

NOES—212

Abercrombie	Everett	Moorhead
Allard	Ewing	Murtha
Baesler	Fazio	Myers
Baker (CA)	Fields (TX)	Myrick
Baker (LA)	Filner	Nethercutt
Ballenger	Flake	Ney
Barcia	Flanagan	Norwood
Barr	Foley	Nussle
Barrett (NE)	Forbes	Ortiz
Barton	Franks (CT)	Oxley
Bateman	Frisa	Packard
Bentsen	Frost	Parker
Bevill	Funderburk	Pastor
Bilirakis	Gekas	Paxon
Bishop	Gephardt	Peterson (FL)
Bliley	Geran	Peterson (MN)
Boehlert	Gonzalez	Pickett
Boehner	Goodlatte	Pombo
Bonilla	Gordon	Pomeroy
Bonior	Graham	Portman
Bono	Green (TX)	Quillen
Boucher	Gunderson	Radanovich
Brewster	Hall (TX)	Rahall
Browder	Hamilton	Regula
Brown (CA)	Hancock	Richardson
Brown (FL)	Hastert	Roberts
Bryant (TN)	Hastings (FL)	Rogers
Bunning	Hastings (WA)	Rose
Burr	Hefner	Sanford
Buyer	Heineman	Saxton
Callahan	Heger	Schaefer
Camp	Hilleary	Scott
Chabot	Hilliard	Serrano
Chambliss	Hostettler	Scott
Chapman	Houghton	Sisisky
Chenoweth	Hoyer	Skaggs
Chrysler	Hunter	Skeen
Clay	Inglis	Skelton
Clayton	Istook	Slaughter
Clement	Jefferson	Smith (MI)
Clinger	Johnson, E.B.	Solomon
Clyburn	Johnson, Sam	Spence
Coble	Jones	Spratt
Collins (GA)	Kaptur	Stearns
Collins (MI)	Kennedy (RI)	Stenholm
Combest	Kennelly	Stockman
Condit	Kim	Stump
Cooley	Kingston	Tanner
Cramer	Klink	Tauzin
Crane	Knollenberg	Taylor (NC)
Crapo	LaHood	Tejeda
Creameans	Latham	Thomas
Cubin	LaTourette	Thompson
Cunningham	Laughlin	Thornberry
Danner	Lewis (CA)	Thornton
de la Garza	Lewis (KY)	Thurman
Deal	Lightfoot	Torres
DeLay	Linder	Towns
Diaz-Balart	Livingston	Volkmer
Dickey	Longley	Vucanovich
Dingell	Lucas	Walker
Dixon	Manton	Walsh
Dooley	Martinez	Watt (NC)
Doolittle	Matsui	Watts (OK)
Doyle	McCollum	Weller
Dreier	McCreary	Whitfield
Duncan	McIntosh	Wicker
Edwards	Meek	Williams
Ehrlich	Mink	Wise
Emerson	Mollohan	Wynn
English	Montgomery	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—12

Brown (OH)	Hayes	McDade
Calvert	Hoke	Payne (VA)
Frelinghuysen	Lantos	Tate
Gillmor	Lincoln	Ward

□ 1819

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Brown of Ohio for, with Mr. Payne of Virginia against.

Mr. Tate for, with Mr. Calvert against.

Mr. NEUMANN and Mr. HUTCHINSON changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TATE. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 233, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WARD. Mr. Chairman, I would like the RECORD to reflect that while I was not recorded as voting on the Durbin amendment that was just considered, I would have voted "no." I was in fact on the floor, working the door, to the extent that I neglected to vote.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I call Members' attention to something that we just discovered this afternoon. Those of us that have been working on the Conservation Reserve Program, members of the Sportsmen's Caucus, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. PETE GEREN, the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. BREWSTER, and others are concerned about some language. I wanted to enter into a colloquy with the distinguished chairman.

Mr. Chairman, what we are concerned about is some report language that appeared in the bill that affects the conservation part of this bill, but it was not under that part of the report language. It was under the part that had to do with the farm service agencies. What it does is, it requires that they take a look at the criteria for the Conservation Reserve Program in a specific way.

The USDA is right at this time promulgating rules to extend this program. What this report language does is, it provides specific instructions to USDA as to how to proceed. What I am most concerned about is that it says in this report language that the committee directs that all acres are to be rebid and evaluated using the same criteria that was used during the 13th sign-up, a sign-up that was held last fall.

My district in northwestern Minnesota has the ninth most conservation reserve acres in the United States. Last year under the 13th sign-up, only 700 acres in my district qualified. If this language goes forward and if we reauthorize the program using this 13th sign-up, what we are going to do is we are going to eliminate all the big tracts of CRP, we are going to eliminate most of the wildlife benefits that we have seen in the Conservation Reserve Program, and I do not believe that that is what we want to do in this House.

Mr. Chairman, what I am asking is that the gentleman take another look at this and consider the possibility in conference committee of deleting this language. I do not think it makes any sense for us to be going in and prescribing to the Department what is going to be the criteria when they are

in the middle of deciding that. They have not even at this point put forward the proposed rule. There has been no public comment. It just seems to me that we are jumping the gun. I would appreciate it if the gentleman would look at that.

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

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I certainly understand the gentleman's concern and his consternation over finding this kind of language and what it will do. We will be happy to try to address the gentleman's concern when we get to conference with the Senate.

Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, if I could comment on this briefly as well, I just want to express appreciation as a cochair of the Sportsmen's Caucus for your looking into this matter.

The Conservation Reserve Program is a top priority for the Sportsmen's Caucus, something we have worked on for the last 2 years in this reauthorization. It is so important to the development for habitat for wildlife in our country. It has been tremendously successful as a habitat development program. It is an issue that the caucus has worked on very hard, and we appreciate very much your interest in working to assure that the concerns are addressed.

Mr. SKEEN. I share the gentleman's concern. Certainly those programs are of great value to both of us. We will do our best to get something worked out.

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

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. POMEROY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would just also ask the chairman to address this in conference committee. This is an extraordinarily consequential policy change to try and be moved forward in report language. That just is not right. It ought to come back to the authorization committee if this is going to be tackled head-on.

I trust that, therefore, this record will establish that there is not clear legislative intent following the report language. I hope we finally get it worked out in a more appropriate way in the conference report.

Mr. SKEEN. Once again, we share the gentleman's concern. We are certainly going to work with him every way we can to come to some resolution of this problem. I will include a table that have the Committee's bill totals,

**AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1997 (H.R. 3603)**

	FY 1996 Enacted	FY 1997 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
TITLE I - AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS					
Production, Processing, and Marketing					
Office of the Secretary	10,227,000	10,336,000	2,836,000	-7,391,000	-7,500,000
Executive Operations:					
Chief Economist	3,948,000	4,292,000	4,231,000	+283,000	-61,000
National Appeals Division	11,846,000	13,363,000	11,718,000	-128,000	-1,645,000
Office of Budget and Program Analysis	5,899,000	5,988,000	5,986,000	+87,000
Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization	804,000	-804,000
Total, Executive Operations.....	21,693,000	24,445,000	21,935,000	+242,000	-2,510,000
Chief Financial Officer	4,133,000	4,437,000	4,283,000	+150,000	-154,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration	596,000	813,000	813,000	+17,000
Agriculture buildings and facilities (USDA)	135,774,000	149,635,000	125,548,000	-10,228,000	-24,087,000
Payments to GSA.....	(89,971,000)	(103,754,000)	(103,754,000)	(+13,783,000)
Building operations and maintenance.....	(20,216,000)	(20,294,000)	(16,794,000)	(-3,422,000)	(-3,500,000)
Repairs, renovations, and construction.....	(25,587,000)	(25,587,000)	(5,000,000)	(-20,587,000)	(-20,587,000)
Advisory committees (USDA).....	650,000	856,000	-650,000	-856,000
Hazardous waste management.....	15,700,000	15,700,000	15,700,000
Departmental administration	27,986,000	29,137,000	28,304,000	+318,000	-833,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.....	3,797,000	3,842,000	3,728,000	-69,000	-114,000
Office of Communications.....	8,198,000	8,317,000	8,138,000	-60,000	-179,000
Office of the Inspector General.....	63,639,000	64,523,000	63,028,000	-611,000	-1,495,000
Office of the General Counsel.....	27,860,000	29,249,000	27,749,000	-111,000	-1,500,000
Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education and Economics.....	520,000	540,000	540,000	+20,000
Economic Research Service.....	53,131,000	54,947,000	54,176,000	+1,045,000	-771,000
National Agricultural Statistics Service	81,107,000	102,624,000	100,221,000	+19,114,000	-2,403,000
Agricultural Research Service.....	710,000,000	728,853,000	702,831,000	-7,169,000	-26,022,000
Buildings and facilities.....	30,200,000	80,100,000	59,600,000	+29,400,000	-20,500,000
Total, Agricultural Research Service.....	740,200,000	808,953,000	762,431,000	+22,231,000	-46,522,000
Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service:					
Research and education activities.....	421,929,000	418,572,000	411,849,000	-10,080,000	-6,723,000
Native Americans Institutions Endowment Fund.....	(4,600,000)	(4,600,000)	(4,600,000)
Buildings and facilities.....	57,838,000	30,449,000	-27,389,000	+30,449,000
Extension Activities.....	427,750,000	423,488,000	409,670,000	-18,080,000	-13,818,000
Total, Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service.....	907,517,000	842,060,000	851,968,000	-55,549,000	+9,908,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs.....	605,000	618,000	618,000	+13,000
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service:					
Salaries and expenses.....	431,921,000	439,033,000	435,428,000	+3,507,000	-3,605,000
AQL user fees 1/.....	(100,254,000)	(100,000,000)	(98,000,000)	(-2,254,000)	(-2,000,000)
Buildings and facilities.....	8,757,000	3,200,000	3,200,000	-5,557,000
Total, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	440,678,000	442,233,000	438,628,000	-2,050,000	-3,605,000
Agricultural Marketing Service:					
Marketing Services.....	46,517,000	48,311,000	37,592,000	-8,925,000	-10,719,000
New user fees.....	(3,887,000)	(3,887,000)	(+3,887,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses, from fees collected)	(58,461,000)	(59,012,000)	(59,012,000)	(+551,000)
Funds for strengthening markets, income, and supply (transfer from section 32).....	10,451,000	10,576,000	10,576,000	+125,000
Payments to states and possessions	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
Total, Agricultural Marketing Service.....	58,168,000	60,087,000	49,368,000	-8,800,000	-10,719,000
Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration	23,058,000	24,595,000	22,728,000	-330,000	-1,867,000
Inspection and Weighing Services (limitation on administrative expenses, from fees collected).....	(42,784,000)	(43,207,000)	(43,207,000)	(+423,000)
Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety	440,000	576,000	446,000	+6,000	-130,000
Food Safety and Inspection Service.....	544,906,000	574,000,000	574,000,000	+29,094,000
Lab accreditation fees 2/.....	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)
Total, Production, Processing, and Marketing.....	3,170,583,000	3,252,323,000	3,106,986,000	-13,597,000	-95,337,000
Farm Assistance Programs					
Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services.....	549,000	572,000	572,000	+23,000
Farm Service Agency:					
Salaries and expenses.....	795,000,000	820,495,000	746,440,000	-48,560,000	-74,055,000
(Transfer from export loans).....	(589,000)	(623,000)	(589,000)	(-34,000)
(Transfer from P.L. 480).....	(745,000)	(783,000)	(745,000)	(-38,000)
(Transfer from ACIF).....	(208,446,000)	(209,485,000)	(208,446,000)	(-1,039,000)
Total, salaries and expenses.....	(1,004,780,000)	(1,031,386,000)	(956,220,000)	(-48,560,000)	(-75,166,000)

**AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1997 (H.R. 3603)—Continued**

	FY 1996 Enacted	FY 1997 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
State mediation grants.....	2,000,000	3,000,000	-2,000,000	-3,000,000
Dairy indemnity program.....	100,000	100,000	100,000
Outreach for socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers.....	1,000,000	3,000,000	1,000,000	-2,000,000
Total, Farm Service Agency.....	798,100,000	828,595,000	747,540,000	-50,560,000	-79,055,000
Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Farm ownership loans:					
Direct.....	(80,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(-10,000,000)
Guaranteed.....	(550,000,000)	(650,000,000)	(550,000,000)	(-100,000,000)
Subtotal.....	(610,000,000)	(700,000,000)	(600,000,000)	(-10,000,000)	(-100,000,000)
Operating loans:					
Direct.....	(550,000,000)	(445,071,000)	(445,071,000)	(-104,929,000)
Guaranteed unsubsidized.....	(1,700,000,000)	(1,750,000,000)	(1,700,000,000)	(-50,000,000)
Guaranteed subsidized.....	(200,000,000)	(250,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(-50,000,000)
Subtotal.....	(2,450,000,000)	(2,445,071,000)	(2,345,071,000)	(-104,929,000)	(-100,000,000)
Indian tribe land acquisition loans.....	(750,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(+250,000)
Emergency disaster loans.....	(100,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(-75,000,000)	(+25,000,000)
Credit sales of acquired property.....	(50,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(+25,000,000)	(-25,000,000)
Total, Loan authorizations.....	(3,160,750,000)	(3,196,071,000)	(2,996,071,000)	(-164,679,000)	(-200,000,000)
Loan subsidies:					
Farm ownership:					
Direct.....	14,034,000	5,920,000	5,920,000	-8,114,000
Guaranteed.....	20,019,000	28,065,000	22,055,000	+2,038,000	-4,010,000
Subtotal.....	34,053,000	31,985,000	27,975,000	-6,078,000	-4,010,000
Farm operating:					
Direct.....	75,185,000	59,150,000	59,150,000	-16,035,000
Guaranteed unsubsidized.....	18,360,000	19,775,000	19,210,000	+850,000	-565,000
Guaranteed subsidized.....	17,960,000	23,100,000	18,480,000	+520,000	-4,620,000
Subtotal.....	111,505,000	102,025,000	96,840,000	-14,665,000	-5,185,000
Indian tribe land acquisition.....	206,000	54,000	54,000	-152,000
Emergency disaster.....	32,080,000	6,365,000	-25,715,000	+6,365,000
Credit sales of acquired property.....	5,060,000	2,530,000	+2,530,000	-2,530,000
Total, Loan subsidies.....	177,844,000	139,124,000	133,764,000	-44,080,000	-5,360,000
ACIF expenses:					
Salaries and expenses.....	208,935,000	209,485,000	208,446,000	-489,000	-1,039,000
Administrative expenses.....	12,606,000	12,606,000	12,600,000	-6,000	-6,000
Total, ACIF expenses.....	221,541,000	222,091,000	221,046,000	-495,000	-1,045,000
Total, Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund.....	399,385,000	361,215,000	354,810,000	-44,575,000	-6,405,000
(Loan authorization).....	(3,160,750,000)	(3,196,071,000)	(2,996,071,000)	(-164,679,000)	(-200,000,000)
Office of Risk Management.....	62,198,000	+62,198,000	+62,198,000
Total, Farm Assistance Programs.....	1,198,034,000	1,188,382,000	1,165,120,000	-32,914,000	-23,262,000
Corporations					
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation:					
Federal crop insurance corporation fund.....	1,263,708,000	1,591,000,000	1,591,000,000	+327,292,000
Commodity Credit Corporation Fund:					
Reimbursement for net realized losses.....	10,400,000,000	1,500,000,000	1,500,000,000	-8,900,000,000
Hazardous waste (limitation on administrative expenses).....	(5,000,000)	(15,750,000)	(5,000,000)	(-10,750,000)
Total, Corporations.....	11,663,708,000	3,091,000,000	3,091,000,000	-8,572,708,000
Total, title I, Agricultural Programs.....	16,032,325,000	7,531,705,000	7,413,106,000	-8,619,219,000	-118,599,000
(By transfer).....	(209,780,000)	(210,891,000)	(209,780,000)	(-1,111,000)
(Loan authorization).....	(3,160,750,000)	(3,196,071,000)	(2,996,071,000)	(-164,679,000)	(-200,000,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(108,245,000)	(117,969,000)	(107,219,000)	(+974,000)	(-10,750,000)
TITLE II - CONSERVATION PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment.....					
Natural Resources Conservation Service:	677,000	693,000	693,000	+16,000
Conservation operations.....	629,986,000	662,910,000	619,392,000	-10,594,000	-43,518,000
Watershed surveys and planning.....	14,000,000	19,188,000	10,762,000	-3,238,000	-8,426,000
Watershed and flood prevention operations.....	100,000,000	116,036,000	101,036,000	+1,036,000	-15,000,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 104-134).....	80,514,000	-80,514,000
Resource conservation and development.....	29,000,000	29,377,000	29,377,000	+377,000
Forestry incentives program.....	8,325,000	6,325,000	6,325,000

**AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1997 (H.R. 3603)—Continued**

	FY 1996 Enacted	FY 1997 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
Colorado River Basin salinity control program.....	2,681,000			-2,681,000	
Wetlands reserve program.....	77,000,000	188,000,000		-77,000,000	-188,000,000
National Natural Resources Conservation Service Foundation.....		500,000			-500,000
Total, Natural Resources Conservation Service	939,506,000	1,022,336,000	766,892,000	-172,614,000	-255,444,000
Farm Service Agency:					
Agricultural conservation program	75,000,000			-75,000,000	
Water quality incentives program	(11,000,000)	(15,000,000)		(-11,000,000)	(-15,000,000)
Conservation reserve program	1,781,785,000	1,924,850,000		-1,781,785,000	-1,924,850,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 104-134).....	30,000,000			-30,000,000	
Total, Farm Service Agency.....	1,886,785,000	1,924,850,000		-1,886,785,000	-1,924,850,000
Total, title II, Conservation Programs.....	2,826,968,000	2,947,879,000	767,585,000	-2,059,383,000	-2,180,294,000
TITLE III - RURAL ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development.....	568,000	588,000	588,000	+20,000	
Rural Housing Service:					
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Low-income housing (sec. 502)	(1,000,000,000)	(1,320,000,000)	(1,000,000,000)		(-320,000,000)
Unsubsidized guaranteed	(1,700,000,000)	(2,300,000,000)	(2,300,000,000)	(+600,000,000)	
Housing repair (sec. 504)	(35,000,000)	(35,000,000)	(35,000,000)		
Farm labor (sec. 514)	(15,000,000)	(18,482,000)	(15,000,000)		(-1,482,000)
Rental housing (sec. 515).....	(150,000,000)	(58,654,000)	(58,654,000)	(-91,346,000)	
Site loans (sec. 524)	(600,000)	(600,000)	(600,000)		
Self-help housing land development fund.....	(603,000)	(600,000)	(600,000)	(-3,000)	
Credit sales of acquired property		(75,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(+50,000,000)	(-25,000,000)
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 104-134).....	(38,960,000)			(-38,960,000)	
Total, Loan authorizations	(2,940,163,000)	(3,806,336,000)	(3,459,854,000)	(+519,691,000)	(-346,482,000)
Loan subsidies:					
Single family (sec. 502):					
Direct.....	145,833,000	109,560,000	83,000,000	-62,833,000	-26,560,000
Unsubsidized guaranteed	2,890,000	6,210,000	6,210,000	+3,320,000	
Housing repair (sec. 504)	14,193,000	11,081,000	11,081,000	-3,112,000	
Farm labor (sec. 514).....	8,829,000	7,565,000	6,885,000	-1,744,000	-680,000
Rental housing (sec. 515):					
Direct.....	82,035,000	28,987,000	28,987,000	-53,048,000	
Unsubsidized guaranteed	(1,000,000)		(1,000,000)		(+1,000,000)
Self-help housing land development fund.....	31,000	17,000		-14,000	
Credit sales of acquired property		6,098,000	4,050,000	+4,050,000	-2,048,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 104-134).....	6,500,000			-6,500,000	
Total, Loan subsidies.....	260,111,000	169,518,000	140,230,000	-119,881,000	-29,288,000
RHIF administrative expenses	385,889,000	366,205,000	366,205,000	-19,684,000	
Rental assistance program:					
(Sec. 521).....	535,000,000	487,970,000	487,970,000	-47,030,000	
(Sec. 502(c)(5)(D)).....	5,900,000	5,900,000	5,900,000		
Total, Rental assistance program	540,900,000	493,870,000	493,870,000	-47,030,000	
Total, Rural Housing Insurance Fund	1,186,900,000	1,029,593,000	1,000,305,000	-186,595,000	-29,288,000
(Loan authorization).....	(2,940,163,000)	(3,806,336,000)	(3,459,854,000)	(+519,691,000)	(-346,482,000)
Community Facility Loans Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Direct.....	(200,000,000)			(-200,000,000)	
Guaranteed.....	(75,000,000)			(-75,000,000)	
Total, Loan authorizations	(275,000,000)			(-275,000,000)	
Loan subsidies:					
Direct.....	34,880,000			-34,880,000	
Guaranteed	3,555,000			-3,555,000	
Total, Loan subsidies.....	38,435,000			-38,435,000	
Administrative expenses	8,836,000			-8,836,000	
Very low-income housing repair grants.....	24,900,000	24,900,000		-24,900,000	-24,900,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 104-134).....	1,100,000			-1,100,000	
Rural housing for domestic farm labor.....	10,000,000	10,000,000		-10,000,000	-10,000,000
Mutual and self-help housing grants.....	12,850,000	26,000,000	26,000,000	+13,350,000	
Rural community fire protection grants.....	2,000,000			-2,000,000	
Compensation for construction defects.....	495,000			-495,000	
Rural housing preservation grants	11,000,000	11,000,000		-11,000,000	-11,000,000
Rural housing assistance program 3/.....		136,435,000	73,190,000	+73,190,000	-63,245,000
Subtotal, grants and payments	62,145,000	208,335,000	99,190,000	+37,045,000	-109,145,000

**AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1997 (H.R. 3603)—Continued**

	FY 1996 Enacted	FY 1997 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
RHS expenses:					
Administrative expenses.....	46,583,000	89,980,000	53,889,000	+7,306,000	-35,771,000
(Transfer from RHIF).....	(377,074,000)	(368,205,000)	(368,205,000)	(-10,869,000)	
(Transfer from ACIF).....	(171,000)			(-171,000)	
(Transfer from CFLP).....	(8,731,000)			(-8,731,000)	
Total, RHS expenses.....	(432,559,000)	(455,885,000)	(420,094,000)	(-12,465,000)	(-35,771,000)
Total, Rural Housing Service.....	1,342,899,000	1,327,588,000	1,153,384,000	-189,515,000	-174,204,000
(Loan authorization).....	(3,215,163,000)	(3,806,336,000)	(3,459,854,000)	(+244,691,000)	(-346,482,000)
Rural Business-Cooperative Service:					
Rural Business and Industry Loans Program Account:					
Loan authorization: Guaranteed.....	(500,000,000)			(-500,000,000)	
Loan subsidy: Guaranteed.....	6,437,000			-6,437,000	
Administrative expenses.....	14,888,000			-14,888,000	
Rural Development Loan Fund Program Account:					
(Loan authorization).....	(37,544,000)	(80,000,000)	(40,000,000)	(+2,458,000)	(-40,000,000)
Loan subsidy.....	22,395,000	36,928,000	18,400,000	-3,995,000	-18,528,000
Administrative expenses.....	1,476,000			-1,476,000	
Rural Economic Development Loans Program Account:					
Direct loans (limitation on obligations).....	(12,865,000)	(14,000,000)	(12,865,000)		(-1,135,000)
Direct subsidy.....	3,729,000	3,095,000	2,830,000	-899,000	-265,000
Administrative expenses.....	654,000	699,000	654,000		-45,000
Alternative Agricultural Research and Commercialization					
Revolving Fund.....	8,500,000	8,975,000	8,000,000	-500,000	-975,000
Rural business enterprise grants.....	45,000,000			-45,000,000	
Appropriate technology transfer for rural areas.....	2,300,000	1,300,000		-2,300,000	-1,300,000
Rural business-cooperative assistance 3/.....		53,750,000	51,400,000	+51,400,000	-2,350,000
RBCS expenses:					
Salaries and expenses.....	9,013,000	27,068,000	25,680,000	+16,667,000	-1,388,000
(Transfer from RBILP).....	(14,747,000)			(-14,747,000)	
(Transfer from RDLP).....	(1,476,000)			(-1,476,000)	
(Transfer from REDLP).....	(654,000)	(699,000)	(654,000)		(-45,000)
Total, RBCS expenses.....	(25,890,000)	(27,767,000)	(26,334,000)	(+444,000)	(-1,433,000)
Total, Rural Business-Cooperative Service.....	112,372,000	129,815,000	104,964,000	-7,408,000	-24,851,000
(By transfer).....	(16,877,000)	(699,000)	(654,000)	(-16,223,000)	(-45,000)
(Loan authorization).....	(537,544,000)	(80,000,000)	(40,000,000)	(-497,544,000)	(-40,000,000)
Rural Utilities Service:					
Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Direct loans:					
Electric 5%.....	(90,000,000)	(125,000,000)	(125,000,000)	(+35,000,000)	
Telephone 5%.....	(70,000,000)	(75,000,000)	(75,000,000)	(+5,000,000)	
Subtotal.....	(160,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(+40,000,000)	
Treasury rate: Telephone.....	(300,000,000)	(300,000,000)	(300,000,000)		
Muni-rate: Electric.....	(525,000,000)	(600,000,000)	(525,000,000)		(-75,000,000)
FFB loans:					
Electric, regular.....	(300,000,000)	(400,000,000)	(300,000,000)		(-100,000,000)
Telephone.....	(120,000,000)	(120,000,000)	(120,000,000)		
Subtotal.....	(420,000,000)	(520,000,000)	(420,000,000)		(-100,000,000)
Total, Loan authorizations.....	(1,405,000,000)	(1,620,000,000)	(1,445,000,000)	(+40,000,000)	(-175,000,000)
Loan subsidies:					
Direct loans:					
Electric 5%.....	21,168,000	3,625,000	3,625,000	-17,543,000	
Telephone 5%.....	13,958,000	1,193,000	1,193,000	-12,765,000	
Subtotal.....	35,126,000	4,818,000	4,818,000	-30,308,000	
Treasury rate: Telephone.....	60,000	60,000	60,000		
Muni-rate, electric.....	56,858,000	32,280,000	28,245,000	-28,613,000	-4,035,000
FFB loans: Electric, regular.....	2,520,000	3,720,000	2,790,000	+270,000	-930,000
Total, Loan subsidies.....	94,564,000	40,878,000	35,913,000	-58,651,000	-4,965,000
RETLP administrative expenses.....	29,982,000	33,070,000	29,982,000		-3,088,000
Total, Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account.....	124,546,000	73,948,000	65,895,000	-58,651,000	-8,053,000
(Loan authorization).....	(1,405,000,000)	(1,620,000,000)	(1,445,000,000)	(+40,000,000)	(-175,000,000)

**AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1997 (H.R. 3603)—Continued**

	FY 1996 Enacted	FY 1997 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
Rural Telephone Bank Program Account:					
Direct loans (limitation on obligations).....	(175,000,000)	(175,000,000)	(175,000,000)
Direct loan subsidy.....	5,023,000	2,328,000	2,328,000	-2,695,000
RTB administrative expenses.....	3,541,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	-41,000
Distance learning and medical link grants and loans.....	7,500,000	20,261,000	7,500,000	-12,761,000
Solid waste management grants, rural water and waste disposal grants, and water and waste disposal facility loans (administrative expenses).....	12,740,000	-12,740,000
Rural utilities assistance program 3/.....	487,868,000	661,560,000	496,868,000	+8,000,000	-164,692,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 104-134).....	11,000,000	-11,000,000
RUS expenses:					
Salaries and expenses.....	18,449,000	33,873,000	33,195,000	+14,748,000	-678,000
Electric and telephone loans (by transfer).....	(29,982,000)	(33,070,000)	(29,982,000)	(-3,088,000)
Rural telephone bank (by transfer).....	(3,541,000)	(3,500,000)	(3,500,000)	(-41,000)
Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account (by transfer).....	(318,000)	(-318,000)
Rural partnership (by transfer).....	(12,623,000)	(-12,623,000)
Total, RUS expenses.....	(64,913,000)	(70,443,000)	(66,677,000)	(+1,764,000)	(-3,766,000)
Total, Rural Utilities Service.....	670,667,000	795,470,000	609,286,000	-61,381,000	-186,184,000
(By transfer).....	(48,484,000)	(36,570,000)	(33,482,000)	(-12,982,000)	(-3,088,000)
(Loan authorization).....	(1,405,000,000)	(1,620,000,000)	(1,445,000,000)	(+40,000,000)	(-175,000,000)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(175,000,000)	(175,000,000)	(175,000,000)
Total, title III, Rural Economic and Community Development Programs.....					
.....	2,126,506,000	2,253,461,000	1,868,222,000	-258,284,000	-385,239,000
(By transfer).....	(449,317,000)	(403,474,000)	(400,341,000)	(-48,976,000)	(-3,133,000)
(Loan authorization).....	(5,157,707,000)	(5,506,336,000)	(4,944,854,000)	(-212,853,000)	(-561,482,000)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(187,865,000)	(189,000,000)	(187,865,000)	(-1,135,000)
TITLE IV - DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services.....	440,000	554,000	454,000	+14,000	-100,000
Food and Consumer Service:					
Child nutrition programs.....	2,348,166,000	3,251,215,000	3,218,844,000	+870,678,000	-32,371,000
Discretionary spending.....	4,000,000	-4,000,000
Transfer from section 32.....	5,597,858,000	5,413,453,000	5,433,753,000	-164,105,000	+20,300,000
Total, Child nutrition programs.....	7,946,024,000	8,668,668,000	8,652,597,000	+706,573,000	-16,071,000
Special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children (WIC).....	3,729,807,000	3,780,000,000	3,729,807,000	-50,193,000
Reserve.....	100,000,000	-100,000,000
(By transfer).....	(4,000,000)	(-4,000,000)
Food stamp program:					
Expenses.....	25,954,828,000	26,353,555,000	26,341,029,000	+386,201,000	-12,526,000
Reserve.....	500,000,000	2,461,200,000	100,000,000	-400,000,000	-2,361,200,000
Nutrition assistance for Puerto Rico.....	1,143,000,000	1,174,000,000	1,174,000,000	+31,000,000
Total, Food stamp program.....	27,597,828,000	29,988,755,000	27,615,029,000	+17,201,000	-2,373,726,000
Commodity assistance program.....	166,000,000	172,000,000	166,000,000	-6,000,000
Food donations programs for selected groups:					
Needy family program.....	65,000,000	65,000,000	65,000,000
Elderly feeding program.....	150,000,000	150,000,000	140,000,000	-10,000,000	-10,000,000
Total, Food donations programs.....	215,000,000	215,000,000	205,000,000	-10,000,000	-10,000,000
Food program administration.....	107,789,000	110,982,000	104,487,000	-3,282,000	-6,495,000
The Center for Nutrition Policy and Promotion.....	4,470,000	-4,470,000
Total, Food and Consumer Service.....	39,762,428,000	43,039,875,000	40,472,920,000	+710,492,000	-2,566,955,000
Total, title IV, Domestic Food Programs.....	39,762,868,000	43,040,429,000	40,473,374,000	+710,506,000	-2,567,055,000
TITLE V - FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS					
Foreign Agricultural Service:					
Direct appropriation.....	115,802,000	132,875,000	124,208,000	+8,406,000	-8,667,000
(Transfer from Commodity Credit Corporation).....	(5,176,000)	(-5,176,000)
(Transfer from export loans).....	(2,792,000)	(3,231,000)	(2,792,000)	(-439,000)
(Transfer from P.L. 480).....	(1,005,000)	(1,035,000)	(1,005,000)	(-30,000)
Total, Program level.....	(124,775,000)	(137,141,000)	(128,005,000)	(+3,230,000)	(-9,136,000)
Public Law 480 Program Account:					
Title I - Credit sales:					
Program level.....	(316,342,000)	(232,849,000)	(230,305,000)	(-86,037,000)	(-2,544,000)
Direct loans.....	(291,342,000)	(218,944,000)	(216,400,000)	(-74,942,000)	(-2,544,000)
Ocean freight differential.....	25,000,000	13,905,000	13,905,000	-11,095,000

**AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1997 (H.R. 3603)—Continued**

	FY 1996 Enacted	FY 1997 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
Title II - Commodities for disposition abroad:					
Program level.....	(821,100,000)	(837,000,000)	(837,000,000)	(+ 15,900,000)
Appropriation.....	821,100,000	837,000,000	837,000,000	+ 15,900,000
Title III - Commodity grants:					
Program level.....	(50,000,000)	(40,000,000)	(29,500,000)	(-20,500,000)	(-10,500,000)
Appropriation.....	50,000,000	40,000,000	29,500,000	-20,500,000	-10,500,000
Loan subsidies.....	236,162,000	179,082,000	177,000,000	-59,162,000	-2,082,000
Salaries and expenses:					
General Sales Manager.....	1,005,000	1,035,000	1,005,000	-30,000
Farm Service Agency.....	745,000	783,000	745,000	-38,000
Subtotal.....	1,750,000	1,818,000	1,750,000	-68,000
Total, Public Law 480:					
Program level.....	(1,187,442,000)	(1,108,849,000)	(1,086,805,000)	(-90,637,000)	(-13,044,000)
Appropriation.....	1,134,012,000	1,071,805,000	1,059,155,000	-74,857,000	-12,650,000
CCC Export Loans Program Account:					
Loan guarantees:					
Short-term export credit.....	(5,200,000,000)	(5,000,000,000)	(5,500,000,000)	(+ 300,000,000)	(+ 500,000,000)
Intermediate-term export credit.....	(500,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(-500,000,000)	(-500,000,000)
Loan subsidy.....	374,347,000	390,000,000	390,000,000	+ 15,653,000
Salaries and expenses (Export Loans):					
General Sales Manager.....	2,792,000	3,231,000	2,792,000	-439,000
ASCS.....	589,000	623,000	589,000	-34,000
Total, CCC Export Loans Program Account.....	377,728,000	393,854,000	393,381,000	+ 15,653,000	-473,000
Total, title V, Foreign assistance and related programs.....	1,627,542,000	1,598,534,000	1,576,744,000	-50,798,000	-21,790,000
(By transfer).....	(8,973,000)	(4,266,000)	(3,797,000)	(-5,176,000)	(-469,000)
TITLE VI - RELATED AGENCIES AND FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION					
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES					
Food and Drug Administration					
Salaries and expenses, direct appropriation.....	819,971,000	823,771,000	819,971,000	-3,800,000
Prescription drug user fee act.....	(84,723,000)	(87,528,000)	(87,528,000)	(+ 2,805,000)
Mammography clinics user fee.....	(13,000,000)	(13,403,000)	(13,403,000)	(+ 403,000)
Total, Program level.....	(917,694,000)	(924,702,000)	(920,902,000)	(+ 3,208,000)	(-3,800,000)
Buildings and facilities.....	12,150,000	8,350,000	21,350,000	+ 9,200,000	+ 13,000,000
Rental payments.....	46,294,000	46,294,000	46,294,000
Total, Food and Drug Administration.....	878,415,000	878,415,000	887,615,000	+ 9,200,000	+ 9,200,000
DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY					
Financial Management Service: Payments to the Farm Credit System Financial Assistance Corporation.....					
	15,453,000	10,290,000	10,290,000	-5,163,000
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Commodity Futures Trading Commission.....	53,601,000	56,601,000	55,101,000	+ 1,500,000	-1,500,000
Farm Credit Administration (limitation on administrative expenses).....	(37,478,000)	(37,478,000)	(+ 37,478,000)
Total, title VI, Related Agencies and Food and Drug Administration.....	947,469,000	945,308,000	953,006,000	+ 5,537,000	+ 7,700,000
Scorekeeping adjustments.....	-235,780,000	127,050,000	-368,000,000	-132,220,000	-495,050,000
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority.....	63,087,898,000	58,444,364,000	52,684,037,000	-10,403,861,000	-5,760,327,000
(By transfer).....	(672,070,000)	(618,631,000)	(613,918,000)	(-58,152,000)	(-4,713,000)
(Loan authorization).....	(14,018,457,000)	(14,202,407,000)	(13,440,925,000)	(-577,532,000)	(-761,482,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(106,245,000)	(155,447,000)	(144,897,000)	(+ 38,452,000)	(-10,750,000)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(187,865,000)	(189,000,000)	(187,865,000)	(-1,135,000)

1/ Such sums as available from AQI user fee account for FY 1996. In addition, \$24,857,000 is anticipated from farm bill direct appropriations.

2/ In addition to appropriation.

3/ The Administration proposed funding for this account under the name "Rural performance partnership program".

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ARMEY was allowed to speak out of order.)

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, it is our hope that we can complete this bill by 7 p.m. tonight, at which time we would intend to take up the budget. After the budget we would intend to take up the rule on the shipbuilding bill.

□ 1830

It is our hope and our belief that we could, under those circumstances, complete our work on shipbuilding and DOD tomorrow and avoid the need for us to be here in session on Friday.

In consideration of these opportunities that would make themselves available in the schedule, I am going to be asking the managers of the bill and those who have amendments to offer, if it would be possible, perhaps, for them to work out a time agreement to complete any consideration of amendments on this bill and move us to final passage by 7 o'clock.

Obviously, it is within their prerogatives to work out such an arrangement, but I would encourage them to do so. I would like to remind the Chairman and Members that I do have, under the rule, the option to rise and report. I would, of course, prefer not to exercise that option and, for that reason, would, to the maximum of my ability, encourage the bill managers and perhaps those with amendments, if at all possible, if they could work out this time arrangement so we can complete work on this bill and move on to the rest of the schedule.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back to the gentleman from New Mexico to see if perhaps he might want to explore that opportunity.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, certainly we would be willing to do that, and I assure the leader that we would get it done.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on all amendments close at 7 p.m. and that the time from this point on be equally divided.

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I want to discuss that. That is a problem. We have an amendment that is ready to be offered that, to me, is more important than the tobacco amendment that took up over an hour and a half or 2 hours, or the previous amendment that took a long time, because it has to do with rural America.

My district is rural. Rural water and sewer is very important to my district. The amendment is to be able to restore some of the money that we need in rural water and sewer, and to say to that we are not going to even get to speak on it unless we do it in, say, a half-hour, means 15 minutes on each side. There are any number of Members who wanted to speak on it because it is important to their district and we are being told we cannot do that.

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, we are not saying the gentleman cannot do something. What we are telling him is something he can do, and what he can do is this: We want to give the other side every opportunity. How many amendments is the gentleman talking about?

Mr. VOLKMER. One amendment that I know of at the present time.

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Under my reservation, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding to me. There is one amendment left from the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, and all we ask is that we have assurances from the other side of the aisle that we have a proper amount of time to debate that amendment.

If I am wrong, I would ask my colleague from Wisconsin to correct me, but as I understand it, that is the only pending amendment that remains for the evening.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, we are talking 30 minutes. Can we do it in 30 minutes?

Mr. BONIOR. We would prefer to have a half-hour on each side.

Mr. SKEEN. Let us go 40 minutes.

Mr. VOLKMER. Would the gentleman give us 30 minutes and you take 10? That is 40 minutes.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, this is not a hog swap.

Mr. VOLKMER. That is 40 minutes.

Mr. SKEEN. How about 45 minutes?

Mr. BONIOR. Why do we not split 45 minutes?

Mr. VOLKMER. Make it 46.

Mr. SKEEN. Forty-five equally divided.

Mr. VOLKMER. Make it 46, 23 on each side.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman to repeat his unanimous-consent request.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this bill and all amendments thereto occur within 45 minutes and that the time be equally divided.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk, but I have decided not to ask for the amendment to be considered. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments to the bill?

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think that it would be worthwhile for some of the Members to know why many of us on this side of the aisle are not going to vote for this bill. I know that the gentleman from New Mexico, who I very strongly support in all the work that he has tried to do, is working under constraints not of his own making. It is the budget, which we are going to take up next, or sometime this evening, that is causing all the problems, but that budget cuts back severely on agriculture programs that will impact adversely, severely, on many rural districts, including my own.

We need more money in here for rural water and sewer, for economic development in the rural areas. That all is possible and would have been possible under the coalition or the blue dog budget. But, no, we had to do the Republican budget, and it makes these severe cuts in agriculture. It is not only in the rural water and sewer areas, but it is also in rural housing that is cut back.

I do not know why the Republican majority wants to devastate rural America, but it seems that they are bound and determined to do so.

If we look at another area of that budget, at the Medicare area, we will find what the cuts in Medicare and Medicaid will mean. In my district, in rural areas, we are going to have hospitals close. So I am going to have hospitals closing down. I will not be able to provide housing for many of my people, and I am going to continue to have communities that do not have adequate sewer systems, do not have any sewer system at the present time, cannot afford it on their own, and yet they do not want to provide the funds that would be necessary.

I had hoped that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] would have offered his amendment to restore \$27 million; \$27 million is vitally needed in this program but we do not have it.

I do not have any alternative, Mr. Chairman, but to vote in protest against this bill. I recognize that the gentleman from New Mexico and the gentleman from Illinois have done their best within the framework of what the budget of the Republican majority has given them, but I say to them that that is not enough.

