

turnover is significantly higher among drug users than nondrug users.

To limit this disease to mere monetary figures, however, would ignore less tangible, but equally important factors. Although harms such as workplace injuries, lost productivity, and other effects of drug use are readily obtainable, some wounds, such as the costs to families and children, seem less obvious. In over 88 percent of families with children under the age of 18, at least 1 parent is employed. Thus, it seems clear that drug abuse among small business employees has implications that extend well beyond mere economics.

Many small business owners corroborate the notion that illicit drug use affects people on both tangible and intangible levels. One owner, Mr. Guzman, noticed that after opening a successful business, he soon found his business floundering. He discovered stolen inventory and low productivity. Upon learning that drug use represented the sole cause of such problems, Mr. Guzman implemented a drug-free workplace policy. Not only did the problems related to drug use subside, but the owner's business also flourished and profited beyond expectations. Such profits likely filtered down from the business to its employees and those employee's families.

This measure will standardize the policy implementation within Mr. Guzman's business. I laud the goals of this Act, for it seeks to educate the small businesses about the advantages of a drug-free workplace, provided financial incentives and technical assistance to enable small business concerns to create a drug-free workplace, and assist working parents in keeping their children drug-free. Such purposes should receive our praise and admiration. Regardless of political persuasion, these goals further all of our interests.

The specifics of the bill seem both adequate and reasonable. The Act establishes a strong relationship with the SBA and coordinates the SBA's efforts with those of the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy. Together, these entities should be able to implement this praiseworthy program. They may also act as a system of checks and balances.

The measure properly requires written policies, training for employees, additional training for employees who are parents, and access to drug testing laboratories. By providing these standards, the bill sets the foundation for a viable program.

I also commend the writers of this bill for providing a broad definition of employees. By including supervisors, managers, officers, and owners as employees, the measure encompasses those who are in the greatest position of power where the opportunity for drug abuses are conceivably greater.

Given the fact that small businesses must run on equally modest budgets, they likely demand even more protection than the large businesses. Moreover, the effects of drug abuse are more pronounced in their small settings. We must protect these businesses, for they represent the very image of America and the ideals we uphold.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYWORTH). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) that the House sus-

pend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3853, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3853.

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

There was no objection.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4101, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 482 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 482

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4101) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 2(l)(6) of rule XI or clause 7 of rule XXI are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. Points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, for failure to comply with clause 2 or 6 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for further amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first

in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform Members that the Committee on Rules has provided an open rule for the consideration of this very, very important measure, one of the most important appropriation measures that come before this body each and every year.

This means that Members will be able to offer any amendment which complies with the standing rules of the House, and that is the way it should be.

In order to expedite the consideration of this legislation, the requirement that the committee report be available for 3 days is waived. The report was filed on Friday night and was available to all Members yesterday morning.

The rule provides for one hour of general debate, which will be equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the committee.

□ 1115

There are two amendments printed in the report accompanying this rule which will be considered as adopted when the rule is passed. The first of these amendments provides relief to certain disadvantaged farmers whose complaints of discrimination were not considered in a timely manner. Through no fault of their own, the statute of limitations ran out.

The amendment limits claims to those between 1993 and 1996. It does not settle any cases, nor should it. It only allows these cases to proceed to be considered by the Department of Agriculture in spite of the statute of limitations.

What that means, Mr. Speaker, is that this provision is self-executed in the rule. So adoption of the rule places the language in the bill to be debated in a few minutes. It does not have to be offered as an amendment.

Adoption of the rule also means that the House will adopt sufficient spending cuts to pay for the cost of the disadvantaged farmers provision as well as paying for a second provision, the Members from agriculture States ought to pay attention to this, a second provision already in the bill to allow the sale of certain commodities to India and Pakistan in spite of the sanctions which recently took effect.

Mr. Speaker, both of these provisions have bipartisan support. The Republican Conference last week settled on a policy that requires that increased spending should be offset with cuts and not labeled as emergency spending. This provision in the rule implements that policy for the agriculture appropriation bill, and I hope will be implemented in all the other appropriation bills that come on this floor.

