ill-advised cut.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, so I understand what the gentlewoman has said, last year for these programs there was no money for ERS under Food and Nutrition, and all of the increase, this $4,509,000, all of that increase is only for this area?

Ms. KAPTUR. For the Economic Research Service, yes.

Mr. COBURN. Or associated with Food and Nutrition Services.

Ms. KAPTUR. That is correct.

Mr. COBURN. And the money that was being spent in the Food and Nutrition Services has been reduced by that amount and transferred to this committee.

Ms. KAPTUR. The Food and Nutrition Service will no longer be doing its own evaluations; that is correct.

Mr. COBURN. But that is different than the amount of money that they were spending on it being reduced from their budget and transferred to the ERS.

Ms. KAPTUR. The Food and Nutrition Service will no longer perform their own evaluative research; that is correct.

Mr. COBURN. But they will still have the money that they were using to do that, and those structures will be in place.

Ms. KAPTUR. They will not be doing research in this evaluative research. We changed it because we thought that perhaps they had too much of a vested interest in continuing programs the way they were, and the monitoring might not have been as objective as it should have been.

This may not work under ERS. We are not sure it will work, but we think it is a way of being more objective.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) is withdrawn.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS SERVICE

For necessary expenses of the National Agricultural Statistics Service in conducting

statistical reporting and service work, including crop and livestock estimates, statistical coordination and improvements, marketing surveys, and the Census of Agriculture, as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1621–1627, Public Law 105–113, and other laws, $100,559,000, of which up to $16,490,000 shall be available until expended for the Census of Agriculture: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $40,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

For necessary expenses to enable the Agricultural Research Service to perform agricultural research and demonstration relating to production, utilization, marketing, and distribution (not otherwise provided for); home economics or nutrition and consumer use including the acquisition, preservation, and dissemination of agricultural information; and for acquisition of lands by donation, exchange, or purchase at a nominal cost not to exceed $100, and for land exchanges where the lands exchanged shall be of equal value or shall be equalized by a payment of money to the grantor which shall not exceed 25 percent of the total value of the land or interests transferred out of Federal ownership, $836,381,000: *Provided,* That appropriations hereunder shall be available for temporary employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $115,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further,* That appropriations hereunder shall be available for the operation and maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed one for replacement only: *Provided further,* That appropriations hereunder shall be available pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 2250 for the construction, alteration, and repair of buildings and improvements, but unless otherwise provided, the cost of constructing any one building shall not exceed $250,000, except for headhouses or greenhouses which shall each be limited to $1,000,000, and except for ten buildings to be constructed or improved at a cost not to exceed $500,000 each, and the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 percent of the current replacement value of the building or $250,000, whichever is greater: *Provided further,* That the limitations on alterations contained in this Act shall not apply to modernization or replacement of existing facilities at Beltsville, Maryland: *Provided further,* That appropriations hereunder shall be available for granting easements at the Beltsville Agricultural Research Center, including an easement to the University of Maryland to construct the Transgenic Animal Facility which upon completion shall be accepted by the Secretary as a gift: *Provided further,* That the foregoing limitations shall not apply to replacement of buildings needed to carry out the Act of April 24, 1948 (21 U.S.C. 113a): *Provided further,* That funds may be received from any State, other political subdivision, organization, or individual for the purpose of establishing or operating any research facility or research project of the Agricultural Research Service, as authorized by law.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SANDERS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SANDERS:

Page 10, line 14 (relating to the Agricultural Research Service), insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $13,000,000)''.

Page 50, line 9 (relating to the commodity assistance program), insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

□ 2000

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I want to assure my colleagues that I do not have 150 amendments, not even 50, only 2, and I believe the majority is going to accept one later. So this is it for me, and I would appreciate support for this amendment.

This amendment is cosponsored by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL). This is a very similar amendment to the one that the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO) and I introduced last year, which won in the House by a strong vote. Unfortunately, the conference committee did not support the effort that we had made in the House.

The purpose of this amendment is to increase funding for a nutrition program of extreme importance to many low-income senior citizens, small children and pregnant women, and that program is the Commodity Supplemental Food Program.

This year, the President requested $155 million for the Commodity Assistance Program, which contains the Commodity Supplemental Food Program. However, the program was funded at $14 million less than the President's request. We are attempting now to add $10 million to the program, which would still be $4 million less than what the President had requested.

Mr. Chairman, it is no secret that malnutrition and hunger among senior citizens is a serious and tragic problem in the United States. Throughout our country, food shelters see more and more use, and hospital administrators tell us that thousands of senior citizens who enter hospitals in this country are suffering from malnutrition. We know that programs like Meals on Wheels have long waiting lists and that large numbers of seniors throughout this country are simply not getting the nutrition that they need.

The Commodity Supplemental Food Program is currently operating in 20 States. Other States are on the waiting list and still more are in the process of applying for the program. We have been told by the USDA that unless additional funds are given to this program, there simply cannot be an expansion, which would be a real tragedy not only for seniors, but for pregnant women and young children who also utilize this important program.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment is offset by cutting $13 million from the Agricultural Research Service. At a time of very, very tight and unreasonable, in my opinion, budget caps, this particular program received a $50 million increase this year, which brings the program up to just over $830 million.

I am not an opponent of the Agricultural Research Service. I think they do a lot of good. I come from an agricultural State, and they do important work. But it seems to me that we have to put our priorities in a little bit better place.

At a time of significant and growing hunger in the United States, it is frankly more important to be funding nutrition programs than adding $50 million to ag research in such programs as funding a geneticist plant breeder for lettuce to develop red snapper agriculture, aquaculture, to conduct golden nematode worm research and rainbow trout research.

I do not mean to make fun of those programs. I am sure that they make sense and are useful. But I think in terms of our priorities, when we have seniors who are hungry and small kids who are not getting the nutrition that they need, I think we should do better; and we can do better by supporting this nutrition program.

I want to thank the cosponsors of this amendment, one of whom is the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), and the schedule has been so thrown off today that I do not know if they are going to come and speak to this right now. But the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) are also cosponsors of this amendment, and I would ask for its passage.

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

Mr. Chairman, I hate to do this, but I rise in opposition to this amendment. All programs within the bill were put on the table as we began to make funding decisions under the tight allocation that we had received. No one can deny the importance of commodity assistance programs, but to use as an offset funds from the Agricultural Research Service to find ways to help farmers, who are less than 2 percent of the Nation's population, to feed this country and much of the world, is not acceptable.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, we provided about $6 million more in this account than the President requested for the Commodity Supplemental Food Program for fiscal year 2000 and maintained TFAP administrative funds at $45 million. These are the only two programs within the Commodity Assistance account.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Sanders amendment, and this may be the only disagreement that the chairman of the subcommittee and I have on this bill.

I compliment the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) for bringing this amendment to us to get the full body's view on this when we vote very shortly, and I support the amendment for several reasons.

One is, around this country, the feeding kitchens of America are empty. We

have an enormous need for additional food. Just the last two weekends ago the letter carriers across our country did a food drive and tried to replenish the supplies in these food banks, because this is not close to Christmas and they have been drawn down, and with all of the changes that have been made in welfare reform, for example, we do have lots of people who are hungry in America tonight, most of them women and children.

So I would say that there is great merit in the gentleman's proposal.

In addition to that, in this bill, we were unable to fund so many worthy programs that would bring food to people, including the Senior Nutrition Program where there had been a proposal to provide a small subsidy so that seniors would not have to pay so much for lunches when they go into some of their lunch programs. We were not able to include that in this bill.

Finally, I will support in this bill and in any subsequent bills any effort that would lift commodities off this market in order to try to help get prices up for our farmers. This bill itself, in the body of this bill, we were not able to provide the kind of surplus commodity assistance that we would have hoped for. We have done some, but we just have not done enough.

I would say to the author of the amendment, it is difficult for me to take money from the Agricultural Research Service. I would hope that as we move toward conference we might be able to find other ways to fund this very worthy proposal. I will vote for the gentleman's amendment when the time comes for all of the reasons that I have listed, but I would hope that we might be able to find other offsets, because truly we know that the future of American agriculture rests in research, and our bounty is directly related to the investments we make in so many crops.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) understands, I am not against ag research. I know that the gentleman has had a difficult time trying to fit in all of the needs. I do not disagree with the gentleman, and I do not disagree with the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR). I just think that when we have senior citizens going into the hospitals suffering from malnutrition, that is an issue that cannot be ignored.

I would raise that to a higher level and ask for the support of the body in the passage of this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Sanders amendment. I think that a $10 million increase for the Commodity Supplemental Food Program is warranted.

I represent a district in Cleveland, Ohio, and in my district there are many seniors who depend on programs like this for their sustenance.

There are those of us who have a prayer that we say that includes the words, ''Give us this day our daily bread.'' This is a very humble and simple request that people have. In America, where there are so many people hungry, where there are so many people who hunger amidst so much plenty, what would it matter to give a mere $10 million to help our senior citizens have improved nutrition, to reduce the waiting lists for Meals on Wheels, to make it possible for those millions of Americans who rely on emergency food assistance to be able to get some help.

We in this country have a moral obligation to provide for those who are without. It is a work of mercy to feed the hungry, and we should with regard to the great power of this government, with the billions of dollars that are spent on so many things that are questionable, that we have an opportunity here to take $10 million and feed some people, give them an opportunity to be better fed so that they do not end up in the hospital from malnutrition.

I think the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) has come up with a wonderful amendment, and while I have the greatest respect for the committee which has created this bill, I have to say that the bill can be improved and it can be improved with the help of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Vermont, Mr. SANDERS, so that he can have a few more minutes to explain the importance of this amendment.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his strong support. I think the essence of the problem that we have as serious legislators is that we are confronting a budget which in many ways prevents us from doing the things that we have to do, and that is not the chairman's fault and it is not the ranking member's fault. But I think when we talk about priorities in the United States, in this great country, in this wealthy country, how can we not address the reality that there are senior citizens who are going to the hospital and the administrators and doctors there are telling us they are malnourished? We are wasting huge sums of money spending dollars on hospital care that could have been prevented if we would provide adequate nutrition to our senior citizens.

The same thing is true with low-income pregnant women who are giving birth to low-weight babies.

So again, I would not argue about ag research. That is important. But I think what we are asking for is taking $13 million out of an increase of $50 million to use $10 million for the expansion of this commodities program.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, the Master said, ''Feed my sheep.'' This is our challenge.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to stand tonight in support of this amendment. This year the President requested $155 million for the Commodity Assistance Program which contains the Commodity Supplemental Food Program. However, this program was funded at $14 million less than the President's request.

The Commodity Supplemental Food Program is currently operating in 20 States. Also, four States are on the waiting list, as are others, such as the State of Ohio; and we believe that all people should be able to participate in this. Too many seniors are suffering already because they live on such tiny incomes they cannot afford to buy food or else they are forced to choose between the life-saving prescription drugs they need and groceries.

The Commodity Supplemental Food Program is often a life-saving source of food for elderly constituents. The source of the money this is coming from is coming from a program that is receiving ample support, and I come from a State that has agriculture, and I do support obviously where the money is going. But the amount of money that is going to go into this program for the Sanders amendment is not going to hurt the existing appropriation, it is going to do an awful lot, really, to help our seniors. So I think it is a good amendment.

It is a senior program that makes good fiscal sense. Studies have shown that malnourished seniors stay in the hospital nearly twice as long as well-nourished seniors, costing thousands of dollars more per stay. So I think it is cost-effective.

It is a good amendment, it should receive good bipartisan support. I think it is the right thing to do, and I urge the support of my colleagues for this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise, regrettably, in opposition to the gentleman's amendment, because I think he is attempting to do something that is proper and good, but I would point out to the gentleman that all of these funds are very competitive with each other. We have done our level best to fully fund the nutrition programs which make up the majority of this bill.

As the gentleman knows, and we have worked together on funding the Emergency Food Assistance Program, it is a very important program. We have raised the funding for that program, the mandatory programs, food stamps and WIC, and we have done our level best to fund those as close to full funding as we can.

The Commodity Supplemental Food Program, the program the gentleman wants to add an additional $10 million to, is funded above the President's budget request level.

So we have gone out of our way to try to find the discretionary funds to meet the needs of these programs. We

just do not have enough money to meet everybody's priorities.

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

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and I have worked together on a number of issues, and I appreciate where he is coming from, and we all understand the difficulty of coming up with the money.

However, I think the gentleman is not accurate in saying that we have funded the program higher than the President's request. I believe it is $14 million below the President's request, to the best of my knowledge.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I will check to verify which one of us is accurate here, but the fact of the matter is, these nonmandatory funds are heavily in demand by all of these programs.

□ 2015

To take the funds from the agriculture research budget and put them into nutrition programs may be penny wise and pound foolish, because the agriculture research, which again, is underfunded, we cannot do enough for the research that needs to be done, but that research, Mr. Chairman, has increased by multiples, geometric progression increases in our yields of crops.

If we neglect our agriculture research on things like the green revolution varieties of wheat and corn and rice that are now feeding the entire world, the disease resistance that we are breeding into our crops, the new varieties of fruits and vegetables that our agriculture research institutions produce for the consumption not only of our citizens but of the whole world, if we continue to neglect our research, we are not going to have nearly enough food to feed ourselves and the rest of the world.

I understand the gentleman's desires here. Perhaps at the end of the process, if there is a way to provide additional funds, we will try to do that. But for the sake of this amendment, I do urge that it be rejected and that we keep the funds in agriculture research where they belong.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Mr. SANDERS' amendment, which will add needed resources for food banks. As you know, growing numbers of Americans are turning up at our nation's food banks—and too many of them are senior citizens.

The food banks from around the United States that I've surveyed during the past two years report many reasons for the increase—from the deep cuts in food stamp funding, to low-wage jobs, to an economy that is leaving too many of our fellow citizens behind. Since last year, 22 percent more people are turning up in their lines, the food banks say—and many of them are going home empty-handed.

The prospect of hunger in our rich nation is troubling no matter who it affects. Children who are poor often and rightly grab our attention, because hunger in the growing years scars them physically and mentally. Working people who are doing all they can to feed their families also disturb us. And hungry senior citizens, who have given so much for their entire lives to their families and our nation, are nothing short of an outrage.

I saw senior citizens at Ohio food banks last year, many of them too weak to stand and wait in long lines; all of them suffering the indignity of being unable to feed themselves; and a surprising number of them there because our healthy system has left them no choice other than to pay for their medicine, or their food.

The Commodity Supplemental Food Program operates in only 18 states (plus one reservation). The WIC program we know so well grew out of this program, which now focuses on poor Americans aged 60 and older. It was cut by $10 million in FY '99; this amendment restores this funding and should enable the program to reach senior citizens in more states. My own state of Ohio is eager to participate, and will do so as soon as the needed funding is available.

No American should have to turn to food banks in the first place; and no one who has no other choice should be turned away empty-handed. This amendment will add needed funding for food banks that serve senior citizens. I commend Mr. SANDERS and Mr. NEY for their strong stand in support of hungry seniors, and urge my colleagues to support it.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SANFORD

The CHAIRMAN. The pending 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 designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 15-minute vote, followed by two five-minute votes.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 143, noes 274, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 155]

AYES—143

Aderholt
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baird
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Biggert
Bilirakis
Blagojevich
Blunt
Brown (OH)
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Campbell
Cannon
Capuano
Castle
Chabot
Chenoweth
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Cox
Crane
Cunningham
Deal
DeFazio
DeLay
DeMint
Doggett
Doolittle
Duncan
Dunn
Ehrlich
Eshoo
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Gibbons
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hilleary
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Istook
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kelly
Largent
Larson
Lazio
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Luther
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
McCarthy (MO)
McCollum
McDermott
McInnis
McIntosh
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mink
Moore
Moran (VA)
Myrick
Napolitano
Northup
Norwood
Paul
Pease
Petri
Phelps
Pitts
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Ramstad
Riley
Rivers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scarborough
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shows
Smith (MI)
Smith (WA)
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Tancredo
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tiahrt
Toomey
Upton
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weller

NOES—274

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bishop
Bliley
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
English
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Maloney (CT)
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Minge
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Packard
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reynolds

Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Snyder
Souder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—16

Brady (TX)
Brown (CA)
Graham
Granger
Hinojosa
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Kasich
Kleczka
Millender-McDonald
Morella
Oxley
Pallone
Reyes
Rothman
Smith (TX)
Stark

□ 2039

Messrs. LIPINSKI, GUTIERREZ, REYNOLDS, TIERNEY, RYUN of Kansas, TRAFICANT, and BECERRA and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. MCNULTY, MARKEY, SHAW, DEFAZIO, and LARSON and Mrs. TAUSCHER and Ms. ESHOO changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, on roll-call No. 155, I was inadvertently detained and missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes''.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COBURN

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

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 129, noes 289, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 156]

AYES—129

Aderholt
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Ballenger
Barr
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Biggert
Boehner
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Camp
Campbell
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chenoweth
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Condit
Cook
Cox
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehrlich
English
Foley
Fossella
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Gibbons
Gillmor
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hunter
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kelly
Largent
Lazio
Linder
LoBiondo
Luther
Manzullo
McCollum
McInnis
McIntosh
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Myrick
Nadler
Northup
Paul
Pease
Petri
Pitts
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Ramstad
Regula
Riley
Rogan
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanford
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Smith (MI)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Tancredo
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Toomey
Upton
Walden
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weller

NOES—289

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Callahan
Calvert
Canady
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Combest
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Forbes
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Packard
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Reynolds
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Snyder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thune
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—15

Blunt
Brown (CA)
Graham
Hinojosa
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Kasich
Millender-McDonald
Morella
Oxley
Pallone
Reyes
Rothman
Smith (TX)
Stark
Weldon (PA)

□ 2049

Messrs. KLECZKA, COOKSEY and MALONEY of Connecticut changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COBURN

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

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 139, noes 278, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 157]

AYES—139

Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baird
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Biggert
Boehner
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Campbell
Cannon
Capuano
Castle
Chabot
Chenoweth
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Conyers
Cook
Crane
Cunningham
Deal
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Doolittle
Duncan
Dunn
Ehrlich
English
Eshoo
Foley
Fossella

Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Gibbons
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Green (TX)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hunter
Inslee
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kelly
Kleczka
Lazio
Linder
LoBiondo
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
McDermott
McInnis
McIntosh
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Metcalf
Mica
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mink
Myrick
Northup
Paul
Petri
Pitts
Pombo
Portman
Ramstad
Riley
Rivers
Rogan
Rohrabacher
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanford
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shows
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Tancredo
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Upton
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wu

NOES—278

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Bachus
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Combest
Condit
Cooksey
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dickey
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Forbes
Ford
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Green (WI)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Miller (FL)
Minge
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Packard
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Shaw
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Snyder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—16

Brown (CA)
Cox
Dicks
Graham
Hinojosa
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Kasich
Largent
McCollum
Millender-McDonald
Oxley
Pallone
Reyes
Rothman
Smith (TX)
Stark

□ 2058

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SHERWOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. Pease, Chairman 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. 1906) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 150, EDUCATION LAND GRANT ACT

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–164) on the resolution (H. Res. 189) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 150) to amend the Act popularly known as the Recreation and Public Purposes Act to authorize disposal of certain public lands or national forest lands to local education agencies for use for elementary or secondary schools, including public charter schools, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, 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 Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana 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 gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. SCHAFFER 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 New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE 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 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 California (Mr. FILNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FILNER 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 North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina 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 Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CUMMINGS 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 Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. UNDERWOOD 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 gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. CARSON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, I missed rollcall votes number 147 and 148 on Monday, May 24, 1999, because I was attending a funeral of a dear friend.

Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on both of these votes.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1905, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. DREIER (during special order of Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–165) on the resolution (H. Res. 190) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1905) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

DAIRY PRICING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am here tonight to talk about an important issue of fairness, fairness to farmers, fairness to consumers, and fairness to taxpayers. I know that ''fairness'' is an overused term. But quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, it has never been more important or more true than it is on the issue that I want to talk about tonight, and that is the issue of dairy pricing.

For the last six decades, we have had a Government mandated system of dairy price supports. It began in the late 1930s because dairy producers had a difficult time getting their goods to consumers in a timely way. They had a difficult time because of technology in meeting consumption needs. We did not, quite frankly, have effective infrastructure or enough technology to transport our surplus to States that had deficit in production.

Those days are over, however. We have the refrigeration, we have the infrastructure to transport dairy products from States like Wisconsin anywhere in America overnight. As a result, the outdated dairy price system, the Federal order system, no longer makes sense.

Wisconsin dairy farmers and Wisconsin communities are being ravaged, they are being destroyed by the current Federal order system. In the last 8 years, Wisconsin has lost over 10,000 dairy farms. Wisconsin has lost 2,000 dairy farms in each of the last 2 years. We have lost more dairy farms in the last 8 years than most States ever have.

Now, I am here tonight to speak to my colleagues, quite frankly, not on behalf of dairy farmers. Dairy farmers are not looking for our sympathy. They are a tough bunch. This is a tough life-style. They know that. They have been fighting uphill all of their lives. They are not looking for sympathy. They are looking for fairness.

More importantly, quite frankly, I would think to the Members of this body is the fact that this unfair system not only hurts our dairy farmers, my family farmers in Wisconsin, of which there are 22,000 remaining, but it is also unfair to consumers.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to realize, it is important to know that the outdated Federal order system artificially inflates the price of milk. And as more farmers go out of business, and as I just said, we are losing farmers each and every year, the more farmers who go out of business, the higher that price will be.

The Citizens Against Government Waste, Americans for Tax Reform, a number of taxpayer groups, groups that do not necessarily have a natural stake in the fight over a dairy policy, they have reached an interesting conclusion. After looking at the Federal order system, they have concluded that the Federal order system that we have had in this country for six decades is little more than a tax on milk. It is a milk tax that consumers are paying all across this land. It is a milk tax to the tune of about $1 billion each and every year.

Now, the reason I come forward today is because of a battle that I believe is going to be on this floor tomorrow and, quite frankly and unfortunately, probably on this floor for weeks and months to come.

Some weeks ago, Secretary Dan Glickman proposed a final order on the Federal order system for dairies. And in that Federal order, Secretary Glickman proposed a very minor change to the Federal order system, a very minor, modest change. And it is true, it will benefit Wisconsin farmers, dairy farmers, but again in a very modest way.

□ 2115

Now, it may be ironic to some of you that I come here today to support a proposal from a Democrat administration. But I come forward because this issue of the Federal order system of the milk tax is not about Republican versus Democrat, it is not about conservative versus liberal. It is about doing the right thing. And I come here tonight to argue that we need to support Secretary Glickman's plan. Modest as it is, it is a step in the right direction.

Now, the Federal order system for dairy is one of the most complicated systems that you can possibly imagine. It is full of acronyms, it is full of terminology that the average person cannot understand, let alone a Member of Congress who may serve on the Committee on Agriculture or who comes from a dairy State. If you tried to explain to your constituents that this system that we have in place creates a price on milk based not upon productivity, based not upon quality, based not upon efficiency, but instead based merely on the distance that a producer is from the city of Eau Claire, Wisconsin, your constituents would not believe you. They would think that you were making it up. The sad reality is that that is the truth.

We have a dairy system in this Nation for which government mandates prices for fluid milk again based merely upon geography. That is wrong. It is unfair to farmers, it is unfair to consumers, it inflates the price of milk and, quite frank,ly it is un-American because it is contrary to our free enterprise system.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT). I know that he shares many of the concerns that I bring forward tonight.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I would like to thank the gentleman for yielding and especially thank him for requesting time for this special order tonight. I suspect there are an awful lot of Americans who may tune us in and certainly most of our colleagues who will be watching in their offices or are still here on the House floor who really do not understand this whole milk marketing order system. Frankly, having studied it now for about 5 years, I honestly cannot say that I completely understand it, either.

But I would correct the gentleman on one fact, and that is, he said it is priced purely on how far you are from Eau Claire, Wisconsin. That is partially right. It is the only commodity I think in the United States, maybe in the world, that is priced not only based on where it comes from, it is also priced on what it will go into. Milk that goes into cheese is of lower value than milk that goes into a bottling plant and is sold for fluid milk for drinking.

There are actually four classes of milk. Class one is milk that goes into liquid dairy products that are drinkable. Class two are spoonable; that would be things like yogurt. Class three is cheese, and class four is dry powdered milk. So we have four classes, and it is all priced based upon where it comes from. And the farther you are from Eau Claire, Wisconsin, the more the dairy farmer gets for their milk. The closer you are to Eau Claire, Wisconsin, the less you get.

And then if you are at an area that has cheese plants and most of the milk goes into cheese, you get a lower price still.

In my opinion, it is the most indefensible thing that the Federal Government ever created. It may have made sense back in 1934. In my opinion, it makes no economic sense today.

Let me just show in this chart that I have next to me, and it sort of illustrates the differentials we are talking about. These are the producer class one blended price benefits per hundred weight. That is the way milk is priced. Milk to dairy farmers, and we have got a former dairy farmer sitting here in the second row and maybe he can talk a little bit about it, maybe he does not even understand how his cream checks were calculated.

But if you lived, for example, in the northeastern part of the United States, your differential came to about $1.40. If you lived in the Appalachian region, that average price was $2.34. If you lived down in Florida, that worked out to $3.32. But if you live in the area that the gentleman from Wisconsin and myself come from, in the upper Midwest, you can see that over here it is only 27 cents. That is what we are talking about, ultimately.

We are not asking for special privilege, for special benefits; we are not even asking to receive equal pay for equal milk; but we would like to equalize it much more than it is today.

The second chart that I have I think illustrates it more geographically and what we are talking about. The country is divided up into all of these milk marketing order regions. For example, these are the average blended prices for current Federal milk marketing order areas. In the Pacific Northwest, that average price last month I believe was $14.75. If you are in the upper Midwest, that is, basically Wisconsin, Minnesota, parts of the Dakotas, you are talking $13.57.

Now, on the other hand, if you lived in eastern Colorado and produced milk, your average blended price last month was $15.16. And if you lived down here in Florida, that price is $16.82. If you look at this, at one time it may have made some sense because the area around Eau Claire, Wisconsin, was considered the dairy capital of the United States and in many respects the dairy capital of the world, and we are still privileged that in this region we produce about 30 percent of the milk in the United States.

But as I say, it may have made some sense back in 1934; that was before the days of refrigeration, that was before the days of the kind of transportation, the interstate highway system that we have, but today we can move milk 1,200 miles in 24 hours. So the whole idea that we need this regional balkanization of the United States as it relates to dairy production is just crazy.

Again, back to the point that my colleague from Wisconsin made about the basic unfairness of this: How can you say to dairy farmers in Glenville, Minnesota, that you are only entitled to $13.57 for your milk, but the same quality, the exact same quality of milk in the Southeast is worth $16.13. That is a difference of over $2. When you are talking about hundreds of thousands of pounds of milk per month, you are starting to talk real differences.

I see the chairman of the Committee on Rules is approaching the microphone and perhaps we should yield to him for a moment.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my very good friends for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate my friends for their very, very hard work and wish them well in their proceedings here.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. We would like to thank the chairman and we hope that he will drink more milk. June is Dairy Month, so enjoy as much as you can.

Mr. DREIER. I will tell my friend that I am a huge dairy consumer. Ice cream is my favorite.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I would like to thank the chairman.

As I mentioned earlier, we have been pushing now for 60 years to get this whole milk marketing order system reformed. Finally, under the leadership of former Congressman Gunderson from Wisconsin, we finally got included in the ag bill a couple of years ago a requirement that the Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary Glickman, was forced to come up with a new plan to begin to bring some equity to this whole milk marketing order system. To his credit, he did come up with a plan that frankly some of us are not completely happy with.

I want to point out these colors if I could. I promise not to take too much time here, but this essentially reflects some of the changes that would occur under the plan that Secretary Glickman came out with. If you look at this, actually Minnesota and Wisconsin lose under the Glickman proposal.

And so we are not asking for completely equal pay for equal milk, but we are asking to level the playing field. The net practical effect of the Glickman plan is, it does eliminate some of the differences. Relative to some of the other areas of the State, if you just go by winners and losers, we lose less than some of the other States, but that is because they already are getting more than we are getting.

So we are prepared to accept what Secretary Glickman has proposed in a spirit of compromise, because at least in general it moves to a leveling of the way that the milk marketing orders are set up.

Before I yield back to my colleague from Wisconsin, I want to play a little visualization game with some of my colleagues. If you could, just close your eyes and think of all of the products that the pricing is based upon some geographic location. Just think about that. Well, the answer is, there is only one. Only milk.

I think we have got a cartoon from, I believe it is from the St. Paul Pioneer Press. Maybe the gentleman from Wisconsin wants to talk a little bit about it. Maybe it is easier for me to talk about it because I have got it right here.

But could we imagine a system where all computers would be price adjusted according to their distance from Seattle? We could not imagine that, could we? Could we imagine a system where all country music should be price adjusted according to how far it is away from Nashville, Tennessee? Where all oranges should be price adjusted according to their distance from Florida?

But we do have a system where all milk is priced based on how far away it is from Eau Claire, Wisconsin.

Now, the question at the bottom is, which of these is actual Federal policy. It is amazing when you stop to think about it. It is the only product where the price is based on some arbitrary geographic location.

Secondly, it is based on what that product is going to go into. In fact, up in northern Minnesota where we produce an awful lot of iron ore, they produce taconite pellets. These taconite pellets, no one could imagine that some Federal bureaucrat would sit up there in front of an iron mine and say, well, these taconite pellets are going to go into automobiles so they will be priced at this level, and these taconite pellets are going to go into steel lockers and therefore the price will be something else. That would be a crazy, absurd idea. But the truth of the matter is that is exactly what happens to milk. It is all done by bureaucrats here in Washington, D.C.

Once again, we are here on the floor of the House tonight arguing this case because farmers in the upper Midwest have been dealing with this antiquated, in fact Justice Anton Scalia has referred to this system as ''Byzantine.''

We have dealt with this Byzantine system for 60 years. Finally, Secretary Glickman has come out with a plan which is not perfect, actually in some respects it still punishes dairy farmers in the upper Midwest, but at least it levels the playing field, at least it is fairer for dairy farmers regardless of where they are than the system we have today. I congratulate him for it.

I am willing, in a spirit of bipartisanship, to move forward with the plan that the Secretary came up with.

I will yield back to the gentleman from Wisconsin and maybe we can talk a little more about this cartoon. As I say, it would be a whole lot funnier if it was not true.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. I thank my friend and colleague from Minnesota. I think he has pointed out again just the absurdity of the system and that cartoon does show it.

Think about this. We are entering the year 2000, the next millennium, yet we have a system for the production and consumption and distribution of milk that is based upon economic realities around World War II. Think about how much technology has changed since then.

Beyond that, we are at a time in our history in which Members of this body

from both sides of the aisle are emphasizing the need to open up borders, to break down barriers for trade all across this world. Yet here in America, in supposedly the bastion of entrepreneurial capitalism, we have a system that creates barriers, that blocks the flow, creates disincentives for the flow of dairy products across State lines and across regional lines. This is counter to everything that we stand for in America today.

Again, I want to come back and emphasize the point, this system is terrible for the dairy farmers in States like Minnesota and Wisconsin. Again, over the last 8 years, we have lost more dairy farmers than most States ever had.

But beyond that, this is bad for consumers. Under this system, we are driving up the price of milk. We are also encouraging large corporate farms, which are buying up the small family farmer.

□ 2130

If that trend continues, we are going to see dairy production in the hands of only a few, and then we will have a true monopoly on the supply of milk. Then we will see milk prices rise, and then milk will no longer be the cheap and wonderful fluid that it is, available to all today.

This is also, this system is bad for taxpayers. It drives up the cost on programs like the school meal program, it drives up the costs for families on food stamps, reduces the value of food stamps. This system, almost any way to look at it, is absurd, it is un-American, and it is wrong.

Now we are not going to change things overnight, we are not going to change things here tonight, but we do want to make our case to the American people. It is a long uphill battle, but it is certainly no longer and no more uphill than our dairy farmers are facing.

We want to start the process tonight, and as has been stated before, it is a long battle that we have ahead.

I yield my friend from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding, and again I thank him for having this special order.

As my colleagues know, if this regional differentiation was not bad enough, and if the fact that we price milk to the producer based on not only how far they are from Eau Claire, Wisconsin, but what ultimately that milk is going to go into, if that were not bad enough, we have one other little wrinkle that has made things worse. It is called regional compacts.

Now this is the only area, again, that I can think of where we have allowed States literally to go together and hold out imports of dairy products from other parts of the country. In other words, they have created their own little fiefdoms.

As my colleagues know, at the very time, as was mentioned by the gentleman from Wisconsin, at the very time we are saying to Europe and we are saying to Asia and we are saying to our trading partners all around the world it is time to bring down those trade barriers, we need open markets and open trade, we have problems trading even with certain regions of the country.

Right now there is a Northeast Dairy Compact, and unfortunately some of our colleagues, even as we speak, are trying to work out new compacts to try and create even worse regional differentiations between the regions and to keep out imports from other parts of the country.

As my colleagues know, this seems, and the gentleman mentioned the word ''un-American''. At the very time that we are trying to break down trade barriers to China and to Asia, we are constructing trade barriers right here in the United States, and in my opinion it is just an outrage, and so the only thing we can do is come to the House floor, offer amendments, talk about this, talk about the fairness, and hopefully in the long light of history sooner or later these trade barriers are going to be knocked down. We are going to see open trade not only with Europe, but with the Northeast as well.

The problem with compacts in my opinion is they do violate, if not the letter, certainly the spirit of the Commerce Clause in the Constitution, and frankly, had they not been legislatively approved, there is a very good chance that the Supreme Court would have thrown them out. That debate is going to get very heated because, as I say, not only does the Northeast want to expand its dairy compact, they are talking about a regional compact in the Southeast, perhaps extending as far west as into Kansas.

And we joked with some of the supporters of those compacts. We would be happy to allow those compacts, if they would just allow the upper Midwest in. I mean, if we could be getting the same price, for example, that they are already getting in New York and New Jersey, and you see by this chart $13.57 for us, $15.40 in New York and New Jersey. The New England Compact States are getting $15.61. Now our dairy farmers would love to be in that compact if that meant that they got $15.61 for their milk.

That is the difference. Again, it is unfair, and if the system is already convoluted and complicated, the terrible tragedy is there are people here in the Congress today, well-intentioned Members, but they are trying to make the situation even worse, even more complicated, even more unfair.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, what my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT), points out is something important, and that is that there are really two different elements to this overall fight that we have on the dairy front.

There is, first of all, the problem of the Federal order system, which is what we began talking about tonight, and that is the differential system that does base the price of milk largely on the proximity to Eau Claire.

In fact, it was interesting. That is a fight that my predecessor has been fighting and so many men and women over the years have been fighting. The Agriculture Commissioner from your State, in Minnesota, pointed out that dairy farmers in Minnesota have become so frustrated with their inability to change that system that they actually think it might be easier to physically relocate the City of Eau Claire to the West Coast than actually making a reform to it. That is the Federal order system.

But the second part of this, and it is a problem, as you rightly pointed out, which is equally bad, it is the problem of the compacts because the compacts do serve to create trade barriers between States and between regions, and Citizens Against Government Waste have calculated that the compacts are a major tax on milk that will drive up the cost of milk for so many consumers in this country.

As my colleagues know, we are the most effective dairy producing region in the whole world in the upper Midwest, and yet because of the combination of the compacts, because of the combination of the compacts with the Federal order system, we are being punished for that very productivity which we have.

And as the gentleman pointed out also, the dairy farmers in Minnesota and Wisconsin are not asking for any favors. They do not want favors. They do not want sympathy. They just want the chance to compete. They know that if they are given that equal chance to compete, they will succeed. They will succeed vis-a-vis farmers in America, but also farmers all across the world.

That is all they are looking for, and in this land of opportunity it seems to be the least that we can do.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, talking about what this really ultimately costs to consumers as well, the estimate that we have of the cost of the compact to New England consumers has been $47 million.

Now some people will say that milk is not a price-sensitive item and that, as my colleagues know, people, consumers will continue to drink about the same amount of milk regardless of the price. I am not sure I really believe that, and in fact I have had some of my friends at the Dairy Association try to tell me that. It seems to me that if you over-price milk in certain regions of the country, the net practical effect is you are going to drive down consumption, and what we desperately, and one of the real problems with what I call the Balkanization, and we are having this war going on in the Balkans right now where that term came from, but basically what we have is Balkanization of the United States as it relates to milk.

The real tragedy is the biggest war that is going on right now for the milk industry is this competition with the soft drink industry, and the soft drink industry is out there, and they are marketing and they are competing, and they are vicious on price and they are vicious on advertising, and they are constantly taking a bigger and bigger share of the beverage market, if my colleagues will, and at the very time, it seems to me, that the milk industry ought to be speaking with one voice and ought to be working together and figuring out how they can get a bigger market share relative to the soft drink industry, at that very time they should be working together. Unfortunately, we have all of these regions working against each other, and the net practical effect, of course, is that we continue to lose market share relative to CocaCola, Pepsi Cola, Mountain Dew and all of those other soft drinks that are out there competing particularly for the younger people's market.

