

Neumann	Rogers	Spratt
Ney	Rohrabacher	Stabenow
Northup	Rothman	Stark
Norwood	Roukema	Stearns
Nussle	Royce	Stenholm
Obey	Ryun	Strickland
Oxley	Salmon	Stump
Packard	Sanchez	Sununu
Pallone	Sanders	Talent
Pappas	Sandlin	Tanner
Parker	Sanford	Tauscher
Pascrell	Saxton	Tauzin
Paul	Scarborough	Taylor (MS)
Paxon	Schaefer, Dan	Taylor (NC)
Payne	Schaffer, Bob	Thomas
Pease	Schumer	Thompson
Pelosi	Scott	Thornberry
Peterson (MN)	Sensenbrenner	Thune
Peterson (PA)	Sessions	Tiahrt
Petri	Shadegg	Trafficant
Pickering	Shaw	Turner
Pitts	Shays	Upton
Pombo	Sherman	Visclosky
Pomeroy	Shimkus	Walsh
Porter	Shuster	Wamp
Portman	Sisisky	Watkins
Poshard	Skeen	Watts (OK)
Price (NC)	Slaughter	Weldon (FL)
Pryce (OH)	Smith (MI)	Weldon (PA)
Quinn	Smith (NJ)	Weller
Radanovich	Smith (OR)	White
Ramstad	Smith (TX)	Whitfield
Redmond	Smith, Linda	Wicker
Regula	Snowbarger	Wolf
Riggs	Snyder	Woolsey
Riley	Solomon	Young (AK)
Rivers	Souder	Young (FL)
Rogan	Spence	

NAYS—116

Ackerman	Fazio	Millender-
Allen	Filner	McDonald
Andrews	Ford	Mink
Baldacci	Frost	Moakley
Barrett (WI)	Gillmor	Murtha
Becerra	Gordon	Neal
Bentsen	Green	Oberstar
Berman	Hamilton	Olver
Berry	Hastings (FL)	Ortiz
Bishop	Hefner	Owens
Blagojevich	Hilliard	Pastor
Blumenauer	Hinchey	Pickett
Borski	Houghton	Rahall
Boucher	Hoyer	Rangel
Brady (PA)	Jackson-Lee	Rodriguez
Brown (CA)	(TX)	Roemer
Brown (FL)	Jefferson	Roybal-Allard
Brown (OH)	John	Rush
Carson	Johnson, E. B.	Sabo
Clayton	Kanjorski	Sawyer
Clement	Kaptur	Skaggs
Clyburn	Kennedy (MA)	Skelton
Condit	Kilpatrick	Smith, Adam
Conyers	Kim	Stokes
Coyne	Kind (WI)	Stupak
Cramer	Klecza	Thurman
Cummings	Klink	Tierney
Danner	LaFalce	Torres
Davis (FL)	Leach	Towns
Davis (IL)	Lofgren	Velazquez
DeGette	Luther	Vento
Deutsch	Markey	Waters
Dicks	Martinez	Watt (NC)
Dingell	Matsui	Waxman
Dixon	McCarthy (MO)	Wexler
Dooley	McDermott	Weygand
Edwards	McGovern	Wise
Eshoo	Meehan	Wynn
Farr	Meek (FL)	Yates
Fattah		

NOT VOTING—13

Burr	Lewis (GA)	Reyes
Engel	McDade	Ros-Lehtinen
Frank (MA)	Mollohan	Serrano
Furse	Moran (VA)	
Gonzalez	Myrick	

□ 1916

Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. OLVER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. TIERNEY and Mr. MEEHAN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. MCINNIS, WALSH, MCHUGH, MASCARA and MANTON changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the concurrent resolution just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1614

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be removed as a cosponsor from H.R. 1614.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1150, AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, EXTENSION, AND EDUCATION REFORM ACT OF 1998

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to previous order of the House, I call up the conference report on the Senate bill (S. 1150) to ensure that federally funded agricultural research, extension, and education address high-priority concerns with national or multistate significance, to reform, extend, and eliminate certain agricultural research programs, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

UNFUNDED MANDATES POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order under section 425 of the Congressional Budget Act regarding unfunded intergovernmental mandates on every single senior citizen homeowner in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, this does increase property taxes on senior citizens, and everybody ought to be listening.

Pursuant to section 426 of the Congressional Budget Act, the language on which this point of order is premised is contained in section 502 of the subtitle A of title V, "Reductions in Payments for Administrative Costs for Food Stamps," of the conference report.

(For section 502, see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 22, 1998, page H2185.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York makes a point of order that the conference report violates section 425(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, and according to section 426 (b)(2) of the Act, the gentleman must specify the precise

language of his objection in the conference report on which he predicates this point of order.

Having met this threshold burden, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes of debate. Pursuant to section 426 (b)(3) of the Act and after debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration, to wit: Will the House now consider the conference report?

Will the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) claim the 10 minutes in opposition?

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I am in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) will be recognized for 10 minutes in opposition, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

I do want the Members to listen up. It is very, very important. We are about to force every single senior citizen homeowner in America to pay more real estate taxes. That is why I raise this point of order against this unfunded mandate.

This conference report would lower each State's reimbursement for administrative costs in the food stamp program by an amount to be determined by the Secretary of Health and Human Services. That provision, my colleagues, according to CBO would limit the Federal Government's responsibility to provide funding to States and local governments to cover the administrative costs of the food stamp program.

Mr. Speaker, the National Governors Association opposes this provision, and almost every single individual governor in America has expressed outright hostility to this reneging on them and putting more costs on our States and our local governments, and that is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned CBO had scored this legislation as exceeding the unfunded mandate threshold in the law, which is \$50 million. In fact, those costs on the States are much, much higher, in the hundreds of millions of dollars in administrative costs to our individual States and each one of our counties and cities and towns and villages that we represent. And that is according to the National Governors Association, my colleagues.

Overall, this represents a cost shift from the Federal Government to the States as high in my State of New York as \$280 million, \$280 million, of which local governments are going to have to pay 25 percent of that cost. That is what we are leveling on our senior citizens. What that means, Mr. Speaker, is a "yes" vote for this unfunded mandate is a vote to increase property taxes on every single one of our homeowners that own a home in America.

Mr. Speaker, there are so many families living in my district on fixed incomes that it is almost impossible

today for them to even pay the taxes. As my colleagues know, we have tremendous school taxes and land taxes, all of which are caused by the cost of welfare. When State and local governments are forced to raise taxes and ordered to pay for this unfunded mandate from Washington it is going to get even worse.

Taken together, this legislation reserves a fundamental principle of the American majority, of the Republican majority in this House, returning power and influence to the States and letting them not be saddled with these terrible unfunded mandates.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time in order to let other people speak as strongly as I have.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I have the utmost and greatest respect for my friend from New York. But I must, Mr. Speaker, correct the issue here because without question this is an unfunded mandate, and we are asking our colleagues to recognize what kind of an unfunded mandate this truly is. Certainly not in the minds of those who passed the unfunded mandate law, but indeed by decision, this is an unfunded mandate. How did it occur?

These are funds, Mr. Speaker, that were allocated to the States as a cushion should the welfare rolls go up and we have a huge downturn in the economy. They are funds that we do not anticipate being used, certainly in the near future, maybe not ever, so they are funds residing within each of the States that may never be used. That is because of the action of this Congress in reducing the welfare rolls by requiring people to work and by reducing the need for food stamps.

So if these funds were not used in the manner in which we have provided to our colleagues in the conference committee report, they would be used for some other purpose, maybe for highways, maybe for other purposes. Certainly there is a great demand for the use of these funds. This in no way is an increase in property taxes, this is in no way an increase in senior citizens' costs, in no way.

Mr. Speaker, let me also advise my colleagues, particularly from these States: California, New York, Florida, Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, Washington, and recently Texas, that funds are already being used, State funds, for the very purposes that we talk about here in the bill and in the conference committee report regarding legal aliens' food stamps. Already States are paying, through State coffers, for these exact kinds of funds for food stamps for illegal aliens. Therefore, the passage of this bill will relieve States like New York and Texas and other States who may choose to substitute the conference committee report for State funds.

It makes great sense to pass this. Believe me, not addressing the unfunded

mandate kills the conference committee report.

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

□ 1930

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

Mr. Speaker, I do not know, I have heard of smoke and mirrors in my lifetime, but let me tell you, I have been a town mayor, I have been a county legislator, I have been a State legislator, and nobody knows more about this welfare system in this country than I do.