I do not blame the gentleman from New Mexico, I blame his leadership, not only for coming down on agriculture, but later on education and other programs as well. I do not plan to vote on those types of things either.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is ill-conceived that they are trying to devastate rural America rather than helping it to grow, at the same time they say what they are doing is good for the country. I tell my colleagues this bill is not good for rural America. I believe that we have no alternative but to defeat the bill. I wish we could, but I know we will not be able to because we do not have the votes, the votes are

over there to do it, but I want the people to know, the people of this House to know, that the gentleman from Missouri, HAROLD VOLKMER, is not going to vote for a bill that devastates rural America.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in reluctant opposition to the fiscal year 1997 Agricultural Appropriations Act. I would like to commend the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee chairman, Mr. SKEEN, for doing a tremendous job in balancing the many demands for funds in this bill with a severe reduction in discretionary authority. I am especially pleased with the attention given to projects and programs which benefit producers in North Dakota and the upper Great Plains. The support given to all aspects of agricultural research and the funding of conservation programs certainly represent significant achievements in this bill. Finally I am relieved the committee restored funding to the market transitions payments the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee had cut.

In the final analysis, however, I find that I cannot support final passage for a few reasons. The main reason is the severe and unwarranted modifications made to the sugar program. Language inserted in the appropriations bill would cap the price of raw sugar at 21 cents per pound, a cent lower than the current domestic market price. Mandating what amounts to a price control on sugar at a time when in all other industries we continually call for free and open markets makes no sense. This provision will actually increase the amount of foreign sugar imported into the United States. Why we would want to increase sugar imports at the expense of our domestic sugar producers defies comprehension.

During the farm bill debate Congress passed a 7-year sugar reform program that raised import levels, removed marketing allotments, and assigned penalties for forfeiture of sugar. These reforms withstood tough votes on both the House and Senate floor. Now, less than 2 months after passage of those reforms, the Appropriations Committee has—at least in the language before us—decided to abandon the reform and make further modifications to the sugar program. If this action represents the commitment of Congress to the 7-year farm bill I truly fear for the rest of the guarantees in that law. Modification of complex and critical programs such as the sugar program in the closed rooms of the Appropriations Committee represents a dangerous precedent that should not be upheld. This attack on the sugar producers and sugar industry workers in the United States must not stand.

Additionally, the elimination of \$2 million in funding for the agricultural mediation program is particularly troublesome. In North Dakota the mediation program has helped hundreds of farmers work through difficult credit problems, usually allowing them to service their loans without resorting to bankruptcy. With this elimination of the mediation grants these producers will have nowhere else to turn. This highly successful program certainly deserves continuing funding.

Finally, the Appropriations Committee, in report language, instructed the Secretary of Agriculture on how to conduct signups for the Conservation Reserve Program. The Secretary currently is preparing regulations for the next signup for CRP. To specify in this bill

what the rule will be for the next signup could throw the process into a tailspin.

For these reasons I must oppose this bill. Despite the many good things in this bill, I cannot support such a brazen attack on the hard-working sugarbeet farmers in North Dakota and the thousands of North Dakotans employed in the sugar industry, and I cannot support the elimination of the highly successful North Dakota Ag Mediation Program. I hope these problems and the CRP provisions can be corrected in the Senate and in conference so I can support the necessary funding of the Nation's No. 1 industry—agriculture.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask that this summary of the U.S. AID's Inspector General's report be included in the RECORD. This summary deals exclusively with the Public Law 480 program and details some of the title III failures as well as title II successes.

U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL, JUNE 11, 1996, TO DARREN WILLCOX, FROM PAUL ARMSTRONG, ACTING AIG/A

REQUESTED EXAMPLES OF PL-480 AUDITS

As requested, I'm sending you some write-ups on recent PL-480 audits which were included in our most recent Semiannual Reports to the Congress. The audits are listed below:

Report No.	Date issued	Report title
5-286-94-014	8-10-95	Audit of USAID/India's Monitoring of the PL-480 Title II Program
3-650-95-18	9-8-95	Audit of REDSO/ESA's PL-480 Title II Program in Southern Sudan
1-521-95-008	6-23-95	Survey Report on Losses of PL-480 Title II Commodities in Haiti During the Political Transition Period September 15, 1994 to January 13, 1995
3-656-96-003	2-9-96	Audit of USAID/Mozambique's Management of PL-480 Title III Program.

I hope this information is helpful.

P.L. 480 TITLE III PROGRAM IN MOZAMBIQUE

In an effort to help alleviate poverty and liberalize commodity markets in Mozambique, the United States donated over 458,000 metric tons of commodities under the P.L. 480 Title III Program. These commodities (mostly grain), valued at \$88 million, were donated to the Government of Mozambique between 1991 and 1994 on the condition that the commodities be used to generate local currency for the purpose of funding various governmental ministries, as well as supporting private voluntary organization activities.

An audit of this program found that USAID had established a system to monitor the receipt, storage, and sale of commodities as required by Agency policies and procedures; however, the following problems were reported: poor quality commodities, subsequently determined by USAID management to be "unfit for human consumption," arrived in Mozambique, resulting in a loss of \$8 million for purchase, transport and disposal costs; and pilferage of \$1,376,378 worth of commodities occurred at Mozambique ports during the unloading of shipments—often in plain view of port security guards.

USAID in Mozambique had complained about the poor quality of commodities being received and the U.S. Ambassador had reported that the shipments had 1) a higher moisture content than allowed under regulations and 2) insect infestation so bad that the entire cargo and ship had to be fumigated several times. A response from USAID and the U.S. Department of Agriculture in Washington stated that the cause for this problem as the floods of the Mississippi watershed and suggested that the Mission upgrade its standard specifications for corn

transports to Mozambique. The Mission did so and the quality of commodities has since improved. The audit made no recommendations in this area.

Regarding the commodity thefts, the audit recommended that USAID condition future shipments of P.L. 480 Title III commodities on improvements in port security, warehouse facilities, and operating procedures for the handling of bulk grain commodities in order to minimize the opportunity to future thefts. The Mission agreed and has suspended a shipment of 18,000 tons of corn (and all future shipments) until such improvements are made. The Mission is also requesting that the Government of Mozambique compensate the U.S. government for the loss.

The audit could not assess whether local currency generated from the sale of commodities was used for its intended purposes because the Mission had not assessed the reliability of the Mozambique government's accounting systems, nor had audits been performed on local currency expenditures. The Mission stated that a previously scheduled assessment had been postponed due to the signing of Mozambique's UN-brokered peace accord in 1992 and the first multi-party elections in October 1994. In addition, the Government of Mozambique's principal audit agency was considered incapable of conducting the audits. The OIG recommended that the Mission conduct an accountability assessment and financial audits as required. If the local audit agency cannot be relied upon, the independent public accounting firms or other alternative means should be pursued. USAID concurred with all the recommendations and initiated corrective actions. (*Audit Report No. 3-656-96-003*)

MONITORING OF THE P.L. 480 TITLE II PROGRAM IN INDIA

A recent audit of the Food for Peace Program in India showed that USAID/India has corrected problems previously identified by a prior audit, and has taken additional steps to improve the program. The Agricultural Trade Development Assistance Act of 1990, Public Law 480 (P.L. 480), is the statutory authority for the Food for Peace Program. During fiscal years 1993 and 1994, \$135 million in food aid was delivered to 8.3 million poverty-stricken people in India. This food was mainly administered through two private voluntary organizations (PVOs)—Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere (CARE) and Catholic Relief Services (CRS).

The audit found that USAID/India generally ensured that the objective of the P.L. 480 Title II program was being achieved, losses were being reported, that claims were submitted on time, and claims were eventually being resolved. (A prior audit had found problems with one of the PVOs failing to report food losses or resolving claims). Finally, the Mission ensured that losses were held to reasonable levels, although improvements could be made in monitoring the ordering and allocating of food by one of the two PVOs.

The audit report recognized USAID/India's efforts to correct problem areas previously reported and the Mission's ongoing efforts to improve the P.L. 480 Program. One recommendation was made for USAID/India to improve its monitoring over the PVO's ordering and allocation of food. Mission officials generally concurred with the report's conclusions and the recommendation was closed upon report issuance. (*Audit Report No. 5-386-95-014*)

REDSO/ESA'S P.L. 480 TITLE II PROGRAM IN SOUTHERN SUDAN

USAID's Title II Emergency Relief program in Sudan is an ongoing effort to alleviate the suffering of the southern Sudanese people following the war between the Christian South and the Islamic government in

Khartoum. An audit of this program found that USAID made a significant impact in its effort through the delivery of large amounts of food aid to the needy. Considering the war conditions, the Regional Economic Development Support Office (REDSO/ESA) had been successful in minimizing the food losses, although some food diversions did occur. For instance, financial difficulties forced a small non-governmental organization (NGO) to withdraw from the relief effort, putting war victims of two displacement camps at risk of starvation. The OIG brought this matter to the attention of REDSO/ESA and food aid was immediately delivered to the camps. In another instance, inadequate transport funding by the Bureau for Humanitarian Response had forced another NGO to suspend food aid distribution, putting 150,000 war victims at risk of hunger. Again, REDSO promptly resumed the delivery of emergency supplies. Finally, the audit found inaccuracies in recipient population estimates. Without accurate estimates, excess food aid deliveries to areas with over-stated populations would lead to the diversion of food to military personnel or market profiteers, while a shortage to areas with under-stated populations would deny starving people.