Because there are some provisions in this bill which constitute legislation on an appropriation bill, and some appropriations for which the authorization has not yet been signed into law, the rule waives the necessary points of order.

This bill also includes a few transfers of funds from one purpose to another, and the rule waives points of order to permit this.

In order to encourage Members to print their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD before they are offered, the rule also provides priority and recognition to Members who do preprint their amendments.

Also under this rule, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole has the authority to postpone and to stack votes so that Members can make more efficient use of their time.

Finally, this rule preserves the right of the minority to offer their final alternative in a motion to recommit just before the vote on adoption of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, one of the most admired and respected Members of this body, sitting here next to me, and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), who we have equal admiration and respect for, for their long hours that have been put into producing this piece of legislation.

They have done yeoman work, they and their staffs, over a number of years now. Again, as I mentioned earlier on, this is one of the most important bills that will come before the Congress each and every year.

I particularly want to thank them for upholding the 1995 farm bill as it concerns milk marketing orders, which is the lifeblood of every small dairy farmer in America. This provision will prohibit the Department of Agriculture from changing the rules until we have gone through both a legislative and an appropriations cycle next year.

The Committee on Agriculture, the authorizing committee, has assured me and others who have deep concern about this that they will look at this in a very favorable way.

The agriculture appropriation bill provides the necessary funding also for agricultural programs and related programs such as school lunch programs and the WIC program, which is the assistance for women and infants and children.

Mr. Speaker, I support this rule, and I support the constructive bill that it makes in order.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON), chairman of the Committee on Rules, for yielding me the time.

This is an open rule. It will allow full and fair debate on H.R. 4101, which is a bill that appropriates \$55.9 billion for agriculture, rural development, and food and nutrition programs in the fiscal year beginning October 1, 1998.

As my colleague the gentleman from New York described, this rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The rule also contains five self-executing amendments. One of those waives the statute of limitations for African American farmers to file discrimination claims against the Agriculture Department. This amendment will help us resolve this lingering injustice.

The Committee on Rules reported the rule by a voice vote. Overall, this is a good rule. It is crafted under difficult circumstances, and I intend to support it. I recognize that the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies was forced to make difficult choices because the funding allocation for agriculture programs is so low. He worked in a bipartisan fashion, carefully balancing many needs.

However, I am particularly disappointed that this bill cuts \$10 million in the Emergency Food Assistance Program which purchases food for needy Americans. The demand is growing for services by the Nation's food banks, emergency feeding centers, and soup kitchens. A survey by the U.S. Conference of Mayors showed that one out of five requests for emergency food in 1997 went unfilled. Now is not the time to cut this vital program. Later, during consideration of the bill, I intend to offer an amendment that will restore the \$10 million for the Emergency Food Assistance Program.

I am also concerned that the bill does not adequately fund the WIC program which helps feed infants, children, and their mothers. This bill would cut off benefits to more than 100,000 needy people, at risk, low-income women and their babies.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the subcommittee's ranking minority member, did everything possible to produce a fair bill. The problem lies not with the subcommittee, but with the larger budgetary decisions by this House to constrain so severely discretionary spending. Because the targets are so low, we are forced to pit the needs of the hungry against the

needs of farmers and food researchers and everyone else who is funded in this bill.

We have the money. Our economy is booming at rates that have rarely been seen in history, creating hundreds of billions of dollars in the last few years. Not only are we the wealthiest nation in the world, we stand today as the wealthiest nation the world has ever seen.

Surely we can find an extra \$10 million to help reduce the food lines in front of our soup kitchens. Surely, out of this new wealth, we can, at the very least, maintain the same level of spending for the emergency needs of poor, hungry people.

This is a disgrace, if we cannot take a tiny percentage of this enormous wealth to feed the needy. We are talking about a \$60 billion to \$100 billion tax cut. This is unbelievable. We cannot find \$10 million more for the EFAP program. That is what our budget agreements are forcing us to do.

