

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 466, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 466, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Ms. VELÁQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained during rollcall vote No. 466, which provided for consideration of H.R. 2084, Conference Report for FY 2000 Transportation Appropriations. If I had been present I would have voted "yes."

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, I am not recorded on rollcall No. 466 for the Conference Report accompanying H.R. 2084, making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000. I was unavoidably detained and therefore, could not vote for this conference report. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on rollcall No. 466.

Stated against:

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 466, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained during rollcall vote No. 466. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON 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 317 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 317

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BE-REUTER). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. DIAZ-BALART asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

□ 1000

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 317 is the standard rule waiving points of order for the conference report to accompany H.R. 1906, the Agriculture, Rural Develop-

ment, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 2000.

The rule waives points of order against the conference report and its consideration and provides that the conference report shall be considered as read.

I strongly support the rule. I also strongly support the underlying conference report. There are many important programs which are being funded. I commend the conferees for their dedication to their work and to the American farmer.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD an editorial from the Miami Herald.

The document referred to is as follows:

[From the Miami Herald, Sept. 24, 1999]

FOOD SALES TO CUBA—WILL BENEFIT ONLY THE REPRESSIVE REGIME

The idea of allowing U.S. firms freely to sell food and medicine to Cuba seems unsailable from afar, a humanitarian gesture toward deprived people, as well as good business for American farmers.

But that's a huckster's pitch being promulgated by U.S. business interests that either misunderstand the way Cuba's politically regimented economy works, or that are trying to break the U.S. trade embargo. Congress shouldn't fall for the pitch to legalize unrestricted food and medicine sales to Cuba.

This isn't about humanitarianism: Selling supplies to the totalitarian regime responsible for so much human misery in no way ensures that any benefits would trickle down to the people of Cuba. This is about money—including money for the regime's repressive machinery.

In Washington this week, the U.S. farm lobby is bringing to a climax its orchestrated campaign against trade sanctions in general and to open Cuba to grain sales specifically. Dreaming about yearly sales that they think could reach \$2 billion within five years, farm groups appear eager to extend plenty of credits and take Cuban sugar or rum in barter. Listen to David Frey, the Kansas Wheat Commission administrator: "With Cuba's stressed economic situation, we are talking about a long-term deal before they are paying cash for a lot of wheat. There will be a time when they will be able . . . to pay cash."

Mr. Frey and his allies are deluding themselves if they believe that selling wheat to a government with no hard currency and a history of stifling business partners is going to save America's farmers. Equally deluded are those well meaning people who think that selling such materials will alleviate the suffering of the average Cuban.

Remember that this is the regime that ruined Cuban agriculture and other industry in the first place. While Cuba's fertile soil and waters no longer produce enough to feed its ration-card weary people, the regime serves lobster to tourists. While Cuban children can't get asthma medication on any given night, foreigners paying for surgery get first-world medicines.

Measures to allow licensed sales of food and medicine were attached to an agriculture appropriations bill by the Senate last month. U.S. Reps. Lincoln Diaz-Balart and Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, both from Miami, helped kill the deal by attaching a provision that would make such sales contingent on Cuba having free elections.

That should end it. Better access to food and medicine isn't going to solve Cuba's big-

gest problem. Ridding itself of an odious state will.

Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues will recall, this was the first appropriations bill to come to the House floor for the fiscal year 2000 cycle. It passed the House in June. I think it is important and appropriate that we commend the subcommittee chairman the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) and the ranking member the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) and all the conferees and those who worked so hard along with them to move this process along. They have done an extraordinary job. They have worked extremely hard to produce legislation which provides approximately \$60 billion in total budget authority for agriculture. We know that spending levels are tight, but I believe the conferees did a very good job of working within their limits.

The agriculture appropriations bill funds programs that help benefit each of us each and every day. From improving nutrition, to helping ensure safe and nutritious food to put on our tables, to fund in this bill so many programs. The reality is that less than 2 percent of the American population provide food that is safe and nutritious and affordable for the over 270 million Americans as well as for countless millions of others abroad.

Much of the funding in this conference report goes towards food stamps, over \$21 billion; child nutrition programs, almost \$10 billion; farm assistance programs, \$1.2 billion; the supplemental nutrition program for women, infants and children, known as WIC, over \$4 billion.

I have consistently supported agriculture, Mr. Speaker, and I commend the hard work of the conferees. Again, I think it is so just and proper that we thank the gentleman from New Mexico for his hard work on this conference report. There are many, many programs that are being brought forth that are important. It is important that this legislation be acted on as soon as possible.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of both this rule bringing forth this conference report and of the conference report itself.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) for yielding me the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This rule makes in order consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 1906 which is the agriculture appropriations bill for fiscal year 2000. The rule waives all points of order against the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report was not written by the members of the conference committee. It was pretty much written by the House and the Senate leadership. Frustration among Democrats is running so high that a few days ago, the ranking Democrat on

the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), took out a special order to detail this process for the record.

The conference report contains many shortcomings. The measure fails to include a Senate provision exempting food and medicine from unilateral embargoes. This policy, I think, hurts the weakest and most needy people in foreign countries, and we should never use food as a weapon.

Leaving out this exemption also hurts the American farmers whom we are trying to help through this bill. The \$1.2 billion in natural disaster assistance is inadequate for drought-stricken farmers and victims of Hurricane Floyd. The drought was particularly hard hitting for farmers in the Midwest and Northeast.

I am afraid the conferees, or whoever wrote this bill, missed a wonderful opportunity to assist farmers and help the needy at the same time. There is a natural link between support for farmers and the food safety net, and this measure does little to strengthen it. By buying commodities for humanitarian aid, we would boost prices for farmers, provide new markets for America's agriculture industry, and help the hungry here and abroad.