And so there are so many things that need to be said positively about the milk industry, the dairy industry, and unfortunately we spend so much of our time here in Washington fighting with each other over this regionalization of the way pricing is structured. It is a terrible mistake, and it has cost the consumers.

Let me also add that, as my colleagues know, a lot of the argument for this system and even for the regional compacts has been that it will save small dairy farmers. Well, over the last 10 years we have lost something like 10,000 dairy farmers. As my colleagues know, if that is the definition of success, we cannot afford much more of that.

What we really ultimately need to do is work together to find fairness, to find common ground, to work together to expand markets for our dairy products, and we are not just talking about fluid milk either. I think there is a tremendous market worldwide for cheese products and other dairy products which we can produce so well, so efficiently, with great quality here in the United States. But unfortunately, as I say, we spend too much of our time from a national perspective not looking for additional markets for our dairy farmers both here in the United States and around the world, but fighting amongst ourselves over this antiquated, Byzantine, unfair milk marketing order system.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pick up on 2 points that the gentleman made.

It is ironic that at this point in our history where as Americans we are so health conscious, we keep talking about dietary changes and the things that we should be doing especially for young people in trying to encourage good health practices, at that very time when we should be encouraging the free flow of milk all around the Nation and keeping milk prices low, we are actually reinforcing a system that does just the opposite. We are making milk a healthy, wonderful product. We are making milk more expensive than its counterparts. We are actually encouraging people to shy away from milk and to go towards such products as soda, and no one is going to say that soda rivals milk for health value. That is a great irony.

Secondly, I know a lot of people out there listening tonight are saying to themselves, well, if the price of milk is going to go up, that is okay if it goes to help the family farm. Well, perhaps the greatest irony of all is that the compact system, the Federal order system, hurts the small farmer to the advantage of the corporate farmer. Every analysis I have seen shows that the lion's share of the value of any increase in the price of milk does not go to that small family farmer. Instead, it goes to the large corporate farm.

Nothing against the corporate farms, but they are pushing the small farmer out, and again, as we put more and more of the means of production for dairy products in the hands of those large corporate farmers, we are losing control, and then one day when we only have milk being produced by a few, then we will truly see milk prices go up. We will have a true monopoly.

So for those out there who are saying, ''I am willing to pay more if it helps the family farm in Minnesota or in Wisconsin,'' the sad reality is it does not. Instead it pushes them out of business. We lost 2,000 dairy farms in Wisconsin last year, 2,000 dairy farms in Wisconsin the year before. We have lost 10,000 over the last 8 years. We have lost 50 percent of all dairy farms lost in the Nation over the last decade were lost in the upper Midwest in States like the gentleman's and mine.

So, people may be thinking that they are helping out dairy farmers with these higher prices. The sad reality is they are not. They are not. If anything, they are accelerating the decline of the family farm, and that is a great tragedy.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, if you look at this purple section here, we are losing an average of three dairy farm families every single day, and as my colleagues know, as I said earlier, if the definition, if this program was designed to protect the small dairy farm, I mean by its very definition it has been an abysmal failure. We cannot afford to continue this policy much longer.

And the gentleman is also exactly right that ultimately, unfortunately, unless we have some real reform of this system and at least have some fairness, and we cannot guarantee that some of these smaller dairy farmers are not going to go out of business. And I will be honest, some of them go out of business just because of quality of life.

I mean there is nobody who works harder than that dairy farmer who gets up every morning at 5 o'clock to milk 60 cows and then has to repeat the process that afternoon. I mean it is one of the hardest lives that anybody can take on, but it should not be made unfair by a Federal milk marketing order system which penalizes someone just because they happen to be from the upper Midwest.

Now in this great debate, and my colleague is going to learn the longer he is here in this business and in this city, when you talk about, and I do not even particularly like the term leveling the playing field. Actually I just like to talk about fairness. All we want is fairness. But many people will use the term ''leveling the playing field.'' The truth of the matter is, in any debate about leveling the playing field there is at least half of the people in that debate who do not want to level the playing field because they have an advantage, and they want to keep the status quo.

But even in some of those areas where they currently have a huge advantage, like the Southeast and down in Florida, even into Texas and over into New Mexico, the further away you get from Eau Claire, Wisconsin, I think even those people have to acknowledge that at the end of the day milk ought to be treated like almost everything else, and it ought to be priced more or less based on what the market will yield.

Now I am fully in favor of putting some kind of a minimum price under the floor of milk. In fact, I have introduced a bill this year to put a floor of at least 10.35.

□ 2145

I think there is a need to create some kind of a job absorber in case there are market aberrations which would drive the price of milk too low, but at the other end of the spectrum, part of the thing that happens with this also is in some respects, it keeps milk from going up. If one cannot expand markets, if one limits oneself in their ability to get into Asian markets with cheese and other dairy exports, ultimately one limits their ability to increase net farm income, and particularly farm income as it relates to dairy producers.

So this is a bad system, a bad system for dairy producers. It is bad because it causes conflict among the regions when we ought to be working together. It is a bad system because it ultimately costs consumers in some areas more than they should have to spend for the milk that they buy, and it really has done almost nothing to protect the small dairy farmer.

So from every perspective I think this has been an abysmal failure. The time has come, even though, as I said earlier, the plan that Secretary Glickman came up with is certainly not perfect; and frankly, on a net basis, we still lose under this plan, but we lose less than we are losing today.

So those of us in the upper Midwest, from Wisconsin, Minnesota, parts of the Dakotas, we are prepared to accept the Secretary's plan. We think it

should be allowed to go into effect, and frankly, we think we should do what the Congress said 2 years ago and then again repeated last year, and that is to allow the compacts to expire.

They were designed originally only as an experiment which would last a year, and part of that experiment was to find out if they could curb the number of small dairy farms that were going out of business. The evidence is in, the evidence is clear; they have not done that. They have cost consumers more money. They have increased the number of corporate farms on every front; in my opinion, the compacts have been an abysmal failure.

We should allow them to do what the agreement originally was, which is just keep all ends of the bargain, move ahead with the dairy reform that Secretary Glickman has come out with, and end these crazy compacts and do not expand them to other States.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. The gentleman has been fighting this fight a lot longer than I have, and I applaud his efforts.

I guess, just to wrap up and summarize, as the gentleman has pointed out, Secretary Glickman's order is not perfect; and for those of us in Minnesota and Wisconsin, we would argue it is far from it, and it is a very small, modest step. But at least it is a step in the right direction.

It recognizes that the long-standing system, standing since 1937, of Federal orders and compacts is bad for farmers, driving our family farms out of business; it is bad for consumers because it inflates the costs of milk, it adds a milk tax in so many ways; and finally, it is counter to free enterprise, free enterprise not just in the manufacturing sector, not just in the service sector, but even in the agricultural sector. It is the only agricultural product treated like this.

So it is bad on all counts. It is time to make a larger change, but at least to support Secretary Glickman's proposal, let that come on line, make a small but positive step and offer some hope to our farmers.

PROGRAMS THAT WORK FOR EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, this evening I want to spend some time with my colleagues talking about an issue that is important not only to me and my colleagues on the minority side, but I think to all Members of this Congress and certainly to the people of America.

The topic is education, an issue that we talk an awful lot about, but I want to talk this evening and share with my colleagues some examples of not only programs that work, but also people that are doing outstanding things for our children, certainly in my district and in my State.

I want to talk a little bit about an innovative program that I visited a couple of weeks ago in Greensboro. It was a program called Reading Together. One of the things that I learned before I came to Congress, and I think we have all known it for a long time, but certainly it was pointed out to me very vividly while I was superintendent of schools, if one can teach a child to read by the time they are in the third grade, one has accomplished a great deal as to what we need to do to help a child learn and do well, and certainly make it in school and in the world.

The Reading Together program is a program that is being piloted in a number of areas; I think it is in Pennsylvania, but also in Greensboro. What that program does is takes mentor students from the upper grades, and in this case they were fifth graders, and on a regular basis they are trained, they work with a trained teacher, and they come down and work with children who have difficulty reading in the earlier grades, normally in the first and second grade, and they become not only mentors, but they become tutors.

I watched them for over an hour, and in this process, as those children worked and worked with young people, they had been trained; and when they finished the reading, they debriefed the young person they were working with, and then when the second graders went back to their classes, the fifth graders met with their teacher. They then were debriefed, talked about what had happened, how each child had done, made notes, kept a journal.

These are things that very few adults do, and here we have young people doing them. I hear so many times people talk about our young people. They need to get out in the schools and see what is happening, the good things that they are doing, the outstanding jobs our teachers are doing. So I thought this was a good time to talk about these good things, as we are now all across America beginning to close down the school year.

In my State, some of the schools were out last Friday and others will finish up this Friday, and many Members like myself will be speaking at commencement exercises. I did last week and will again this week.

But I would like to share a program that really is working and making a difference. It is a pilot program that had been started really before I came to Congress, and it is working with some money through the U.S. Department of Education on a direct grant, and it is making a difference. The reading scores have improved dramatically.

Students really work their way out of these classes and into the regular class. So that is what it is all about. We give a child some help, and then they can help themselves.

Mr. Chairman, my friend from Maryland (Mr. (CUMMINGS) has been out in his schools working, and is a great leader for education and a leader in this Congress. He has some excellent examples, and I would like to yield to him so he may share those with us.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding and thank him for his leadership in the Congress in reminding all of us how important education is.

Mr. Speaker, I am a great believer in Dr. James Comer. Dr. Comer has a philosophy which I truly believe in, and he talks about the fact that a child can have the will, a child can have the genetic ability, but if a child does not have the opportunity, then that child is in trouble, he is going to have problems.

I look at my own life. I started it off in special education. I was told I would never be able to read or write. But because of opportunity, because there were teachers who stood by me and told me what I could be instead of telling me what I could not be, because of my parents who were involved, and I know we are going to be talking about parents tonight and how important that is; but I can remember, I say to the gentleman, that when my father, who worked at Davidson Chemical Company, he would come to our PTA meetings. And he used to work in the evenings and his boss would let him come to the PTA meetings in his overalls, all greasy, but he would come in there and talk to the teachers and participate in the PTA meetings, and he played a significant role in our lives, and the teachers expected him to be there.

But just going back to some of the things that the gentleman was saying a little while earlier, I too have been involved in these commencements and I have seen so many of our children who go through so much difficulty to get through high school and they make it, and it just makes one feel good to see those young people marching down that aisle and to know that they have truly accomplished something.

I think it is important for us as Members of Congress to do what the gentleman said that he does and I do and I am sure many of our other Members do, and that is to celebrate our children's lives, to celebrate their victories.

I think I was telling the gentleman a little bit earlier about a wonderful contest that we had in our State whereby our Department of Children, Youth and Family, the Governor's Department of Children, Youth and Family, sponsored a contest for the school that read the most books. Out of our 24 counties, I am very pleased to say, and out of our eight congressional districts, there was a school in my district that read the most books, an elementary school. The school is not located in the most affluent area, but these children made a decision that they were going to work hard; and they read these books and they had a way of making sure that they examined them, and they had to do little reports and whatever.

But I say to the gentleman, I am going to go by there when they have the awards to celebrate with them, to say, hey, you did a good job. I think that those are the kinds of things that are so important.

Again, I emphasize that I want to thank the gentleman, because as we watch the gentleman on this floor and all of the things that he does behind the scenes, his coming to this Congress has been very significant in that he has lighted the way we view education; and the gentleman has put it definitely out on the front burner and has made it something that is extremely significant, reminding us that if we support our children and work with them, we can make a difference.

So I am going to yield back to the gentleman, but I will be here for a while, so I look forward to just listening him.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman mentioned the reading program, and I want to share one with him, if I may. It was something that we started maybe 2 years ago, and I shared this with the gentleman earlier.

First, though, I want to tell a little story. We gave out an award we call the Golden Key Award for parent involvement, for the parents who got involved in the PTA, because I think this is the key to improving the quality of our schools and helping the teachers get the parents back in the schools.

So that led to the issue of how do we engage the parents with students and really help the reading, because I believe that is important.

When I came to Congress and was no longer superintendent, I wanted to keep that going. So we started what we call a Congressional Reading Program, for lack of a better word; I could not think of a better one. So what we do is, I have encouraged the students to read. I told them last year, if they would read 100 books, I would personally come and deliver a certificate.

Well, I figured there would be a few books read, and I had just an outstanding principal in Anderson Creek. We had a number of others involved. We had probably a half a dozen schools in our pilot, but we only do it for kindergarten, first and second graders. We did not want to go much higher than that, realizing how many it would be. So we kept about six schools involved. They did an outstanding job.

The reason I mention Anderson Creek is because they were one of our first pilots. They did it again last year. They must have had 300, and some children read 100 books, at least 100. Some of them read as many as 200 and 300. The significant thing was that when I went to give those awards a year ago, there were probably 400 parents, grandparents, aunts and uncles that filled up the gym.

So I will go back this year to give the awards again. This year, there were 481 children who read at least 100 books. Several of the children had read more than 500 books. I mean, we are talking about children reading two and three books a day. They were not very big. We did not tell them how thick the books had to be. But the interesting thing was the number of kindergartners in this school, a lot of them, they received an award.

Well, it is quite obvious to me that kindergartners, very few can read when they start, they do not read. But guess who read the books? The parents or the grandparents or the aunts or uncles, whoever. But what we do is, we get a significant adult involved with that child early and then we get the linkage to the school.

So this year I delivered 481 certificates. We had more parents in the gym than it would hold. They were standing outside. They stood in line, a lot of them stood up, because they did not have seats, for almost 2 hours because I stood up for 2 hours and handed out the certificates and shook the hand of every child in that school.

Mr. Speaker, I only tell that story because I think every Member can do something like that.

We ought to honor and encourage our children. It is not enough to stand on the floor of the House and point out the problems; there are plenty of problems in the world. But I think we need to go and honor and reward the good things that are happening.

I have always believed that if one rewards successes, one will get more. If you let people know you encourage good things, more good things will happen.

I was so pleased because I left there that day, and of course my back was sore from having to bend over to shake hands. When one is 6 feet, 6 inches and shaking hands with little folks, one gets sore, but I felt so good. I was late for the next school; I had to deliver more certificates.

We are now going to expand it.

But these are the kinds of things all of us can do. It is not very creative, and the cost of a little certificate is not much, but for some of those children it was so important. We could tell in talking with the children and watching their parents who came up to take the photographs.

The neat thing was the principal, a lady by the name of Alice Cobb, who is just an outstanding leader and a great educator, she was smart enough to understand how important it was to her children.

□ 2200

So she had a video camera going, digital video camera, through all of it so she could photograph every child in the video. Of course, as we know, one can print that out on paper. She sent me a whole stack of stuff she had done.

I know the type of person she was, that she had given every child a photograph when they got their certificate. There are some things that we do not think about sometimes. Those of us who are in public office appreciate being acknowledged. Just think what we will do for a plaque or certificate. So a child will do good things, and schools understand that.

I hear people sometimes belittle some of the good things teachers do and call it woman fusses. If you are a child and you need someone to say you look good today when you do not feel good, when you are not real sure you look good, someone to tell you you are a nice child or they love you when nobody at home may be telling you that, it may make the difference in that child's life. All of us can talk about things like that to make a difference.

We have to require the academics of every child, make them achieve the most they can do. We do that in North Carolina. We require it. We assess each child. We have a tough curriculum. But at the same time, all of us need to be loved, and every child needs that. If you do that, you encourage, you give them love and you give them tough love when you have to, you can get a lot.

That is what the gentleman is talking about with the program he was just sharing in his district. We can do a lot of those things.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I agree with him. As the gentleman was talking, I was thinking to myself that we spend a lot of time on this floor and we spend a lot of time in committee, but the kind of things that the gentleman is talking about costs very little.

We are always worried about how much money we are spending, spending. We just allocated quite a bit of money for the war in Kosovo. But the fact is, is that taking some time, just taking some time and celebrating, that is what we are doing. First of all, we are encouraging our children to read. Then when they have done that, we take time to celebrate their victories.

I have often said to parents in my district that there is nothing greater that we can do as adults, nothing greater than creating positive memories in the minds of children.

One of the things that I have to always remind myself of is that children think differently than we do. Those certificates will last those children until they die. They will go with them. That is something that they can look back on and say that ''I was recognized by one of 435 Members of the House of Representatives.'' Not a lot of children in our country can say that. That is very significant.

I have given certificates to children, and then parents will let me know, grandmothers let me know, ''You know what? You presented a certificate to my child 7 years ago, and it is still up there on my child's wall. It is up there on that wall to remind my child that she was recognized or he was recognized at an early age.''

That leads me to another point. I would like to really have the gentleman's comments on this. I had an opportunity to visit a school not very long ago where a teacher, the principal

said ''We really want you to see our best teacher.'' We had gone through several classrooms. My staff and I had gone through several classrooms.

When we got to this last classroom, it was a second grade class, and this was on a Monday. So the principal said, ''Well, Ms. Jones, what are you teaching today?'' She said, ''Well, I am teaching the material that we tested on Friday, this past Friday.'' So the principal said, ''Well, why are you doing that? I mean you already had the test.''

The teacher said something that will stick in the DNA of every cell of my brain forever. She said, ''Every child in my class should have an A, and not everybody got an A.'' That really touched me, because I mean she got it. She understood. She wanted all of her children to rise. She did not want some As, some Bs, some Cs and some Ds. She made it clear that ''I am going to make sure that all of my children rise so that they can move on to the next level.''

I think sometimes what happens is we are so busy trying to categorize our children that maybe, just maybe we do a disservice. One of the things that research has shown over and over again is that a lot of our children, the children that we talk about, the little kindergartners and the first graders, they have so much enthusiasm and they are so anxious to learn. Even when they are in that little 0 to 3, 2 and 3-year-old range, they are like little sponges and they are just grabbing information, and they are excited and jumping up and down.

But research has shown, as they get a little bit older, get to that fourth and fifth grade, a lot of times that enthusiasm for some reason goes down. I mean the gentleman from North Carolina having been an educator and the head of education for his State, I would just like to have his comments on that.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Maryland is absolutely correct. I have often said that children come to public schools across this country, and certainly in my State, from a number of backgrounds; and they do not all come.

This is where I get frustrated. I used to get frustrated at the State level, and I get frustrated here with some of my colleagues when they want to talk about and start criticizing the schools, because when they start doing that, they are criticizing our children.

My colleagues have to be careful because schools are children and the professionals that are trying to help them. They come from a variety of backgrounds, from a variety of experiences. But all of them do not come in top dollar for the same level of knowledge and experiences when they come to school. So they come, as the gentleman says, at different levels. That teacher understood it.