This is the bill which feeds our Nation and hungry people around the world. This is the bill which contributes to our agricultural bounty. We should not set such low spending targets.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, let me just say to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) that we are prepared to close, get on with the regular business, if the gentleman wants to proceed.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, again let me just say that this is one of the most important appropriation bills to come before this House each and every year. I again want to just praise the work of the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), ranking minority member, and their staffs for the yeoman work that they have done on this legislation. It is very important. I hope the Members will come over and vote for the rule and then vote for the bill.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule allowing consideration of H.R. 4101, the Fiscal Year 1999 Agriculture Appropriations Bill.

This rule allows for the orderly consideration of the Agriculture Appropriations Bill.

It waives points of order against unauthorized programs in the bill.

The rule also self-executes an amendment that waives the statute of limitations for minority farmers who have complaints against the Department of Agriculture for discriminatory actions that occurred in the past. This language has been cleared with the Judiciary Committee and the Administration, and we support its inclusion in this bill.

The amendment self-enacted by the rule also provides the necessary offsets for scoring against the bill resulting from both the lan-

guage providing relief to minority farmers and the scoring created by the provision excluding agricultural exports from sanctions against India and Pakistan.

Again, I support this rule and the amendment it provides for.

My only disappointment is that the rule did not make in order an amendment by Congresswoman Lowey which would provide for civil penalties to be used a tool against meat and poultry plants which violate food safety laws. I support the efforts of the gentlelady from New York on behalf of American consumers, and will work with her to ensure the enactment of that provision.

Mr. Speaker, again I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the Agriculture Appropriations Bill. I thank my colleagues on the Rules Committee, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE ACT OF 1998

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3853, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3853, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 9, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 257]

YEAS—402

Abercrombie	Bono	Combest
Aderholt	Borski	Condit
Allen	Boswell	Cook
Andrews	Boucher	Cooksey
Archer	Boyd	Costello
Arney	Brady (PA)	Cox
Bachus	Brady (TX)	Coyne
Baesler	Brown (CA)	Cramer
Baldacci	Brown (FL)	Crane
Ballenger	Brown (OH)	Crapo
Barcia	Bryant	Cubin
Barr	Bunning	Cummings
Barrett (NE)	Burr	Cunningham
Barrett (WI)	Burton	Danner
Bartlett	Buyer	Davis (FL)
Barton	Callahan	Davis (IL)
Bass	Calvert	Davis (VA)
Bateman	Camp	Deal
Becerra	Campbell	DeFazio
Bentsen	Canady	DeGette
Bereuter	Capps	Delahunt
Berman	Cardin	DeLauro
Berry	Carson	DeLay
Bilbray	Castle	Deutsch
Bilirakis	Chabot	Diaz-Balart
Bishop	Chambliss	Dickey
Blagojevich	Chenoweth	Dicks
Bliley	Christensen	Dingell
Blumenauer	Clayton	Dixon
Blunt	Clement	Doggett
Boehlert	Clyburn	Dooley
Boehner	Coble	Doolittle
Bonilla	Coburn	Doyle
Bonior	Collins	Dreier