Despite my concerns about this bill, I think that the rule is in good shape. It is a standard rule for conference reports. I urge adoption of the rule.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me this time. I am opposed to the agriculture appropriations bill. This is a difficult issue for me as a member of the Committee on Appropriations to stand before this body and advocate opposition to an appropriation bill. Unfortunately, I have such great respect for our chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) and the chairman of the full committee is my colleague from Florida who is just across the Skyway Bridge from me. But unfortunately this conference report when we sent it over to the Senate, it was a total of \$60.7 billion. It has now grown to over \$69 billion. There have not been any hearings on this. \$8 billion. We are trying to live with a budget that was agreed to back in 1997 with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) to live within some constraints. What are we doing but spending \$8 billion more without the hearings? They are saying it is the disaster. I am not opposed to supporting disasters in agriculture, if we have floods, if we have drought. I think we have a responsibility to step forward. But that is not most of this money. Most of this \$8 bil-

lion in more spending is going to help destroy what Freedom to Farm created, which was the marketplace. That is what is unfortunate about this bill. It was approved last night, they got the signatures, we really have not had a chance to really look at the details in the bill, and that is unfortunate and disappointing. I supported the Freedom to Farm back in 1996 because it was a giant step in the right direction, so that the farmers were freed up from growing for the government but growing for the marketplace. The idea was we were going to have declining subsidies over the years to allow the farmers to free up and address the marketplace. We are only talking about approximately a third of the farmers in this country, because over two-thirds of the farmers are not dealing with these issues.

For example, in my area, I have a lot of agriculture in my area, a lot of citrus, Tropicana is headquartered in my area, we have lots of citrus groves in my area, we are the largest tomato grower in the State of Florida. We have two tomato crops a year in my area, November and December and again in April and May. These crops do not get help from the Federal Government. Two-thirds, as I say, of the farmers do not get help. So what is happening is for the one-third, they are getting dependent on the Federal Government when we try to develop a plan to get them not dependent on the Federal Government. In theory it was a good idea, but what we are doing now is we are just locking people in to dependency on these programs. There are over 400 major crop products in the Federal Government and only a few dozen get this subsidy.

Now, when this bill got into conference, it became a Christmas tree, and everybody said, "I want something of that pie." Let me give my colleagues one illustration. Sugar. Sugar is the sugar daddy of all corporate welfare. It is costing consumers over \$1 billion a year. What do they get? \$80 million. Sugar, \$80 million. They are the ones making the most money. These sugar plantations in Florida are rolling in the money and we give them \$80 million. Because everybody deserves a piece of this pie once the conference, which is a small group of people on both sides of the aisle came together with.

It is unfortunate this bill was allowed to be brought to the floor today especially so quickly. For those of us opposed to it we just found out early this morning that it was going to be on the floor. I plan to seek time in opposition to the bill when it comes up. I will not be calling for a vote on the rule even though I will be voting against it. I look forward to further debate on the appropriation bill.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 13 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), who is the ranking minority member on the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural De-

velopment, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio for yielding me this time. I would say to my colleagues that I rise in opposition to the rule and I urge my colleagues to vote against the bill. For me, this is a very sad day personally, I think it is a sad day for our committee, it is a sad day for this institution, and it is really a sad day for the people that this bill is meant to assist, the farmers in rural communities across this country that are being pounded by the lowest prices in the last decade and a half, and by horrendous weather conditions.

Now, why do I ask my colleagues to vote against the rule and this bill? I believe that if we do this, the leadership of this institution—that should feel very bad about what it has done in this bill—the President of the United States, and the rest of the membership of this institution will do what is necessary to meet the needs of the farmers and rural dwellers of this country.

Let me tell my colleagues what the process has done over the last week and a half. I have been here 17 years. This has never happened in a committee on which I have served. Twice last week we were recessed because the majority could not reach agreement on some of the amendments that our committee was duly debating. And so we were sent out into the woods, and we were never called back. And all of a sudden the deal began to be brokered in the offices of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) and Speaker HASTERT. There were a lot of special interests that were accommodated as these discussions ensued, but the truth is that the needs of the American people were shelved as people took care of their regional interests.

I do not have a problem with milk. I do not have a problem with citrus. I do not have a problem with hogs or specialty crops or corn or wheat or beans. But the issue is really bigger than that. The issue really is, will all interests of this country get a fair hearing in the normal committee process? That has not happened. This rule and bill were discussed after midnight last night up in the chambers here. Who was really present to hear that? And members of our committees never even had the text of the bill. Now, at some point, somebody has to say, stop, this game ought to be over.

Members of our committee were appointed in good faith by the members of this institution to discharge our duties. We have a crisis situation in rural America where today the suicide rate is three times as great as it is in urban America. The pain is really deep. So we have even more of an obligation to produce a bill that meets the needs of our country. I do not have a bone to pick with our chairman, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), because his members were divested of their power, too, and that is not how this institution should work. Who is really

afraid of open debate? Who is really afraid of that, and letting the normal committee process work?

Let me just say, what are some of the issues that should have been brought up, that cannot be brought up under the process under this tourniquet rule and narrow-focused process that we have been forced to go through? We should be talking about targeting this assistance to the people that really need the help. At least 20 percent of the assistance that is in this bill is going to go to people that really do not need it. And people who really need it are not going to be able to get it because we have not had an opportunity to amend. People who serve on the Committee on the Budget ought to be concerned about that. Somebody ought to be taking a look at these formulas. We never had a chance to debate that in our committee.

□ 1015

Now, what about adequate financing for victims of hurricanes and natural disasters across our country? This bill is a fig leaf for them. Yesterday in the Labor HHS appropriations the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) whose district is devastated was able to tuck in an additional \$500 million in a Labor, Health, and Human Services appropriation bill to try to make up for what is not in this bill. Procedurally we cannot wed those two bills on this floor today, but that was just another sign of how inadequate this bill really is.