Let me tell you, when you take away the administrative cost of this, you are going to give them something on one hand and take something away on the other. Let me tell you, that is a smoke and mirrors.

This letter from the Governors Association says this would deny several hundred million dollars in food stamps and Medicaid funding from New York State alone, and \$3.6 billion in Federal costs to the States by forcing States to absorb food stamp and Medicaid administrative costs, and it goes on and on and on.

Let me tell you, in New York State, and I think it is the same in most every State in the Union, the local share is raised by property taxes. That means that older Americans that are paying property taxes today are going to have to pay that increase, a very substantial increase, to pay for somebody else's food stamps in another area.

That is wrong. If you are going to give those food stamps, at least pay for them out of Federal coffers, and do not force local governors to raise property taxes.

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

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), the ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture.

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

Mr. Speaker, I must say I was reminded of the famous quote of Will Rogers, when he observed that, "it ain't people's ignorance that bothers me so much, it is them knowing so much that ain't so is the problem."

The gentleman from New York is totally nonfactual in what he was saying. All States are not affected by this bill. States are affected only to the extent they charge common AFDC food stamp administrative costs, and the only States that will be detrimentally affected are those that have been double-dipping, and that is something that we would not want to see done.

First, make no mistake about it, a vote against consideration of S. 1150 will kill the bill, and that is what the gentleman from New York honestly wants to do, is kill this bill. Funding for crop insurance research and rural

development and nutrition will be denied.

Now, Federal mandates are generally thought of as any provision that imposes an enforceable duty upon a State, except as a condition of Federal assistance. The original intent was simply to require the Federal Government to pay for requirements placed on States. The Committee on Rules identified the purpose of the unfunded mandates bill as being to prevent Congress from passing feel-good legislation that transfers the cost burden from the Federal Government to State and local governments, for example, the Occupational Safety Health Act, the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act.

The provision we are considering in this bill today is unlike any of these. Technically, a Federal intergovernmental mandate is any provision that relates to a program which provides \$500,000 annually to States if the provision would decrease funding to the State and the State lacks authority to amend their programmatic responsibility.

An unintended consequence of the 1996 welfare reform bill allows States to shift administrative costs previously charged to the AFDC program and already included in their Temporary Assistance for Needy Families grants, the TANF block grants, to the food stamp program. The result is duplication of Federal administrative reimbursement to States for the same activity, since these costs are included in the TANF block grants and would be matched at a 50 percent rate by the food stamp program.

S. 1150 would close this loophole by annually adjusting States' claims for administrative cost reimbursement by the amount that was included in their TANF block grants for the same purpose. The CBO has identified this provision of S. 1150 as an unfunded mandate relative to the food stamp program because there would be a reduction in funding for that program without a commensurate reduction in administrative requirements.

While this determination is technically correct for the food stamp program in isolation, the provision is drafted to deal with interaction between the two programs. Therefore, when the provision in question is examined from a broader perspective, it prevents States from being overfunded due to the combined effects of TANF block grants and the change in the food stamp cost allocation methodology.

It is difficult to see the provision as an unfunded mandate in this light. Without S. 1150, CBO estimates payments to States for food stamp administrative costs will be \$2.5 billion more than prior to welfare reform. Even with enactment of this conference report, States will receive over \$800 million more for administrative costs than they were projected to receive prior to enactment of welfare reform.

Welfare reform was never intended to allow States free access to the Federal

Treasury, to double-dip for reimbursements to carry out these programs. I certainly am speaking for the State of Texas, who has informed me they support what we are attempting to do for the reason that the gentleman from Oregon (Chairman SMITH) mentioned a moment ago. We are one of those States that will, in fact, benefit fairly from the passage of this act, and double-dipping or having an unlimited access to the Federal Treasury is something I believe this body would not want us to do.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me just say to the previous speaker, you know, he says, "All SOLOMON wants to do is kill the bill." The gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) came here when I did 20 years ago. The gentleman knows that I represent an agricultural district in this country. We are the 20th largest dairy-producing district in America. The last thing I want to do is kill this bill. I just want the Federal government to pay for it and not saddle the local property taxes with the costs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) to counter what the other gentleman from Texas just said.

(Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I will enter into the record a letter received by every Member of Congress from the National Conference of State Legislators, dated June 4, 1998, signed by Representative Tom Johnson, Ohio House of Representatives.

It says, "As reported by the conference committee, S. 1150 contains a substantial unfunded mandate to States, confirmed repeatedly by CBO, that not only violates the Unfunded Mandate Reform Act but breaks the agreement crafted by the Congress and the States on welfare reform. The proposed offset reducing the Federal reimbursement rate for State food stamp administration represents a \$1.7 billion cost shift to States without similar reduction in programmatic responsibilities required under the Unfunded Mandate Reform Act."

The National Conference of State Legislators supports the point of order of the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON).

Mr. Speaker, under the savings that were found in the conference, there were \$2 billion of administrative cost savings found in the overall administration of the food stamp program. The conferees allocated \$800 million to restore benefits for certain categories of legal aliens in this country. That is 40 percent of the increase. They did provide an additional \$500 million for crop insurance and \$600 million in a new program for agricultural research and an additional \$100 million for other agriculture research programs.

Those are good programs that would stand the scrutiny of this House. I am not sure that \$800 million restoration of food stamp benefits for legal aliens would withstand the scrutiny of this House if we had a full vote.

I hope we would sustain the point of order of the gentleman from New York (Chairman SOLOMON). Let us eliminate the unfunded mandates that are in this bill. Let us report out the money for the farmers and the research universities that needs to be reported and then work on the food stamp program as a stand-alone issue.

Mr. Speaker, I include the letter from Representative Tom Johnson for the RECORD.

NATIONAL CONFERENCE
OF STATE LEGISLATURES,
Washington, DC, June 4, 1998.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: The National Conference of State Legislatures fully supports the Rules Committee's decision to allow a point of order on S. 1150, the Agricultural Research bill and urges you to support the point of order when it is raised by Representatives Rob Portman and Gary Condit.

As reported by the conference committee, S. 1150 contains a substantial unfunded mandate to states (confirmed repeatedly by CBO) that not only violates the Unfunded Mandate Reform Act (UMRA) but breaks the agreement crafted by the Congress and states on Welfare Reform. The proposed offset reducing the federal reimbursement rate for state Food Stamp administration represents a \$1.7 billion cost shift to states without similar reduction in programmatic responsibilities required under UMRA.

The National Conference of State Legislatures has long been supportive of efforts to restore Food Stamp benefits to legal immigrants; however, we vehemently oppose the funding of these benefits through a reduction in federal Food Stamp administrative reimbursement to states. It is disingenuous for the Congress to solve one cost shift to states by imposing another.

We urge you to support the point of order on S. 1150 and look forward to continued partnership with the Congress in restoring Food Stamp benefits to legal immigrants.

Sincerely,

TOM JOHNSON,

Ohio House of Representatives, Chair,
NCSL Federal Budget & Taxation Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST).

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

Mr. Speaker, the conference report includes a provision that corrects an unintentional consequence in the 1996 welfare law reform. That provision would have allowed some States to be paid twice for the same administrative costs for determining eligibility for food stamps. That is corrected in the conference report.

What we are presented with is a situation in which it is an obvious windfall extra payment to some States that must be corrected. If I were one of those States or representing one of those States, I would probably like to be a part of the recipient of \$2.5 billion of Federal money that is not due to those States. If in fact that is the desire of Members, to give them \$2.5 bil-

lion more than is necessary, then vote with the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON). If it is not and you have a desire to see the bill continue to move forward, vote on the position of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), one of the most respected Members of this body.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, you know, it is funny that we pass welfare reform and then turn around the next year and destroy it. It is also kind of funny that we have a provision in here that does not address just crop insurance and agricultural research, which is what we should be addressing. Instead, we add to it a bunch of unfunded mandates, which has been admitted by the Committee on Agriculture chairman, and those same unfunded mandates that are coming out of our hide are going to be asked of the Committee on Ways and Means again, we just learned today, to take another \$16 billion out of this very same program.

Somewhere, the well runs dry. We have to pay the piper. It is time to stand on the laws that we passed. It is time to stand with our welfare reform and not suck the States into more spending.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY), also a member of the conference committee.

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I think every Member has to fully understand what would happen if you vote with the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) on this point of order. You would ensure that we would not provide the largest increase in agriculture research which will benefit U.S. farmers in a generation. You will ensure we will not provide the crop insurance money which is vitally needed by a lot of farmers struggling out there.

