

we treating the farm sector of our economy fairly? I think in this regard it is important to first note that the appropriations subcommittee is constrained by the budget.

I happen to serve on the Committee on the Budget. I was very disappointed with the unfair treatment that America's farmers received from the Republican budget. I was constrained to vote against it, and I hope that as this appropriations bill moves to the Senate and comes back for consideration, that we can rectify some of its shortcomings. I would just like to point out a few.

First, and perhaps most importantly, we have failed to target the billions of dollars of agricultural assistance that is being spent in the U.S. Treasury. Instead, this money is going out the back-door, billions and billions these months; and it is going largely for the benefit of land ownership. It is not being targeted to assist those operating farmers who, indeed, are suffering from low prices.

Mr. Speaker, we are not targeting this money. We ought to be targeting the money. We ought to have programs that focus on the safety net concept, dealing with prices that farmers are receiving, not simply spending billions willy-nilly. We ought to have programs that recognize effective caps, but instead we have some that are receiving hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars and others scarcely enough to enable them to stay in their farming occupation.

A second problem is that the farm programs are largely administered by the Farm Service Agency. That agency, unfortunately, has many new programs thrust upon it, complicated changes in the programs it administers; and it has an inadequate staff. This is a dangerous recipe for disappointment, frustration and resignation ultimately by key employees. We ought to be providing the Farm Service Agency with the resources it needs, the staff that it needs to carry out its mission.

Third, the farm programs are also implemented, especially in the conservation area, by the Natural Resources and Conservation Service. The service itself is not adequately compensated. Furthermore, the conservation programs themselves are short-changed.

Fourth, we have a dramatic limit on agricultural research, dramatically less than requested by the President.

Fifth, we have a dramatic limit on rural development, and, again, dramatically less than requested by the President.

Sixth, we have inadequate funding for the Packers and Stockyards Administration, or GIPSA. This is the agency in the Department of Agriculture that is charged with making sure that in the livestock sector we do not have unfair trade practices that undermine the farmer's ability to receive a fair price for the livestock that he or she is mar-

keting. It is absolutely necessary that if we are going to fulfill the mission of the Packers and Stockyards Act, that GIPSA be adequately financed. It is shortchanged.

Similarly, the Office of General Counsel within the Secretary's office is shortchanged. We cannot expect these agencies of the Federal Government to perform their mission if they do not have an adequate staff of attorneys and economists.

Finally, the promise of trade has been held out to America's farmers as really the hope that they have for improved prices. But trade cannot be the cornerstone of our agricultural policy. It has to be one part.

We have talked about trade with Cuba today. Unfortunately, trade with Cuba is an illusion. It is not in the agriculture appropriations bill, and I fear it will not be when it comes back.

To be sure, we need to do the very best we can in this appropriations bill, but we have got to do more.

#### MISSILE DEFENSE

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

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend we had one in a series of tests of our national missile defense program, which is currently under development, and supported both by the White House and by overwhelming support in both the House and the Senate. Unfortunately, this test was not a success, and there are those who are using this test to criticize the overall program and to say that technologically we are not prepared to move forward with missile defense.

I want to take a few moments to clarify what did happen and to clarify for the record what occurred in that test, and am offering to Members this week to have a full briefing, both classified and unclassified, on the details of the test that occurred this past weekend.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, the hit-to-kill technology that is fundamental to missile defense was not tested. It was not tested because we could not get the separation stage away from the main rocket.

Now, that is not new technology. That is not missile defense technology. In fact, Wernher von Braun and other scientists solved this problem 40 years ago. It is a technology necessary to launch every communications satellite into outer space. It is a technology utilized for every space mission that we get involved with. It is not a technology specific to missile defense. However, it failed. No one expected it to fail, just as when we launch communications satellites, we do not expect the separation technology to fail to allow that communications satellite to be put into an orbit.

Unfortunately, there are those who are misinformed; and there are those

who are informed but want to mischaracterize what occurred as to say that this test was an indication that we are not ready to move forward with missile defense. Nothing could be further from the truth.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I have come out and strongly criticized the corporation who was responsible for the separation stage technology and have put them on notice that if we do not solve this quality-control issue, there will be legislation to punitively punish them for other failures that may occur in the future.

But make no mistake about it, this test was not a failure of missile defense capability. We never got to that stage. The kill vehicle never had the opportunity to go after the target. It never had the opportunity to employ the sensors that are needed in missile defense to kill the incoming missile on its way into an American city.

We will do a full analysis and the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization and the Department of Defense will provide the full reports to us. But this week I will arrange, as the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services Subcommittee on Research and Development, for any colleague in this Chamber that wants, a full briefing on the test, exactly what occurred and why the test failed.

But, again, I would repeat, it was not a failure of missile defense, any more than a rocket trying to launch a satellite into space and failing would cause us to stop all future communication satellite launches. It is simply a problem that we need to get corrected, and we will get corrected.

As Jack Gantzler, our Deputy Secretary of Defense, and General Kadish, our three-star general in charge of missile defense, stated in Congressional hearings 2 and 3 weeks ago, they are totally confident in our technology; and we will move forward. But there are those who want to distort the facts. The Union of Unconcerned Scientists is one of them. Those members of the Flat Earth Society that would like to mischaracterize what occurred are not going to be allowed to get away with that, and I would encourage our colleagues to make sure they avail themselves of all the factual information surrounding that test.

#### NUCLEAR ENERGY CRISIS LOOMING

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

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, we all know what happens when we are too reliant on foreign sources for oil; and, as a result, in my district in southern Ohio and across this country, consumers are paying outrageous prices for a gallon of gasoline.

But there is another energy crisis looming that many of us seem not to be aware of. I think it is important for