

Appropriations Committees, and the Governor of Alaska.

(d) SPECIAL FUNCTIONS.—

(1) RURAL UTILITIES.—In carrying out its other functions, the Denali Commission should provide assistance as appropriate and seek to avoid duplication and to complement the water and wastewater programs under section 306D of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1926d) and under section 303 of the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1996 (33 U.S.C. 1263a).

(2) BULK FUEL TANKS.—The Denali Commission, in consultation with the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, shall develop a program to provide for the repair or replacement of bulk fuel storage tanks in Alaska which are not in compliance with Federal law, including the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, or State law.

SEC. 605. INSPECTOR GENERAL. Section 8G of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended (5 U.S.C. appendix 3 section 8G) is amended in subsection (a)(2) thereof by adding after "the Corporation for Public Broadcasting", "the Denali Commission".

SEC. 606. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Denali Commission to carry out this Act and for necessary expenses including staff, \$20,000,000 in fiscal year 1999 and such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2000 through 2003.

This Act may be cited as the "Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1999".

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. DOMENICI. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2727, AS MODIFIED

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 2727 previously agreed to be modified with the changes now at the desk. We made an error in where we put a number and we are just correcting it to what it ought to be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. No objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 2727), as modified, is as follows:

On page 21, line 19: strike "\$456,700,000, to remain available until expended." and insert "\$424,600,000, to remain available until expended."

ENERGY SUPPLY

On page 21, line 2 strike "motor vehicles for replacement only, \$699,836,000, to re-" and insert "motor vehicles for replacement only, \$727,836,000, to re-".

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate receives from the House of Representatives the companion bill to S. 2138, the Senate immediately proceed to its consideration; that all after the enacting clause be stricken; that the text of S. 2138 as passed be inserted in lieu thereof; that the House bill, as amended, be read for a third time and passed; that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and the Chair be authorized to appoint the following conferees on the part of the

Senate: Senators DOMENICI, COCHRAN, GORTON, MCCONNELL, BENNETT, BURNS, CRAIG, STEVENS, REID, BYRD, HOLLINGS, MURRAY, KOHL, DORGAN, and INOUE; and that the foregoing occur without any intervening action or debate.

I further ask unanimous consent that the bill, S. 2138, not be engrossed and it remain at the desk pending receipt of the House-passed companion bill; that upon passage of the House companion bill by the Senate, the passage of S. 2138 be vitiated, and the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Chair.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I want to take just a minute to express my appreciation for the work of the chairman of the subcommittee. We have worked hard to get the bill passed. It is now passed.

I also have expressed on the record on a number of occasions what a pleasant arrangement the senior Senator from New Mexico and I have on this legislation. I reiterate that. I also want to express my appreciation for the hard work done by Senator DOMENICI's staff, Alex Flint, the majority clerk, David Gwaltney, who handled the water project, which is very large and significant in this bill. They are very professional and work very hard. The taxpayers get more than their money's worth from these gentlemen.

I also express publicly my appreciation for Greg Daines, minority clerk, who worked very hard on this legislation for months, getting it to the point where we now are. I have a very important congressional fellow who has worked with me on this legislation and others, Bob Perret, who has done an outstanding job.

Also, I want to express my appreciation to Lashawnda Leftwich, who is the staff assistant to Mr. Flint, the majority clerk in this matter, and also Liz Blevins, the staff assistant to the minority clerk. We have, I think, a good team, a good group of people here who have worked very hard together. Again, I express my appreciation to the chairman of the subcommittee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. This is a good bill we passed. It has a lot of interesting and needed policy decisions, projects and programs. We will have a very difficult conference with the House because they have some noticeably different priorities, especially when it comes to spending more money on water projects than we were able to spend. There will be less on research on DOE's nondefense research projects. But, overall, I am most particularly pleased with the nuclear part of this bill, for nuclear research, which we have five or six more new nuclear research projects, three that the President asked for, three that we asked for.

You know, the United States is very much behind the world on matters of nuclear power and nuclear science and

nuclear engineering. Frankly, the world is moving in that direction. We were the beginners. We were the ones who started it. We were heralded as the world's most knowledgeable and efficient, and we are going to play some catchup, but catch up we will do, in the next decade, because nuclear power and nuclear energy will come back in the world. Whether America makes policy decisions sufficiently to give it a chance or not, only time will tell. But some decisions of the past 20 years, with reference to nuclear activities, have been about as inconsistent with what is happening in the world as anything anyone could imagine, based on wrong premises, expecting action in the world that never occurred.

Those things are going to have to be debated. A few of them start to move here. But, over the long run, there will be very significant debate about what happens to nuclear power and nuclear activities in the United States.

Right alongside that, while all that is going on that I have described, be it negative or however one would categorize it, clearly the Science-Based Stockpile Stewardship, which we are using in lieu of any further underground testing to protect our nuclear arsenal and make sure it is safe and trustworthy, is generating some of the most exciting new physics and science of anything going on in the world. Indeed, our great scientists and engineers are producing instrumentation, computerization, and new methods of looking inside of nuclear bombs to see what is really going on so we can replace the right parts, since we do not make any new ones. This is all very exciting and is adding a great dimension of science activity while a very valuable thing is being done for our country. Expensive it may be, but the right thing, without question, it is.

With that, more will be said during the year on those issues. I thank, in conclusion, my ranking member, Senator REID. I believe between us we not only work well together but I think we have helped each other make this bill a better bill. For that, I am very grateful to the Senator from Nevada, and I thank him very much.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

AGRICULTURE RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now begin consideration of Calendar No. 409, S. 2159, the agriculture appropriations bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I don't intend to object, but I just wanted my colleagues to be put on notice about my

concerns with this bill. I appreciate the work of my two Senate colleagues who developed this bill, and my concerns about this bill actually fall with what is not included in the bill, rather than what is in the bill.

Mr. President, we have a very serious problem at the USDA that no one seems to be very interested in solving. As some of you may know, there are a number of minority farmers who filed discrimination complaints with the USDA back in the 1980's and were told that the USDA was on the case. In fact, they weren't and didn't intend to be. After the statute of limitations passed for these farmers to file their discrimination complaints in a court of law, the USDA acknowledged that they never investigated or attempted to resolve these complaints. Since the statute of limitations has now passed for a number of these farmers, these farmers have been left with no remedy for the alleged acts of discrimination they suffered, all because of the inaction of the USDA. It seems to me we ought to address that matter at the earliest possible opportunity.