The audit recommended that REDSO/ESA take steps to ensure the NGOs obtain reasonable population estimates, recover claims for losses of food aid commodities, and improve on the system for reporting and recovering losses. REDSO/ESA management concurred with the audit findings and promptly took action to close the recommendations. All recommendations had been closed upon report issuance. (Audit Report No. 3-650-95-018)

LOSSES OF PUBLIC LAW 480 TITLE II COMMODITIES IN HAITI

The OIG conducted an audit survey of alleged losses of Public Law (P.L.) 480 Title II commodities in Haiti. The survey included a review of the physical security environment and control structure of the feeding program and a partial assessment of whether USAID/Haiti can provide reasonable assurances that program commodities are adequately safeguarded and used for intended purposes. The survey was conducted between September 1994 and January 1995, when Haiti was in transition from a military to a civilian government.

The survey found that the P.L. 480 Title II food program incurred substantial commodity losses due to theft during the political transition period. Three Title II cooperating sponsors reported 2,732 metric tons of commodity losses valued at \$1.1 million or 16 percent of the total commodities while reporting 14,259 metric tons of commodities distributed during the first quarter of fiscal year 1995.

Although civil unrest has subsided and general stability has returned to Haiti, the situation remains somewhat volatile and uncertain. The OIG believes that a normal P.L. 480 Title II control structure is not designed to function under the absence of civil authority and the type of civil instability that occurred; therefore, the report recommended that USAID/Haiti establish procedures for determining the extent and causes of commodity losses in order to formalize alternatives for providing additional security measures to prevent future losses. USAID/Haiti generally agreed with our report findings. (Audit Report No. 1-521-95-008)

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this appropriations bill, which provides funding for many of the important agricultural programs that have helped to make our Nation's farming industry strong. While the funding that is provided in this bill is reduced from last year for many programs, I am also sup-

portive of the effort to reign in Federal spending and balance the Federal budget. I urge my colleagues to join with me in support of the tough fiscal decisions the Appropriations Committee has made.

Particularly important for Missouri agriculture is the inclusion of funding for soybean cyst nematode research. This funding supports research which is conducted at the University of Missouri's Delta Area Agricultural Research Center in Portageville. Last year, American soybean farmers lost hundreds of millions of dollar of farm income because of soybean yield losses. Fortunately, the Delta Center has made significant advances in order to help the many U.S. soybean farmers fighting this profit destroying cyst nematode.

I am also particularly supportive of the aspects of this bill which will facilitate a growing export market for agricultural goods. Without a doubt, world trade is the key to the future of American Agriculture. Within our borders, U.S. consumers enjoy an abundant supply of food at a price lower than nearly anywhere else on earth. Therefore, in order to expand, American agriculture must look to foreign populations and consumers that are anxious to obtain a higher quality and a wider variety of foodstuffs.

Agricultural exports are expected to grow rapidly in the near future in certain markets, especially in the Pacific Rim. However, in other markets that are developing less rapidly, assistance through PL-480, or Food for Peace, will pave the way to greater U.S. exports in the long term. I have a longstanding interest in food aid and have observed many examples of countries that successfully have made the transition from a concessional to a cash buyer. And, as we help these countries meet their basic food needs, we also help U.S. farmers who grow the commodities and those who process, bag, can, rail, and ship the food to developing countries.

Accordingly, I am especially supportive of the funding that H.R. 3603 provides for the Food for Peace program and urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill.

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill. But, while I do support this bill, due to the full committee's correction of a major flaw in the measure originally reported by the subcommittee, I'm still very concerned that agriculture, year after year, is asked to do more than its fair share to help balance the budget.

Balancing the budget must remain a priority, and I'm a strong supporter of balancing the budget. However, the bill before us reduces spending for USDA, FDA, and related agencies by 16 percent—over \$10 billion!

Unfortunately, not only are the spending reductions in this bill excessive, the appropriations subcommittee on agriculture attempted to revisit many of the issues we debated and voted on during the farm bill debate. For example, the House has spoken on the sugar program, which I remind you is mandated to operate at no net cost to the Government, and on granting farmers true freedom to manage their land. I'm afraid some in this urban-dominated Congress do not understand the nature of farming or agriculture programs.

The Federal Agricultural Improvement and Reform Act of 1996, the FAIR Act, was the first real reform of Federal farm programs in 60 years, and the only entitlement reform bill to be signed into law during the 104th Congress. I'm proud to have joined with Agri-

culture Chairman Roberts in this historic legislation that transitions farmers from dependence on Government subsidies to independent planting and marketing decisions. Enactment of the FAIR Act was a great accomplishment for this Congress, and the final vote reflected true bipartisan support.

However, it's time to move on. With the farm bill signed into law and with the passage of the fiscal year 1997 agriculture appropriations bill, I believe we must rebuild the partnership of all rural districts in support of agriculture—the largest single sector of the economy. I look forward to working with my colleagues as this Congress comes to an end and into the future to raise the voice of rural America.

The appropriations subcommittee on agriculture was put in a difficult position with its low budget allocation. I respect your work and thank you for making the best of a bad situation.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3603, the Agriculture Appropriations bill for fiscal year 1997.

First, I need to thank my chairman, JOE SKEEN, and the ranking Democrat, DICK DURBIN, for their assistance during the last few weeks. I only recently became a member of this subcommittee, although it is one I have admired for many years. My admiration stems from the bipartisanship traditionally displayed by this subcommittee, and exemplified by the Skeen-Durbin team, and it is truly a model for the House, so I am proud to join the subcommittee's ranks.

H.R. 3603 is not a perfect bill. In fact, our bill continues an alarming trend in providing the absolute minimum resources to USDA to accomplish their important missions in the areas of agriculture research, animal and plant inspection, food safety and inspection, conservation programs, and rural housing and development.

The Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee is a victim of our budget-balancing efforts, which, of course, we all support. But the implications of our balanced budget efforts have manifested themselves in several disagreeable ways:

First, we had perhaps an unnecessary confrontation with our brethren on the Agriculture Committee when our subcommittee acted in a manner which I thought appropriate under the circumstances, to ask farmers to share some of the burden demanded by our budget allocation—which was nearly \$1 billion below last year.

Second, our budget allocation has been changed at least twice—the first in response to complaints about our action which cut just 1.5 percent from the farm transition payments, and second, the result of a scoring problem pointed out by the Congressional Budget Office.

But these problems point to the overall difficulty with the Republican budget resolution, and the inadequate domestic budget allocations, and the real impact it has on our agriculture programs and other important functions of Government.

Despite some of these reservations, I support the bill and I think JOE SKEEN and DICK DURBIN have done a good job under demanding circumstances.

I have particular praise for several items of importance to California agriculture and to my district.

First, funds have been included for buildings and facilities construction within the Cooperative State Research Service, including funds for an important integrated pest management research facility at the University of California at Davis.

A new pest is introduced into California every 60 days, and it is imperative that we have the up-to-date facilities to develop effective methods to deal with them. This facility will support and accelerate research needed for environmentally compatible pest management strategies.

These institutions—such as the University of California at Davis—are required to provide a specific and verifiable cost-share. So this program represents a real commitment by State governments and the Federal Government to developing the successful agriculture strategies of the future.

Second, the bill provides funds mandated by the Agriculture Committee for the Market Access Program [MAP].

I anticipate that this program will come under attack again this year by an amendment seeking to eliminate it.

But there is probably no more important tool for export promotion than MAP. In California, where specialty crop agriculture is the rule, export promotion is extremely important.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The EU spends more on wine exports—\$89 million—than the U.S. currently spends for almost all commodities under the Market Promotion Program.

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

In California, MAP has been tremendously successful in helping promote exports of California citrus, raisins, walnuts, almonds, peaches, and other specialty crops.

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

For every \$1 we invest in MAP, we reap a \$16 return in additional agriculture exports. In short, the Market Promotion Program is a program that performs for American taxpayers.