The question really is, is it just North Carolina that needs help? What about the bill's inadequacies in terms of covering those who raise apples or specialty crops or vegetables or happen to be in the livestock industry like up in my part of the country, in the hog industry where they are on their knees? Are they second class producers, that they do not get in this bill? They did not get in the room with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT)? Somehow they were not in the line? Should we close our eyes to their needs? Are we really going to take care of the fundamental problem here, which is low prices and bad weather? There are not provisions in this bill really to clear our markets and to lift commodities off these markets through humanitarian shipments and monetized sales to other countries at the level that is necessary to begin to give some easing in prices in the markets here at home.

So, this bill will not meet the needs of our country. We do not have any measure before us that will prevent the very same kind of chaos today next year in the market. If I look at the numbers, in the Commodity Credit Corporation over the last few years, we have spent more in this year trying to plug holes in Freedom to Farm. Rather, we should be going back and altering that, adding to it, changing it so we are not hemorrhaging in terms of

the budget next year in trying to plug the holes in the dike in rural America.

Just in this year alone, 1999, we will spend \$18.4 billion to try to make up for the insufficiencies of Freedom to Farm. People are worried about Social Security and everything else, and Mr. Speaker, I can tell my colleagues the bill before us today is not going to do a thing to change the fundamentals.

There were a host of other provisions that Members wanted us to debate and, on the merits, vote up or down in the committee. We never had a chance to do that. On economic sanctions relative to countries like Cuba and others in the Middle East, in Africa, there was a royal debate. And it should have continued, and we should have had a right to vote. That did not happen. The democratic process was squelched by the leadership of this institution.

In addition to that, we had Members who wanted to offer provisions dealing with protection of the American people on imported meats, making sure they were inspected and that plants were licensed in other places. Guess what? They never had a chance to bring those provisions up.

What about poultry inspections and all the outbreaks that we have had across this country in salmonella and trying to get amendments in here to deal with the health and safety of the American people? Could not do it. Those were squelched too. Those Members left the committee room as we were asked to leave.

Again I want to say we have no criticism of the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN). And I do not have any criticism of our subcommittee staff because they were poised to do a good job, but they were disposed of their duties. In many ways they are victims like the rest of us.

My parents always said to do good, do not ignore the needs of others if you hope that some day they will respond when you have needs of your own. This vital life lesson got lost in this whole process.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Members are listening to what the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) was saying about process, and I hope that regardless of our political philosophy, we will oppose this bill if for no other reason than we think the Committee on Appropriations itself should be making the decisions and not a hand full of people in the House leadership.

I would like to ask the gentlewoman a question. I am concerned about dairy. All Members know that last week by a vote of 285 to 140, the Members of this body overwhelmingly defeated the administration's market reform proposal and voted for option 1 A. I wonder if the gentlewoman will tell me how much time the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administra-

tion, and Related Agencies Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations spent in debating and discussing the bill that was passed on the floor of the House by two to one; was it 5 hours? Was it 10 hours? I wonder if the gentlewoman could inform our Members on this issue?

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I would just have to say that on the issue of milk, the committee was dismissed. A private meeting was held somewhere; I was not invited to that, and a decision was made. Do not ask me what they did, but of course the issue never came before our committee.

Mr. SANDERS. So what the gentlewoman is saying, that despite the fact that 285 Members of this body, Democrats, Republicans, Independent, voted overwhelmingly to reform our milk marketing order. The Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Subcommittee did not spend 1 minute in discussing that issue, and of course what we voted for is not part of the bill that we are supposed to be voting on now.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that comment.

I thank the gentleman, and I apologize for taking this many minutes, but it is the only time I have been able to be unmuzzled through this whole process, so it feels sort of good.

I just want to also want to state for the RECORD that in terms of the way this committee functions, when I first got to Congress, and I used to go to Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Subcommittee meetings, there would be people that would come in and testify from around the country. They would talk about the country's needs. In addition to that we heard from Members of Congress, and they would come in, and they would talk to us about how they view the situation, whatever it might be in their area. And then we heard from people from the Executive Branch, and they would come in and they would make their plea. I always thought that the Committee on Appropriations ought to leave Washington and go out into the country and hold some hearings out there too. We never did that.

But in the last 3 years, what has happened is all outside witnesses have been asked not to come to our committee, and so we began to hear from the narrower band of people. And then this year, even the Members of Congress were not brought into our committee; they were told we will just send a letter. And so we were left only, Mr. Speaker, with dealing with people from the administration.

But the point is, whether it is the way this bill was handled or whether it is the way we are receiving information about the needs of rural America and agriculture in our country the viewing lens has gotten extremely myopic, Mr. Speaker, and that affects the way a bill looks when it comes forward here onto the floor of Congress.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would beg my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule based on the way we have been treated. This is an emergency situation. If the leadership hears us, we can produce a bill that meets the needs of our country. We have had no conference report to look at. Members on our side, and I would daresay I would guess Members on the other side on our committee, have had no materials to really review. Then late last night after midnight, the Rules Committee met and then we were directed to come to the floor first thing in this morning. Members are saying to us, "Jeez, are you really up at 10 o'clock in the morning with the agriculture appropriation?"

But yes, we are, and yet we have not had the opportunity even for an orderly briefing by our own conferees. Then some members ask us to put in the \$500 million for natural disaster in that was inserted in the Labor, Health, and Human Services bill yesterday into this bill, but procedurally we cannot do it. So we are asking the Members to help us produce a good bill.

We can do this. Give us the chance to do this. Please vote no on the rule. Please vote no on the bill when it comes before the membership.