Mr. President, many here may also be aware of several provisions which took effect with the enactment of the 1996 Farm bill which have resulted in the denial of credit to farmers, based on a write-down of a previous loan. This has a particularly disproportionate effect on minority farmers, even though in a number of cases it was the USDA that encouraged the individuals to take a write-down. This body added language to the Emergency Supplemental earlier this year which addressed this problem. However, that language was taken out in a conference with the House. It would seem to me that the least we could do here is to add that language to this bill.

In sum, Mr. President, I do not object to proceeding with this bill, but I want to work with the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Arkansas to see if we can address these issues in this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the unanimous consent request is agreed to.

The clerk will report the bill.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2159) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for fiscal year ending September 30, 1999.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following Appropriations Committee staff members and fellow and intern be granted floor privileges during the consideration of this bill, S. 2159, and during any votes that may occur in relation thereto: Rebecca Davies, Martha Scott Poindexter, Rachelle Graves, Cornelia Tietka and Haywood Hamilton.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to present for the Senate's consideration S. 2159, the Fiscal Year 1999 Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies appropriations bill. This bill provides fiscal year 1999 funding for all programs and activities of the United States Department of Agriculture—with the exception of the Forest Service—the Food and Drug Administration, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, and expenses and payments of the farm credit system.

As reported, the bill recommends total new budget authority for fiscal year 1999 of \$56.8 billion. This is \$7.0 billion more than the fiscal year 1998 enacted level, and \$740 million less than the President's fiscal year 1999 budget request.

Changes in mandatory funding requirements account for the overall increase from the fiscal year 1998 enacted level, principally reflecting lower estimated Food Stamp and higher Child Nutrition program expenses, along with a \$7.6 billion increase in the required payment to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for net realized losses.

Including Congressional budget scorekeeping adjustments and prior-year spending actions, this bill recommends total discretionary spending of \$13.715 billion in budget authority and \$14.080 billion in outlays for fiscal year 1999. These amounts are consistent with the Subcommittee's discretionary spending allocations.

Let me take a few minutes first to summarize the bill's major funding recommendations.

For the Food Safety and Inspection Service, appropriations of \$605 million are recommended, \$16 million more than the fiscal year 1998 level. These additional funds are necessary to maintain the current inspection system and to continue to implement the Hazardous Analysis and Critical Control Point meat and poultry inspection system.

For farm credit programs, the bill funds an estimated \$2.4 billion total loan program level, including \$489 million for farm ownership loans and \$1.8 billion for farm operating loans.

Total funding of \$922 million is recommended for the Farm Service Agency, \$11 million more than the 1998 level. Increased funding is provided to maintain non-Federal staff years at the level requested in the budget, preventing reductions beyond those already planned.

For agriculture research, education, and extension activities, the bill provides total appropriations of \$1.7 billion. Included in this amount is a reduction from fiscal year 1998 of \$35.2 million for Agricultural Research Service buildings and facilities, a \$24 million increase for research activities of the ARS, and a \$12 million increase in funding for the Cooperative State Re-

search, Education, and Extension Service, which includes a 3-percent increase in base formula funds.

For USDA conservation programs, total funding of \$792 million is provided, \$5 million more than the 1998 level. This includes \$638 million for conservation operations, \$101 million for watershed and flood prevention operations, and \$34 million for the resource conservation and development program.

USDA's Foreign Agriculture Service is funded at a level of \$136 million. In addition, a total program level of \$1.1 billion is recommended for the Public Law 480 program, including \$221 million for Title I, \$837 million for Title II, and \$30 million for Title III of the program.

The bill also provides a total program level of \$2.2 billion for rural economic and community development programs. Included in this amount is \$700 million for the Rural Community Advancement Program, an increase of \$48 million from the fiscal year 1998 level; and a total \$1.5 billion program level for rural electric and telecommunications loans, \$92 million more than the 1998 level.

The Committee has devoted adequate resources to those programs which provide affordable, safe, and decent housing for low-income individuals and families living in rural America.

Estimated rural housing loan authorizations funded by this bill total \$4.3 billion, a \$65 million increase from the fiscal year 1998 appropriations level. Included in this amount is \$1.0 billion in section 502 low-income housing direct loans and \$129 million in section 515 rental housing loans.

In addition, \$583 million is recommended for the rental assistance program. This is the same as the budget request level and \$42 million more than the 1998 appropriation.

Over 65 percent of the bill's total funding, \$37 billion, is provided for USDA's domestic food assistance programs. This includes \$9.2 billion for child nutrition programs; \$3.9 billion for WIC, including \$15 million for the farmers' market nutrition program; \$141 million for commodity assistance; and \$23.8 billion for the food stamp program.

For those independent agencies funded by the bill, the Committee provides total appropriations of \$1.0 billion. Included in this amount is \$61 million for the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, and \$953 million for the Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Total appropriations recommended for the FDA are \$27 million more than the 1998 level, reflecting the full increase requested in the budget for FDA rental payments and an additional \$4 million more than the request level for buildings and facilities. In addition, the bill makes available \$132 million in Prescription Drug User Fee Act collections, \$15 million more than the fiscal year 1998 level.

I would like to point out to my colleagues that the discretionary spending

allocations for this bill are approximately \$200 million in budget authority and outlays below a freeze at the 1998 levels. To provide the selected increases I just cited and to maintain funding for essential farm, housing, and rural development programs, several mandatory funding restrictions are included in the bill. Modest limitations are imposed on Food Stamp program commodity purchases and on acreage enrollments in the Wetlands Reserve Program, and restrictions are imposed on fiscal year 1999 funding for the Conservation Farm Option Program and the Fund for Rural America.

In the case of the Fund for Rural America, it was a choice between providing adequate appropriations for research and rural development—the increases in funding recommended for agriculture research and rural development, including \$48 million for the Rural Community Advancement program and \$24 million for ARS research—or allowing the Administration to decide how to spend funds for selected rural development and agriculture research purposes.