A year ago, we passed welfare reform by a large bipartisan margin. That welfare reform decreased AFDC benefits, it decreased food stamp benefits, and it was certainly not the intention of those who supported welfare reform to increase administrative payments to the States.

What we are doing with this legislation is ensuring we are going to have a commensurate reduction in the administrative costs to the administration of the welfare programs. This is a sound fiscal approach. The States should not be allowed to double-dip when we are reducing their obligations under our welfare reform policies.

Ensure that we can maintain the agricultural research funding. Ensure that we can maintain the crop insurance funding. Vote against the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON).

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON), a member of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I also want to emphasize the fact that this may be an unfunded mandate in its technical sense, but you have a way to close this and you also have a way of correcting the unintended result.

Please know when you vote yes for the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON), you vote against agricultural research, you vote against crop insurance, and you vote against the opportunity to correct something that we should not have had in the first place. Plus you do good by allowing legal immigrants to have food they so desperately need, particularly children and senior citizens and the disabled.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the final 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I would just point out again to Members that this unfunded mandate does not impact States because they are not in a position to use it, as has been indicated by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) and others. They are in no position to use it. It is excess money that will never be used.

Here is a chance to reinvigorate agriculture, for crop insurance, for research and for food stamps for legal aliens in this country. Here is our chance to do it. If you vote for the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON), you lose that opportunity. Please vote no.

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

Mr. Speaker, let us clear the record here. The worst thing we can do is to not use accurate figures. In a few minutes we are going to take up the budget for 1999, and I want Members to look at it very carefully, because in that budget we are going to knock off another \$16 billion out of this same category, okay? Where is that money coming from? Your State and local governments are going to pick up that. In this alone, we are talking about \$3.6 billion.

My good friend from North Carolina, and I have great respect for her, she says that this is a vote against crop insurance and ag research. Let me tell Members what a no vote does here right now. A no vote is to not go forward; and if we carry the no vote, it means that the bill rests on the calendar until we find a better way to pay for it and not mandate this expense on your counties and towns and cities and villages.

□ 1945

We have until June 30 to solve the crop insurance program. Nothing is in danger. We have got another 3 weeks here.

So I ask you to vote "no" so that it stays on the calendar so we have time to come here with a manager's amendment from my very good friend, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SMITH), who is articulate and very innovative about finding ways to pay for things, and we will pay for this and not mandate it on local governments.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, you all should vote for every homeowner in

America and vote no to go forward at this time, and we will take that bill up in a few days when we find a way to legitimately pay for it.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Point of parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU). The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I am attempting to determine how Members are going to analyze this vote. This is a vote, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, regular order here. What is the gentleman doing?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of inquiry.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Is this a vote to proceed?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question before the House is: Will the House now consider the conference report?

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

Mr. STENHOLM. 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 324, nays 91, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 203]

YEAS—324

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Boniior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert

Camp
Campbell
Canady
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chambliss
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Combest
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers

Emerson
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Ganske
Gedensson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Goodling
Gordon
Graham
Granger
Green
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Hefner
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra

Holden
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHale

McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Millender
McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moran (KS)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pomeroy
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryun
Sabo

Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Siskiy
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Souder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (AK)

NAYS—91

Archer
Armey
Barr
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Bryant
Cannon
Chabot
Chenoweth
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Condit
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Deal
DeLay
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Ehrlich
English
Ensign

Fawell
Fossella
Fowler
Gallegly
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Greenwood
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hefley
Herger
Hinchey
Hostettler
Ingalls
Istook
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kingston
Largent
Livingston
Manzullo
McHugh
McIntosh
Mica
Miller (FL)

Neumann
Pappas
Paul
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Rohrabacher
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shuster
Smith (TX)
Solomon
Spence
Stump
Sununu
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)

Tiahrt	Wamp	Whitfield
Traficant	Weldon (FL)	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—18

Burr	Hoyer	Myrick
Engel	Lewis (GA)	Ney
Frank (MA)	Markey	Pelosi
Furse	McDade	Reyes
Gonzalez	Mollohan	Ros-Lehtinen
Harman	Moran (VA)	Yates

□ 2015

Messrs. ARMEY, CRAPO, DREIER, WAMP, GILLMOR, PORTER, BILBRAY, INGLIS of South Carolina, and EHRlich changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

So the question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU). Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement see proceedings of the House of Wednesday, April 22, 1998, at page H2171.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference committee report on S. 1150.

Mr. Speaker, first I want to thank members of the conference committee who were responsible for bringing this issue to us after long and deliberate discussion, dating back to last year, in fact, with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) and the Committee on Agriculture discussions on this very issue, but especially the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BARRETT) who served with us, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) and the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY), who with myself made up the House side of the conference committee.

I want to say first, Mr. Speaker, that this is a transfer of spending, as most Members understand, mandatory spending to mandatory spending. We have rearranged the priorities here, and we have rearranged them in a way which we think is most beneficial to agriculture, but certainly takes into consideration food stamps to legal aliens as well.

In fact, as some have already identified, the Members' conference committee is bringing to them a bill which provides for \$600 million of research money, which we think is the backbone of the future of agriculture. We know it is imperative that we pass crop insurance, and finally we have a 5-year program, mandatory spending at \$500 million for crop insurance, which again is going to be used, by the way, by the end of this month, and therefore it is essential that we act, and act today.

Of course, there is a \$100 million program for rural development, which all of us in rural areas of America would support, as well as the food stamp money, which is \$800 million, to compose totally the so-called unfunded mandate which we just discussed, of about \$2 billion.

The urgency of the conference committee report, Mr. Speaker, is simply, as I mentioned, that we must provide a solid program for crop insurance. Risk management is an essential part of the future of agriculture, as is research. So those two factors are addressed directly in this conference committee report.

We have not only provided for crop insurance, but through innovative management we have reduced the cost to taxpayers of some \$500 million, so the passage of this research bill will essentially provide a savings of some \$500 million in crop insurance itself. As I mentioned, the whole program for crop insurance is now \$500 million.

The conference committee report was carefully balanced to offset further reductions in excess food stamp spending, and represents, and I want to underline this, represents no net increase in spending. So if budgeteers are listening, there is no net increase in spending. The conference committee accomplished the most substantive reforms to our agricultural research infrastructure in more than 20 years.

If there is another part of the responsibility of government besides risk management, it is certainly research, because those of us who have found that it is the responsibility of government to provide help in research know that is the underpinning of a huge agricultural export program for this country. We export almost \$60 billion, Mr. Speaker, of agricultural commodities to foreign countries. The reason we do that is because we are the most competitive Nation in the world, bar none, in the production of foods and fiber. That is why we can be competitive in the world, and it is the result of research that has been successfully done in the past.

Let me give some examples. For instance, one that most of us know about, I know more, from Oregon now, than I did before, having traveled to Georgia, but the whole question of the boll weevil, the control of the boll weevil has restored cotton production to much of the South, a huge breakthrough for agriculture in America.

The genetically modified organisms that we have heard about, BT corn, Roundup Ready soybeans, the increase in grain crop production and yields, the protections for food safety, all are part of this research program, of which we are quite proud.

Yes, it does include some money for legal aliens coming into this country. Listen to who they are, please: the elderly, over 65, living in this country since August 22, 1996; the disabled, legal noncitizens, living in this country since August 22, 1996; and children

under the age of 18, living in this country since before August 22nd of 1996. All of these people must have lived here before August 22, 1996.

We invited them here. They are legal; not citizens, but they are legal aliens. We have invited them to this country.

□ 2015

And if, for a small time, it is our responsibility to help them with food stamps, it is my belief we ought to do that.

Mr. Speaker, this is the most important agricultural issue and bill that Members will vote on in this session of Congress, without question. This is a huge advance for agriculture production in America, and it is a huge advance for agricultural people and farmers.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this conference report, and I want to begin by acknowledging and thanking the gentleman from Oregon (Chairman SMITH), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST), the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BARRETT), and the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY) for their work on the conference that brings us this report tonight, a result of months of hard work by Members on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, a number of significant differences between the House and the Senate bill had to be reconciled during conference. I believe the legislation we bring now is a fair and balanced compromise among those competing priorities.

This legislation provides for a number of improvements in our system to conduct and deliver information from federally funded agricultural research. It increases producer input into the research process and authorizes research in several new and important areas such as nutrient management, food safety, and crop diversification.