What the educators are talking about, when they say ''I want them to all have As,'' they are talking about mastery, so they are mastering the subject. There is a difference in learning and mastering. Most of us can get a bit of knowledge on the computer. If we get training here, all of us have computers in our office, and we have staffs to have mastery. A lot of us just have cursory understanding so we can turn it on and retrieve a little bit of information. If we want to get a little bit further, we have to call and get help.

What those teachers were saying to the principal and to the gentleman, I want all my children to be able to have mastery on this computer. I want them to be able to use it, not just turn it on and call for help. They want to be able to go and get all the data that it has in it.

I have often said that not all of us learn at the same speed. We forget that sometimes. It takes longer for others, and they still get it. If one watches students, if one ever notices, there will be some who we say they are slow. The truth is they are not as interested in school as others. They may not bloom until they get to be sophomores or juniors in high school sometimes. Sometimes it happens even after they leave high school.

There are stories, and I am sure there are Members right here on the floor of this House who would say that they went into the military or went somewhere else and came back. Many times, those who came out of the military, they had 2 or 3 years to adjust. All of a sudden, they came home and realized, ''I did not apply myself when I was in school. I really need to settle down and get focused.''

Today with a lot of young people who go into youth service corps or something else and leave school, and all of a sudden they say, gosh, ''I did not apply myself. I wish somebody would give me a quick kick in the slacks to understand what I needed.'' That is at that level.

But at the early years, where those youngsters are such sponges, and they really do want to learn. They come with bright eyes. If you watch those little ones, they all have bright eyes. They are ready to learn. They are ready to go.

There is something that we are learning more every day about the brain and how much children can learn and their capacities, and we are doing away with a lot of the myths we used to have, because all children can learn. Let me repeat that again. All children. It makes no difference what their economic, their ethnic, where they come from, or where they are going, all children can learn. They can learn at very high levels. They may have different learning styles.

Dr. Comer has a great program. We used him a number of times in North Carolina. We had a number of his projects in our State. I think he does just a wonderful job in showing that we need to bring the family nurturing the youngsters. Because if a youngster comes in in less than a nurturing background or comes to school hungry, and if someone tells us the child does not come, I can assure my colleagues they can go any place, most places in this country where they will see a child come in on Monday morning, and I am going to break the stereotype here because a lot of folks think when we are talking about youngsters, we are talking about children from economically deprived backgrounds. It may be children who just have not had a chance to eat, and it may be upper middle class neighborhoods many times, parents who have the resources. They do not take time to eat, and they grab something from school.

Certainly there are those who, after Friday afternoon, who get a regular meal during the week, and Friday is the last really regular warm meal they get until they show back up on Monday morning.

My wife works in the child nutrition program in my home county and has for a number of years. She said one can really tell it when school is out for the summer. A lot of the children are reluctant to leave because they know something is going to be missing. School is a safe haven for them, but it also provides for them a real nurturing environment.

We have had some problems recently in some of our schools. But, by and large, they are loving, caring, nurturing places for people who really make a difference.

We had a program, and I will come back to the question the gentleman raised again in a minute, that we started really in 1992, called Character Education. It was not unique with us. There is nothing really new under the sun. We borrowed a lot of things. We borrowed this from a professor at Vanderbilt and from a number of other folks. But Character Education is about teaching those things that we can all agree on that children ought to know. Rather than add it on as an add-on in the classroom, one really teaches it as an integrated part of the curriculum.

So in 1995 we got a grant, wrote a project, got a grant from the U.S. Department of Education, and it started in Wake, Cumberland and Mecklenburg Counties, our three larger counties. A lot of other counties, Nash County, Johnston County, Harnett and others picked it up.

But what we do in that process is the community goes through a meeting with parents, and the community says here is some of the basic issues; in this case, this two, four, six, eight, nine issues that they agreed on in Nash County. I think Wake is about the same. Trustworthiness. Most folks will not disagree with that. Respect, responsibility, caring, fairness, citizenship, perseverance, courage, self-discipline.

They teach this every single day in some part of the curriculum in every single school. My colleagues say, well, why is that important? When we get bogged down in arguments of whether

or not we ought to have prayer in school and all these other issues, that tends to be divisive. This is not divisive. We can agree on these, on all those issues.

If we look at those issues, those really are the kinds of issues that build communities, that build respect, that make a school what it ought to be.

In the process of putting this in, what we have found in some of our schools, I visited a school down in Johnston County, in Selma. I went in and talked with a principal. He said, ''Oh, yeah, it is working.'' He said, ''Our dropouts went down like 48 percent. The number of suspensions were down, in half.'' But he said, ''The significant thing was children have more respect for one another, for their teachers. And what we saw was our academic scores went up.''

So why would that happen? Very simply. We look at those issues. We are building trustworthiness. Pretty soon we have respect one for another. Children get to talk about those things in the classroom as a part of math, as a part of algebra or science or whatever they are doing.

So all of those things start to fit. Pretty soon, we find out that we are back to some of the things we used to do years ago in our schools, that we sort of bumped out, and now it is catching on in other places.

But we will be talking about some of these and having an opportunity, as my colleagues well know, in the weeks to come we will talk about the education budget that will come up. There will be those that say we do not need the Department of Education. We do not need those monies over there.

I am here to tell my colleagues, having been a former superintendent of school at the State level, that was a grant, and every penny of the money went to local schools, and it made a difference.

Now after we have been a pilot, we are putting it in in all of our schools, and it will now be used across the country, and the Department has become a clearinghouse.

Those are the kind of things that really make a difference. We take those sponges and start feeding them good stuff like this, along with a rich curriculum, and encourage them and reward them, pretty soon we start seeing the pressure that used to build that is not there, but the learning environment goes up. But it takes a long time to make a change.

Some people want to, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) and I understand this, that many times we want to pass legislation and have instant results. Last time I checked, about the only thing that is instant we can get is coffee and tea and those things we buy that are instant.

Children take a while to grow and to really make major changes in education. It really takes 8 to 10 years because it takes a child about 12 to 13 years to get through school.

□ 2215

Mr. CUMMINGS. I want to thank the gentleman for what he just talked about. When the gentleman presented that list, those are also the things that build character. That is what character is all about, when we look at that list, trustworthiness and respect.

But that leads me to something else also. We have, certainly in the last few weeks, this Congress and our Nation have become very, very upset about what happened in Littleton, Colorado, and what happened in Conyers, Georgia; and I think all of us have been searching for answers, as parents first and legislators second, trying to search our souls to try to figure out how can we bring a peace and a needed tranquility to our schools so that our children can learn and feel safe in school.

And one of the things that I guess has truly impressed me is a school in my district called Walbrook Senior High School. Walbrook is an inner city school and had had quite a few problems. They brought in a principal, a fellow named Andrey Bundley, Dr. Andrey Bundley; he is about 38 years old. And while other schools were putting up metal detectors, he was taking them down, and he did it with the very kind of things the gentleman just talked about.

What he said was, look, young people, let us create an environment of safety. This is before all of these events just happened or came about. But he said, I want to create an environment of safety, and he talked about the very things that the gentleman has there. He just said, we are going to be responsible for each other, we are going to respect each other, we are going to trust each other. He said, there is no such thing as a snitch because what we want to do is create an environment where we all feel safe.

So what I have done, taking a note from the gentleman's own notebook, I have created what I call the U-Turn Award. This is an award that we are presenting to schools that have been able to turn their schools around. And we are going to be presenting it on June 1 to Walbrook and to their principal, Dr. Bundley.

When I walk through that school, and the gentleman and I talked about this a little earlier, a person can walk through a school and in 30 seconds to a minute they can tell a lot about the principal. And when I walk through that school now, all the children are in their classes or they are moving peacefully through the halls. They are very respectful of each other.

Dr. Bundley, on my last visit, just stopped some students in the hall and he said, what kind of school do we have here, and they said we have a school where we respect each other. As Pollyanna-ish as it may sound, the fact is that is what it should be all about, reminding our young people.

And these kids are a little older now, because we are talking about high school, but reminding them that, as he says, if we all want a safe school, then we are all going to make sure we create an environment of safety and we are all part of that environment. The students have as much say as the principal has to say.

And then what he found was that a lot of these children, while their homes may not have been like that, when they got these lessons, acquired these lessons at school, he found them taking them into their homes. Because the parents would say, I am surprised, Johnny always talks about this trustworthiness and this responsibility.

What they discovered was that once they began to do that and they took down the metal detectors, they discovered that by having that type of responsibility, that trustworthiness, that looking out for each other, that that is sort of valuing the family, the family of the school, and it felt good. It felt good that they could sit in that classroom.

And the next thing that happened was, other people were recognizing it. And that is one of the most important things about this recognition that the gentleman talked about.

When I was in school, we felt so proud of our school. And one of the reasons we felt so proud was we always had people coming in, the Mayor would come in sometimes, the Congressmen would come in and would recognize what we did. So that creates a certain pride, and that is why when the gentleman talks about the awards that he gives, I think that is so special and so important. Because by coming in there and saying, look, gang, you are really doing a great job and I recognize you; and even tonight, the gentleman mentioning the schools that he has mentioned, and my mentioning the schools that I have mentioned, that word will get out. And I guarantee that somebody will be on a P.A. system tomorrow morning saying, guess what, in the Congress of the United States of America our school was mentioned or our school was highlighted.

But something else will happen, too, and that is that there will be other schools that will say, ''Well, the next time I see Congressman ETHERIDGE standing up, I'm hoping that he will talk about what we did.''

And something else will happen through this dialogue, and that is, other Members of Congress and other State and local officials will look at this and say, well, hey, maybe we can do some of these same things.

Because truly we all have to work together to make our schools work. So I take this moment to congratulate Walbrook Senior High School for what they have done. And, again, it is just so interesting that when the gentleman mentioned that list of items just a moment ago, it is the same list, almost identical to the very things that Dr. Bundley at Walbrook talked about.

I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. I thank the gentleman. And the truth is, like I said

earlier, there is nothing really new. You sort of borrow ideas and you redo them, but this came from people that had worked somewhere else, so we put it in, expanded it and made it work.

The gentleman talked about his schools, and I talked about Anderson Creek, I have been to, and Broadway, and the other schools in Lee County and up in Wake, but we are going to get a chance in this Congress in the next few weeks to show what kind of mettle we are made of, too. Because as the gentleman knows, we introduced a bill last week to create 30,000 more counselors to put in our schools across this country, that are badly needed, and 10,000 more resource officers to be out there to assist and help these young people in these areas where it is needed.

Because certainly in our middle and high schools there are not enough counselors to meet with them and counsel and help them with all the assessments. The others that are out there are doing all the paperwork. That is just one little piece; it will not solve all the problems, but it will sure help.

I trust before this Congress adjourns that we will also have a chance to deal with the issue all across America that we are all facing, in rural and inner cities and certainly in our growing communities, and that is this issue of school construction, an issue we can do something about it. I have a bill on it, the gentleman from New York (Mr. Rangel) does, a number of others do, and I trust we will pass something on that.

There are great needs. There is no question about it. And as an example, in Wake County, one of the counties I represent, they have grown 29.9 percent since 1990. And every county that touches it has grown in double digits. A small rural county, 29.7, adjacent to it. They cannot run fast enough to keep up. They are passing bond issues and they still cannot keep up. And I think it is time, if we really believe what we say up here and we really believe education is important, I happen to believe it is one of the most important things beyond our national defense that we have to put out, we are going to have to step up to the plate and take care of that issue.

We can do it on a one-time basis through the tax code to really help these States and localities meet the needs. Because as the gentleman well knows, over the next 10 years we will see some of the fastest growth at our high school levels in the history of this country, because we are going to see the ''baby boom echo,'' as they are calling it. The baby boomers are having children, and that growth is going to come, and we have an obligation, I think, to help meet that need.

I would yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CUMMINGS. As the gentleman was talking about school construction, one of the things that we recently did in my district, we had to get new computers, and so we decided to take our old computers and give them to one of our public schools. And the amazing thing about this situation is, when we gave those computers, we did not know how bad off that school was.

The school had 1,600 students and they had 260 kindergartners. And the interesting thing, out of that 260 kindergarten children, they had one computer. One computer. And what the principal and the teachers would do, they were very innovative and they were able to rotate those 260 kids around one computer.

Now, what we did in our district is, just last week, we gave nine computers. And we were able to clean them up and get them to these kindergartners and these first graders. But I wish the gentleman could have seen how excited they were about those computers. And one of the things that we said during our press conference was that we were encouraging other businesses and other government agencies, before they just toss those computers away, to look at our schools.

When a school has a total of 1,600 kids and one computer in this day and age, that is not very good. I look at my office, and we do not even hire folks unless they are pretty efficient and effective with regard to using a computer. And I mention that only because I thought about the fact that my office had gotten EPA a few months ago to give some computers, but the school was so ill-equipped and so old that they did not even have the proper electrical circuits to use the computers.

So that goes back to what the gentleman was saying, and I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. That is absolutely true. And that is why when we talk about school construction and renovation, and I should have added renovation to it, and someone says, well, the building I went to was fine, they are not even being honest with themselves when they say that, because the truth is, if there is a building and it is not wired for computers, it has to be done.

Now, there is a program that we did in North Carolina, and a lot of States have done it, where the community actually goes in and helps rewire the buildings. And that is all well and good, but those computers need to be networked. They need stations in the classroom. And if we do not allow children that access, it makes no difference where they come from, whether the inner cities or rural areas, that becomes, in my mind, one of the real problems we have in this country.

There might be those who would say to that, we do not really need the computers, we need to teach them to read and write. Well, give students a computer, and they will learn to write. People tell me, we do not have computers; we cannot write. Today, with computers and sending e-mail, people are doing more writing today than they have ever done in their lives. There are fewer clerical positions and more managers are using that.

So my point is that for children, when we put the computers in a kindergarten classroom, the students just start to shine. They absolutely shine. And the point the gentleman made about donating his computers, I gave mine, we gave some of ours out of our office a couple of weeks ago, and I would encourage other Members of Congress to do so. All they have to do is get permission. They can do it when they buy new ones.

There are a lot of them out there. But I would hope they would turn them over pretty quickly so they can get good equipment and not get worn-out equipment. Because the last thing schools need is old, worn-out equipment. They all upgrade them.

I will share this story with the gentleman, because there is a program going on, and actually this Congress helped fund it last time, though I was not aware of it, but we have a couple of schools that actually take the computers, they get the internal parts from one of the, I am not sure which computer firm they get it from, and they actually rebuild the computers so they are up to date with the new standards and all the speed of the new computers. And they are letting the young people do it in school as part of their vocational classes.

So when that youngster comes out of school, not only can they operate a computer, they can help build one. And they have a job as a technician available to them just like that, and they make good money.

So there are things we can do to help if we will be creative and innovative.

And there is no question that if we have just one computer to even 25 children, that is not enough. We tried to put them in North Carolina, 1 to 50, and we realized that would not work. Then we upped it to 1 in 25. But really they should have five in a classroom, where there are no more than 25 students. Then when they start working in stations, there is tremendous results. The teacher can work in other areas while that child is working on computers.

The gentleman has been in classrooms, as I have, I am sure; and especially if there are enough computers, they are over there just working at it, going to it, just doing all those things. And the neat thing about a computer is, what the child is doing can be instantly assessed. They get instant feedback, and that is so important.

Mr. CUMMINGS. And they love it. They actually love it.

I assume we are beginning to run out of time here.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TANCREDO). The gentleman has 18 minutes remaining.

Mr. CUMMINGS. As I was listening to the gentleman, I was thinking about how great this country is and how blessed we are to be here, and I could not help but think about all the things

that the gentleman and I have talked about tonight. And the gentleman said something to me earlier that just really touched me.

□ 2230

My colleague said that what we need to do is make sure we talk about the positives. So often I think what happens is that we hear the negative stories and we do not hear the positives.

Right now probably tonight all over this country and for the next two or three weeks young people are going to be marching down aisles of auditoriums and some of them will have graduation in churches. And these young people have achieved a lot.

I look at some of the students in my district, the graduation I just attended. A young man had cancer throughout his last 3 years of high school, and he is graduating with honors. Then I think of a young lady whose mother had died of AIDS, and she took care of her brothers and sisters for 2 or 3 years and now is graduating with a very, very high average, over 92 average. I really think that, and that is why I say my colleague is absolutely right, we have to look at all the wonderful things that our children are doing.

As I have said to many audiences in my district, these are the children that come from our womb. They are the children that have our blood running through their veins. And if we do not lift up our children, who are we going to lift up, I mean if we really think about it? I think that we, as a Congress, have to continue to find innovative ways to lift our children up so that they can be the best that they can be.

Every time I see a group of children come here to the Capitol, and I saw my colleague talking to a group just in the last week or so, I look at those children and I ask myself, Where will they be 5 years from now? Where will they be 10 years from now? Will they be sitting in the Congress? Will they be teachers? Will they be lawyers? Will they be doctors? Or will they have dropped out?

And I know that we as adults have a tremendous responsibility to do everything in our power to make their lives the very best that they can be. Because when we really think about it, if it were not for adults that gave us the guidance, we would not be standing here right now. If it were not for the teachers that taught us to read and write and do arithmetic, we would not be here right now.

So I think we have to continue to say to ourselves, look, it is not enough to talk, but to go out there and do the kinds of things that my colleague and I have talked about this evening. And again, I applaud my colleague for all the wonderful things that he has done and I thank him for sharing this evening with me and sharing these ideas. Because I am going to take a lot of the ideas that my colleague just talked about now, and I have got to tell him, I might not give him the credit for them when I take them, but I am going to use them. But I want to thank him for his leadership.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for his help and for being here this evening.

Let me close and say to my colleagues that this thing of education is no one has a lock on all that needs to be done. We have thousands of teachers across this country who every day go into those classrooms and fight the battle of ignorance day after day. They do it without a great deal of pay, but they deserve forever our gratitude and our thanks.

The children who will soon be following us as doctors and lawyers and teachers and preachers and, as I told a group that graduated the other night, if they slip up, they might become politicians and become congressmen and governors, but the truth is they are great youngsters and we have an obligation to be better role models. We really do.

Because most of them, most of them, are great youngsters. We hear about those problems. And I think we have an obligation to make sure that we honor those who do well and encourage those who want to do better and challenge those that slip up. And I think if we will do that, they will do better, we will be prouder of them. And that means that we have an obligation here to make sure that we shepherd the resources we have, that we do fund the education budget to the extent that we can and stretch it a little bit when we have to. Because there are a lot of places in this country where, as my colleague has pointed out, there are not enough computers. We can help.

The school buildings are not as safe as they ought to be, 50- and 60-year-old buildings that are not air-conditioned, that are not wired well. We can do better. In our Nation, in having the boom time we are having today, if we cannot fix them today and provide those resources for a good environment for children to learn, if we tell a child school is important and then he rides by a $40- or $50-million prison to go to a $3-million school, he has already figured out what is important in that community.