I also want to remind my colleagues that the President's budget for programs and activities under this Subcommittee's jurisdiction assumes new user fees will be enacted and generate a net total of over \$650 million in collections to offset the discretionary spending increases proposed by the President. While relying on savings from new user fees and other legislative proposals may allow the President to claim discretionary spending levels which conform with those set forth in the bipartisan budget agreement, appropriations cannot be reduced until these legislative proposals are acted on by Congress and enacted into law.

However, that is not the case and this bill assumes none of the user fee savings proposed in the budget. Consequently, the savings assumed in the President's budget are not available to this Committee to offset the discretionary spending increases and new initiatives proposed by the Administration. Many of these proposals have merit and are ones I might support. However, this Committee must comply with the discretionary spending levels in the Bipartisan Budget Agreement and we have had to make some difficult decisions as a result. We have worked hard to maintain funding for the programs and activities funded by this bill as close to the 1998 program levels as possible, providing increases necessary to maintain essential personnel levels and to meet increased subsidy costs where necessary to sustain 1998 loan levels.

Also, despite recent reports, food safety continues to be a high priority of this Committee. The bill recommended to the Senate provides the funds necessary to ensure that American consumers continue to have the safest food in the world. This bill makes no reductions in appropriations for USDA and FDA food safety activi-

ties. In fact, the bill continues the enhanced levels provided last year for activities defined to be part of the Administration's food safety initiatives. This includes the additional \$24 million for FDA food safety initiatives and \$9 million for USDA food safety initiatives provided for fiscal year 1998. In addition, the bill includes \$3.6 million of the increase requested in the fiscal year 1999 budget for USDA food safety initiatives. Not included in the President's food safety initiatives but equally important to the continued safety of our nation's food supply is based funding for the Food Safety and Inspection Service. This bill provides fiscal year 1999 appropriations of \$605 million for the Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS), \$455 million more than the Administration's requested level and \$16 million more than the 1998 level. With the appropriations for FSIS inspection activities included, this bill recommends total appropriations of \$806.3 million for FDA and USDA food safety activities for fiscal year 1999, as compared to the President's \$380.6 million appropriations request. This does not include enhanced funding of \$50.7 million for FDA food safety initiatives which the President proposes be funded through new user fees.

Mr. President, in closing, I remind Senators that this will be the last time that my good friend from Arkansas and the distinguished ranking member of the Subcommittee, Senator BUMPERS, will manage this appropriations bill. Senator BUMPERS has been a valued member of the Appropriations Committee for the past 20 years and of this Subcommittee for the past thirteen years. The work of the Subcommittee reflects his intimate knowledge of the programs and activities. Senator BUMPERS has been an advocate of American agriculture and a proponent of programs to improve the quality of life and help bring jobs to rural areas. His many contributions to this process and this bill will continue on after his retirement from the Senate, but his leadership and participation in the work of the Committee in the future will be missed, particularly by this Senator.

Included in this bill is a general provision to designate the United States National Rice Germplasm Evaluation and Enhancement Center in Stuttgart, Arkansas, the "Dale Bumpers National Rice Research Center." The Senator from Arkansas has been an effective advocate of agricultural research and is the father of this ARS research center. I believe it is most appropriate to name this facility in his honor.

Mr. President, I thank the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee, Senator BUMPERS, as well as all other Members of the Subcommittee for their support and cooperation in putting this bill together.

Mr. President, I believe the bill represents a balanced and responsible set of funding recommendations within the limited resources available to the sub-

committee. I ask my colleagues to give it their favorable consideration.

Mr. President, I urge Senators to notice in our bill some important efforts to contrast the process that we followed to appropriate these funds with the proposal the President made when he submitted his budget request for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies.

A great deal of attention has been called to the President's request for additional funding of so-called new initiatives in certain areas covered by this bill. To propose these new funding levels, these so-called new initiatives, the President has had to assume that funds would be generated for those purposes by the enactment by the Congress of user fees. These cover Food Safety and Inspection Service activities. They also cover Food and Drug Administration activities.

The Congress has not enacted these user fees, and there is no expectation that Congress will through the legislative committees that have jurisdiction of these subjects. Therefore, that has led to the appearance that the committee, in its action to bring this bill to the floor, has not appropriated funds that the President has requested for these so-called new initiatives and additional spending programs.

We have not been able to accommodate the President's request because the allocation of funds to this subcommittee is insufficient to cover both the funding of the programs that we have had to fund in the bill, the continuing programs of research and extension and education which I have described so far, many of which are above the President's requested level, but the additional funds that he presumed would be available to this committee from user fees are not available to the committee, and therefore, for some accounts, it may appear that the committee is not funding those activities at the levels the President promised to secure the funding.

I think that explanation will serve to alleviate some concerns that I have heard expressed. One was expressed in the meeting of our full committee when this bill was under consideration, that we were going to put in jeopardy in some way, by having the funding levels that we had for food safety, the safety of school lunch food that is consumed by students at school. We have actually increased the programs that help safeguard the food supply well over and above what the President had requested.

He has suggested that funds be allocated to some so-called new initiatives, but he didn't request that we have inspectors in our poultry and meatpacking plants, as we have to have under current law, to inspect those processes and those plants to be sure that the food is packaged and processed in a way that is safe and will result in wholesome, nutritious food supplies for our country. We funded that. We have actually increased the

funding above last year's levels, so that we wouldn't have to close any of these plants or shut them down for any periods of time that would be required if we had not come up with this funding.

I assure Senators that we have taken great care to make sure that the funds are there for this next fiscal year for these food safety programs, including the so-called HACCP program, the new program that has been under development for the last several years in which this committee has cooperated to fund, so that it can bring to the challenge of food safety the latest in technologies and understanding and information so that we don't have to worry that we are not doing enough to help protect the food that is consumed in the United States.

I must say, too, that I think our producers and those who work to bring us this food supply have to be given great credit for the success they have had in producing a reasonably priced, wholesome, nutritious food supply for our country and, beyond that, millions and billions of dollars in excess of what we need in our country for export in the world marketplace.

Senators will also know that one of the areas of emphasis in this legislation is the funding of programs to help make sure that our exporters and our farmers are treated fairly in the international marketplace, that we continue to endeavor to break down barriers to fair trade for American agriculture products.