Mr. Speaker, with the crisis in rural America, the country knows we need to do the right job here. Give us the chance to do it.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we have just seen in the last two distinguished speakers a beautiful example of democracy genuinely at work. The first speaker that we heard said that he was opposing this legislation because he feels that it is spending approximately \$10 billion too much; a very distinguished Member of this House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER).

We then heard another very distinguished Member of this House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) explain in detail why she is opposing this legislation, one of the reasons being why, it is, in her estimate, not spending billions enough.

There is obviously a disagreement, but that is democracy. Some feel too much is being spent, others feel too little is being spent.

I think it is appropriate at this time, if I may, if I could take just a few minutes to explain what the bill is doing. It has been on line since we finished meeting in the Committee on Rules last night and has been available for reading.

Thirteen, almost 14, billion dollars, \$13.988 billion, are in this conference committee report for agriculture; \$8.7 billion to provide emergency aid to help farmers, including 1.2 billion for natural disasters; 5.5 billion for market loss payments, including 125 million for dairy producers; 650 million for crop insurance premium subsidy and for crop insurance associated costs.

With regard to supporting farmers in rural America, the Farm Service Agen-

cy, salaries and expenses are increased by \$80 million over last year to continue the delivery of the farm ownership, farm operating, and disaster loan programs. Total funding is \$796.8 million, which is the same as the President's request. Total loan authorization levels for agricultural credit programs are increased by \$798.3 million over last year. Total loan authorization funding is \$3.083 billion which is 74.6 million above the President's request. Rural housing loan authorizations are increased by \$337.7 million over last year, including 334.7 million for single family housing. Total loan authorization funding is \$4.589 billion which is \$14.3 million above the President's request. Rental assistance programs are restored to the fiscal 1999 level of 640 million, an increase of 200 million over the President's request. The rural electric and telephone loans are 1.05 billion above the fiscal year 1999 levels. Total loan authorization funding is \$2.612 billion, which is 1.54 billion above the President's request. The Distance Learning and Telemedicine Program loan authorization is increased by \$50 million over last year, bringing fiscal year 2000 loan level to \$200 million, which is the same as the President's request. Agricultural research activities are increased by \$76 million over last year. Total funding is 1.837 billion, which is 12 million over the President's request.

Conservation operations activities are increased by \$20 million over last year, bringing them to 661 million, 19 million below the President's request. Protecting human health and safety, the Food Safety Inspection Services, increased by \$32 million over fiscal year 1999 for a total of 649 million, approximately the same as the President's request. The Food and Drug Administration is funded at \$1.186 billion, \$83 million more than fiscal year 1999, \$69 million below the President's request.

Fulfilling commitments to important food and nutrition programs, the child nutrition programs are funded at almost \$10 billion, an increase of \$377 million over fiscal 1999, 11 million below the President's request. The special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children, WIC, is funded at \$4.032 billion, an increase of \$108 million, 73 million below the President's request. The Food Stamp Program is funded at \$21.073 billion. The Food For Peace Program is funded at 976 million, an increase of 38.7 million above the President's request, and yet a decrease of 105 million below the fiscal year 1999.

□ 1030

Title IX of the bill provides provisions regarding mandatory livestock price reporting which will provide information regarding the marketing of cattle, swine, lamb, and livestock prices that can be easily understood by packers and will encourage competi-

tion. My colleagues saw I had not mentioned the issue of sanctions, and I feel very strongly about that issue. The authorizing committee feels very strongly. The chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), sent a letter saying that if there is one issue that should not be dealt with in the Committee on Appropriations as a rider but that should be dealt with by the authorizing committee, it is an issue as sensitive as authorizing and financing sales to terrorist states. Yet the issue has been brought up. I just want to make one point with regard to Cuba, because the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) mentioned it.

One word to those interests who feel that it is appropriate now to sell to and finance to the Cuban dictatorship: irrespective and over and above the ethical questions, which obviously are important, it is not good business practice to do business, to make sales and finance them, with the jailers of the Vaclav Havel and Lech Walesas of that imprisoned island. They will be the future leaders of Cuba that will be making the decisions that are of so much import, that are so important, to so many interests.

If you do not want to base yourselves on ethics, base yourselves on the fact that the future leaders of democratic Cuba, many of them are in prison today, and it is not good business practice to be cozying up and financing sales with their jailers. I bring that point up because it was brought up previously; secondly, because the authorizing committee made its views known very clearly; and, thirdly, because the Committee on Appropriations as well voted earlier in the summer on that issue and rejected it. So I wanted to bring that out on the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and also for the great leadership that he has shown on the Committee on Rules.

I rise in support of the rule, Mr. Speaker, to the conference report on the agriculture appropriations bill. I applaud the work of the conferees in submitting a clean bill and one which upholds U.S. law and furthers U.S. domestic and humanitarian priorities.

As the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) pointed out, the lifting of sanctions would not have really helped American farmers, but would have helped to extend the suffering of people by providing a lifeline to their oppressor.

As it stands now, the bill before us strengthens the position of human rights dissidents and the expanding political opposition by telling them that the world's remaining superpower supports their struggle for freedom and that it stands firm in its commitment to see democracy flourish; that it defends the human, political and civil rights of all oppressed people, and that

dictators should not use food as weapons.

This bill underscores the humanitarian concerns enshrined in U.S. law which allows for the donations of food and medicine, rather than promoting the perception of greed at the expense of slave labor.

We look forward to the day when freedom reigns eternal and a democratic government is in power everywhere. Then we will be proud to trade and have relations with those in leadership.

This bill promotes America's interests, it helps America's farmers, it helps the poor who are on food stamps, and I am proud to support it.

I thank the gentleman for his leadership. I especially thank the gentleman from New Mexico (Chairman SKEEN), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), and so many who have worked in the conference committee to bring this agriculture appropriations rule and bill to the floor.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by concurring with much of what the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) had to say a few minutes ago about the process that we undertook.