We can do something about that. We can make that school an attractive, inviting place to go if it is well-lighted. And lighting is important if we are talking about learning.

So let me thank my colleague for joining me this evening in this special order.

DRUG CRISIS IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TANCREDO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, again tonight I come to the floor to discuss this serious situation in our Nation relating to the problem of illegal narcotics.

I was pleased in January to assume responsibility to chair the House Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources, which deals with formulating our national drug policy.

I know that on the front pages of tomorrow's newspapers the stories of China sabotage and I know that illegally obtained intelligence, the fundraising scandals, money that poured into our country through illegal foreign contributions, sabotage of our intelligence, information relating to missile technology are serious problems and will be splashed across the headlines tomorrow.

I know what the headlines have been for the past several weeks since Columbine and Atlanta that the Nation's attention, the Congress' attention, has been riveted on the question of school violence. And we all are saddened by these great tragedies.

But let me say tonight, and I have said it before, that for every instance of school violence, if we took all the instances of school violence and death in Paducah, Kentucky; Jonesboro, Arkansas; and Columbine and we added up all of those tragic deaths the last several years, we would still have a small figure of 30 or 40 individuals maybe maximum; and, unfortunately, I hate to use this analogy, but unfortunately, we have a Columbine times three or four every single day in the United States as a result of the use of illegal narcotics.

The effects of illegal narcotics on our society are dramatic and costly. They are indeed costly to over 1.8 million Americans, almost 2 million Americans who are behind bars. Estimates are that some 60 to 70 percent of those incarcerated in our prisons and jails and penitentiaries are there because of a drug-related offense.

I might say they are not there for casual use of drugs. They are there because they have committed a crime while under the influence of illegal narcotics, they are there because they have committed a felony, robbery, they have been trafficking and selling illegal narcotics. And they are the victims of illegal narcotics. But we have nearly 2 million Americans behind bars.

The cost that this Congress will be considering in a few more weeks to fund the anti-narcotics effort is probably in the range of $18 billion. That is the direct cost that we will look at funding because of, again, the problems created by illegal drugs.

That is only the tip of the iceberg. We spend somewhere in the neighborhood of a quarter of a trillion dollars a year in the tremendous cost of social, economic, welfare support, judicial systems, incarceration, all these costs to our society because of the illegal narcotics problem.

Again, the tragedy is just immense. And again, we have the equivalent of a Columbine times three or four every single day. The sad part about all this is that many of these tragic deaths are

our young people. The sad part about this is that last year over 14,000 Americans lost their lives to drug-related deaths.

The tragedy is that, in the past 6 years, under the Clinton administration, going on 7, we in fact have lost almost a 100,000 people. That is the number of Americans killed in some of our wars and conflicts. That is the size of entire populations of cities. It is an incredible tragedy.

And somehow tomorrow in the newspapers it will not be publicized along with the China sabotage or the Columbine problem. But what will be publicized is back in the obituaries or on the local page or the State page is a list of human tragedies. And those tragedies will be recounted in heroin overdose deaths. They will be recounted if someone would have died at the hands of someone under the influence of narcotics, someone who is committing a felony, another murder, under the influence of illegal drugs. Those are the sad statistics of this tragedy that we are facing as a Nation.

I come again tonight to talk about this, Mr. Speaker, because I think it is the most important and critical social problem facing our Nation, long ignored, not talked about.

As chair of that subcommittee, human resources is one of our topics, in addition to criminal justice and drug policy. We conducted a hearing this past week of over 6 hours, hearing from various school officials and law enforcement officials, some district attorneys, and other people involved with schools, psychiatrists, psychologists. And they repeatedly told our panel that, in fact, illegal narcotics and drug use are at the root of most of our school violence problems.

Of course, we only see splashed across the front pages of our newspapers and on our television nightly screens one incident with a large number of casualties at one time. This is a slow and tragic death, again, thousands of them across the Nation, and an effect on our young people that is dramatic. Most of the victims of this tragedy are prime youth and are young people.

Let me also talk tonight about the history of the problem. And I try not to be partisan in nature, but I do want to be factual and state that part of the reason that we have this epidemic particularly of hard narcotics, heroin, cocaine, methamphetamines, in the United States and other dramatic increases in usage of illegal drugs is really the result of the policy of the Clinton administration.

If we look at the charts, and I have said this before, back in the 1980s we had an explosion of cocaine back in the Reagan administration. But we saw that the policies of President Reagan brought the statistics down, the usage down, of illegal narcotics and the deaths down from hard drugs.

□ 2245

That continued into the Bush administration, with tough policies, tough eradication at the source, tough interdiction, use of the military, the Coast Guard, every possible resource of the United States to bring down illegal narcotics trafficking and the supply of hard drugs into this country.

Unfortunately the new President in 1993 as one of his first policies adopted cuts in the Drug Czar's office, began the elimination of many of the personnel in the Drug Czar's office, and then adopted a policy which I think we are still seeing the results of today. That is cuts in the interdiction forces; that is, trying to stop drugs at their source. Cuts and elimination of the source country eradication programs; that is, stopping the growth and production of illegal narcotics at their source. Again the two most cost-effective ways of stopping illegal narcotics. And then we saw the cuts of the military, dramatic cuts of use of the United States military in the interdiction of drugs, a Federal responsibility of stopping the flow of illegal drugs before they came to the borders of the United States. And then we also saw dramatic cuts, almost 50 percent cut in some of the Coast Guard budgets that protected some of our areas and coastal regions, particularly around Puerto Rico, where we had a good barrier to stop illegal narcotics coming into the United States through Puerto Rico.

Then, to top off these cuts, the President appointed a Surgeon General and that Surgeon General sent a mixed message. Joycelyn Elders did probably as much damage as any public official in the history of the United States as far as bad health policy. She sent a mixed message that even our young people repeat today, of ''Just say maybe'' to casual drug use.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICA. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. As a Member of the Republican task force who served with the gentleman last year, I want to first say I commend his leadership on this because not only is he down here night after night speaking about the need for Congress to act quickly but he is doing that in committee and he is a consistent national leader on this. I am here also because I am a father of a 16-year-old, a 14-year-old and a 10 and an 8-year-old and much to my shock these children are already able to get drugs at their school, as almost all kids across America are able to get it in the school yard. The fact that he is saying, ''Let's attack the source of these drugs, let's enforce the law when you are caught with it, and let's work with treatment,'' I think that is very important. I too as a parent when the President's appointee said the statement, you know, ''Let's legalize marijuana,'' I was shocked and very concerned about that.

Mr. MICA. Our President sets the tone. I think that as a role model, as an individual who young people look up to, when you have the President appoint a Surgeon General that sends a mixed message, our young people pick that up. When you have a President that has said, ''If I had it to do over again, I would inhale,'' our young people pick that up.

Now, the gentleman told me that he had teenagers. Could he tell me the ages of them again?

Mr. KINGSTON. Sixteen, 14, and one 10 turning 11.

Mr. MICA. The gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Speaker, might be interested in this National Household Survey on Drug Abuse, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Administration report dated August 21, 1998. I did not know the gentleman from Georgia was coming tonight to mention the ages of at least two of his children, but this is the report. For kids 12 to 17, first-time heroin use surged a whopping 875 percent from 1992 to 1996. That is an 875 percent increase in heroin use among our teenagers. So I believe that a policy has consequences, and the consequences of a bad policy of sending a mixed message and also of not having a policy in place that stops drugs at their source in a cost-effective manner results in an increased supply, a lowering of price, a tremendous availability of illegal narcotics at these sources and into the United States.

In my central Florida area, a banner headline in the Orlando Sentinel shouted out recently that in fact drug deaths exceeded homicides in central Florida. So this is the type of result we are seeing from a policy that was enacted some 6 years ago and again through repeated failures of this administration.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will yield further, I want to make sure that in a nutshell what he is saying, as the usage has actually gone up, the number of arrests and enforcement has gone down?

Mr. MICA. The number of arrests, I believe, have gone up. The enforcement prosecution did go down with this administration. Now, we have hammered them some and there has been more prosecution. However, those statistics are dramatically impacted by New York City and several other tough Republican mayors. The statistics in New York City are so dramatic where you have had tough enforcement by Mayor Guiliani. For example, they had approximately 2,000 murders, 1,980 we will say, in the year he took office. Tough enforcement has resulted in a 70 percent drop, somewhere in the range of 600 murders in the entire population of New York City. So that type of tough enforcement, tough prosecution has actually skewed some of the national figures.

But if we look at the Department of Justice under this administration, they failed to go after drug dealers and hard core drug offenders in the numbers that they should have.

I also wanted to point out to my colleagues that according to the Drug Abuse Warning Network, which is called DAWN, the annual number of

heroin-related emergency room admissions and incidents increased from 42,000 in 1989 to 76,000 in 1995, an 80 percent increase. This is from the National Narcotics Intelligence Consumer Committee report in November of 1998. The number of Americans who used heroin in the past month has increased steadily since 1992. The number of Americans who used heroin in the past month increased from 68,000 in 1993, the year this President took office, that was 68,000, to 325,000 in 1997. This is also according to the National Household Survey on Drug Abuse. This is the most recent data we have from 1997. Heroin users are becoming younger, they are becoming more diverse. And because the heroin that we are seeing come into the United States today has much higher purity levels, we are seeing dramatic increases in deaths, particularly among first-time users, particularly among young people who mix heroin with some other substance, alcohol, other drugs and do not know that the purity levels are absolutely deadly. So that is why we are seeing so many young people dropping like flies in Florida and in other areas of the United States.

Mr. KINGSTON. Where does the heroin primarily come from? Is this also Colombia?

Mr. MICA. I am glad the gentleman asked.

Mr. KINGSTON. The gentleman just happens to have a chart.

Mr. MICA. I brought back tonight one of my charts to show the flow of illegal narcotics. This is a pretty simple pattern. Before the President took office in 1993, Colombia was really more of a transit country and drug processing country. Now, since we have had such good results with President Fujimori of Peru who has also had a tough enforcement program and President Hugo Banzer in Bolivia, the production of cocaine and coca is down dramatically in those countries. In the past 2 years, the Republican majority has helped those two countries in stopping drugs at the source, cutting drug production through eradication policies and alternative crop policies.

Now, would you not know it, but in 1993, again there was almost no coca produced in Colombia. It was almost all produced in Bolivia and Peru. But this administration through its policy managed to make Colombia the largest producer of cocaine in the world. In 1993, there was almost no heroin produced in Colombia. Most of our heroin came in from Asia or through Afghanistan and Balkan routes. This administration managed through its policy of stopping aid and assistance to Colombia to make Colombia the source of 75 percent of the heroin. It is the largest heroin producer in the world today. They managed to do all this since 1993. The way this heroin and cocaine is now coming up, the Colombians have formed cartels with the Mexicans, and then some is coming up through and past Puerto Rico and into the United States through these routes. So the very direct policy, despite letters, despite pleas by the chairman of our Committee on International Relations, by the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform, by numerous Members of Congress to get helicopters, to get ammunition, to get assistance and resources to Colombia to stop this production and trafficking, Colombia now is the major producing area.

I will say that with some of those individuals I mentioned, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), we participated in a dedication and contract signing of six helicopters which are on their way to Colombia, these are Black Hawk helicopters, to start in an eradication program.

Now, our other problem area, and this is Mexico, and despite this administration giving NAFTA approval, underwriting the finances of Mexico, Mexico is the largest source of illegal narcotics coming into the United States through these routes. Again, despite being a good ally, a good friend, Mexico has turned almost into a narcoterrorist state as a result of the amount of trafficking.

So this is the pattern of illegal narcotics. Heroin, cocaine and methamphetamine coming into the United States today. What is disturbing about this pattern is that in spite of all of the assistance this Congress and this administration has given to Mexico, Mexico has really slapped the United States in the face.

When both of my colleagues who are on the floor were with me 2 years ago in March, the House of Representatives passed a resolution asking Mexico to help in about five different areas. First of all, we asked Mexico to extradite a major drug trafficker or major drug traffickers, assist us in extraditing those who have been indicted in the United States, Mexican nationals, and send them to the United States. And what did we get in return? This past week, the New York Times, ''Setback for Mexico in 2 Big Drug Cases.'' Major producer, again we have helped Mexico, we are a good friend and ally of Mexico. What did they do? Let me read this:

''Mexico City, May 19. Efforts to prosecute the Amezcua Contreras brothers whom the American authorities say rank among the world's largest producers of illegal methamphetamines appear to be collapsing.''

They have in fact let these brothers who were part of this methamphetamine operation off the hook, dropped the charges against them. Two of them, I understand, are still held in detention. One has been set free. Even the Mexicans, who are corrupt from the bottom to the very top, and I can prove what I am saying with those remarks, are chagrined that even their judicial system has collapsed, even their judicial system is corrupt, and these decisions go as high as their Supreme Court in Mexico.

□ 2300

So, it is a very sad day when we have not one major Mexican drug dealer extradited to date. We have had one Mexican national, and that is only one, and that was a minor player, but not one major Mexican drug dealer has been extradited to the United States, and again, this is in spite of the assistance that this Congress has given that country, in spite of financial aid, NAFTA trade and other benefits that we have bestowed on Mexico.

And part of it is because of the failed policy of this administration. They made a charade out of the certification process, rather than decertifying Mexico and giving them a national interest waiver and holding them under the microscope of our law which says that we must certify whether a country is fully cooperating.

Now I ask you: Is Mexico fully cooperating when they let drug traffickers out? Is Mexico fully cooperating when last year these statistics were provided us?

Mexican drug seizures were down in 1998. Opium was down, the seizure of opium in Mexico, 56 percent. The seizure of cocaine was down in Mexico by 35 percent. The seizure of vehicles and vessels involved in narcotic trafficking was down.

To top it off, we held a hearing in our subcommittee to find out what was going on in Mexico, and I talked about corruption. This is a March 16 article from the New York Times. This should absolutely frighten every Member of Congress, every member and parliamentarian in any civilized legislative body, to know that one country could be so corrupt from the bottom to the top, and particularly one that is a close ally of the United States.

This article by Tim Golden details how our Customs agents penetrated Mexican military and other Mexican high officials' offices and discovered that the Mexicans, in this case a general and maybe as high as the Minister of Defense, were attempting to launder $1.15 billion. That is one individual was trying to launder $1.15 billion. That is how high the corruption has grown in this country, and that is how serious this problem is. And think about that. That is over a billion dollars that one individual was trying to launder in that country.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will yield, what is the benefit to a country being certified, and why do we decertify it, and why has it become so political, because it does appear by the bipartisan findings of the gentleman's committee that Mexico is not cooperating in giving us the statistics that we need to fight drugs, but it seems to get politicized once the issue gets to the floor of the House.

Mr. MICA. Well, only in this administration has it so politicized. The law is a simple law. The law was passed in 1986. President Reagan and the Republican Senate passed the law that just tied foreign aid and foreign assistance

to cooperation in eradicating drugs and trafficking, stopping trafficking in their drugs.

So the law is simple. It says that if a country is cooperating with the United States to stop illegal narcotics, then they get our finance benefits, they get our trade benefits, they get our foreign aid.

Now Mexico does not get a lot in the way of foreign aid, as some Third World countries may get from the United States, but what it gets is tremendous trade benefits, a trade benefit and now we have an incredible imbalance, that many more cheap Mexican goods are pouring into the United States. We have lost tens of thousands of jobs to Mexico.

We have provided most of the financing and underwriting for Mexico, including a bailout which basically saved their financial system. So in turn we ask for very little. We have asked for cooperation in going after these corrupt officials, we have asked for extradition.

This is what Tom Constantine, our DEA administrator, said on February 24, 1999. He said: In spite of existing United States warrants, government of Mexico indictments and actionable investigative leads provided to Mexico by U.S. enforcement, limited enforcement action has taken place within the last year.

This is Tom Constantine, and I might say that one of the saddest bits of news that I bring to the floor tonight is that Tom Constantine, who has been a shining light in this scandal-ridden administration, who has been a tough spokesperson in restarting the War on Drugs, there was no War on Drugs under this administration except for what Tom Constantine has done, Tom Constantine has unfortunately announced that he will be leaving this summer, a tremendous blow to our efforts. He is the only one who has been speaking out, the only one who has repeatedly said that we have to restore the eradication programs, the interdiction programs, the use of the military, the Coast Guard, and that tough law enforcement does work, and he has proved it time and time again before our committee with statistics, with facts. So, it is a great loss to the Congress, it is a great loss to the American people, it is a tremendous loss to the war on drugs which we have restarted under this Republican Congress, and his departure is a sad note for us this evening.

I wanted to also talk tonight a little bit about some of the other things that Mexico was requested to do and has not done.

First, I mentioned extradition. Then I mentioned going after these corrupt officials in enforcing their laws, and they did not enforce their laws.

Even worse is we had an operation, another Customs operation in Mexico dealing with money laundering, and we found in this operation, which was called Operation Casablanca, that hundreds of millions of dollars were being money laundered, and when we discovered this, we informed the Mexicans. We know the Mexicans knew about this operation.

What did the Mexicans do rather than cooperate with the United States? They threatened to indict and go after our Customs officials. So, did we have cooperation? The answer has to be no based on, again, the extradition requests, based on the failure to go after these corrupt officials, based on their coming after our agents and threatening them.

So these are several areas, and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my friend from Florida, and representing a border State, as I do in Arizona, I share my colleague's concern, Mr. Speaker, because as my friend from Florida has capably laid out for us this evening, the time has come for a reasonable, sober reassessment of our relationship with our ally, Mexico. That is something I do not say lightly, given the fact that the history of Arizona, indeed the history of this Congress of the United States has been one of cooperation with our neighbor to the south.

But part of being a good neighbor entails a reasonable interchange and expression and ability to achieve common goals. As my friend has pointed out, sadly Mexico has devolved into a leading distributor and source of illegal drugs in our society, and because of that we must have this reassessment.

It is especially vexing to a State like Arizona with a vast border area, with many problems that entail this situation in terms of border security, and let us not forget that it is our constitutional charge to protect the borders of the United States.

□ 2310

As compelling as the facts and figures are, I think both my friends from Florida and Georgia, Mr. Speaker, and indeed everyone in the House, knows there is a very real human equation at work that these threats come to Americans, and while this is not warfare in the traditional sense, still, it is an assault and an attack on the very fiber of our society. We talk about increasing drug usage. We talk about a cavalier attitude expressed, sadly, by this President in an appearance on MTV when asked by one of the young people in the audience, if you had it to do all over again, would you inhale, and the President said, yes, I would. To use that cavalier notion toward drug usage sets a pattern that is very difficult to break.