This morning, we had an opportunity to meet with representatives of a number of national farm organizations who were here in the Capitol to discuss the problems in certain sectors of agri-

culture in certain regions of this country. The meeting was actually convened by Senator CONRAD BURNS of Montana and Senator PAT ROBERTS of Kansas. The majority leader was President—was present—he may be President, not yet; he may be President later. Senator DICK LUGAR, the chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, was present.

We had 12 or 14 Senators involved in this meeting to find out what the suggestions were for helping to deal with some of these problems of low prices on the farm in certain areas and in certain commodities, and problems in trade, problems with tax laws that operate to the detriment of many who own and operate our Nation's farms. It was a good meeting.

I say to Senators that this bill addresses many of the problems that were identified in that meeting this morning. So it is responsive to the concerns that we hear.

We do need to do a more aggressive job to take up for our Nation's farmers both at home, in terms of regulations and tax policies which make it hard to operate or more expensive, and in terms of trade policies and national initiatives, to be sure that we have an opportunity to sell what we produce in the international marketplace at competitive prices, so there can be profit in agriculture and we can continue to reap the benefit in our country and our economy, in all aspects of our economy that are related and involved with agriculture, of a healthy, vibrant agriculture economy.

We have all heard how many jobs depend upon our farmers, how many people are in the processing businesses,

the value-added processing of food products, the transportation, the inputs that go into the farming operations in every rural community and every State in this great Nation. It is a huge business enterprise. And it deserves the sensitive support of the policymakers in Washington and a department of agriculture that cares when there is a problem on the farm and moves quickly to try to deal with it.

I think this legislation is consistent with those aims and those goals and those interests that we all have here in the Senate. I am hopeful that Senators will review the bill and give it their full support. And I hope Senators who have suggestions for changes in the bill will come to the floor and present those suggestions, and we will consider them in a very careful and sympathetic way.

We just as soon there not be any amendments. We think this is a good bill. We hope Senators will agree with us. We do have some committee amendments, and we have recommendations that have been cleared on both sides of the aisle for changes in the bill after the bill was considered in our committee.

At this time, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table comparing the committee's recommendations for fiscal year 1999 to the fiscal year 1998 levels and the President's fiscal year 1999 budget estimates be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999

Item	1998 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation compared with (+ or -)	
				1998 appropriation	Budget estimate
TITLE I—AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS					
Production, Processing, and Marketing					
Office of the Secretary	\$2,836,000	\$2,941,000	\$2,836,000	— \$105,000
Executive Operations:					
Chief Economist	5,048,000	5,823,000	5,048,000	— 775,000
Commission on 21st Century Production Agriculture		350,000		— 350,000
National Appeals Division	11,718,000	13,297,000	11,718,000	— 1,579,000
Office of Budget and Program Analysis	5,986,000	6,045,000	5,986,000	— 59,000
Office of Chief Information Officer	4,773,000	7,222,000	5,551,000	+ \$778,000	— 1,671,000
Total, Executive Operations	27,525,000	32,737,000	28,303,000	+ 778,000	— 4,434,000
Office of the Chief Financial Officer	4,283,000	4,562,000	4,283,000	— 279,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration	613,000	636,000	613,000	— 23,000
Agriculture buildings and facilities and rental payments	131,085,000	147,689,000	137,184,000	+ 6,099,000	— 10,505,000
Payments to GSA	(98,600,000)	(108,057,000)	(108,057,000)	(+ 9,457,000)
Building operations and maintenance	(24,785,000)	(24,127,000)	(24,127,000)	(— 658,000)
Repairs, renovations, and construction	(5,000,000)	(15,505,000)	(5,000,000)	(— 10,505,000)
Relocation expenses	(2,700,000)	(— 2,700,000)
Hazardous waste management	15,700,000	15,700,000	15,700,000
Departmental administration	29,231,000	32,168,000	27,034,000	— 2,197,000	— 5,134,000
Outreach for socially disadvantaged farmers	3,000,000	10,000,000	3,000,000	— 7,000,000
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations	3,668,000	3,814,000	3,668,000	— 146,000
Office of Communications	8,138,000	8,319,000	8,138,000	— 181,000
Office of the Inspector General	63,128,000	87,689,000	63,128,000	— 24,561,000
Office of the General Counsel	28,759,000	30,446,000	28,759,000	— 1,687,000
Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education and Economics	540,000	560,000	540,000	— 20,000
Economic Research Service	71,604,000	55,839,000	53,109,000	— 18,495,000	— 2,730,000
National Agricultural Statistics Service	118,048,000	107,190,000	103,964,000	— 14,084,000	— 3,226,000
Census of Agriculture	(36,327,000)	(23,741,000)	(23,599,000)	(— 12,728,000)	(— 142,000)
Agricultural Research Service	744,382,000	776,828,000	767,921,000	+ 23,539,000	— 8,907,000
Buildings and facilities	80,630,000	35,900,000	45,430,000	— 35,200,000	+ 9,530,000
Total, Agricultural Research Service	825,012,000	812,728,000	813,351,000	— 11,661,000	+ 623,000
Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service:					
Research and education activities	431,410,000	412,589,000	434,782,000	+ 3,372,000	+ 22,193,000
Native Americans Institutions Endowment Fund	(4,600,000)	(4,600,000)	(4,600,000)
Extension Activities	423,376,000	418,651,000	432,181,000	+ 8,805,000	+ 13,530,000
Total, Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service	854,786,000	831,240,000	866,963,000	+ 12,177,000	+ 35,723,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999—Continued