In addition, this conference report reprioritizes the spending which falls under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture to provide critically needed resources to a number of important national priorities. By limiting the States' ability to shift administrative cost to the Federal Government, this legislation prevents States from circumventing welfare reform while at the same time providing necessary funding for agricultural research, crop insurance, rural development and nutrition programs.

Despite the fact that this bill results in a \$1.2 billion reduction in Federal spending for food stamps, S. 1150 has still won support from nutrition advocates. This legislation enjoys broad support because it reprioritizes spending in the food stamp program to provide needed benefits for those who cannot move to self-sufficiency as envisioned by the recent welfare reform, such as the elderly, disabled, and children. And for those refugees and

asylees who are fleeing political and religious persecution, it provides a realistic time frame to make application for United States citizenship.

In addition, this bill fulfills a commitment made by our government during the Vietnam war to some unfamiliar people, the Hmongs and the Highland Laotians who assisted our military during the Vietnam era. As a result of providing assistance to our military, these people suffered terribly at the hands of Communists. By supporting this legislation, we can provide assistance to those who fought so bravely for us.

S. 1150 will provide funding certainty for the crop insurance program. Farmers will no longer have to worry if crop insurance will be delivered, nor will bankers who require it. But although S. 1150 provides this certainty, make no mistake about it; much more needs to be done. We must continue to search for new and innovative ways to improve the program in order to provide meaningful risk management for our farmers.

In terms of budget discipline, S. 1150 is a perfect example of what balancing the budget is all about. Unlike other bills recently considered which provide no offsetting reductions in spending, this bill will not result in increased government expenditures as was stated by the gentleman from Oregon (Chairman SMITH). I underline that. We do not balance the budget by creating new spending but by redirecting existing resources to needed areas.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation simply reprioritizes existing funds from within the agriculture function. From my perspective, that is the very definition of budget discipline.

This bill does not create unlimited spending but limits it by closing a loophole that the States could use to shift costs to the Federal Government, costs that were funded as a result of welfare reform. We are simply looking at agriculture, rural development, and nutritional needs and reprioritizing our existing resources to address current problems.

If we are going to successfully address problem areas, our programs cannot remain static. With limited resources we have to have the ability to address issues as they arise.

So if Members care about agricultural research, if they care with rural communities, if they want to save farmers' crop insurance, if they are concerned about reducing hunger in America, I urge them to support passage of this conference report. It is a responsible and balanced piece of legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST).

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to again re-emphasize the title of this conference report as the Agricultural Research

Extension and Education Reform Act of 1998. Initially, I would like to join with Chairman SMITH in also thanking him but also thank our colleagues, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY), and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BARRETT) for their hard work and cooperation in bringing the conference report to the floor.

This has been a bipartisan effort from the start, and it represents a lot of hard work on the part of a lot of Members. Agricultural research has brought us a multitude of results, from the mass production of penicillin to the sixfold increase in today's agricultural productivity. For American agriculture to continue to be profitable and competitive in the global economy, it is critical that we maintain strong agricultural research programs.

As chairman of the subcommittee with jurisdiction over ag research, I presided over four hearings which provided the basis for crafting this bill. We worked diligently to improve upon the structure of research education and extension. We increase competition and maximize the research by leveraging private dollars with limited Federal funds.

As we know, this conference report contains several provisions which were not in the House research bill. S. 1150 is the product of some very tough negotiations in conference. In the end, we meet our responsibilities to the truly needy, to the farmers who feed them and the researchers and crops insurers who support them; and we do this by putting unspent Ag Department funds to work.

The funding for food stamps is limited primarily to the truly needed among immigrants who legally entered this country prior to the 1996 welfare reform. Children, the elderly, and the disabled will be included in the coverage. Let me stress, no food stamps will be given to new immigrants, only to needy immigrants legally here on or before August 22, 1996.

This is by no means a wholesale repeal of the provisions of welfare reform. Those who can and should work will still be required to do so. No immigrant who came here after August 22, 1996, will be able to receive food stamps.

The funding for the crop insurance program and ag research programs fulfill a commitment that the last Congress made to our farmers and ranchers. With the passage of the 1996 farm bill, Congress reduced the direct payments farmers have historically received to offset the natural risk of farming. In return, Congress promised to provide better risk management, production and marketing tools to maintain farmers' competitive advantages in the global market.

Mr. Speaker, passage of this conference report is critical to America's farmers and ranchers. They deserve our support. I commend this to our colleagues, and I would urge them to support this conference report.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

(Mr. FARR of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, today we have an opportunity to pass bipartisan legislation built by broad coalition. This should have been a no-brainer, but, once again, the House leadership decided to attack the most vulnerable of our society. I commend my colleagues for their strong vote on opposing the previous rule on May 22 and ask them to join me in supporting this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 1150, the Agricultural Research, Extension and Education Reform Act, and I would like to thank the hard work of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SMITH), our chairman; the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST); the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY); and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM); along with their staff, for crafting this legislation that is so important to the central coast of California and to the rest of the Nation.

The farmers in my district are the most productive specialty crop growers in the world. They produce over \$2.2 billion worth of fresh fruits, vegetables, and horticultural crops each year. I represent the "Salad Bowl" of the country. The agriculture industry is the backbone of the communities in my district, and they do this without Federal price supports.

In this highly competitive field of agriculture, research is one of the few ways that the Federal Government can help my farmers. The new money in the Initiative for Future Agriculture and Food Systems will jump-start our efforts on emerging technologies as farming moves into the 21st century. The partnerships for high-value agriculture product quality research will give farmers and researchers the ability to work in conjunction with each other to address a wide range of opportunities facing the research community, including production, packaging technology, and value-added enterprises in rural areas.

Mr. Speaker, the bill contains for the first time an initiative for organic farming and will help this niche market continue to grow. We have barely begun to tap the full potential of organic farming systems today. This initiative will provide competitive grants to facilitate the development of organic agriculture production, processing, and potential economic benefits associated with both domestic and foreign markets.

Lastly, I think we have an obligation to provide food assistance to those who fell through the cracks when we restored the SSI benefits to the elderly and disabled last year. This conference report restores the nutritional safety net for 250,000 legal immigrant adults and children who were indiscriminately cut off from the food stamp rolls.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure that this debate is based upon the manner in which this bill was brought to the floor, that is, with respect and restraint. Now, the facts are that if it were not for the leadership, this bill would not be on the floor. And I will say that one more time. If it were not for the leadership, this bill would not be on the floor.

So from this point on, I hope that this discussion continues on a bipartisan basis, because that is the only way this bill will pass.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BARRETT).

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I, of course, rise to urge the adoption of the conference report, S. 1150, and am very pleased, incidentally, to see the House is considering this bill this evening.

The Federal Government's investment in research, except for agricultural research, has increased dramatically over the last several years. The reality is that spending on ag research has barely kept up with the rate of inflation. As a matter of fact, this is the first time that agricultural research has been seriously reevaluated in about 25 years. This bill would correct that situation and provide a total of, as has been mentioned, \$600 million over 5 years to boost research for agriculture.

Today, we are at a critical juncture. The 1996 farm bill charted the course for a free market in agriculture. Unfortunately, this year we are experiencing for the first time since passage of that bill a depressed market for agriculture. If Congress does not resist the call to open the farm bill, we could end up seriously distorting our markets, reversing a positive trend toward a free market in agriculture and losing credibility with many of our trading partners.

Agriculture research can help this situation. It could help with the depressed prices by developing new uses and markets for our products and through teaching programs that help farmers and ranchers learn new marketing techniques.

Congress' support for this bill gives agriculture a confidence boost. Farmers and the industry will know that Congress is interested in agriculture and will support it in the future, even if we do not support it in the old way with subsidies and acreage controls. This new way is much more positive. We support research, new and expanded markets for our products, and less restrictions on private land.

Let me say a few words to my friends who are opposed to the bill because it restores food stamps to some legal immigrants. I understand the controversy that this creates for many. I have the same concerns. I supported welfare reform in 1996. I believe, however, that the Congress can do more to further reduce the dependence on and the size and the cost of government. However, I

think there are times when one has to swallow the good with the bad; and I think this is one of those times, Mr. Speaker. And in this case, I think the good far outweighs the bad.

Congress is about compromise. We come from all parts of the country. We have widely divergent political and ideological backgrounds, but we are here to achieve the best we can for this country. This conference report is the best thing that we could do for agriculture right now, and we need Members' support.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly encourage all of my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW).

□ 2030

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to strongly support the conference committee for agricultural research and to first commend our chairman and ranking member, as well as the Chair and ranking member of the subcommittee who have worked so hard.