Now our friend tells us of the soon-to-be expected departure of Mr. Constantine from his role and indeed, one who has observed this administration and tried to work on common goals, those of us in the Congress cannot help but note that it is incredibly ironic that many of the capable, effective people in a variety of different posts leave, and those who should bear the responsibility for a number of misadventures and maladroit steps insist on staying on the job in a variety of different areas.

Indeed, I think we are not far afield at all when we point out that this is a threat to our families, to our citizenry; indeed, this is a threat to our national security. As much as we want to be a good neighbor, and I have participated in the U.S.-Mexico Interparliamentary Conference in the past, the State of Arizona has a very strong relationship with the Mexican State of Sonora first established by a former Governor of Arizona much earlier, now almost 30, maybe in excess of 30 years ago when we look at the panorama and the march of time, and yet the words of my colleague from Florida are compelling, because they insist that this House and this government reassess the relationship with Mexico, reassess our relationship with these States that export narcoterrorism, and that is something we do not say lightly. Because, as my colleague has pointed out, in the past Mexico has been a strong ally of the United States. As my colleagues have also pointed out, Mr. Speaker, the United States has been a good friend to Mexico.

I can recall in the first days when I arrived when the now departing Treasury Secretary, Robert Rubin, came to new Members of the 104th Congress, asked us to step up to the plate and essentially bail out the Mexican economy, prop up the currency there, and of course the President found almost what could be called an executive end run to provide those loan guarantees because they knew it would be very rough going in the Congress of the United States.

So I share my friend's concern. I salute his determination and his dedication to bringing this issue to light, and more than just bringing the issue to light, Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Florida, in his committee jurisdiction, has also worked, as we did in the 105th Congress on the Drug Task Force, to find credible solutions. For that, I salute him, and from a border State like Arizona, and indeed across the whole phalanx of the Southwestern border of the United States, this becomes a major concern.

Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker. Just as we see threats from around the world, threats as relevant as tomorrow's headlines in view of bipartisan work in other areas, so too do we confront a threat to our families, to our children and, sadly, directly in our hemisphere, and it is a threat that has gone unabated. It is a threat that has increased, and this House is compelled, I think, by the work of our colleague from Florida, to take a closer look to deal with the security of our homes, the security of our families; indeed, our national security in this very important area of rising drug abuse and a cavalier attitude that has been expressed.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for his leadership and coming out tonight to talk about this topic that is so important to American society.

I just want to continue along the line that I had been talking about, and that is the problems with Mexico. We have not had one major drug dealer extradited. Despite over 200 requests for extradition and requests specifically for over 40 major drug dealers, not one Mexican national has been extradited today as far as a major drug dealer.

In addition to that, we talked about the enforcement, lack of enforcement, the corruption at the highest level, not enforcing the laws that they have on the books. In addition, this Congress asked two years ago that the Mexicans install radar to the south. It is a simple request. If we look at where the drugs are coming in, they are coming in from the south. We asked that they install radar to the south, and still no radar to the south that was promised, and again when our President met with President Zedillo in the Yucatan Peninsula earlier this year. To date, still no maritime agreement signed; there is no agreement to go after drug traffickers in these waters, particularly Mexican nationals.

Finally, we had asked for protection of our drug DEA agents, our drug enforcement agents. We have a small number in that country. We had one of our agents just horribly tortured and murdered in the 1980s. We do not want to see that repeated. We want our agents to be able to defend themselves, and still we have been denied that ability for our law enforcement agents that are working in Mexico.

So Mexico, what do we get? This administration ruined the certification process, made a joke of it and still continues to certify a country as fully cooperating. They are not by any measure.

I might say tonight that we will have before this House in the not-too-distant future several measures that will deal with this that the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the chairman of the Committee on International Relations; the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform; the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), our chairman of the Select Committee on Intelligence; and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM), our chairman of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice of the Committee on the Judiciary, have been working on with the Members of Congress. So there still will be responsibility to the country of Mexico for their involvement in illegal narcotics. This new Congress will hold their feet to the fire.

I just want to talk again about another failed policy, international policy, and it is our responsibility to deal with these issues of where the drugs are coming from. It is tougher as these drugs get to the streets, but if we can stop them at their source, their transiting before they get here, it is much more cost-effective.

One of the stories we will not read on the front page of the paper tomorrow is about the bungled negotiations of this administration in Panama. Now, why is Panama important? Again, I can hold this up and if we look and see Colombia through Panama up to Mexico, that is where these narcotics transit. But Panama has been the center of all of our narcotics operations, all forward surveillance operations for the United States and the Caribbean area, the south and Central America. Of course we see where drugs are coming from, which is primarily from Colombia, one of the major sources that this administration has helped make a major source. And as of May 1, 1999, just a few weeks ago, we were basically kicked out of Panama. We had 15,000 flights from Panama last year, and there were zero as of May 1. This administration bungled the negotiations, and we were told months and months ago that negotiations were going forward. When we found out earlier this year that the State Department had dropped the ball, we asked what was going to be done. The administration has scurried the last few months and signed interim agreements with Curacao, Aruba, the Netherlands and also with Ecuador for temporary bases there.

We were told that on May 1 we would be ready to go. We were told on May 1 we would have flights continuing.

□ 2320

We were told that, at the very worst, maybe we would have a 50 percent reduction in flights after May 1 in testimony before our subcommittee. What have we found out that has taken place? From Ecuador, there are zero. There have been zero flights from Ecuador, zero flights. From Aruba and Curacao, just a few limited flights.

So basically this administration bungled the negotiations with Panama. We are turning over 5,600 buildings, $10 billion in assets. Already we have seen, in addition to closing down Howard Air Force Base, another scandal that should be on the front pages of the newspaper, that our two ports in Panama that we had operated out of had been given through corrupt vendors, and these are the words of our administration officials, through corrupt vendors to foreign countries; and one of them happens to be the Chinese.

In both instances, I believe the Chinese Liberation army owns or has a controlling interest in the stock and ownership of those activities. So we basically turned over the Panama Canal and one of the ports to the Red Chinese Army. The other one, again also through a corrupt vendor and through a Taiwan-Hong Kong front, that second port is gone.

Our major drug operation in that entire region we have been kicked out of as of May 1. The interim agreements are not signed. I believe the agreement in Ecuador is only for a few months. At the last hearing our subcommittee held, we were presented a bill for another $40 plus million for improvements in addition to $73 million which the Drug Czar put in the budget for relocating the forward surveillance operations of the United States.

So basically we are wide open for the hard drugs to come into this United States. Panama is a wide open area. Again we have lost our shirt and basically been kicked out. The $73 million originally requested plus the supplemental, $43 million, which has not been given yet, is only the tip of the iceberg. I am told we may be at a half a billion dollars to replace these operating facilities. We do not have a single permanent agreement in place.

I do not know how an administration can possibly bungle anything in a more inept manner than they have done with this Panama situation and basically closing down all of our forward drug surveillance operations.

These surveillance operations affect the operations, for example, in Peru, where we have gotten the cooperation of the Peruvian government to go in and eradicate narcotics fields, coca fields. Basically, that information stops because we do not have the operation going forward to identify those locations.

So these are some of the incredible problems that I wanted to detail tonight, both with the Mexico, with Colombia failed policy, stopping again the equipment from getting into Colombia.

I do not want to leave on a note that we are only here to criticize the administration. I must say that I am very proud of this new majority and what they have done. First of all, under the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) who is now the Speaker of the House of Representatives, he came in several years ago and chaired the Subcommittee on National Security, International Affairs and Criminal Justice on which I serve. In that capacity, he helped put together the war on drugs.

We have to remember, from the day this President got elected, they dismantled the war on drugs. I have heard people say we do not have a war on drugs. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have not had a war on drugs. It was dismantled in January of 1993 by this President.

From 1993, this President dismantled the war on drugs. The Congress, which was controlled by the Democrats in the House and the other body, by wide margins, dismantled systematically all of the programs that the Reagan and the Bush administration had put into placement and years and years of work.

Some of that was bipartisan. The gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and other Members on both sides of the aisle put together effective drug strategy. That was dismantled. There was no war on illegal drugs from 1993 to 1995.

In 1996, the Republicans, who gained control, did damage assessment and

started restoring some of the funds for eradication programs for interdiction, restoring the military in this effort, and for also putting back the Coast Guard on watch and active in this antinarcotics effort. So that is some of what we have done.

We have, through the leadership of those that I have mentioned, again, including the current Speaker of the House, put back last year almost $1 billion in additional funding to support these efforts.

In addition to the programs that I have talked about, enforcement, interdiction, eradication, we also put $195 million in education, which is the first time that anything has been done on that scale, to start educating our young people.

If it has to be a paid message, if it is not a high message setting a role model from the office of the President of the United States, then we will pay for it. That $195 million is matched by donations, at least equal to that sum.

So hopefully we will, again, in restarting all of these efforts, and particularly in education, we can get out the message. The First Lady under President Reagan, Mrs. Reagan, had a simple message: ''Just say no.'' It was repeated over and over and effective, and our young people heard that message.

But there has been a gap in this administration. No word, a mixed message, a mixed signal, no role model for young people to look up to. We have seen the results, and I described them here tonight. There is an 875 percent increase in heroin usage by our teenagers 12 to 17, dramatic figures that should shock every American and every Member of Congress.

So we have, again, put these programs back together that work. We are overseeing those programs. We will see if they are cost effective, if they are working, and will continue to expand them.

In the next few weeks when we return, we will be conducting a hearing on the question of legalization and decriminalization. I know the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) and his State has taken action on this issue. We do not know if they are headed in the right direction or the wrong direction. We do know that tough enforcement works.

The Guiliani in New York City method works. It cuts crime. It cuts murders. It cuts drug deaths. It cuts violence in our streets when one of our largest cities is one of our safest cities.

We see the alternative. Baltimore, which Tom Constantine, our DEA director, who is leaving, pointed out to us just a few years ago, Baltimore had 900,000 people and less than 1,000 heroin addicts. Through a liberal policy and a permissive policy Baltimore now has a population of 600,000. It has dropped 300,000 people. It has 39,000 heroin addicts.

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), who is my former ranking member on the Subcommittee on Civil Service and on this subcommittee has told me privately that the estimate is probably in excess of 50,000 heroin addicts in Baltimore.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, is it not true that Baltimore also had a very aggressive, privately funded by very liberal philanthropists, a needle exchange program where addicts could have quick and easily available access to free needles? That was one of the misguided policies that led to such a dramatic increase in the number of addicts.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, it is true that Baltimore has had one of the most liberal policies and has now been devastated. When any city in this Nation has 39,000 heroin addicts, we have a major, major problem.

□ 2330

And the crime, the social disruption, the human tragedy that that has caused in a liberal policy is very serious.

So I intend, as chair of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources of the Committee on Government Reform to conduct hearings beginning in June, when we return, on this question. We will examine what is going on in Baltimore, what is going on in New York, in other countries.

And we hope to also look at Arizona, which has had a decriminalization program that they have touted. And we will see whether that is successful and whether it is something we should look at as a model; whether it is something that should have the support of this Congress or whether they are headed in the wrong direction and we should not support those efforts.

So I am pleased tonight to come and provide the House, Mr. Speaker, with an update on some of our activities in our subcommittee, some of my efforts to try to bring to light what I consider is the biggest social problem facing this Nation, I know in my lifetime, I know in a generation, and that is the problem of illegal narcotics.

Again, over 14,000 Americans lost their lives last year. Over 100,000 have died from illegal narcotics since this President took office.

It is a human tragedy that extends far beyond Columbine or Jonesboro or any of the other tragedies we have seen in this Nation. And as I said, it is repeated day after day in community after community, and we can read it in the obituaries.

I am not here just to complain about the cost to the Federal Government. I am here to complain about the loss in productive lives. Even in this city, which is our Nation's Capital, of which we should all be proud, each year that I have come here in the last 10 years they have lost between 400 and 500 young people, mostly black African-American males who have been slaughtered on the streets, most in tragedies, some by guns, some by knives, some by other violent death, but almost all related to illegal narcotics trafficking.

And that is the root of some of the problems in the streets of Washington, D.C., and across our country, when we have 60 to 70 percent of those behind bars there because of felonies committed under the influence of illegal narcotics or trafficking in illegal narcotics or committing felonies under the influence of illegal narcotics.

So we have a serious social problem. It is ignored by this administration, it has been ignored by this President, but it is not going to be ignored by this new majority. And if I only serve the remainder of this term in Congress, every week I will be here talking about this problem and its effects on the American people and what we intend to do as far as positive programs to resolve that. And we will do that. We will succeed.

I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my friend from Florida again for his leadership and for bringing this problem to the floor.

And again I would say that this is a question of security, personal security and the security of our families and our communities. Because, as my colleague pointed out very graphically and very tragically, the cost in human lives, with the incredible violence that accompanies illicit drug distribution and use, is ultimately a question of our national security and the security of our borders.

And, indeed, on the geopolitical stage, the consequence of those who would or who have traditionally been our friends is now sadly changing, if not to foes, then certainly not aiding us in the traditional sense as allies have in the past. And again, from the State of Arizona, from my constituents in the Sixth District, and indeed all across America, because this is a problem that transcends our borders, that transcends State lines, that sadly goes virtually into every community in the United States, it is a question we must address.

This is one of many vexing questions that now have come into our purview and that have gained the prominence and attention necessary, and again the gentleman is to be saluted for offering a clarion call to this House, to this government and, more importantly, to our people in terms of the tough choices that loom ahead for this House and for this Nation.

Mr. MICA. I thank the gentleman and yield finally to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me again say to the gentleman from Florida that we appreciate everything he is doing, the diligence that he is showing in taking this on. I wish him the best and thank him. And I want him to know that he has the support of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) and myself, and we will be following up with the gentleman and working with him.

Mr. MICA. I thank the gentleman.

CHINESE ESPIONAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TANCREDO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) is recognized until midnight.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), and also invite the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) to join us. He is welcome to do so.

Mr. Speaker, the biggest and the scariest espionage in the history of our country has taken place, and many of the details were revealed today in the Cox report. Now, the Cox report was a bipartisan congressional investigation, and it raised many pertinent questions.

The Communist Chinese now have in their possession our top nuclear secrets. They have cut in half, certainly more than half, the years of research that it took the United States to construct such weapons. They stole this information. They saved many, many years and they saved millions, if not billions, of dollars.

And while this has gone on under a lot of different administrations and over a long period of time, it is obviously clear that the Clinton administration, the National Security Adviser Sandy Berger, knew about this at least in April of 1996. He briefed the President of the United States in July of 1997, again in November of 1998, and since January of 1999, the White House has been sitting on the completed Cox report.

And yet only in March of this year did they take steps to fire one potential suspected spy, Wen Ho Lee. Only then. And, actually, he is not arrested at this point. He is still only on administrative leave, I think. I do not know exactly what the term is.

But the two questions here are: How big is this thing; how much information do they have on our nuclear weapons in China? And why did the administration react the way it did?

I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, our colleague from Florida amply pointed out just one threat to our national security. Mr. Speaker, I would go further in the realm of Chinese espionage to say to this House and to the American people that we face a clear and present danger.

Mr. Speaker, the report released today, available on the Internet, and I am sure many responsible publications across the United States will carry it in detail tomorrow, outlines a traumatic, devastating loss to this Nation in terms of national security, and that is why I describe it as a clear and present danger.

My colleague from Georgia pointed out the fact that this bipartisan report was drafted and really completed in January of this year, and only now, some 5, almost 6 months later, has this report at long last been released to the American people.

It has been a strength of our society that once we as a people recognize a threat, we deal with that threat in a responsible manner. And yet, Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to do so at this juncture in our history because of what has been called, in common parlance, ''spin''; what some used to call in the past ''smoke and mirrors.'' And while my colleague pointed out that espionage is nothing new, that different countries observe and conduct surveillance on one another, the fact is that the disturbing information is something that this House and this Nation must deal with and should deal with immediately.

□ 2340

A point that should be addressed is the inevitable spin echoes from sympathetic pundits and indeed from the spin machine at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue that, oh, this has happened before and previous Presidents are to blame.

Let me offer this simple analogy: Mr. Speaker, suppose you contemplate a vacation and you take reasonable precautions in your house. You will lock your doors. You lock your windows. If you have an alarm device, you activate it. And yet thieves are aware that you have left your home. They disable the alarm system. They gain entrance to your home. And they begin to take your property. Your belongings.

Now, that is one thing. But contrast it. If someone is sitting at home in the easy chair and these same thieves pull up and the person in the home says, ''Well, come on in. And you might want to look in this area. And by the way, let me offer to show you where my wife keeps her jewelry. And here are our stocks and bonds. And let me help you take these and load up your van. And listen, we will just keep this between us because it would be very embarrassing to me if I allowed this information to get out, if I chose to stop this. So I will take minimum action to stop what has gone on.'' That analogy, however imperfect, essentially sums up what has transpired.

It is important to note, as my colleague from Georgia capably points out, that, sadly, our national security advisor, with the responsibility that that title in fact describes, has aided our national insecurity, compounding that, the curious actions of the Justice Department and our current attorney general.

My colleague from Georgia mentioned Wen Ho Lee, the suspected spy at one of our national labs, still not arrested. And indeed the Justice Department asked for wiretap authority when there was a preponderance of evidence and more than reasonable suspicion that it should be checked.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, actually it was the FBI that asked the Justice Department.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for correcting the record. I misspoke. The FBI asked the Justice Department for the ability to wiretap this individual because of the threat to our national security. And in all the wiretaps issued following our constitutional procedures, this particular wiretap was denied. This special surveillance was denied.

Couple that with the curious case of a Chinese arms merchant suddenly gaining clearance for the import into this country of 100,000 weapons to be used on the streets of our inner cities where again the agency in charge looked the other way. Couple that with the disturbing reality of the fact that the communist Chinese through their business operations controlled by their so-called People's Liberation Army actually contributed to the Clinton-Gore effort in 1996 and, sadly, to the Democratic National Committee in that same year, and we have a compelling devastating case that should cause concern for every American.

Before I yield back to my friend from Georgia, just so we can clear this up, this is not a matter of partisanship. It is a question of patriotism. Because we confront a clear and present danger, we must avoid the temptation of engaging in personalities and instead deal with policies and change those policies.

But regrettably, to this date, this administration has been more interested in spin and preening and posturing and offering the clever retort or the by now familiar rejoinder that ''everyone does it.''

Mr. Speaker, I am here to tell my colleagues again that not everyone does it, but sadly all too many people within this administration have not fulfilled their responsibilities to the citizens of this country to maintain vigilance and to take actions against those who would steal our secrets.