Third, the committee has continued to provide the greatest possible funding for research in two main forms: through the agricultural research stations of the Agricultural Research Service, and through the special grants and

competitive grants in the Cooperative State Research Education and Extension Service.

I am concerned that formula funding for our land-grant colleges and universities has been affected by our low budget allocation—requiring about a three-percent reduction from last year's levels. All of us who represent land-grant institutions know that State governments are having the same difficulties as the Federal Government in providing the resources these institutions deserve.

Our future success in agriculture, especially market-oriented agriculture as envisioned by the Farm Bill enacted just a few months ago, will require an on-going commitment to research if we are to maintain the U.S. lead.

Nevertheless, the committee has done a good job in keeping those resources as generous as possible under the circumstances. And I'm especially pleased that the committee was able to provide an increase for research into alternatives to methyl bromide and has initiated a special research grant to develop alternatives to rice-straw burning.

In summary, this is not a perfect bill, but it is a fair bill given the many needs and many issues within the committee's jurisdiction. I commend Chairman JOE SKEEN and ranking member DICK DURBIN for their efforts in support of American agriculture, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3603, the Agriculture Appropriations bill for fiscal year 1997. The CHAIRMAN. If there are no other amendments, under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DREIER) having assumed the chair, Mr. GOODLATTE, 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. 3603) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 451, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 351, nays 74, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 234]

YEAS—351

Ackerman	Armev	Baker (CA)	Filmer	Lucas
Allard	Bachus	Baker (LA)	Flake	Luther
Archer	Baessler	Baldacci	Flanagan	Maloney
			Foley	Manton
			Forbes	McCollum
			Fowler	Martinez
			Fox	Mascara
			Franks (CT)	Matsui
			Frisa	McCarthy
			Frost	McIntosh
			Funderburk	McCrery
			Furse	McHale
			Galleghy	McHugh
			Ganske	McInnis
			Gejdenson	McIntosh
			Gekas	McKeon
			Geren	McKinney
			Gilchrest	McNulty
			Gilman	Meek
			Gonzalez	Metcalfe
			Goodlatte	Meyers
			Goodling	Mica
			Gordon	Millender-
			Goss	McDonald
			Graham	Miller (FL)
			Greene (UT)	Moakley
			Greenwood	Molinari
			Gunderson	Mollohan
			Gutierrez	Montgomery
			Gutknecht	Moorhead
			Hall (OH)	Morella
			Hall (TX)	Murtha
			Hamilton	Myers
			Hansen	Myrick
			Harman	Nadler
			Hastert	Neal
			Hastings (FL)	Nethercutt
			Hastings (WA)	Ney
			Hayworth	Norwood
			Hefley	Nussle
			Hefner	Oberstar
			Heineman	Obey
			Herger	Olver
			Hilleary	Ortiz
			Hilliard	Orton
			Hinchev	Oxley
			Hobson	Packard
			Hoekstra	Pallone
			Holden	Parker
			Hostettler	Pastor
			Houghton	Paxon
			Hoyer	Payne (VA)
			Hunter	Pelosi
			Hutchinson	Peterson (FL)
			Hyde	Pickett
			Inglis	Porter
			Istook	Portman
			Jackson (IL)	Poshard
			Jackson-Lee	Pryce
			(TX)	Quillen
			Jefferson	Quinn
			Johnson (CT)	Radanovich
			Johnson, E. B.	Rahall
			Johnson, Sam	Ramstad
			Jones	Rangel
			Kanjorski	Reed
			Kaptur	Regula
			Kasich	Richardson
			Kelly	Riggs
			Kennedy (MA)	Rivers
			Kennedy (RI)	Roemer
			Kennelly	Rogers
			Kildee	Ros-Lehtinen
			Kim	Rose
			King	Roth
			Kingston	Sabo
			Klink	Salmon
			Klug	Sanford
			Knollenberg	Sawyer
			Kolbe	Saxton
			LaFalce	Schaefer
			LaHood	Schiff
			Lantos	Schumer
			Largent	Scott
			Latham	Seastrand
			LaTourette	Shadegg
			Laughlin	Shaw
			Lazio	Shays
			Leach	Shuster
			Levin	Siskis
			Lewis (CA)	Skaggs
			Lewis (GA)	Skeen
			Lewis (KY)	Skelton
			Lightfoot	Slaughter
			Linder	Smith (MI)
			Lipinski	Smith (NJ)
			Livingston	Smith (TX)
			Longley	Smith (WA)
			Lowey	Solomon

Souder	Thornton	Weldon (FL)
Spence	Thurman	Weldon (PA)
Spratt	Tiahrt	Weller
Stearns	Torres	White
Stenholm	Towns	Whitfield
Stokes	Trafcant	Wicker
Stump	Upton	Williams
Stupak	Vento	Wise
Talent	Viscolosky	Wolf
Tanner	Vucanovich	Woolsey
Tate	Walker	Wynn
Taylor (NC)	Walsh	Young (AK)
Tejeda	Wamp	Young (FL)
Thomas	Ward	Zeliff
Thompson	Watt (NC)	Zimmer
Thornberry	Watts (OK)	

NAYS—74

Abercrombie	Gephardt	Pombo
Andrews	Gibbons	Pomeroy
Barrett (WI)	Green (TX)	Roberts
Becerra	Hancock	Rohrabacher
Beilenson	Hoke	Roybal-Allard
Berman	Jacobs	Royce
Blute	Johnson (SD)	Rush
Chabot	Johnston	Sanders
Chenoweth	Klecza	Scarborough
Clay	LoBiondo	Schroeder
Collins (IL)	Lofgren	Sensenbrenner
Conyers	Markey	Serrano
Cooley	Martini	Stark
Coyne	McDermott	Stockman
Crapo	Meehan	Studds
DeFazio	Menendez	Tauzin
Dellums	Miller (CA)	Taylor (MS)
Doggett	Minge	Torkildsen
Engel	Mink	Torricelli
Eshoo	Moran	Velazquez
Fattah	Neumann	Volkmer
Foglietta	Owens	Waters
Ford	Payne (NJ)	Waxman
Frank (MA)	Peterson (MN)	Yates
Franks (NJ)	Petri	

NOT VOTING—9

Calvert	Hayes	McDade
Frelinghuysen	Horn	Roukema
Gillmor	Lincoln	Wilson

1901

Messrs. COOLEY of Oregon, MINGE, and FATTAH changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BONILLA changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 234, I was unavoidably detained on official business and unable to vote for the agricultural appropriations bill. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3610, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FISCAL YEAR 1997

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-619) on the resolution (H. Res. 453) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3610) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

AUTHORIZING RUNNING OF 1996 SUMMER OLYMPIC TORCH RELAY THROUGH CAPITOL GROUNDS

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 172) authorizing the 1996 Summer Olympic Torch Relay to be run through the Capitol Grounds, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Senate amendment:
Page 2, line 8, strike out all after "Grounds" down to and including "overnight," in line 9.

The SPEAKER (Mr. DREIER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so for the purpose of asking the gentleman for an explanation of the proceeding.

I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST].

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, we would like to expedite this bill. There is only a minor change between what we did in the House and what they did in the Senate. The torch is going to move on. It will not spend the night here so the Senate bill did not reflect the House bill in that way. So we would like to expedite the process and agree with the Senate version of the bill.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the changes in the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 211 on H.R. 3540, the foreign operations appropriations bill, I was absent due to the death of my father.

Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 212 on H.R. 3540, the foreign operations appropriations bill, I was absent, due to the death of my father. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 214 on H.R. 3540, the foreign operations appropriations bill, due to the death of my father, I was absent. If I had been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 216 on H.R. 3540, the foreign operations appropriations bill, due to the death of my father, I was absent. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes".

Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 217 on H.R. 3540, the foreign operations appropriations bill, I was absent due to the death of my father. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes".

Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 218 on H.R. 3540, the foreign operations appropriations bill, I was absent due to the death of my father. Had I been present, I would have voted "no".

Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 219 on H.R. 3562, I was absent due to the death of my father. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes".

CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 178, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1997

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 450 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 450

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 178) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 1997 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read. The conference report shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EWING). The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my very good friend, the gentleman from South Boston, MA [Mr. MOAKLEY], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. All time yielded is for the purposes of debate only.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for consideration of the conference report on House Concurrent Resolution 178, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1997, which sets out a fiscally sound and responsible path to a balanced budget in 6 years. The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and its consideration. The rule provides that the conference report will be considered as read and provides 1 hour of general debate divided equally between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most important things we can do for future generations of Americans is balance the Federal budget. Big government liberals controlled Congress for decades