I am very glad that our friend from Florida informed us about some of what was in the bill. It is good to know some of the things that are in the bill, because there is not a Member of the House who has yet seen the bill.

Here is the bill. This bill is hundreds and hundreds of pages, and it ended up on our desks this morning. I dare say that there is not one Member of the House who has a deep understanding of what is in the bill, and yet we are asked this morning to vote for it, which is why I strongly oppose the rule and even more strongly oppose the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, there are two main issues involved: one is process and one is content. In terms of process, I would hope that every Member of this body, progressive, conservative, Democrat, Republican, believes that there should be full and free discussion in a committee on appropriations, a consensus reached, and the bill come back to the floor for a serious vote by the Members.

That did not happen in the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Committee on Appropriations. This bill was dictated by the Republican leadership, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT). They are the ones who called the tune, and it was not the members of the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Committee on Appropriations, whether they were Republicans or Democrats. Deals were made in the back room; and at a time when the American people are more and more cynical about the political proc-

ess, that is not the type of legislation we should be bringing before them today.

Mr. Speaker, my particular concern, coming from the State of Vermont and coming from New England, is dairy. In the State of Vermont and throughout the northeast, in fact, throughout this country, our dairy farmers are going out of business because the price that has been paid to them in recent years in real dollars is going down and down and down while their expenses and their costs go up. The bottom line is that the total number of dairy operations dropped by almost 26 percent in the last 6 or 7 years.

Now, last week on the floor of this House we spent an entire day, six or seven amendments came up. There was a major debate on dairy; and at the end of the day, by an overwhelming vote of 285 to 140 the Members of this House rejected the Agricultural Department's option 1-B, which the Members believed would be a disaster for farmers in almost every region of this country. And we said no, we do not want that. We want to see the price that farmers get for their milk go up, we want stability, we want to protect the family farmers.

All over, liberals, conservatives, people voted for that bill. I would ask the gentleman from Florida, I would ask the gentleman from Florida, after a full debate on dairy on the floor of the House, would the gentleman tell the Members how much time was spent in the conference committee discussing the 285 to 140 vote? My understanding is not one minute was spent discussing that. I hear no response, so I am assuming that the gentleman from Florida concurs. Of course he does; he is an honest man.

I ask my friends on the Democratic side, how much time was spent discussing the dairy issue that passed the House 285 to 140 that had the votes to pass the Senate? Is anyone going to tell me that 1 minute was spent discussing that issue? I am listening. I do not hear it.

So I say to all of my friends in this House, Republicans, Democrats, those of you who believe in a fair process, those of you who voted for option 1-A, reject this legislation. The gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) was right. Let us send a loud signal to the leadership and say that is not the way we want to do business.

Now, all over this country family farmers are crying out for help. We are seeing a tragedy of utmost proportions. From one end of this country to the other we are seeing the struggling family farmers who are maintaining rural America, who are maintaining our rural economies, working 60, 70, 80 hours a week, they are going out of business. And what does this legislation do for them? It does nothing.

Mr. Speaker, let me simply conclude by saying this: for those Members of the body, Republicans, Democrats, who are concerned about the family farmer,

vote no on this bill. Send it back, and let us develop legislation that can save the family farm and help rural America.

For those Members of this body who are concerned about the democratic process, honest debate, real discussion, I urge you to vote "no" on this legislation. Send it back and let us have a real debate, an honest debate, as to how we can save family farmers.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD).

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, if you want to save the family farm, I suggest that you vote for this rule and vote for this bill. This bill helps family farms.

I represent one of the largest agricultural districts in the country, 14 counties in central Illinois, hog producers, corn producers, soybean producers, people who have made their living for years and years and years on the good black soil of central Illinois.

What I have been doing is traveling around my district throughout the summer and the fall, and what I found is there are two economies in America. There is the booming economy, where you drive around your district and every fast-food restaurant says "hiring for all positions." Americans are doing well; they are investing in the stock market. That is the one economy.

The other economy is the agriculture economy, which is in a recession; and if you are a hog producer, you are in a depression. Many of the hog producers in my districts have gone out of business, and many of the corn and soybean producers in my district are hurting very badly.

This bill helps them. Just because you feel you were shut out or you were not a part of the final negotiations, why should we sell short then those people who badly need this assistance? I say to all of you who represent agriculture, all of you who represent hard-hit farmers, this is the time to step up and vote for a bill that provides the needed assistance.

Now, you can say all you want about Freedom to Farm. You can criticize it. Many people have. I have not heard any criticism of Freedom to Farm for the first 3 years that it was in existence. Not one word have I heard.

This year we have. You know why? Because we got lousy markets. The Asia market is lousy, Russia is a mess, we never passed Fast Track. That is the reason behind Freedom to Farm.

One of the successes of Freedom to Farm is you have to have markets. We do not have the markets. Every time I have met with Secretary Glickman, Secretary Bill Daley, they ask, when are we going to pass Fast Track to open up the South American market? We need trade. We need markets in order for our farmers to survive.

So I say to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman

from Texas (Mr. COMBEST), thank you for agreeing to hold hearings next year on Freedom to Farm. We are going to have a debate on that. But because you do not like Freedom to Farm, do not vote against the rule, do not vote against the bill.

We have farmers all over America, either because of a drought, which we have not experienced in central Illinois, or because of lousy prices because we do not have the markets which are in a recession, and this bill helps them. So if you want to help hard-hit farmers, this is your opportunity today to do it. Vote for the rule, vote for the bill, and we will help them get out of this recessionary period.

This is an opportunity for Congress and the government to step up and help those who need the help. I say vote for the rule, vote for the bill, and we will help our hard-hit farmers.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY).