Item	1998 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation com- pared with (+ or -)	
				1998 appropriation	Budget estimate
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs	618,000	642,000	618,000		-24,000
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service:					
Salaries and expenses	425,932,000	417,752,000	424,473,000	-1,459,000	+6,721,000
AQI user fees	(88,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(95,000,000)	(+7,000,000)	(-5,000,000)
Buildings and facilities	4,200,000	5,200,000	4,200,000		-1,000,000
Total, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	430,132,000	422,952,000	428,673,000	-1,459,000	+5,721,000
Agricultural Marketing Service:					
Marketing Services	46,567,000	58,469,000	45,567,000	-1,000,000	-12,902,000
New user fees	(4,000,000)	(4,000,000)	(4,000,000)		
(Limitation on administrative expenses, from fees collected)	(59,521,000)	(60,730,000)	(59,521,000)		(-1,209,000)
Funds for strengthening markets, income, and supply (transfer from section 32)	10,690,000	10,998,000	10,998,000	+308,000	
Payments to states and possessions	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000		
Total, Agricultural Marketing Service	58,457,000	70,667,000	57,765,000	-692,000	-12,902,000
Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration	25,390,000	11,797,000	26,390,000	+1,000,000	+14,593,000
Inspection and Weighing Services (limitation on administrative expenses, from fees collected)	(43,092,000)	(42,557,000)	(42,557,000)	(-535,000)	
Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety	446,000	598,000	446,000		-152,000
Food Safety and Inspection Service	588,761,000	149,566,000	605,149,000	+16,388,000	+455,583,000
Lab accreditation fees	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)		
Total, Production, Processing, and Marketing	3,291,760,000	2,840,480,000	3,279,614,000	-12,146,000	+439,134,000
Farm Assistance Programs					
Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services	572,000	597,000	572,000		-25,000
Farm Service Agency:					
Salaries and expenses	699,579,000	723,478,000	710,842,000	+11,263,000	-12,636,000
(Transfer from export loans)	(589,000)	(672,000)	(589,000)		(-83,000)
(Transfer from Public Law 480)	(815,000)	(845,000)	(815,000)		(-30,000)
(Transfer from ACIF)	(209,861,000)	(227,673,000)	(209,861,000)		(-17,812,000)
Total, salaries and expenses	(910,844,000)	(952,668,000)	(922,107,000)	(+11,263,000)	(-30,561,000)
State mediation grants	2,000,000	4,000,000	2,000,000		-2,000,000
Dairy indemnity program	550,000	450,000	450,000	-100,000	
Total, Farm Service Agency	702,129,000	727,928,000	713,292,000	+11,163,000	-14,636,000
Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Farm ownership loans:					
Direct	(78,320,000)	(85,000,000)	(63,872,000)	(-14,448,000)	(-21,128,000)
Guaranteed	(425,000,000)	(425,031,000)	(425,000,000)		(-31,000)
Subtotal	(503,320,000)	(510,031,000)	(488,872,000)	(-14,448,000)	(-21,159,000)
Farm operating loans:					
Direct	(565,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(560,472,000)	(-4,528,000)	(+60,472,000)
Guaranteed unsubsidized	(992,906,000)	(1,700,000,000)	(992,906,000)		(-707,094,000)
Guaranteed subsidized	(235,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(235,000,000)		(+35,000,000)
Subtotal	(1,792,906,000)	(2,400,000,000)	(1,788,378,000)	(-4,528,000)	(-611,622,000)
Indian tribe land acquisition loans	(1,000,000)	(1,003,000)	(1,000,000)		(-3,000)
Emergency disaster loans	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)		
Boll weevil eradication loans	(53,467,000)	(30,000,000)	(40,000,000)	(-13,467,000)	(+10,000,000)
Credit sales of acquired property	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)		
Total, Loan authorizations	(2,400,693,000)	(2,991,034,000)	(2,368,250,000)	(-32,443,000)	(-622,784,000)
Loan subsidies:					
Farm ownership loans:					
Direct	8,329,000	12,725,000	9,562,000	+1,233,000	-3,163,000
Guaranteed	16,407,000	6,758,000	6,758,000	-9,649,000	
Subtotal	24,736,000	19,483,000	16,320,000	-8,416,000	-3,163,000
Farm operating loans:					
Direct	36,823,000	34,150,000	38,280,000	+1,457,000	+4,130,000
Guaranteed unsubsidized	11,617,000	19,720,000	11,518,000	-99,000	-8,202,000
Guaranteed subsidized	22,654,000	17,480,000	20,539,000	-2,115,000	+3,059,000
Subtotal	71,094,000	71,350,000	70,337,000	-757,000	-1,013,000
Indian tribe land acquisition	132,000	153,000	153,000	+21,000	
Emergency disaster loans	6,008,000	5,900,000	5,900,000	-108,000	
Boll weevil loans subsidy	472,000	432,000	576,000	+104,000	+144,000
Credit sales of acquired property	3,255,000	3,260,000	3,260,000	+5,000	
Total, Loan subsidies	105,697,000	100,578,000	96,546,000	-9,151,000	-4,032,000
ACIF expenses:					
Salaries and expense (transfer to FSA)	209,861,000	227,673,000	209,861,000		-17,812,000
Administrative expenses	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000		
Total, ACIF expenses	219,861,000	237,673,000	219,861,000		-17,812,000
Total, Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund	325,558,000	338,251,000	316,407,000	-9,151,000	-21,844,000
(Loan authorization)	(2,400,693,000)	(2,991,034,000)	(2,368,250,000)	(-32,443,000)	(-622,784,000)
Total, Farm Service Agency	1,027,687,000	1,066,179,000	1,029,699,000	+2,012,000	-36,480,000
Risk Management Agency:					
Administrative and operating expenses	64,000,000	66,000,000	64,000,000		-2,000,000
Sales commission of agents	188,571,000			-188,571,000	
Total, Risk Management Agency	252,571,000	66,000,000	64,000,000	-188,571,000	-2,000,000
Total, Farm Assistance Programs	1,280,830,000	1,132,776,000	1,094,271,000	-186,559,000	-38,505,000
Corporations					
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: Federal Crop Insurance Corporation fund	1,584,135,000	1,504,036,000	1,504,036,000	-80,099,000	
Commodity Credit Corporation Fund:					
Reimbursement for net realized losses	783,507,000	8,439,000,000	8,439,000,000	+7,655,493,000	
Operations and maintenance for hazardous waste management (limitation on administrative expenses)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)		
Total, Corporations	2,367,642,000	9,943,036,000	9,943,036,000	+7,575,394,000	
Total, title I, Agricultural Programs	6,940,232,000	13,916,292,000	14,316,921,000	+7,376,689,000	+400,629,000
(By transfer)	(211,265,000)	(229,190,000)	(211,265,000)		(-17,925,000)
(Loan authorization)	(2,400,693,000)	(2,991,034,000)	(2,368,250,000)	(-32,443,000)	(-622,784,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(107,613,000)	(108,287,000)	(107,078,000)	(-535,000)	(-1,209,000)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999—Continued