Duncan	King (NY)	Pomeroy
Dunn	Kingston	Porter
Edwards	Klecza	Portman
Ehlers	Klink	Price (NC)
Ehrlich	Klug	Pryce (OH)
Emerson	Knollenberg	Quinn
Engel	Kolbe	Radanovich
English	Kucinich	Rahall
Ensign	LaFalce	Ramstad
Eshoo	LaHood	Rangel
Etheridge	Lampson	Redmond
Evans	Lantos	Regula
Everett	Largent	Reyes
Ewing	Latham	Riley
Farr	LaTourette	Rivers
Fawell	Lazio	Rodriguez
Fazio	Leach	Roemer
Filner	Lee	Rogan
Foley	Levin	Rogers
Forbes	Lewis (GA)	Rohrabacher
Ford	Lewis (KY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Fossella	Linder	Roukema
Fowler	Lipinski	Roybal-Allard
Fox	Livingston	Royce
Franks (NJ)	LoBiondo	Rush
Frelinghuysen	Lofgren	Ryun
Frost	Lucas	Lowey
Furse	Luther	Sabo
Gallegly	Maloney (CT)	Salmon
Ganske	Maloney (NY)	Sanchez
Gejdenson	Manton	Sandlin
Gekas	Manzullo	Sanford
Gibbons	Markey	Sawyer
Gilchrest	Martinez	Saxton
Gillmor	Mascara	Scarborough
Gilman	Matsui	Schaffer, Bob
Goode	McCarthy (MO)	Sensenbrenner
Goodlatte	McCarthy (NY)	Serrano
Goodling	McCollum	Sessions
Gordon	McCrery	Shadegg
Goss	McDade	Shaw
Graham	McDermott	Shays
Granger	McGovern	Sherman
Green	McHale	Shimkus
Greenwood	McHugh	Shuster
Gutierrez	McInnis	Sisisky
Gutknecht	McIntosh	Skaggs
Hall (OH)	McIntyre	Skeen
Hall (TX)	McKeon	Skelton
Hamilton	McKinney	Slaughter
Hansen	McNulty	Smith (MI)
Harman	Meehan	Smith (NJ)
Hastert	Meek (FL)	Smith (OR)
Hastings (FL)	Meeks (NY)	Smith (TX)
Hastings (WA)	Menendez	Smith, Adam
Hayworth	Metcalfe	Smith, Linda
Hefley	Mica	Snowbarger
Hefner	Millender-McDonald	Snyder
Herger	Miller (FL)	Solomon
Hill	Minge	Souder
Hilleary	Mink	Spence
Hilliard	Moakley	Spratt
Hinchee	Mollohan	Stabenow
Hinojosa	Moran (KS)	Stark
Hobson	Moran (VA)	Stearns
Hoekstra	Morella	Stenholm
Holden	Murtha	Stokes
Hooley	Myrick	Strickland
Horn	Neal	Stump
Hostettler	Nethercutt	Stupak
Houghton	Neumann	Sununu
Hoyer	Ney	Talent
Hulshof	Northup	Tanner
Hutchinson	Norwood	Tauscher
Hyde	Nussle	Tauzin
Inglis	Obeys	Taylor (MS)
Istook	Oliver	Taylor (NC)
Jackson (IL)	Ortiz	Thomas
Jackson-Lee	Owens	Thornberry
(TX)	Oxley	Thune
Jefferson	Packard	Thurman
Jenkins	Pallone	Tiahrt
Johnson (CT)	Pappas	Tierney
Johnson (WI)	Parker	Trafficant
Johnson, E. B.	Pascarell	Turner
Johnson, Sam	Pastor	Upton
Jones	Paxon	Velazquez
Kanjorski	Payne	Vento
Kaptur	Pease	Visclosky
Kasich	Pelosi	Walsh
Kelly	Peterson (MN)	Wamp
Kennedy (MA)	Peterson (PA)	Watts (OK)
Kennedy (RI)	Petri	Weldon (FL)
Kennelly	Pickering	Weldon (PA)
Kildee	Pickett	Weller
Kilpatrick	Pitts	Wexler
Kim	Pombo	Weygand
Kind (WI)		White
		Wicker

Wise	Woolsey	Young (AK)
Wolf	Wynn	Young (FL)

NAYS—9

Clay	Frank (MA)	Scott
Conyers	Nadler	Waters
Fattah	Paul	Watt (NC)

NOT VOTING—22

Ackerman	Oberstar	Torres
Baker	Poshard	Towns
Cannon	Riggs	Watkins
Gephardt	Rothman	Waxman
Gonzalez	Sanders	Whitfield
Hunter	Schaefer, Dan	Yates
Lewis (CA)	Schumer	
Miller (CA)	Thompson	

□ 1144

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

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, I missed rollcall No. 257 due to attending a program with constituents including a student, Sheila Williams and her teacher, Brenda Triesdale from Crowder High School in Pittsburg County, Oklahoma. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I missed the last vote. The bells did not ring in my office. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent yesterday, Monday, June 22, 1998, and, as a result, missed Rollcall votes 252 through 256.

Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on Rollcall Vote 252; "yes" on Rollcall 253; "yes" on 254; "yes" on 255; and "yes" on Rollcall 256.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill (H.R. 4101) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.