Mr. Speaker, it is worth noting that the findings are chilling. In the overview, just to repeat from the Cox summary, China has stolen design information on the United States' most advanced thermonuclear weapons. The Select Committee on Intelligence, the bipartisan committee, judges that China's next generation of thermonuclear weapons currently under development will exploit elements of stolen U.S. design information and China's penetration of our national weapons laboratories spans at least the past several decades and almost certainly continues today.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if I can reclaim my time, I want to stop at that point for a minute. Because what is interesting is we hear these incessant defenders of this administration, regardless of what the administration does, they are automatically with them but forget the facts. They keep saying, well, it still does not matter because China has x number of nuclear warheads and America has x-number-plus nuclear warheads.

But they miss the whole point. This is not about our number of nuclear warheads versus their numbers. It is about the technology. And we have now given China the know-how to catch up should they choose to. And they also have these so-called legacy codes, which are the ones that actually predict what a nuclear explosion will do; and that seems to be the reason why they signed a nuclear test ban treaty because they had stolen information and the know-how from America. They did not have to test their weapons anymore.

My colleague went quickly, though, on the subject of Wen Ho Lee. Wen Ho Lee, the suspected spy at Los Alamos Lab, the weapons lab, when the FBI suspected him of spying, they went to the Justice Department to get a wiretap and they were turned down, which my colleague has pointed out.

What was not pointed out was there was 700 wiretaps that year and all but two were approved by the same Justice Department. So you have to ask yourself, was this Justice Department purposely protecting an international spy? We know this was the Justice Department who turned down a special prosecutor of the Chinese money scandal, even though the FBI recommended one.

But let us say, I want to give the Justice Department the benefit of the doubt and say, okay, out of the two that they turned down, 700 were approved, two were turned down, and one of them had to be the biggest spy in the history of the United States of America. Okay, you did it nobly. Well, then is it just plain old incompetence? How did you miss that one? What was it more that the FBI could have said?

And maybe it is not just the Justice Department's fault. Maybe it is the FBI did not describe the situation well enough to the Justice Department. I worry about what other decisions are being made or have been made along the way.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I would point out and I would challenge my former colleagues in television at the various networks and the 24-hour cable news services to show the American people the videotapes of the communist Chinese business people in the Oval Office with the President of the United States now knowing in the fullness of time that those same communist Chinese business people contributed massive amounts of cash to a reelection effort.

There is a disturbing tendency in this country to succumb to the cult of celebrity. And if one has a clever enough rejoinder or simply returns to the school yard taunt that everybody does it and it is unfair to criticize one party or one administration for their actions, to do so is to willingly be blinded to what is staring us in the face.

Mr. Speaker, I made the comment to some of my constituents over the weekend that Washington today is wrapped up in what is an Alan Drury novel come to life. It is so mind boggling, it is so far afield to ever think that an administration would out of incompetence or blissful ignorance or for political advantage allow the transfer of technology, allow espionage from a foreign power to jeopardize the security of the United States of America.

□ 2350

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States came to this podium in one of his recent State of the Union messages and boasted that no longer were United States cities and citizens targeted by Russia. Well, of course, technically that was true, although the missiles could be reprogrammed in a matter of minutes.

But now we face a situation where the Chinese have the technology, they have made a quantum leap because of the stolen information, because of the aforementioned legacy codes and computer models. Because of their ill-gotten gains in terms of hundreds of supercomputers that can provide the simulations of nuclear explosions, now the Chinese have the same technology that we have.

Indeed in some areas, for example, the neutron bomb, often maligned and lampooned by late night comedians and pundits in this town as the weapon that kills people, but does not destroy property, the United States never went into production of a neutron bomb, and yet the Chinese are moving full tilt ahead.

They have acquired that technology, they have expounded upon the technological advancements of this society and our constitutional Republic, and our leaders of the time decided not to pursue that particular weapon, but the Chinese have it. And soon they will have small, more accurate thermonuclear warheads.

And make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, those warheads will be targeted at the United States. We say this not to inspire fear but instead, Mr. Speaker, to encourage the American people to check the facts available on the Internet.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will go back to the great ad that Ronald Reagan had and a philosophical question that he asked the American people about, ally sometimes and enemy sometimes. The evil empire itself, Russia. In that ad he said, ''There is a bear in the woods, but some Americans believe there's not a bear in the woods. Wouldn't it be nice to know that if there was a bear in the woods, that you would be protected from the bear?''

Now we are at the situation with China, we have a lot of people saying, oh, no, China they're our friend, everything's fine.

Well, let us go back. China, I hope, is our friend, but if they are not our friend, would it not be nice to know that in a country of 1.4 billion people, that we, with 260 million, are at least protected against aggression on their part? Would it not be nice to know that should they choose to become an aggressive adversary, that we are protected? Of course it would be nice to know that. Yet, thanks to this espionage, we are not.

The gentleman has pointed out, it has gone on a lot longer than the current administration. I hope that any previous administration that had knowledge of it reacted strongly. But we do know for a fact that when this particular spy in this particular scandal first came to light by the National Security Adviser in April 1996, that it was apparently ignored.

We also know, and the gentleman has not pointed this out, that when the Deputy Director of Intelligence, Notra Trulock, at the Department of Energy, 3 years ago said, there's spying going on, we know that he was ignored and he was later demoted from his job. Let us hope that is coincidence, but I would have a hard time believing it.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Fact is stranger than fiction as my colleague from Georgia is pointing out.

Another oddity, the aforementioned National Security Adviser, one Sandy Berger, when informed of the breach of security at Los Alamos National Laboratory by Notra Trulock, in that same month, the Vice President of the United States went to California for what was first described by his staff and by him personally, if I am not mistaken, as a community outreach event. Subsequently, it has been discovered that this was a fund-raiser where substantial amounts of foreign cash from China were pumped into the Clinton-Gore reelection effort.

Mr. Speaker, it is fair to ask the American people, what price victory? We take an oath of office here to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States. It is this same Constitution that says in its remarkable preamble that one of the missions of our Federal Government as we the people have formed this union is to provide for the common defense. Yet Vice President Gore in meeting the press offered an endless chorus of justification for contribution irregularities. He said, now in an infamous line, ''My legal counsel informs me there is no controlling legal authority.''

How sad, how cynical, and ultimately how dangerous that those in whom the American people have placed their trust, in those who have taken the oath of office to uphold and defend the Constitution, of one who aspires to become our Commander in Chief would so callously disregard the safety of our constitutional republic, the national security of every family, every child, every citizen of this Nation, to win political advantage. Or to soft-pedal, to silence because of political implications. The design is there.

It is said that one of the criticisms of our society is that we have become cynical. Mr. Speaker, how could we not grow even more cynical with the revelations that have appeared, some that have come out in dribs and drabs with

the delay of the release of this report, despite the fact that there are national security concerns, we do have our own counterintelligence efforts, it appears that in this city, politics is preeminent.

Again let me state this. I take no joy in this. It is mind-boggling, it is disturbing, but every American should ask themselves this question: Have our leaders in the administration been good custodians of the Constitution? Have they provided for the common defense; or, in boastful claims of reinventing government, claiming drawdown, a reduction in government employees, eviscerated our military to the tune of a quarter million personnel, put American lives at risk, and brought us to this? A question not of personal conduct in terms of relationships but of actions taken that jeopardize and threaten the security of every American. That is the juncture at which we find ourselves now.

No one takes joy in this but the strength of the American people is in understanding once a problem has been confronted through our constitutional processes, through the fact that we must all stand at the bar of public opinion and let the public render a judgment, that we can rectify the problem.

Jefferson spoke of it, that the vitality of this country would eventually overcome those who would follow mistaken policies, for whatever reason, and that is the challenge that we confront, not as Democrats or Republicans but as Americans, because nothing less than our national security and our national vitality in the next century is at stake. This is the stark reality that we confront.

That is why all of us who serve in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, as constitutional officers to provide for the common defense, to provide for our national security, must have answers to these hard questions. And that is why, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General of the United States should tender her resignation immediately, the National Security Adviser should tender his resignation immediately, and those who are elected officials will have the verdict of history decide but that history and history's judgment will not be a century away, it will be forthcoming and in short order.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me just say this. I think the gentleman from Arizona is absolutely right, as certainly Jefferson was, about the vitality of the American people and may they use that strength quickly and decisively on this particular scandal. But we have got to protect our Nation and our national security interest.

That is one reason why this Congress is going to move ahead to make recommendations to get rid of the spies at Los Alamos and anywhere else. But one thing I want to emphasize is that this is a bipartisan effort. That report, the Cox report, passed unanimously from a bipartisan committee. This is not about getting onto the White House. This is about national security. I think that it is very important that we all keep in mind that the Democrats and Republicans on this one are scared to death.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Mr. REYES (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Mr. MCCOLLUM (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today after 8:00 p.m. and May 26 until 3:00 p.m. on account of family business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

The following Members (at the request of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. UNDERWOOD, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. CARSON, for 5 minutes, today.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. SESSIONS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, for 5 minutes each day, today and on May 26.

Mr. FLETCHER, for 5 minutes, on May 27.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 26, 1999, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2314. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Cranberries Grown in the States of Massachusetts, et al.; Temporary Suspension of a Provision on Producer Continuance Referenda Under the Cranberry Marketing Order [Docket No. FV99–929–1 IFR] received May 10, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2315. A letter from the the Director, the Office of Management and Budget, transmitting cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685(e); (H. Doc. No. 106–71); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2316. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a request of transfers from the Information Technology Systems and Related Expenses account; (H. Doc. No. 106–70); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2317. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Section 8 Tenant-Based Assistance; Statutory Merger of Section 8 Certificate and Voucher Programs [Docket No. FR–4428–1–01] (RIN: 2577–AB91) received May 18, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

2318. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revised Restrictions on Assistance to Noncitizens [Docket No. FR–4154–F–03] (RIN: 2501–AC36) received May 18, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

2319. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a statement with respect to a transaction involving U.S. exports to Saudi Arabia; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

2320. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's semiannual report on the activities and efforts relating to utilization of the private sector, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1827; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

2321. A letter from the Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Service's final rule—Secondary Direct Food Additives Permitted in Food for Human Consumption [Docket No. 98F–0342] received May 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2322. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Passenger Automobile Average Fuel Economy Standards [Docket No. NHTSA–98–4853] (RIN: 2127–AG95) received May 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2323. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Land Disposal Restrictions Phase IV: Treatment Standards for Wood Preserving Wastes, Final Rule; and Land Disposal Restrictions Phase IV: Treatment Standards for Metal Wastes, Final Rule; and Zinc Micronutrient Fertilizers, Final Rule; and Carbamate Treatment Standards, Final Rule; and K088 Treatment Standards, Final Rule [FRL–6335–7] (RIN: 2050–AE05) received April 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2324. A letter from the Legal Advisor, Cable Services Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commisssion's final rule—Implementation of Section 304 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996; Commercial Availability of Navigation Devices [CS Docket No. 97–80] received May 21,1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2325. A letter from the Special Assistant Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the

Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (East Brewton, Alabama and Navarre, Florida) [MM Docket No. 97–233 RM–9162] received May 14,1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2326. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Consolidated Guidance about Materials Licenses: Program-Specific Guidance about 10 CFR Part 36 Irradiator Licenses, dated January 1999—received May 17, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2327. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Rulemaking for EDGAR System [Release Nos. 33–7684; 34–41410; IC–23843; File No. S7–9–99] (RIN: 3235–AH70) received May 17, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2328. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on the status of efforts to obtain Iraq's compliance with the resolutions adopted by the U.N. Security Council, pursuant to Public Law 102–1, section 3 (105 Stat. 4); (H. Doc. No. 106–69); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

2329. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Navy's Proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to United Kingdom for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 99–15), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

2330. A letter from the Chairman, International Fund for Ireland, transmitting the Fund's 1998 Annual Report; to the Committee on International Relations.

2331. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 13–64, ''Solid Waste Facility Permit Amendment Act of 1999'' received May 19, 1999, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2332. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 13–58, ''Insurance Demutualization Amendment Act of 1999'' received May 19, 1999, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2333. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 13–65, ''Closing of Public Alleys in Square 51, S.O. 98–145, Act of 1999'' received May 19, 1999, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2334. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 13–66, ''Chief Technology Officer Year 2000 Remediation Procurement Authority Temporary Amendment Act of 1999'' received May 19, 1999, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2335. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 13–59, ''Petition Circulation Requirements Temporary Amendment Act of 1999'' received May 19, 1999, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2336. A letter from the Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Thelypodium howellii ssp. spectabilis (Howell's spectacular thelypody) (RIN: 1018–AE52) received May 21, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2337. A letter from the Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Threatened Status for Johnson's Seagrass (RIN: 1018–AF62) received May 21, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2338. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Species in the Rock sole/Flathead sole/ ''Other flatfish'' Fishery Category by Vessels Using Trawl Gear in Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 990304063–9063–01; I.D. 042799B] received May 5, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2339. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Economic Exclusive Zone Off Alaska; Groundfish Fisheries by Vessels Using Hook-and-Line Gear in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 990304062–9062–01; I.D. 051299E] received May 20,1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2340. A letter from the Chief, Regs and Admin Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Rules of Practice, Procedure, and Evidence for Administrative Proceedings of the Coast Guard [USCG–1998–3472] (RIN: 2115–AF59) received May 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2341. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone: 4th of July Celebration Fireworks Display, Great South Bay, Sayville, New York [CGD01–99–040] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received May 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2342. A letter from the Chief, Regs and Admin Law, USGC, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone: Groton Long Point Yacht Club fireworks display, Main Beach, Groton Long Point, CT [CGD01–99–039] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received May 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2343. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations: Hudson Valley Triathlon, Hudson River, Kingston, New York [CGD01–98–155] (RIN: 2115–AE46) received May 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2344. A letter from the Chief, Regs and Admin Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operating Regulation; Lake Pontchartrain, LA [CGD08–99–032] (RIN: 2115–AE47) received May 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2345. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulations; River Rouge (Short-Cut Canal), Michigan [CGD09–98–055] (RIN: 2115–AE47) received May 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2346. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Helicopter Systems (MDHS) Model 369E, 369FF, 500N, and 600N Helicopters [Docket No. 99–SW–11–AD; Amendment 39–11113; AD 99–08–07] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2347. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations: Fleet's Albany Riverfest, Hudson River, New York [CGD01–98–163] (RIN: 2115–AE46) received May 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2348. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon Aircraft Corporation Beech Models 65–90, 65–A90, 65–A90–1, 65–A90–2, 65–A90–3, 65–A90–4, B90, C90, C90A, E90, H90, and F90 Airplanes [Docket No. 90–CE–18–AD; Amendment 39–11171; AD 99–10–07] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2349. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Uniform National Discharge Standards for Vessels of the Armed Forces [FRL–6335–5] (RIN: 2040–AC96) received April 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2350. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation that would make changes to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974; jointly to the Committees on Commerce and Transportation and Infrastructure.

2351. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, National Ocean Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting an announcement concerning the Request for Proposals for the Ecology and Oceanography of Harmful Algal Blooms Project; jointly to the Committees on Resources, Commerce, Science, and Armed Services.

2352. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation which would provide a more competitive electric power industry; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means, Commerce, Agriculture, Transportation and Infrastructure, Resources, and the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. YOUNG of Florida: Committee on Appropriations. Report on Suballocation of Budget Allocations for Fiscal Year 2000 (Rept. 106–163). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 189. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 150) to amend the Act popularly known as the Recreation and Public Purposes Act to authorize disposal of certain public lands or national forest lands to local education agencies for use for elementary or secondary schools, including public charter schools,

and for other purposes (Rept. 106–164). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DREIER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 190. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1905) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–165). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. LAZIO (for himself, Mr. KING, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. LUTHER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ARMEY, and Mr. DELAY):

H.R. 1915. A bill to provide grants to the States to improve the reporting of unidentified and missing persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TURNER (for himself, Mr. FROST, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. POMBO, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. SANDLIN):

H.R. 1916. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce to 36 months the amortization period for reforestation expenditures and to increase to $25,000 the maximum annual amount of such expenditures which may be amortized; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. COBURN, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HILLEARY, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. ACKERMAN):

H.R. 1917. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to make additional payments under the Medicare Program to certain home health agencies with high-cost patients, to provide for an interest-free grace period for the repayment of overpayments made by the Secretary to home health agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HERGER (for himself, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. CRANE, Mr. RAMSTAD, Ms. DUNN, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. WELLER, Mr. FOLEY, and Mr. TANNER):

H.R. 1918. A bill to provide for implementation of prohibitions against payment of Social Security benefits to prisoners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERGER (for himself, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. CRANE, Mr. RAMSTAD, Ms. DUNN, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. WELLER, and Mr. FOLEY):

H.R. 1919. A bill to require the Commissioner of Soical Security to provide prisoner information obtained from the States to Federal and federally assisted benefit programs as a means of preventing the erroneous provision of benefits to prisoners; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin (for himself and Mr. OBEY):

H.R. 1920. A bill to establish a program to provide grants to expand the availability of public health dentistry programs in medically underserved areas, health professional shortage areas, and other Federally-defined areas that lack primary dental services; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BILBRAY (for himself, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. COX, and Mr. EHRLICH):

H.R. 1921. A bill to provide that the provision of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 on the accounting of tips in determining the wage of tipped employees shall preempt any State or local provision precluding a tip credit or requiring a tip credit less than the tip credit provided under such Act and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that tips received for certain services shall not be subject to income or employment taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE (for himself, Mr. DELAY, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. PAUL, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. CRANE, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CANNON, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LINDER, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. DREIER, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. POMBO, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. WICKER, Mr. CAMP, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. BAKER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. COOK, Ms. DUNN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. KING, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. SALMON, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. MICA, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. ROGAN, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. EVERETT, and Mr. HERGER):

H.R. 1922. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reform the financing of campaigns for election for Federal office; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. FROST, Ms. SANCHEZ, and Mrs. THURMAN):

H.R. 1923. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore the exclusion from gross income for damage awards for emotional distress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEKAS:

H.R. 1924. A bill to prevent Federal agencies from pursuing policies of unjustifiable nonacquiescence in, and relitigation of, precedents established in the Federal judicial courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin:

H.R. 1925. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit sex offenders from entering National Parks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEFLEY (for himself, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. WHITFIELD, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KING, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. HOSTETTLER):

H.R. 1926. A bill to provide for the granting of refugee status in the United States to nationals of certain foreign countries in which American Vietnam War POW/MIAs or American Korean War POW/MIAs may be present, if those nationals assist in the return to the United States of those POW/MIAs alive; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HOLT (for himself, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, and Mr. MOORE):

H.R. 1927. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to preserve all budget surpluses until legislation is enacted significantly extending the solvency of the Social Security and Medicare trust funds; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HOUGHTON (for himself, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. ENGLISH):

H.R. 1928. A bill to simplify certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. INSLEE (for himself, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. LEE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 1929. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to control the disclosure by financial institutions of personal financial information of customers of the institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. LOBIONDO:

H.R. 1930. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require the operator of a World Wide Web site that offers to provide communication with any prisoner to disclose on the site the crime for which the prisoner is incarcerated and the release date for the prisoner; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MCCOLLUM (for himself, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. BACHUS, and Mrs. ROUKEMA):

H.R. 1931. A bill to require agreements entered into between depository institutions and private parties relating to the Community Reinvestment Act of 1977 to be made available to the public and the appropriate Federal banking agency, to require each party to the agreement to regular report to such agency any amount received from other parties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. ROEMER (for himself, Mr. KING, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. SOUDER, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. DANNER, Mr. DELAY, Mr. FROST, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. LAFALCE,

Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. QUINN, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. KIND, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. WAMP, Mr. GORDON, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HILL of Indiana, Mr. WYNN, Mr. MOORE, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. TANNER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. WU, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. LARSON, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. TURNER, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. HOYER, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. DOYLE, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. MASCARA):

H.R. 1932. A bill to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to Father Theodore M. Hesburgh, in recognition of his outstanding and enduring contributions to civil rights, higher education, the Catholic Church, the Nation, and the global community; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. SALMON (for himself and Mr. TANCREDO):

H.R. 1933. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide for parental notification and consent prior to enrollment of a child in a bilingual education program or a special alternative instructional program for limited English proficient students; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SAXTON (for himself, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. LOBIONDO):

H.R. 1934. A bill to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to establish the John H. Prescott Marine Mammal Rescue Assistance Grant Program; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. STARK (for himself, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. STRICKLAND):

H.R. 1935. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to strengthen the limitations on participation by the Armed Forces in overseas airshows and trade exhibitions involving military equipment; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 1936. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to prevent overpayment for hospital discharges to post-acute care services by eliminating the limitation on the number of diagnosis-related groups (DRGs) subject to the special transfer policy; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TANCREDO:

H.R. 1937. A bill to amend the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, and the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act of 1994, to allow grants received under such Act to be used to establish and maintain school violence hotlines; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WEXLER:

H.R. 1938. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require appropriate training and certification for suppliers of certain listed items of orthotics or prosthetics; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WEYGAND (for himself, Mr. STARK, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. FROST, Mr. WEINER, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. WOLF, Mr. HILLIARD, Mrs. KELLY, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. PHELPS, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. GOODE, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. SANDLIN, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. DANNER, Mr. HOLDEN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 1939. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to allow postal patrons to contribute to funding for Alzheimer's disease research through the voluntary purchase of certain specially issued United States postage stamps; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 1940. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the tax treatment of Settlement Trusts established pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONDIT (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. TURNER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. WISE, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. FORD, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, and Mr. STUPAK):

H.R. 1941. A bill to protect the privacy of personally identifiable health information; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KUYKENDALL (for himself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. HORN, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi):

H. Con. Res. 112. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued in honor of the S.S. LANE VICTORY; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. BERRY (for himself, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. FORD, and Mr. MINGE):

H. Con. Res. 113. A concurrent resolution expressing the commitment of Congress to address the emergency that currently exists in American agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOEHLERT:

H. Con. Res. 114. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that a postage stamp should be issued as a testimonial to the Nation's tireless commitment to reuniting America's missing children with their families, and to honor the memories of those children who were victims of abduction and murder; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. FORBES:

H. Con. Res. 115. A concurrent resolution expressing the support of the Congress for activities to increase public awareness of the dangers of pediatric cancer; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. FORD (for himself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. MATSUI):

H. Con. Res. 116. A concurrent resolution expressing congressional support for the International Labor Organization's Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. ROTHMAN:

H. Con. Res. 117. A concurrent resolution concerning United Nations General Assembly Resolution ES–10/6; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. PORTER, Mr. HOYER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. GREENWOOD, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. KING, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HEFLEY, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. OLVER):

H. Con. Res. 118. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the culpability of Slobodan Milosevic for war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide in the former Yugoslavia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself and Mr. ROHRABACHER):

H. Res. 187. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should seek to prevent any Talibanled government in Afghanistan from obtaining a seat in the United Nations, and should refuse to recognize any Afghan government, while gross violations of human rights persist against women and girls there; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. FROST:

H. Res. 188. A resolution designating minority membership on certain standing committees of the House; considered and agreed to

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 11: Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 85: Ms. NORTON and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 111: Mr. ENGEL Ms. LEE, and Mr. BROWN of California.

H.R. 151: Mr. MCINTOSH.

H.R. 165: Ms. WATERS and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 206: Mrs. TAUSCHER.

H.R. 218: Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. CRANE, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 263: Mr. WATKINS and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 264: Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 274: Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. HORN, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 306: Mr. SHAYS and Mr. MCINTOSH.

H.R. 315: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. WU, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 347: Mr. JONES of North Carolina and Mr. SHOWS.

H.R. 353: Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. COOK, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. SANCHEZ.

H.R. 354: Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. LUTHER, and Mr. PEASE.

H.R. 355: Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.R. 358: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 363: Mr. BONILLA and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.
H.R. 382: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.
H.R. 405: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and Mr. BOYD.
H.R. 424: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. MOLLOHAN.
H.R. 445: Mr. LUTHER.
H.R. 483: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 500: Mr. JEFFERSON and Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky.
H.R. 531: Mr. TIAHRT.
H.R. 544: Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.R. 583: Mr. HILLEARY and Mr. WISE.
H.R. 595: Mr. HOLDEN and Mr. HOEFFEL.
H.R. 599: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. OLVER, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H.R. 611: Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma.
H.R. 612: Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. DOYLE, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Ms. DANNER, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 700: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 721: Mr. CALLAHAN and Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 728: Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. RILEY, Mr. SHERWOOD, and Mr. POMBO.
H.R. 731: Mr. MOAKLEY and Ms. KILPATRICK.
H.R. 776: Mr. GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 777: Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.R. 804: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 815: Mr. TRAFICANT.
H.R. 828: Mr. MATSUI.
H.R. 844: Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. CRANE, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. BAKER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 845: Mr. PASTOR and Mr. FAFALCE.
H.R. 846: Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon and Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 850: Mr. TALENT.
H.R. 853: Mr. ROYCE and Mr. HALL of Texas.
H.R. 859: Mr. CRANE and Mr. MCCRERY.
H.R. 860: Ms. RIVERS.
H.R. 865: Mrs. THURMAN, Mrs. WILSON, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H.R. 896: Mr. WICKER.
H.R. 902: Ms. LEE, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 915: Mr. KASICH, Mr. BLILEY, and Mr. FORD.
H.R. 919: Mr. OLVER, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 959: Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.R. 1000: Mr. PICKETT, Mr. CLAY, and Ms. LEE.
H.R. 1020: Mr. QUINN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. OLVER, Mr. KUCINICH, and Ms. RIVERS.
H.R. 1055: Mr. HILLEARY and Mr. ARMEY.
H.R. 1057: Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, and Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 1063: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 1070: Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. WICKER.
H.R. 1071: Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 1081: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H.R. 1168: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 1172: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. KLINK, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Ms. CARSON, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. REGULA, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. WAMP, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ENGLISH, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 1180: Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. SPENCE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. SHOWS.
H.R. 1193: Mr. BONILLA and Mr. COOKSEY.
H.R. 1194: Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 1208: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 2309: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 1248: Mrs. NORTHUP.
H.R. 1259: Mr. CONDIT, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. MCINTOSH.
H.R. 1273: Mr. COX, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. STEARNS, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. ROGAN, Mr. NORWOOD, and Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 1275: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BASS, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. EWING, Mr. LEWIS of California, and Mr. COOK.
H.R. 1300: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. PITTS, Mr. WISE, and Mr. GOODLING.
H.R. 1304: Mr. FORBES, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. COOK, Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. OSE, and Mr. GRAHAM.
H.R. 1317: Mr. DUNCAN and Mr. BISHOP.
H.R. 1330: Mr. SCHAFFER.
H.R. 1344: Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 1354: Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. COOK, and Mr. NETHERCUTT.
H.R. 1434: Mr. MCKEON.
H.R. 1436: Mr. MCKEON.
H.R. 1437: Mr. MCKEON.
H.R. 1438: Mr. MCKEON.
H.R. 1439: Mr. MCKEON.
H.R. 1443: Ms. PELOSI.
H.R. 1448: Mrs. KELLY and Mr. FOSSELLA.
H.R. 1484: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 1495: Mr. BARCIA, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. CROWLEY, and Ms. LEE.
H.R. 1525: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, and Mr. VENTO.
H.R. 1545: Mr. STRICKLAND, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 1546: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. TALENT, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mrs. BONO.
H.R. 1578: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. BAKER, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. HILLEARY.
H.R. 1590: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 1604: Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. WAMP, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
H.R. 1622: Mr. WU and Mr. COOK.
H.R. 1627: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1634: Mr. OXLEY, Mr. BRYANT, and Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.
H.R. 1648: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. WATERS, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. SISISKY.
H.R. 1673: Mr. GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1689: Mrs. KELLY and Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.
H.R. 1702: Mr. TOWNS and Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 1707: Mr. HEFLEY.
H.R. 1713: Mr. TALENT, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, and Mr. WATKINS.
H.R. 1717: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1748: Mr. STUPAK.
H.R. 1750: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. SANDERS.
H.R. 1768: Mr. FORD and Mr. LANTOS.
H.R. 1791: Mrs. MORELLA and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1794: Mr. GILMAN, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mr. WU.
H.R. 1795: Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. MCNULTY,and Mr. FROST.
H.R. 1841: Mr. PASTOR.
H.R. 1850: Mr. KASICH, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, and Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 1857: Mr. BENTSEN.
H.R. 1861: Mr. HAYWORTH.
H.R. 1862: Mr. SHOWS and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 1863: Mr. WATKINS and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 1882: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. HILL of Montana.
H.J. Res. 33: Mr. BARTON of Texas and Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.
H.J. Res. 389: Mr. SHAYS.
H.J. Res. 46: Mr. HYDE and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.J. Res. 47: Ms. DANNER.
H.J. Res. 55: Mr. SESSIONS.
H. Con. Res. 77: Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.
H. Con. Res. 107: Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. GUTKNECHT.
H. Con. Res. 109: Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. FOSSELLA, and Mr. RANGEL.
H. Res. 34: Mr. WU.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1259

OFFERED BY: MR. TRAFICANT

AMENDMENT NO. 2: Add at the end the following new section:

SEC. 6. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF THE OLD-AGE, SURVIVORS, AND DISABILITY INSURANCE PROGRAM AND THE HOSPITAL INSURANCE PROGRAM.

It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the moneys of the United States held for purposes of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program and the hospital insurance program maintained under the Social Security Act and related laws of the United States should always be held in separate and independent trust funds and should always be segregated from all other moneys of the United States,

(2) the receipts and disbursements of such programs (including revenues dedicated to such programs) should never be included in any budget totals set forth in the budget of the United States Government as prepared by the President or any budget prepared by the Congress,

(3) the Congress should never make any law authorizing the use of such trust funds for any purpose other than for providing for the prompt and effective payment of benefits, payment of administrative expenses, and payment of such amounts as may be necessary and appropriate to correct prior incorrect payments, and no agency or instrumentality of the United States, or any officer or employee thereof, should ever be authorized to use, or to authorize the use of, such trust funds for any such other purpose, and

(4) as soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Congress should consider for adoption a constitutional amendment which would establish the policies described in this section as the permanent law of the United States.

H.R. 1401

OFFERED BY: MR. BEREUTER

AMENDMENT NO. 3: At the end of title X (page 305, after line 5), insert the following new section:

SEC. 1040. ASIA-PACIFIC CENTER FOR SECURITY STUDIES.

(a) WAIVER OF CHARGES.—(1) The Secretary of Defense may waive reimbursement of the

costs of conferences, seminars, courses of instruction, or similar educational activities of the Asia-Pacific Center for military officers and civilian officials of foreign nations of the Asia-Pacific region if the Secretary determines that attendance by such persons without reimbursement is in the national security interest of the United States.

(2) In this section, the term ''Asia-Pacific Center'' means the Department of Defense organization within the United States Pacific Command known as the Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies.

(b) AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT FOREIGN GIFTS AND DONATIONS.—(1) Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary of Defense may accept, on behalf of the Asia-Pacific Center, foreign gifts or donations in order to defray the costs of, or enhance the operation of, the Asia-Pacific Center.

(2) The Secretary may not accept a gift or donation under paragraph (1) if the acceptance of the gift or donation would compromise or appear to compromise—

(A) the ability of the Department of Defense, any employee of the Department, or members of the Armed Forces to carry out any responsibility or duty of the Department in a fair and objective manner; or

(B) the integrity of any program of the Department of Defense or of any person involved in such a program.

(3) The Secretary shall prescribe written guidance setting forth the criteria to be used in determining whether the acceptance of a foreign gift or donation would have a result described in paragraph (2).

(4) Funds accepted by the Secretary under paragraph (1) shall be credited to appropriations available to the Department of Defense for the Asia-Pacific Center. Funds so credited shall be merged with the appropriations to which credited and shall be available to the Asia-Pacific Center for the same purposes and same period as the appropriations with which merged.

(5) If the total amount of funds accepted under paragraph (1) in any fiscal year exceeds $2,000,000, the Secretary shall notify Congress of the amount of those donations for that fiscal year. Any such notice shall list each of the contributors of such amounts and the amount of each contribution in that fiscal year.

(6) For purposes of this subsection, a foreign gift or donation is a gift or donation of funds, materials (including research materials), property, or services (including lecture services and faculty services) from a foreign government, a foundation or other charitable organization in a foreign country, or an individual in a foreign country.

H.R. 1401

OFFERED BY: MR. BEREUTER

AMENDMENT NO. 4: At the end of title X (page 305, after line 5), insert the following new section:

SEC. ___. REPORT ON EFFECT OF CONTINUED BALKAN OPERATIONS ON ABILITY OF UNITED STATES TO SUCCESSFULLY MEET OTHER REGIONAL CONTINGENCIES.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report describing the effect of continued operations by the Armed Forces in the Balkans region on the ability of the United States, through the period covered by the current Future-Years Defense Plan of the Department of Defense, to prosecute to a successful conclusion a major contingency in the Asia-Pacific region or to prosecute to a successful conclusion two nearly simultaneous major theater wars, in accordance with the most recent Quadrennial Defense Review.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report under subsection (a) shall set forth the following:

(1) In light of continued Balkan operations, the capabilities and limitations of United States combat, combat support, and combat service support forces (at national, operational, and tactical levels and operating in a joint and coalition environment) to expeditiously respond to, prosecute, and achieve United States strategic objectives in the event of—

(A) a contingency on the Korean peninsula; or

(B) two nearly simultaneous major theater wars.

(2) The confidence level of the Secretary of Defense in United States military capabilities to successfully prosecute a Pacific contingency, and to successfully prosecute two nearly simultaneous major theater wars, while remaining engaged at current or greater force levels in the Balkans, together with the rationale and justification for each such confidence level.

(3) Identification of high-value platforms, systems, capabilities, and skills that—

(A) during a Pacific contingency, would be stressed or broken and at what point such stressing or breaking would occur; and

(B) during two nearly simultaneous major theater wars, would be stressed or broken and at what point such stressing or breaking would occur.

(4) During continued military operations in the Balkans, the effect on the ''operations tempo'', and on the ''personnel tempo'', of the Armed Forces—

(A) of a Pacific contingency; and

(B) of two nearly simultaneous major theater wars.

(5) During continued military operations in the Balkans, the required type and quantity of high-value platforms, systems, capabilities, and skills to prosecute successfully—

(A) a Pacific contingency; and

(B) two nearly simultaneous major theater wars.

(c) CONSULTATION.—In preparing the report under this section, the Secretary of Defense shall use the resources and expertise of the unified commands, the military departments, the combat support agencies, and the defense components of the intelligence community and shall consult with non-Department elements of the intelligence community, as required, and other such entities within the Department of Defense as the Secretary considers necessary.

H.R. 1401

OFFERED BY: MR. METCALF

AMENDMENT NO. 5: At the end of title VII (page 238, after line 22), insert the following new section:

SEC. ___. REVIEW OF RESULTS OF INDEPENDENT RESEARCH REGARDING GULF WAR ILLNESSES AND RESEARCH TO REPLICATE OR DISPUTE THE RESULTS.

(a) REQUIREMENT TO CONDUCT REVIEW.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall review the independent research conducted regarding the presence and detection of squalene antibodies in the blood of veterans of the Persian Gulf War, as described in the report of the General Accounting Office numbered GAO/NSIAD–99–5, and the possible relationship between the presence of squalene antibodies and the complex of illnesses and symptoms known as Gulf War syndrome.

(b) REQUIREMENT TO CONDUCT ADDITIONAL RESEARCH.—The Secretary shall conduct research on the presence and detection of squalene antibodies in the blood of veterans of the Persian Gulf War designed to replicate or dispute the results of the independent research reviewed under subsection (a).

(c) COMPTROLLER GENERAL REVIEW.—The Comptroller General shall review the results of the Secretary's review and research and submit to Congress a report evaluating the merits of the Secretary's review and research.

H.R. 1401

OFFERED BY: MR. ROEMER

AMENDMENT NO. 6: At the end of title XXXI (page 453, after line 15), insert the following new section:

SEC. 31___. REPORT ON COUNTERINTELLIGENCE AND SECURITY PRACTICES AT NATIONAL LABORATORIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than March 1 of each year, the Secretary of Energy shall submit to the Congress a report for the preceding year on counterintelligence and security practices at the facilities of the national laboratories (whether or not classified activities are carried out at the facility).

(b) CONTENT OF REPORT.—The report shall include, with respect to each national laboratory, the following:

(1) The number of full-time counterintelligence and security professionals employed.

(2) A description of the counterintelligence and security training courses conducted and, for each such course, any requirement that employees successfully complete that course.

(3) A description of each contract awarded that provides an incentive for the effective performance of counterintelligence or security activities.

(4) A description of the services provided by the employee assistance programs.

(5) A description of any requirement that an employee report the foreign travel of that employee (whether or not the travel was for official business).

(6) A description of any visit by the Secretary or by the Deputy Secretary of Energy, a purpose of which was to emphasize to employees the need for effective counterintelligence and security practices.

H.R. 1906

OFFERED BY: MR. CHABOT

AMENDMENT NO. 17: Insert before the short title the following new section:

SEC. __. (a) LIMITATION.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to award any new allocations under the market access program or to pay the salaries of personnel to award such allocations.

H.R. 1906

OFFERED BY: MS. KAPTUR

AMENDMENT NO. 18: In the third paragraph under the headings ''RURAL HOUSING SERVICE'' and ''RURAL HOUSING INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)'', strike the period at the end of the paragraph and insert the following: '': *Provided,* That of this amount the Secretary of Agriculture may transfer up to $7,000,000 to the appropriation for 'Outreach for Socially Disadvantaged Farmers'.''.