This is truly a bipartisan bill. It is good for production agriculture and it is good for families in Michigan. It is good for families across the country. We have heard tonight about the important need for crop insurance, critical agricultural research, food and nutrition programs, and I want to speak just a moment about food safety.

My good friend, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and I introduced a safe food action plan just a number of months ago. Two critical provisions of that are in this legislation: making food safety a top priority for research, and creating a crisis management team to respond in the case of an emergency in a very rapid fashion. Today also at Michigan State University, where we have a national food safety and toxicology program, we are doing a two-day national research institution conference to focus on risk factors for food safety. Today's action could not come at a better time.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING), a member of the committee.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time. I thank all on the conference committee for the hard work on this important bill, S. 1150, the Agricultural Research, Extension and Education Reform Act of 1998.

This is the first comprehensive overhaul of agricultural research programs in over 20 years. This is quite an impressive accomplishment. It provides \$600 million over the next five years for research. This conference report funds important agricultural research programs, vital crop insurance, rural development programs, and restores food stamps for some legal aliens.

S. 1150 is fully offset from savings from food stamp programs. There is no budget impact with this legislation. If

American farmers are to compete in the world of free trade, the commitment that we made in the Freedom to Farm Act must be provided. This is a step in that direction. Crop insurance, research, these are very important elements of keeping the Freedom to Farm movement going in America.

In my part of the country the corn is up, the beans are in the field, and the wheat is green, and it is time that we give them their crop insurance program and let them know what it is so they can move ahead.

This bill also creates some exciting new research opportunities, improving the productivity and efficiency and generating, I think, a better environment, higher quality air and safer and more affordable food products for American consumers. This legislation also establishes an animal waste management research initiative, something we hear so much about today when we talk about confinement livestock operations.

Mr. Speaker, this is an excellent bill. It is time that we move on. Parts of it are very time sensitive, particularly the crop insurance portion. I hope that we will give this a resounding "yes" vote tonight. Again, my thanks to the chairman and all on the conference committee.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE).

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding time to me. Let me also congratulate the chairman and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) and other members of the committee for bringing this conference report to us. I commend the Republican leadership for bringing this report to the floor.

I hope we now realize it is time to stop balancing the budget on the backs of farmers. Farmers have taken it on the chin, and it is time that we show our support for the people who risk so much to produce the safest, most abundant food supply in the world.

This conference report passed the Senate by 92 to 8. We should pass it in a similar margin in the House. Nothing could have highlighted more the support for this bill than our failure to pass it prior to the Memorial Day recess. I certainly heard about it. I am sure others did.

Americans want to support their farmers. Americans want farm communities to be made whole after a disaster. Americans want research reform that will make our food cheaper and safer. Americans want research reform that makes production agriculture environmentally friendly, and Americans want this bill passed.

The most important part of this legislation or at least one of the more important ones, in my opinion, is the provision on crop insurance. With the traditional safety net for farmers disappearing, crop insurance is the one barrier to ruin for farm families from natural disaster. Maybe the only one left.

In North Carolina farmers have been faced with two hurricane seasons in a row. Without a healthy insurance system in place, many farmers in these communities would have been ruined. This is a good bill for farmers in their communities, which means it is a good bill for all Americans.

I urge Members to cast their votes in favor of these hard-working Americans and the programs that they depend on. Vote "yes" on the conference report.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS).

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this conference report. I would like to take a moment to congratulate the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) and the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY) for the great job they did in putting this ag bill together.

In 1996 we passed a farm bill that is a very historic farm bill, a farm bill that is a 7-year bill instead of the normal 5-year bill, a farm bill that participated in the balanced budget process, a farm bill that moves agriculture into the 21st century, and a farm bill that gets the Federal Government off the farm and allows our farmers to do what they do best and grow the very finest agriculture products of anybody in the world. In that farm bill we phase out commodity support prices over that 7-year period.

The Federal Government has got to stay involved in agriculture in three areas: Number one, we have got to stay involved from a market standpoint. We have got to move forward to continue to open markets for our agriculture products.

Secondly, we have to provide a safety net, a safety net in the form of a good substantive crop insurance program.

Thirdly, the Federal Government has got to stay involved in the area of research.

Why do we need crop insurance? The year 1997 was a disastrous one in my section of the country from an ag perspective. Going into July we had the most beautiful crops we had ever had and then the rain stopped. We had 60 days of drought, when yields started decreasing and the sun took its toll. Then the rain started again in September and El Nino brought rains into February and March, and our farmers were unable to get their crops out of the field. Crop insurance is extremely important to farmers who are faced with that problem.

Why do we need research? My son-in-law is a farmer. Joe is living the American dream of coming back home and farming with his father. But Joe is only able to do that because through research we are now planting seeds in the ground every day that are more resistant from a disease standpoint than what his father planted, and we are also providing seeds that yield higher yields and better quality yields than

what his father was able to produce. That is why we have to have research.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for this very positive bill, and I urge its passage.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes and 30 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE).

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, the bill that is before us this evening is truly one that is supported on a bipartisan basis, as is evident in the discussion. But I think that it needs to be said that we have gone through a fair amount of turmoil in this body as we have discussed agricultural policy, and there is not unanimity as to the wisdom or the effectiveness of the farm bill under which we are operating.

Agriculture in many areas of this country is in severe economic distress. The bankers in my area tell me that we have more farmers that are facing foreclosure or forced exit from farming than we have had since the mid-1980s, and the condition of the farm economy rivals what we saw in the farm depression of the mid-1980s. The farm bill, by transferring billions of dollars in automatic transition payments, is not truly addressing the needs that many of these farmers face.

What I feel is good news is that the bill that we are taking up this evening indeed does. I believe that agricultural research is something that has paid rich dividends to the American consumer and to the American farmer, and investing in this area is one of the key investments that we should make in this Nation. Agricultural research is every bit as important as scientific research, medical research and other research.

The crop insurance program similarly pays rich dividends because what we are doing is, we are giving farmers a better tool with which to manage their risks. This is not from my perspective a safety net or a welfare program for farmers. This is a tool to manage risk. What we are doing is making sure that we are handling at the Federal level the overhead or the administrative cost of the insurance program and the farmers are paying for the underwriting cost or the risk element of the program.

They choose what level of coverage they wish. I believe one of the more exciting opportunities is to move ahead with what is called crop revenue insurance, and this would enable farmers to not just look at the problems of crop failure but also of marketplace failure; that is, where prices are too low. I hope that the U.S. Department of Agriculture uses the authority that it has and the funds that are now available through this bill to expand the revenue assurance program throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this indeed is an historic occasion this evening, that we are operating on such a bipartisan basis in a body that often is fractured by partisan rhetoric. I look forward to quick passage of this measure.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD).

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the assault two weeks in a row by the chairman of the Committee on Rules, I am glad that we are finally at the point where we can pass in a very bipartisan way this bill. I think some of us who have worked for the last year and a half in many ways dislike the tactics that were used to assault a bill that was passed in a very bipartisan way. I am glad that we are at the point now that I am sure it will pass overwhelmingly.

I give a good amount of credit to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) and the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY) for the many hearings that they held, for wanting to reach out to every Member that had any interest in agriculture to say, give us good information and we will put a bill together. And they did that. And to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), our thanks to them, too.

For me personally, I have one of the four ag research labs in my home town of Peoria. This bill means an awful lot. For agriculture it is just not growing corn and soybeans. Research is the future of agriculture well into the 21st century. That is why this bill is important, because what happens in these ag research labs and what happens at the University of Illinois in Champaign, Illinois as a result of this bill means that corn farmers and soybean farmers and people that grow commodities and crops all over this country will have the advantage of the best research anywhere in the world. I am delighted to have played a very small part in that.

In addition, this bill contains an opportunity for those of us who live in States where these megahog farm operations are beginning to crop up all over to really do some swine odor research over the next four or five years, to really try and go after the problem that has been created by megahog operations not just in Illinois but in other parts of the country. I know that Members grin and smile when we talk about swine odor research but if they have one of these megahog operations crop up in one of their communities, they know it is a very serious problem. This bill also helps address that.

So for the future of agriculture, for the future of research in agriculture, I ask everyone in the House to support the bill.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

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

I too want to join and commend the leadership on both sides of the House for bringing this bill to this point and hope that the delicate, carefully crafted, bipartisan compromise conference

report is indeed overwhelmingly supported. Members should know that it provides vital funding for agriculture research, education and extension programs, as well as the restoration of food stamps benefits and much-needed crop insurance.