Item	1998 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation com- pared with (+ or -)	
				1998 appropriation	Budget estimate
TITLE II—CONSERVATION PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment	693,000	719,000	693,000		- 26,000
Natural Resources Conservation Service:					
Conservation operations	632,853,000	742,231,000	638,231,000	+ 5,378,000	- 104,000,000
Watershed surveys and planning ²	11,190,000		11,190,000		+ 11,190,000
Watershed and flood prevention operations ³	101,036,000	49,000,000	101,036,000		+ 52,036,000
Resource conservation and development	34,377,000	34,377,000	34,377,000		
Forestry incentives program	6,325,000		6,325,000		+ 6,325,000
Total, Natural Resources Conservation Service	785,781,000	825,608,000	791,159,000	+ 5,378,000	- 34,449,000
Total, title II, Conservation Programs	786,474,000	826,327,000	791,852,000	+ 5,378,000	- 34,475,000
TITLE III—RURAL ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development	588,000	611,000	588,000		- 23,000
Rural community advancement program	652,197,000	715,172,000	700,201,000	+ 48,004,000	- 14,971,000
Delta region economic development program		26,000,000			- 26,000,000
Rural Housing Service:					
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Single family (sec. 502)	(1,000,000,000)	(1,000,000,000)	(1,000,000,000)		
Unsubsidized guaranteed	(3,000,000,000)	(3,000,000,000)	(3,000,000,000)		
Housing repair (sec. 504)	(30,000,000)	(25,001,000)	(30,000,000)		(+ 4,999,000)
Farm labor (sec. 514)	(15,000,000)	(32,108,000)	(15,758,000)	(+ 758,000)	(- 16,350,000)
Rental housing (sec. 515)	(128,640,000)	(100,000,000)	(128,640,000)		(+ 28,640,000)
Multi-family housing guarantees (sec. 538)	(19,700,000)	(150,000,000)	(75,000,000)	(+ 55,300,000)	(- 75,000,000)
Site loans (sec. 524)	(600,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(+ 4,400,000)	
Self-help housing land development fund	(587,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(+ 4,413,000)	
Credit sales of acquired property	(25,000,000)	(30,007,000)	(25,000,000)		(- 5,007,000)
Total, Loan authorizations	(4,219,527,000)	(4,347,116,000)	(4,284,398,000)	(+ 64,871,000)	(- 62,718,000)
Loan subsidies:					
Single family (sec. 502)	128,100,000	118,200,000	118,200,000	- 9,900,000	
Unsubsidized guaranteed	6,900,000	2,700,000	2,700,000	- 4,200,000	
Housing repair (sec. 504)	10,300,000	8,808,000	10,569,000	+ 269,000	+ 1,761,000
Multi-family housing guarantees (sec. 538)	1,200,000	3,480,000	1,740,000	+ 540,000	- 1,740,000
Farm labor (sec. 514)	7,388,000	16,706,000	8,199,000	+ 811,000	- 8,507,000
Rental housing (sec. 515)	68,745,000	48,250,000	62,069,000	- 6,676,000	+ 13,819,000
Site loans (sec. 524)		16,500	16,000	+ 16,000	- 500
Credit sales of acquired property	3,492,000	4,672,000	3,826,000	+ 334,000	- 846,000
Self-help housing land development fund	17,000	282,000	282,000	+ 265,000	
Total, Loan subsidies	226,142,000	203,114,500	207,601,000	- 18,541,000	+ 4,486,500
RHIF administrative expenses (transfer to RHS)	354,785,000	367,857,000	360,785,000	+ 6,000,000	- 7,072,000
Rental assistance program:					
(Sec. 521)	535,497,000	577,497,000	577,497,000	+ 42,000,000	
(Sec. 502(c)(5)(D))	5,900,000	5,900,000	5,900,000		
Total, Rental assistance program	541,397,000	583,397,000	583,397,000	+ 42,000,000	
Total, Rural Housing Insurance Fund	1,122,324,000	1,154,368,500	1,151,783,000	+ 29,459,000	- 2,585,500
(Loan authorization)	(4,219,527,000)	(4,347,116,000)	(4,284,398,000)	(+ 64,871,000)	(- 62,718,000)
Mutual and self-help housing grants	26,000,000	26,000,000	26,000,000		
Rural community fire protection grants	2,000,000			- 2,000,000	
Rural housing assistance grants	45,720,000	46,900,000	45,720,000		- 1,180,000
Subtotal, grants and payments	73,720,000	72,900,000	71,720,000	- 2,000,000	- 1,180,000
RHS expenses:					
Salaries and expenses	57,958,000	60,978,000	60,978,000	+ 3,020,000	
(Transfer from RHIF)	(354,785,000)	(367,857,000)	(360,785,000)	(+ 6,000,000)	(- 7,072,000)
Total, RHS expenses	(412,743,000)	(428,835,000)	(421,763,000)	(+ 9,020,000)	(- 7,072,000)
Total, Rural Housing Service	1,254,002,000	1,288,246,500	1,284,481,000	+ 30,479,000	- 3,765,500
(Loan authorization)	(4,219,527,000)	(4,347,116,000)	(4,284,398,000)	(+ 64,871,000)	(- 62,718,000)
Rural Business-Cooperative Service:					
Rural Development Loan Fund Program Account:					
(Loan authorization)	(35,000,000)	(35,000,000)	(33,000,000)	(- 2,000,000)	(- 2,000,000)
Loan subsidy	16,888,000	17,622,000	16,615,000	- 273,000	- 1,007,000
Administrative expenses (transfer to RBCS)	3,482,000	3,547,000	3,482,000		- 65,000
Total, Rural Development Loan Fund	20,370,000	21,169,000	20,097,000	- 273,000	- 1,072,000
Rural Economic Development Loans Program Account:					
(Loan authorization)	(25,000,000)	(15,000,000)	(23,000,000)	(- 2,000,000)	(+ 8,000,000)
Direct subsidy	5,978,000	3,783,000	5,801,000	- 177,000	+ 2,018,000
Rural cooperative development grants	3,000,000	5,700,000	3,000,000		- 2,700,000
RBCS expenses:					
Salaries and expenses	25,680,000	26,396,000	25,680,000		- 716,000
(Transfer from RDLFP)	(3,482,000)	(3,547,000)	(3,482,000)		(- 65,000)
Total, RBCS expenses	(29,162,000)	(29,943,000)	(29,162,000)		(- 781,000)
Total, Rural Business-Cooperative Service	55,028,000	57,048,000	54,578,000	- 450,000	- 2,470,000
(By transfer)	(3,482,000)	(3,547,000)	(3,482,000)		(- 65,000)
(Loan authorization)	(60,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(56,000,000)	(- 4,000,000)	(+ 6,000,000)
Alternative Agricultural Research and Commercialization Revolving Fund	7,000,000	10,000,000	7,000,000		- 3,000,000
Rural Utilities Service:					
Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Direct loans:					
Electric 5 percent	(125,000,000)	(55,000,000)	(71,500,000)	(- 53,500,000)	(+ 16,500,000)
Telecommunications 5 percent	(75,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(75,000,000)		(+ 25,000,000)
Subtotal	(200,000,000)	(105,000,000)	(146,500,000)	(- 53,500,000)	(+ 41,500,000)
Treasury rates: Telecommunications	(300,000,000)	(300,000,000)	(250,000,000)	(- 50,000,000)	(- 50,000,000)
Muni-rate: Electric	(500,000,000)	(250,000,000)	(295,000,000)	(- 205,000,000)	(+ 45,000,000)
FFB loans:					
Electric, regular	(300,000,000)	(300,000,000)	(700,000,000)	(+ 400,000,000)	(+ 400,000,000)
Telecommunications	(120,000,000)	(120,000,000)	(120,000,000)		
Subtotal	(420,000,000)	(420,000,000)	(820,000,000)	(+ 400,000,000)	(+ 400,000,000)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999—Continued