□ 1045

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, if the previous speaker has not heard any criticism of Freedom to Farm, he has not been listening. The criticism has been loud and clear from the moment that bill came to the floor. In fact, so much so that over the past several years people in the farm belt are calling it no longer Freedom to Farm but freedom to starve, but that is not the issue before us today.

The issue before us right now is the rule governing the agricultural appropriations bill. There are good things in that agricultural appropriations bill, and they were put in there by the Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies in this House and the other body.

I want to say that I have the greatest respect for the chairman of our Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies. I do not think there is a man in this body who is held in greater affection than is the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), but the process was wrested from his hands just as it was wrested from the hands of all of the rest of us all who were members of that conference committee; and the result is disaster and this rule continues that disaster because it does not give us the opportunity to offer to the full body here, all the Members of this House, the opportunity to vote up or down on critical issues.

Ought we not open some of these markets? The market in Cuba alone represents \$800 million a year for agricultural producers in this country. We are providing \$5.5 billion of subsidies, some of it going to people telling them not to grow anything, while we are depriving them of an \$800 million-a-year market right offshore. That is true of other markets as well that are closed

to us, open to our allies but closed to us only because we adhere to an archaic principle founded in the Cold War that is no longer relevant to anyone anywhere on this planet, except for a narrow group of people in this country who are controlling this process. It is the height of absurdity.

Furthermore, we are deprived from having the opportunity to vote up or down on a dairy provision which will save dairy farms in New England, in New York, in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and the coastal Atlantic States. We are deprived of that because this is a bad rule. Vote "no" on this rule.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER), in the spirit of democracy.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) for yielding me this additional time.

Mr. Speaker, since I am not going to be able to get time under the general debate on the conference report, I appreciate the opportunity to speak once again. I think the process, I have to agree with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, it is very limited and everybody gets what they want within that small group. I do not agree with my colleagues on everything because I think one of the good things in the bill is they did not put a dairy provision in there. That is the utter nonsense of the whole agriculture program is dairy, and I am delighted that that was not included in that.

I am also glad that the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies will be having hearings on Freedom to Farm and I will be able to bring up issues of sugar and peanuts and such.

One of the problems about this whole agricultural subsidy program is that only one-third of the farmers in this country get to benefit from this. I am not advocating that the other two-thirds get it. I think we should open up to the free market.

Let me give some numbers we have here. The third that get benefit out of this receive an average subsidy of \$24,000 a crop year. Now they are going to get \$35,000 a year in subsidies, \$35,000 a year per farmer for just those one-third of the farmers.

Now, we had a debate under Labor-HHS and on the welfare issue that the average welfare family of three gets \$12,000 a year, but we are going to give \$35,000 a year to the farmer and the statistics will show only 57 percent of it goes to families of limited resource and small family farms; 43 percent of it goes to these big corporate farms, retirement farmers, residential life-style, the hobby farmer.

So it is not really helping the small farmer as much because we are just providing \$8 billion. That is what is frustrating about this bill. I voted for it, I believe, when it came originally on

the floor of the House, keeping the process moving forward; but we had \$8 billion added without any hearing, without any participation, getting it in the middle of the night, and it is very frustrating.

So for fiscal conservatives, I urge their opposition to this particular appropriation bill. I do this, as I say, with great reluctance.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACCI).

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

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. I rise in opposition to this conference report. There is not a Member on either side of this aisle that can go home and look their farmers in the eye and say that we brought home a fair deal. There is not enough money in this conference agreement to take care of all of the natural disasters across the United States.

I know that some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle think that they have the power to add an additional month to the calendar year and in some cases have even invoked Scottish law in terms of U.S. law. I know there has even been an attempt to try to change the Constitution and say that the census is an emergency, but the fact of the matter is that there are disasters and droughts that are going on throughout this country that cannot be controlled, even though some think that they can control the weather.

The drought and those disasters are impacting throughout this country even to today, and just in the Northeast alone we are talking about \$2.5 billion in crop losses; Pennsylvania, \$700 million, less than \$3 million being allowed for in this bill; New York, \$370 million. How much money is in this bill to help New York? Maine, \$31 million. Less than \$1 million is available in this legislation. Virginia, \$200 million; Ohio, \$600 million. Disasters that have occurred on the East Coast in 13 East Coast States, very little, if any, assistance is being provided or available to them. Those are natural disasters.

Those pigs that are floating in the waters in North Carolina are real. We see them on our TV screens every night, and we talk to our friends here in the House that have been impacted, not to say anything of the toxic waste and the underground piles that are floating throughout the country both in North Carolina and in the South.

We do not have enough assistance, and a promise that \$500 million additional in a Labor-HHS bill is going to be available for disaster assistance is not good enough.

I am encouraging Members to vote against the rule, vote against the conference report, and send this back.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking minority member on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, in the end I will be voting for the bill and the rule, but before I do I would like to get some things off of my chest about what I think the real problems are.

I do not think that the committee was wrong not to include dairy in this bill because there were no provisions on dairy, and they would have been not germane to the bill to begin with. I think the committee made the proper decision.

I think a number of things happened in the conference that should not have happened. Example: we had a serious debate on the issue of sanctions. I think this country's sanctions policy is deeply flawed. I think it makes no sense to use farmers as pawns in foreign policy. I did not agree with the Senate language on sanctions because I thought it was open sesame and I thought it was carelessly applied; and it could have made available to a number of dictatorial regimes around the world items which they could use to build their own foreign exchange, and we do not want to do that.

I think we could have, if we had had the opportunity in conference, worked out a recalibrated sanction program to meet the national interests of the country without making farmers be the infantrymen in every argument we have with a foreign power, but we did not get the chance because the conference was shut down.

I think that the distribution of money under the emergency bill should have been along the lines of the suggestions by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), because that would have guaranteed that the aid would go to people who are actually farming; but we did not get a chance to deal with that issue because the conference was shut down before we were able to offer amendments.