□ 2045

This legislation is also critical as it addresses badly needed funding for crop insurance for particular farmers and for those who have suffered disasters in years past.

These moneys will be used for Federal crop insurance research. The moneys will be used for production liability and limiting of a farmer's risk due to natural disasters beyond their control.

I am pleased that the conference report continues to recognize the need for research along with the need for water and sewage on this rural development program.

This agreement continues the education, research and extension programs that are so vital at our county level. They also provide essential funding for the entire agriculture community, providing new research initiatives and priorities, including *Pfisteria*, a microorganism that has plagued much of our waters in North Carolina, creation of consistent funding standards that all the universities will know how to have access to the funding, and better funding and better accountability for these funds.

It also furnishes integral funding for land grant universities, including historically black colleges and universities, oftentimes who need these research funds to further their education research activities. It also provides much needed funds for Hispanic-serving institutions as well.

Finally, I want to express my heartfelt appreciation and profound support for the restoration of food stamp benefits for legal immigrants. The food stamp restoration program has caused a lot of discussion, but this conference report, I think, targets this to the most vulnerable of our legal immigrants, the elderly, the disabled, children, refugees, those who often come to this country with very little, those who have come to our country who were veterans, who fought alongside other veterans in the U.S. military forces in Vietnam. They were eligible for food stamps prior to the Welfare Reform Act of 1996. When we changed the rule, we really denied these persons who needed these benefits. I am pleased that we are doing the right thing by restoring that.

I represent a rural district where the need for Federal crop insurance is very great and very much appreciated. 1996 demonstrated not only our need but also our utilization of this. I am pleased that we are restoring that today.

The importance, the urgency and the fairness of this conference report both by the producers and the consumers of agriculture products is paramount.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this much needed and very well crafted report.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS).

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the conference committee report. It has not been all that long ago that we passed the 1996 farm bill, the most dramatic 7-year farm bill in the history of agriculture. At the time that we passed the bill, a majority of the Members of this body supported it, the leadership of this body supported it, the other body supported it by voting for it, and by his signature the President showed his support.

What was one of the main points that we made in the 1996 farm bill? We said, "Farmers, go forth and farm for the market and we will help provide you with the tools that you need."

Today, Mr. Speaker, we have a wonderful opportunity to help provide those tools. This bill provides additional resources for agricultural research to the tune of \$600 million, a commitment that the Federal Government has been involved in for 130 years that has benefited not only farmers and ranchers but the American consumer, as well as crop insurance, almost \$400 million to make that program work, to make those resources maximize themselves.

The amazing thing is, this is funds that the committee in effect made decisions that were saved, the money was saved in other areas and then spent in these areas. The best of all worlds. We live up to our commitments, we use the resources that we have more efficiently allocated, and we have done what we said we would do. I thank the chairman for the opportunity to support this conference committee report.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE).

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for all the good work of the leadership on this committee and the leadership of the House in bringing this bill to the floor.

A couple of years ago we did away with production controls and supply management and price supports and deficiency payments and all those things that have marked our farm policy for a lot of years. In doing so, we said to the American agricultural producer that we want you to make your living at the marketplace. But we did not give them very many tools with which to manage their risk. Crop insurance is really the only thing that they have out there to do that. We have the opportunity here today to cure this annual crisis that we have over the funding mechanism for crop insurance. This is very important for that reason.

The second thing that is important is because this legislation provides a mechanism whereby researchers can compete for ag research funding. The

reason American agriculture is even remotely profitable today to the extent it is, and many would argue when you have prices below the cost of production that it is even the least bit profitable, but the reason it is is because of the technological breakthroughs that we have seen in the past few years. We have become much more efficient. We have got a lot better yields on a lot less farmable land. If American agriculture is going to be profitable and continue to be profitable in the future, we are going to have to make the investment in research and development.

Agriculture is a tough business under even the best of conditions. We have an opportunity today to say something that is very positive to producers of this country, and, that is, that we want to work with you in making this crop insurance program workable so that you have a tool whereby you can manage your risk, and, secondly, we are going to invest in research, so as we head into the next century that agriculture continue to lead the way and our producers can be the most efficient in the world and our consumers can continue to benefit from the lowest prices for food. This is a very important step in that direction.

Again, I thank the leadership and the chairman for his hard work, diligence and persistence in bringing this bill to the floor and would urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the agriculture research conference report. As my colleagues know, the United States has led the world in agricultural production. We have the best producers in the world. We can compete on a level playing field with anyone, any producer, anywhere in the world.

Right now things are not very good on the northern plains. We have dry conditions, we have trade imbalances, market failures, and it has created a lot of problems for producers on the northern plains. This bill does not address all those problems, but it does deal with one, and that is the insurance program for our drought conditions. But we cannot continue to compete unless we have research and an investment in research, because it is research that increases the productivity of our farms and ranches, it is how we lower costs, and it is how we increase yields. Frankly it is how we feed America and it is how we feed the world and it is why Americans enjoy the highest living standard in the world.

When the last Congress asked U.S. farmers to compete in the world markets, we said that we would help them manage risk with a better insurance program and assure our commitment to an effective crop insurance program. This bill delivers on that promise. We also said that we would invest in research so that we could assure our

long-term competitiveness. This conference report delivers on that promise as well.

Mr. Speaker, my State leads in agricultural research. At Montana State University, we have research with regard to different grains. At our Agricultural Research Station at Sidney, we are dealing with pest management. At Fort Keogh, we are dealing with increased production for people in the livestock industry. It is research that has increased our production, it is research that will improve our environment, and it is research that will deliver on our standard of living for all Americans. I urge all my colleagues to support the conference report.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds for purposes of saying thank you to the staffs on both the majority side and the minority side for the hours and days and weeks and months of hard work that they have put in to bringing us to this point tonight. We appreciate it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Forestry, Resource Conservation, and Research and I thank him for his work.

(Mr. DOOLEY of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I also want to commend the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST), along with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), for really continuing the tradition of the Committee on Agriculture to work in a bipartisan fashion to devise ag policy which is going to work in the best interests of our farmers.

I think also that the environment that they have created in the Committee on Agriculture, that bipartisan environment, certainly has contributed to our staffs working in a very effective and bipartisan fashion, too.

I rise today in strong support of the conference report to accompany S. 1150, the Ag Research, Extension and Education Reform Act. It has been a long road, but I believe that passage of this bill is imperative, and I am pleased that the House will vote on it today.

As with any legislation that we consider in Congress, S. 1150 is a product of hard work and compromise. While there will be some here today who will criticize certain provisions of this bill, I strongly believe that we have crafted a good bill that deserves the support of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Federal investment in ag research is the most vital component of the agricultural safety net for the future. Our country has a long and successful history of agricultural research innovations, and our system is the envy of the world. I believe that the research provisions of S. 1150 will lead to an even better agricultural research system in

our country and provide farmers with the tools that they will need to be competitive in this international marketplace into the next century.

Specifically, the conference report requires a competitive process for high-priority research projects and requires a match for those projects. The conference report does not contain any earmarked projects for specific States or specific universities, and I also think that the peer review and merit review provisions will improve the quality of research conducted at USDA.

The most exciting provision of the bill is the establishment of the Initiative for Future Agriculture and Food Systems. This new program, which is funded at \$120 million per year, will provide a new and stable source of competitively awarded research money to be targeted at high-priority issues. I want to applaud Senator LUGAR for his persistence in establishing this program and know that it will begin delivering benefits to farmers in the next few years.

While the research provisions of the bill were a top priority, the crop insurance components are also very important, because they provide the needed ability for farmers to manage the risk that is going to be inherent in the marketplace certainly as we move away from many direct subsidies to farmers.

But one other important component was the restoration of food stamp benefits for certain groups of legal immigrants and refugees and asylees. Many people in this body have criticized this provision, but I take exception to that. As part of the Balanced Budget Act we passed last year, we tried to provide some I think responsible reforms to the welfare act that many of us voted for in a bipartisan fashion.

We are not turning our back on welfare reform. What we are trying to do is provide some important assistance to some people who we invited into our country that have been important contributors to our society. I am particularly pleased about this because in my district I am home to a large number of Hmong refugees who will be benefiting from these provisions.