Item	1998 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation com- pared with (+ or -)	
				1998 appropriation	Budget estimate
Total, Loan authorizations	(1,420,000,000)	(1,075,000,000)	(1,511,500,000)	(+ 91,500,000)	(+ 436,500,000)
Loan subsidies:					
Direct loans:					
Electric 5 percent	9,325,000	7,172,000	9,325,000		+ 2,153,000
Telecommunications 5 percent	2,940,000	4,895,000	7,342,000	+ 4,402,000	+ 2,447,000
Subtotal	12,265,000	12,067,000	16,667,000	+ 4,402,000	+ 4,600,000
Treasury rates: Telecommunications	60,000	810,000	675,000	+ 615,000	- 135,000
Muni-rate: Electric	21,100,000	21,900,000	25,842,000	+ 4,742,000	+ 3,942,000
FFB loans: Electric, regular	2,760,000			- 2,760,000	
Total, Loan subsidies	36,185,000	34,777,000	43,184,000	+ 6,999,000	+ 8,407,000
RETLP administrative expenses (transfer to RUS)	29,982,000	32,000,000	29,982,000		- 2,018,000
Total, Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account	66,167,000	66,777,000	73,166,000	+ 6,999,000	+ 6,389,000
(Loan authorization)	(1,420,000,000)	(1,075,000,000)	(1,511,500,000)	(+ 91,500,000)	(+ 436,500,000)
Rural Telephone Bank Program Account:					
(Loan authorization)	(175,000,000)	(175,000,000)	(140,000,000)	(- 35,000,000)	(- 35,000,000)
Direct loan subsidy	3,710,000	4,637,500	3,710,000		- 927,500
RTP administrative expenses (transfer to RUS)	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000		
Total	6,710,000	7,637,500	6,710,000		- 927,500
Distance learning and telemedicine program:					
(Loan authorization)	(150,000,000)	(150,000,000)	(150,000,000)		
Direct loan subsidy	30,000	180,000	180,000	+ 150,000	
Grants	12,500,000	15,000,000	12,500,000		- 2,500,000
Total	12,530,000	15,180,000	12,680,000	+ 150,000	- 2,500,000
RUS expenses:					
Salaries and expenses	33,000,000	33,445,000	33,000,000		- 445,000
(Transfer from RETLP)	(29,982,000)	(32,000,000)	(29,982,000)		(- 2,018,000)
(Transfer from RTP)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)		
Total, RUS expenses	(65,982,000)	(68,445,000)	(65,982,000)		(- 2,463,000)
Total, Rural Utilities Service	118,407,000	123,039,500	125,556,000	+ 7,149,000	+ 2,516,500
(By transfer)	(32,982,000)	(35,000,000)	(32,982,000)		(- 2,018,000)
(Loan authorization)	(1,745,000,000)	(1,400,000,000)	(1,801,500,000)	(+ 56,500,000)	(+ 401,500,000)
Total, title III, Rural Economic and Community Development Programs	2,087,222,000	2,220,117,000	2,172,404,000	+ 85,182,000	- 47,713,000
(By transfer)	(391,249,000)	(406,404,000)	(397,249,000)	(+ 6,000,000)	(- 9,155,000)
(Loan authorization)	(6,024,527,000)	(5,797,116,000)	(6,141,898,000)	(+ 117,371,000)	(+ 344,782,000)
TITLE IV—DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services	554,000	573,000	554,000		- 19,000
Food and Consumer Service:					
Child nutrition programs	2,612,675,000	3,887,703,000	4,171,747,000	+ 1,559,072,000	+ 284,044,000
Discretionary spending	3,750,000	10,000,000		- 3,750,000	- 10,000,000
Transfer from section 32	5,151,391,000	5,332,194,000	5,048,150,000	- 103,241,000	- 284,044,000
Total, Child nutrition programs	7,767,816,000	9,229,897,000	9,219,897,000	+ 1,452,081,000	- 10,000,000
Special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children (WIC)	3,924,000,000	4,081,000,000	3,924,000,000		- 157,000,000
Reserve		(20,000,000)			(- 20,000,000)
Food stamp program:					
Expenses	23,736,479,000	22,365,806,000	22,365,806,000	- 1,370,673,000	
Reserve	100,000,000	1,000,000,000	100,000,000		- 900,000,000
Nutrition assistance for Puerto Rico	1,204,000,000	1,236,000,000	1,236,000,000	+ 32,000,000	
The emergency food assistance program	100,000,000	100,000,000	80,000,000	- 20,000,000	- 20,000,000
Total, Food stamp program	25,140,479,000	24,701,806,000	23,781,806,000	- 1,358,673,000	- 920,000,000
Commodity assistance program	141,000,000	317,081,000	141,000,000		- 176,081,000
Food donations programs for selected groups:					
Needy family program	1,165,000		1,081,000	- 84,000	+ 1,081,000
Elderly feeding program	140,000,000		140,000,000		+ 140,000,000
Total, Food donations programs ⁴	141,165,000		141,081,000	- 84,000	+ 141,081,000
Food program administration	107,505,000	111,848,000	109,069,000	+ 1,564,000	- 2,779,000
Total, Food and Consumer Service	37,221,965,000	38,441,632,000	37,316,853,000	+ 94,888,000	- 1,124,779,000
Total, title IV, Domestic Food Programs	37,222,519,000	38,442,205,000	37,317,407,000	+ 94,888,000	- 1,124,798,000
TITLE V—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS					
Foreign Agricultural Service and General Sales Manager:					
Appropriation	131,295,000	141,087,000	131,795,000	+ 500,000	- 9,292,000
(Transfer from export loans)	(3,231,000)	(3,413,000)	(3,231,000)		(- 182,000)
(Transfer from Public Law 480)	(1,035,000)	(1,093,000)	(1,035,000)		(- 58,000)
Total, Foreign Agriculture Service and General	135,561,000	145,593,000	136,061,000	+ 500,000	- 9,532,000
Public Law 480 Program and Grant Accounts:					
Title I—Credit sales:					
Program level	(244,508,000)	(111,558,000)	(221,083,000)	(- 23,425,000)	(+ 109,525,000)
Direct loans	(226,900,000)	(102,163,000)	(203,475,000)	(- 23,425,000)	(+ 101,312,000)
Ocean freight differential	17,608,000	9,395,000	17,608,000		+ 8,213,000
Title II—Commodities for disposition abroad:					
Program level	(837,000,000)	(837,000,000)	(837,000,000)		
Appropriation	837,000,000	837,000,000	837,000,000		
Title III—Commodity grants:					
Program level	(30,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(30,000,000)		
Appropriation	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000		
Loan subsidies	176,596,000	88,667,000	176,596,000		+ 87,929,000
Salaries and expenses:					
General Sales Manager (transfer to FAS)	1,035,000	1,093,000	1,035,000		- 58,000
Farm Service Agency (transfer to FSA)	815,000	845,000	815,000		- 30,000
Subtotal	1,850,000	1,938,000	1,850,000		- 88,000
Total, Public Law 480:					
Program level	(1,111,508,000)	(978,558,000)	(1,088,083,000)	(- 23,425,000)	(+ 109,525,000)
Appropriation	1,063,054,000	967,000,000	1,063,054,000		+ 96,054,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999—Continued