I agree, there is not enough money in this bill for disasters, for the Carolina region and for other areas. I think the basic problem in this bill is not the Committee on Appropriations. All we can do is deal with funding issues. The basic problem is that we are dealing with an underlying law that makes no sense because it is based on ideology rather than real-world economics.

Somebody said once that economists are people who spend their time worrying about whether what works in real life could actually work in theory, and that certainly is the case when we are dealing with agricultural economics.

We have a law right now, the Freedom to Farm Act, which basically says we are going to let the market work, but there is no true market in agriculture for the most part. There is not

a country on this globe that does not play games with trade to the detriment of somebody else's farmers.

Processors have a fundamental advantage in dealing with farmers in the exchange of most commodities. Markets need to recognize that there are weather problems, there are pest problems, there are disease problems, and we need to try to use government to even out what happens to farmers when they get hit with those problems. Otherwise, we are not going to have family farmers left to produce any commodities in this country.

What ought to happen is that the Freedom to Farm bill, which in my opinion has become the freedom-to-lose-your-shirt bill, that bill ought to be tossed out and we ought to start over and produce a bill that makes long-term sense for American farmers.

Until that is done, the Committee on Appropriations cannot fix up the problem.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we saw a magnificent, as I said before, demonstration of the clash of views in a democratic process. Again and again, we saw the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) feeling so strongly about the fact that in his view the bill spends too much money; and despite the fact that it breaks usual tradition, I allowed him time to speak twice with regard to that point of view. He believes it spends too much money, and we had a number of speakers on the other side of the aisle say that this bill spends too little money. That is a clash. That is what democracy is about.

We had some allegations made which I think deserve reference, some of which because I believe they were incorrect. For example, one of the speakers mentioned that with regard to the Cuban market a billion dollars of sales are possible there.

Let us remember that a few years ago, even after the Cuban dictator had destroyed that economy, he was receiving \$6 billion a year in subsidies from the Soviet Union, and that is why he could maintain his tyranny functioning and purchasing things. He does not have that subsidy anymore. How could he now have a billion dollars from American farmers? It would seem that any intelligent analysis would see how illusory that is and how patently absurd that is, and yet we hear it.

Now, the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) made one point which was very important, and I disagree with his conclusion; yet I think it is important to mention it. He said that while he disagrees with our sanctions policy, the Senate language, the Senate rider which was on this legislation, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) mentioned, I think correctly, it was very sloppily drafted and overly broad and it would have facilitated terrorist states obtaining hard currency.

That points to the fact of why the authorizing committee, the Committee on International Relations that has hearings on this issue, was so adamant, as made clear through a letter by its chairman, that this rider-way of legislating on appropriations bills on such delicate issues is not the appropriate way to proceed.

□ 1100

So wisely I believe because of the point brought out by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the sloppiness of the Senate language and the underlying seriousness of the issue as brought out by the authorizing committee why it was wise that legislating through a rider was not permitted by the conference committee.

So I now close and urge support for this rule because of the importance of the underlying legislation, Mr. Speaker. My colleagues know very well that this legislation is needed by American farmers, that there are a myriad of critical programs in this legislation that are going to be funded; that there are many families that will benefit directly and immediately in our country from this legislation.

That is why we need to bring it to the floor, and that is why we need to vote for the rule, and that is why we need to vote for this underlying legislation, and that is why I support it, and that is why I urge my colleagues to vote for it.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BE-REUTER). The question is on the resolution.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 188, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 467]

YEAS—230

Aderholt	Bono	Coburn
Archer	Boswell	Collins
Armey	Brady (TX)	Combest
Baker	Bryant	Cook
Ballenger	Burr	Cox
Barr	Burton	Cramer
Barrett (NE)	Buyer	Crane
Barton	Callahan	Cubin
Bateman	Calvert	Cunningham
Bereuter	Campbell	Danner
Berry	Canady	Davis (VA)
Biggert	Cannon	Deal
Bilbray	Capps	DeLay
Bilirakis	Capuano	DeMint
Bishop	Castle	Diaz-Balart
Bliley	Chabot	Dickey
Blunt	Chambliss	Dingell
Boehner	Clyburn	Dooley
Bonilla	Coble	Doolittle

Dreier	Kolbe	Ros-Lehtinen
Duncan	Kuykendall	Royce
Dunn	LaHood	Ryan (WI)
Edwards	Largent	Ryun (KS)
Ehlers	Latham	Sanchez
Ehrlich	LaTourette	Sandlin
Emerson	Leach	Sanford
Evans	Lewis (CA)	Schaffer
Everett	Lewis (KY)	Sensenbrenner
Ewing	Linder	Serrano
Fletcher	Lucas (KY)	Sessions
Foley	Lucas (OK)	Shadegg
Fowler	Manzullo	Shaw
Frelinghuysen	McCollum	Shays
Galleghy	McInnis	Shimkus
Ganske	McIntosh	Simpson
Gekas	McIntyre	Sisisky
Gibbons	McKeon	Skeen
Gilchrest	Metcalf	Skeltton
Gillmor	Mica	Smith (MI)
Goode	Millender-	Smith (TX)
Goodlatte	Souder	Smith (TX)
Goss	McDonald	Souder
Graham	Miller, Gary	Spence
Granger	Minge	Spratt
Green (WI)	Mollohan	Stearns
Greenwood	Moran (KS)	Stenholm
Gutknecht	Morella	Stump
Hall (OH)	Myrick	Stupak
Hall (TX)	Nethercutt	Sununu
Hansen	Ney	Talent
Hastert	Northup	Tancredo
Hastings (WA)	Norwood	Tanner
Hayes	Nussle	Tauzin
Hayworth	Obey	Taylor (MS)
Hefley	Ose	Taylor (NC)
Herger	Oxley	Terry
Hill (IN)	Packard	Thomas
Hill (MT)	Pastor	Thompson (MS)
Hilleary	Paul	Thornberry
Hilliard	Pease	Thune
Hobson	Petri	Tiahrt
Hoekstra	Phelps	Toomey
Horn	Pickett	Traficant
Hostettler	Pitts	Upton
Houghton	Pombo	Walden
Hulshof	Porter	Wamp
Hunter	Portman	Watkins
Hyde	Pryce (OH)	Watts (OK)
Isakson	Radanovich	Weldon (FL)
Istook	Rahall	Weldon (PA)
Jenkins	Ramstad	Weller
Johnson, Sam	Regula	Whitfield
Jones (NC)	Reyes	Wicker
Kasich	Reynolds	Wilson
Kingston	Riley	Wise
Klecza	Rogan	Wolf
Knollenberg	Rogers	Young (AK)
	Rohrabacher	Young (FL)