Oftentimes, we forget the sacrifices that these Hmong and Lao refugees have provided our country in participating in the secret war, participating alongside of our soldiers in the Vietnam War, saving many of their lives. I do not think we have to make any apologies for providing a restoration of food stamp benefits to some of these individuals who we invited into our country and provided service to our country.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have a great conference report here that meets the needs of U.S. farmers and is a responsible bill. I urge the entire body of the House to vote in support of it.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. In closing, let me thank again the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STEN-

HOLM) and his great statement about our staff, on both sides. They have worked arduously and well together. Members would be surprised how closely we work. I think they would be proud, as I am, this evening, proud of the conduct of this debate, and the people who are in it, because we who represent agriculture represent farmers. We do not represent anybody else, not huge companies, not foreign interests. We represent farmers. I think that is the reason that we can find ways to accommodate one another's issues and accommodate one another's ideas.

I am especially proud to bring this conference committee report to my colleagues. I might say to them that it is not only because of our work together. There were 71 agricultural organizations in America, I cannot find any organization that was not represented, that not only had great patience with us with this bill when we asked them to have patience but then when we asked them to step forward and to support this bill with Members, they did so enthusiastically. It is out of great respect for the organization of agriculture in America which stood together on this issue is the reason that we are here.

□ 2100

So, Mr. Speaker, I again thank all my colleagues for the debate, and I ask them all to support this very good conference committee report.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member rises in reluctant support of the conference report for S. 1150, the Agricultural Research Bill.

This Member is voting for the conference report because of the urgent need for crop insurance and the importance of agricultural research. However, this Member is strongly opposed to the provision in the bill that reinstates food stamp benefits for legal immigrants.

Two years ago, we finally passed major legislation that ended welfare as we knew it. The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act of 1996 contained a provision that barred most legal immigrants from the Food Stamp program, and we need to remember that immigrants are sponsored by American citizens who have agreed to take financial responsibility for their needs during the naturalization process. Too many sponsors have failed in their responsibility. This Member is strongly opposed to the reinstatement of food stamps for legal immigrants that was added to the bill during conference.

However, the need to approve crop insurance funding has reached a critical point. Funding is necessary so that our nation's farmers have in place a safety net to protect them against the natural disasters which are a constant threat. Allowing crops insurance coverage to lapse would make too many producers vulnerable to the uncertainties caused by weather. The farm bill enacted in 1996 creates more freedom and opportunities for farmers, but it is important for crop insurance to remain in place as a viable option.

It is also critically important to reauthorize the agricultural research program. Funding for research offers a long-term and far-sighted approach to supporting producers and improving our nation's food supply. Clearly, the success

of agriculture in the future depends on the research we support now.

This Member is voting for the conference report because of the importance of crop insurance and agricultural research.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to support passage of S. 1150, the conference report on the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reauthorization Act, which reauthorizes these programs for five years. Funding provided through this authorization is used by state research centers to protect and improve the use of crops.

Three weeks ago, I spoke against the rule that would have allowed a vote on this legislation. The rule, if passed, could have stopped funding for food and nutrition assistance.

Today we have a chance to vote on a clean bill. This bill contains funding for some of the most important research done in this country. In my congressional district, scientists at the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station have used U.S. Department of Agriculture grants to fund research on ticks that cause Lyme Disease and on yew trees that produce Taxol to fight breast and ovarian cancer.

I support today's bill because it ensures that 250,000 individuals and families will receive needed hunger assistance. I also support this bill because it provides for research that saves lives.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this important legislation.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Chairman SMITH, Ranking Member STENHOLM, and the members of the Committee. I commend you for the excellent legislation we have before us today.

The Agriculture Research, Extension and Education Reform Act will give stability to crop insurance programs, boost spending on agricultural research for the first time in 10 years, and provide an additional \$100 million for economic development in rural areas. By doing so, the bill will bring jobs to East Texas and improve long-term productivity and profitability for East Texas farmers and ranchers.

As government subsidies for agriculture come to an end, crop insurance has become one of the last barriers against financial ruin for farm families. The 1996 farm bill guaranteed crop insurance to our agricultural producers, but without this bill, farmers across the nation face the prospect of crop insurance cancellations as early as this month. In East Texas, there are agricultural producers facing drought conditions in some counties and floods in others, and we cannot deny them the crop insurance they have been promised. I share the relief of every crop producer in East Texas tonight as we pass this bill and ensure the continuation of crop insurance.

Equally important is the research component of this bill, providing \$600 million over five years in mandatory spending on agricultural research, including funds for the Texas A&M University System across Texas. We have a long history of agricultural research in this country, and it has led to the most productive and most efficient agricultural industry in the world. Continuation of this commitment is vital for America's farmers and ranchers as agricultural subsidies disappear and global markets become more competitive.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has been carefully crafted to pay for itself and protect the future of our agricultural producers and every American who relies on their products. I encourage

all my colleagues to cast a strong vote for rural America and pass this bill.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to speak on this crucial issue. I strongly oppose the rule striking reauthorizing food stamps for legal immigrants in the United States.

The rule that has been recommended would set up a ridiculous procedure which gives Republican opponents two extraordinary procedural mechanisms to kill the bill. Under this absurd procedure, the House will not even be allowed to debate the bipartisan conference report, even though the conference report has already been filed and has already been approved by an overwhelming bipartisan majority in the Senate. I vote to reauthorize food stamps for those who need them.

We must restore food stamps to our 900,000 legal immigrants including farmworkers. Food stamp recipients are refugees, the elderly, disabled Vietnam veterans and children who are facing food and nutritional deficiencies in larger and larger numbers.

This year, approximately 600,000 U.S. citizen children with immigrant parents will have less food on their tables because of these cuts. Since food stamp access has been cut, a widening hunger crisis has emerged that private charities and State and local governments have not been able to handle.

There simply have not been enough resources to feed all the hungry. Catholic Charities USA, Second Harvest and the U.S. Conference of Mayors have all reported major increases in request for emergency food assistance while food pantries are going empty and are turning people away.

In my home State of Texas, 124,000 legal immigrants lost food stamps. 13,090 of these who lost food stamps are children!!! The State itself is only able to cover approximately 15,000 people under a State program for elderly and disabled during this biennium.

The elimination of food stamp benefits for adults without children is calculated to create a mass of people who are desperate to take any job, no matter how poor the wages and conditions.

It will serve to intimidate all lower paid workers, a valuable and crucial section of the American workforce.

President Clinton singled out these welfare provisions as particularly unfair, and has since asked for \$2 billion to restore benefits to about 730,000 immigrants.

Striking this rule would deny almost a million people, old and young, and those contributing as a valuable force to our Nation's economy. I vote not to strike the rule and to reauthorize food stamps.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU). All time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered. The question is on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. 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 364, nays 50, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 204]

YEAS—364

Abercrombie	Dingell	Kanjorski
Ackerman	Dixon	Kaptur
Aderholt	Doggett	Kasich
Allen	Dooley	Kelly
Andrews	Doyle	Kennedy (MA)
Armedy	Dreier	Kennedy (RI)
Bachus	Duncan	Kennelly
Baessler	Dunn	Kildee
Baker	Edwards	Kilpatrick
Baldacci	Ehlers	Kim
Ballenger	Ehrlich	Kind (WI)
Barcia	Emerson	King (NY)
Barrett (NE)	English	Klecza
Barrett (WI)	Eshoo	Klink
Becerra	Etheridge	Klug
Bentsen	Evans	Knollenberg
Bereuter	Everett	Kolbe
Berman	Ewing	Kucinich
Berry	Farr	LaFalce
Bilbray	Fattah	LaHood
Bilirakis	Fawell	Lampson
Bishop	Fazio	Lantos
Blagojevich	Filner	Latham
Blumenauer	Foley	LaTourette
Boehert	Forbes	Lazio
Boehner	Ford	Leach
Bonilla	Fossella	Lee
Bonior	Fowler	Levin
Bono	Fox	Lewis (CA)
Borski	Franks (NJ)	Lewis (KY)
Boswell	Frelinghuysen	Linder
Boucher	Frost	Lipinski
Boyd	Gallegly	Livingston
Brady (PA)	Ganske	LoBiondo
Brown (CA)	Gejdenson	Lofgren
Brown (FL)	Gekas	Lowe
Brown (OH)	Gephardt	Lucas
Bryant	Gibbons	Luther
Bunning	Gilchrest	Maloney (CT)
Burton	Gillmor	Maloney (NY)
Buyer	Gilman	Manton
Callahan	Goodling	Markey
Calvert	Gordon	Mascara
Camp	Graham	Matsui
Campbell	Granger	McCarthy (MO)
Canady	Green	McCarthy (NY)
Capps	Gutierrez	McCollum
Cardin	Gutknecht	McCrery
Carson	Hall (OH)	McDermott
Castle	Hall (TX)	McGovern
Chambliss	Hamilton	McHale
Chenoweth	Hansen	McHugh
Christensen	Hastert	McInnis
Clay	Hastings (FL)	McIntosh
Clayton	Hastings (WA)	McIntyre
Clement	Hayworth	McKeon
Clyburn	Hefner	McKinney
Coble	Hill	McNulty
Combest	Hilleary	Meehan
Condit	Hilliard	Meek (FL)
Conyers	Hinchey	Meeks (NY)
Cook	Hinojosa	Menendez
Cooksey	Hobson	Metcalfe
Costello	Hoekstra	Mica
Cox	Holden	Millender-
Coyne	Hooley	McDonald
Cramer	Horn	Miller (CA)
Crapo	Houghton	Minge
Cubin	Hoyer	Mink
Cummings	Hulshof	Moakley
Cunningham	Hutchinson	Moran (KS)
Danner	Hyde	Morella
Davis (FL)	Inglis	Murtha
Davis (IL)	Jackson (IL)	Nadler
Davis (VA)	Jackson-Lee	Neal
DeFazio	(TX)	Nethercutt
DeGette	Jefferson	Ney
Delahunt	Jenkins	Northup
DeLauro	John	Norwood
Deutsch	Johnson (CT)	Nussle
Diaz-Balart	Johnson (WI)	Oberstar
Dickey	Johnson, E. B.	Obey
Dicks	Jones	Olver