NAYS—188

Abercrombie	DeGette	Johnson (CT)
Ackerman	Delahunt	Johnson, E. B.
Allen	DeLauro	Jones (OH)
Andrews	Deutsch	Kanjorski
Bachus	Dicks	Kaptur
Baird	Dixon	Kelly
Baldacci	Doggett	Kennedy
Baldwin	Doyle	Kilpatrick
Barcia	Engel	Kind (WI)
Barrett (WI)	English	King (NY)
Bartlett	Eshoo	Klink
Becerra	Etheridge	Kucinich
Bentsen	Farr	LaFalce
Berkley	Fattah	Lampson
Blagojevich	Filner	Lantos
Blumenauer	Forbes	Larson
Boehlert	Fossella	Lazio
Bonior	Frank (MA)	Lee
Borski	Franks (NJ)	Lewis (GA)
Boucher	Frost	Lipinski
Boyd	Gejdenson	LoBiondo
Brady (PA)	Gephardt	LoGren
Brown (FL)	Gilman	Lowe
Brown (OH)	Gonzalez	Luther
Camp	Gordon	Maloney (CT)
Cardin	Green (TX)	Maloney (NY)
Carson	Gutierrez	Markey
Clayton	Hastings (FL)	Martinez
Clement	Hinche	Mascara
Condit	Hoeffel	Matsui
Conyers	Holden	McCarthy (MO)
Cooksey	Holt	McCarthy (NY)
Costello	Hoyer	McCreery
Coyne	Hutchinson	McDermott
Crowley	Inslee	McGovern
Cummings	Jackson (IL)	McHugh
Davis (FL)	Jackson-Lee	McKinney
Davis (IL)	(TX)	McNulty
DeFazio	John	

Meehan	Price (NC)	Stabenow
Meek (FL)	Quinn	Stark
Menendez	Rangel	Strickland
Miller (FL)	Rivers	Sweeney
Miller, George	Rodriguez	Tauscher
Mink	Roemer	Thompson (CA)
Moakley	Rothman	Thurman
Moore	Roukema	Tierney
Moran (VA)	Roybal-Allard	Towns
Murtha	Sabo	Turner
Nadler	Salmon	Udall (CO)
Napolitano	Sanders	Udall (NM)
Neal	Sawyer	Velazquez
Oberstar	Saxton	Vento
Olver	Schakowsky	Visclosky
Ortiz	Scott	Vitter
Owens	Sherman	Walsh
Pallone	Sherwood	Waters
Pascrell	Shows	Watt (NC)
Payne	Shuster	Weiner
Pelosi	Slaughter	Wexler
Peterson (MN)	Smith (NJ)	Weygand
Peterson (PA)	Smith (WA)	Woolsey
Pickering	Snyder	Wynn

NOT VOTING—16

Bass	Hinojosa	Rush
Berman	Hooley	Scarborough
Brown	Jefferson	Waxman
Clay	Levin	Wu
Ford	Meeks (NY)	
Goodling	Pomeroy	

□ 1122

Mrs. CLAYTON, and Messrs. COYNE, CAMP, SHOWS and COOKSEY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. MCINNIS and Mr. MINGE changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, regrettably I was unavoidably detained for rollcall votes 466 and 467. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on rollcall vote 466 and "no" on rollcall vote 467.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. RES. 298

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SAWYER) be removed as a cosponsor of H. Res. 298.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BE-REUTER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1906, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 317, I call up the conference report 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, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 317, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of Thursday, September 30, 1999, at page H9141.)

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report to accompany H.R. 1906, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I feel somewhat like Mrs. Custer, and how she would have felt about Indian relief, after we have gone through this exercise earlier. But I am pleased to bring before the House today the conference report on H.R. 1906, providing appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, the Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies.

This bill does a lot of good for important nutrition, research, and rural development programs and still meets our conference allocations on discretionary and mandatory spending.

Basic research on agriculture, food safety and nutrition has been increased by \$80 million. The Farm Service Agency budget is also increased by \$80 million, and this will be especially important to farms affected by the drought, the floods and the low prices.

Loan authorizations for the Rural Housing Service are increased by \$330 million. The program to provide loans and grants for rural schools and medical facilities, to allow them to access the resources of large urban institutions, is increased by two-thirds to \$20.7 million.

Our feeding and nutrition programs are all increased or maintained at the 1999 levels. This report has \$108 million for the WIC program over last year, and the direct appropriation for Food and Drug Administration is \$70 million over last year.

We were able to make these increases by cutting administrative and management costs and by benefiting from lower loan costs in our farm and rural development programs.

Finally, this bill carries an additional title this year that provides about \$8.7 billion in emergency assistance, including \$1.2 billion for farm losses caused by natural disaster.

OMB Director Lew has promised an assessment of Hurricane Floyd damage