Ortiz	Roybal-Allard	Stupak
Owens	Rush	Tanner
Oxley	Ryun	Tauscher
Packard	Sabo	Tauzin
Pallone	Sanchez	Taylor (NC)
Parker	Sanders	Thomas
Pascarella	Sandlin	Thompson
Pastor	Sawyer	Thornberry
Paxon	Schaffer, Bob	Thune
Payne	Schumer	Thurman
Pease	Scott	Tierney
Pelosi	Serrano	Torres
Peterson (MN)	Sessions	Towns
Peterson (PA)	Shaw	Trafigant
Petri	Shays	Turner
Pickering	Sherman	Upton
Pickett	Shimkus	Velazquez
Pitts	Shuster	Vento
Pombo	Sisisky	Visclosky
Pomeroy	Skaggs	Walsh
Porter	Skeen	Wamp
Portman	Skelton	Waters
Poshard	Slaughter	Watkins
Price (NC)	Smith (MI)	Watt (NC)
Quinn	Smith (NJ)	Watts (OK)
Radanovich	Smith (OR)	Waxman
Rahall	Smith (TX)	Weldon (PA)
Ramstad	Smith, Adam	Weller
Rangel	Smith, Linda	Wexler
Redmond	Snowbarger	Weygand
Regula	Snyder	White
Riggs	Souder	Whitfield
Riley	Spence	Wicker
Rivers	Spratt	Wise
Rodriguez	Stabenow	Wolf
Roemer	Stark	Woolsey
Rogan	Stenholm	Wynn
Rogers	Stokes	Young (AK)
Rothman	Strickland	Young (FL)

NAYS—50

Archer	Goodlatte	Roukema
Barr	Goss	Royce
Barton	Greenwood	Salmon
Bass	Hefley	Sanford
Bliley	Herger	Saxton
Blunt	Hostettler	Scarborough
Brady (TX)	Hunter	Schaefer, Dan
Cannon	Istook	Sensenbrenner
Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Shadegg
Coburn	Kingston	Solomon
Collins	Largent	Stearns
Crane	Manzullo	Stump
Deal	Miller (FL)	Sununu
DeLay	Neumann	Taylor (MS)
Doolittle	Pappas	Tiahrt
Ensign	Paul	Weldon (FL)
Goode	Rohrabacher	

NOT VOTING—19

Bartlett	Harman	Pryce (OH)
Bateman	Lewis (GA)	Reyes
Burr	Martinez	Ros-Lehtinen
Engel	McDade	Talent
Frank (MA)	Mollohan	Yates
Furse	Moran (VA)	
Gonzalez	Myrick	

□ 2119

Messrs. GOODLATTE, HERGER and SALMON changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, earlier this evening, I was unavoidably detained and as a result missed rollcall votes #202, #203, and #204.

Had I been present for these votes, I would have voted "Yea" on rollcall vote #202, "Nay" on rollcall vote #203, and "Nay" on rollcall vote #204.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall no. 204, I was unavoidably detained in traffic. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

MAKING IN ORDER AT ANY TIME CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3989, USER FEE AND TAX INCREASE ACT OF 1998

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, after consultation with the minority, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time to consider the bill (H.R. 3989) to provide for the enactment of user fees proposed by the President in his budget submission under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, for fiscal year 1999; that the bill be considered as read for amendment; that the amendment I have placed at the desk be considered as adopted; and that the previous question be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill, as amended, equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) and the minority leader or his designee; and (2) one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill add the following title:

TITLE IV—TAX INCREASES

SEC. 401. TAX INCREASES.

It is the sense of the House of Representatives that the following tax increases proposed by the President should be enacted as soon as possible:

(1) ACCOUNTING PROVISIONS.—

(A) Repeal lower of cost or market inventory accounting method.

(B) Repeal nonaccrual experience method of accounting and make certain trade receivables ineligible for mark-to-market treatment.

(2) FINANCIAL PRODUCTS AND INSTITUTIONS.—

(A) Defer interest deduction on certain convertible debt.

(B) Extend pro rata disallowance of tax-exempt interest expense that applies to banks to all financial intermediaries.

(3) CORPORATE TAX PROVISIONS.—

(A) Eliminate dividends received deduction for certain preferred stock.

(B) Repeal tax-free conversion of large C corporations into S corporations.

(C) Restrict special net operating loss carryback rules for specified liability losses.

(D) Clarify the meaning of "subject to" liabilities under section 357(c).

(4) INSURANCE PROVISIONS.—

(A) Increase the proration percentage for property and casualty insurance companies.

(B) Capitalize net premiums for credit life insurance contracts.

(C) Modify corporate-owned life insurance rules.

(D) Modify reserve rules for annuity contracts.

(E) Tax certain exchanges of insurance contracts and reallocations of assets within variable insurance contracts.

(F) Modify computation of "investment in the contract" for mortality and expense charges on certain insurance contracts.

(5) ESTATE AND GIFT TAX PROVISIONS.—

(A) Eliminate nonbusiness valuation discounts.

(B) Modify treatment of gifts of "present interests" in a trust (repeal "Crummey" case rule).

(C) Eliminate gift tax exemption for personal residence trusts.

(D) Include qualified terminable interest property trust assets in surviving spouse's estate.

(6) FOREIGN TAX PROVISIONS.—

(A) Replace sales source rules with activity-based rule.

(B) Modify rules relating to foreign oil and gas extraction income.

(C) Apply "80/20" company rules on a group-wide basis.

(D) Prescribe regulations regarding foreign built-in losses.

(E) Prescribe regulations regarding use of hybrids.

(F) Modify foreign office material participation exception applicable to certain inventory sales.

(G) Modify controlled foreign corporation exception from United States tax on transportation income.

(7) ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.—

(A) Increase penalties for failure to file correct information returns.

(B) Modify definition of substantial understatement penalty for large corporations.

(C) Repeal exemption for withholding on gambling.

(D) Modify deposit requirement for FUTA.

(E) Clarify and expand math error procedures.

(8) REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT COMPANY PROVISIONS.—

(A) Freeze grandfathered status of stapled or paired-share REITs.

(B) Restrict impermissible businesses indirectly conducted by REITs.

(C) Modify treatment of closely held REITs.

(9) EARNED INCOME TAX COMPLIANCE PROVISIONS.—

(A) Simplify foster child definition under the earned income credit.

(B) Modify definition of qualifying child for purposes of the earned income credit where more than one taxpayer satisfies the requirements with respect to the same child.

(10) OTHER REVENUE-INCREASE PROVISIONS.—

(A) Repeal percentage depletion for certain nonfuel minerals mined on Federal and formerly Federal lands.

(B) Modify depreciation method for tax-exempt use property.

(C) Impose excise tax on purchase of structured settlements.

(D) Reinstate Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund excise tax and increase Trust Fund ceiling to \$5,000,000,000 (through September 30, 2008).

(11) REINSTATE HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND EXCISE TAX AND ENVIRONMENTAL INCOME TAX.—

(A) Reinstate Superfund corporate environmental income tax.

(B) Reinstate Superfund excise taxes (through September 30, 2008).

Mr. SOLOMON (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

There was no objection.