Item	1998 appropriation	Budget estimate	Committee recommendation	Senate Committee recommendation com- pared with (+ or -)	
				1998 appropriation	Budget estimate
CCC Export Loans Program Account:					
Loan guarantees: Export credit	(5,500,000,000)			(- 5,500,000,000)	
Loan subsidy	527,546,000			- 527,546,000	
Emerging markets export credit	(200,000,000)			(- 200,000,000)	
Salaries and expenses (Export Loans):					
General Sales Manager (transfer to FAS)	3,231,000	3,413,000	3,231,000		- 182,000
Farm Service Agency (transfer to FSA)	589,000	672,000	589,000		- 83,000
Total, CCC Export Loans Program Account	531,366,000	4,085,000	3,820,000	- 527,546,000	- 265,000
Total, title V, Foreign Assistance and Related Programs (By transfer)	1,725,715,000 (4,266,000)	1,112,172,000 (4,506,000)	1,198,669,000 (4,266,000)	- 527,046,000	+ 86,497,000 (- 240,000)
TITLE VI—RELATED AGENCIES AND FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION					
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES					
Food and Drug Administration					
Salaries and expenses, direct appropriation	857,501,000	878,884,000	940,367,000	+ 82,866,000	+ 61,483,000
Prescription drug user fee act	(117,122,000)	(126,845,000)	(132,273,000)	(+ 15,151,000)	(+ 5,428,000)
Mammography clinics user fee	(13,966,000)	(14,385,000)	(14,385,000)	(+ 419,000)	
Subtotal, program level	(988,589,000)	(1,020,114,000)	(1,087,025,000)	(+ 98,436,000)	(+ 66,911,000)
Buildings and facilities	21,350,000	8,350,000	12,350,000	- 9,000,000	+ 4,000,000
Rental payments (FDA)	46,294,000	82,866,000		- 46,294,000	- 82,866,000
By transfer from PDUFA		(5,428,000)			(- 5,428,000)
Subtotal, program level	(46,294,000)	(88,294,000)		(- 46,294,000)	(- 88,294,000)
Total, Food and Drug Administration	925,145,000	970,100,000	952,717,000	+ 27,572,000	- 17,383,000
DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY					
Financial Management Service: Payments to the Farm Credit System Financial Assistance Corporation	7,728,000	2,565,000	2,565,000	- 5,163,000	
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Commodity Futures Trading Commission	58,101,000	63,360,000	61,000,000	+ 2,899,000	- 2,360,000
Farm Credit Administration (limitation on administrative expenses)	(34,423,000)			(- 34,423,000)	
Total, title VI, Related Agencies and Food and Drug Administration	990,974,000	1,036,025,000	1,016,282,000	+ 25,308,000	- 19,743,000
TITLE VII—EMERGENCY APPROPRIATIONS					
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE					
Farm Service Agency					
Emergency conservation program	34,000,000			- 34,000,000	
Tree assistance program	14,000,000			- 14,000,000	
Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account:					
Emergency insured loans:					
Loan subsidy	21,000,000			- 21,000,000	
(Loan authorization)	87,400,000			- 87,400,000	
Total, Farm Service Agency	69,000,000			- 69,000,000	
Commodity Credit Corporation					
Livestock disaster assistance fund	4,000,000			- 4,000,000	
Dairy production indemnity assistance program	6,800,000			- 6,800,000	
Total, Commodity Credit Corporation	10,800,000			- 10,800,000	
Natural Resources Conservation Service					
Watershed and flood prevention operations	80,000,000			- 80,000,000	
Total, title VII, Emergency appropriations	159,800,000			- 159,800,000	
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority	49,912,936,000	57,553,138,000	56,813,535,000	+ 6,900,599,000	- 739,603,000
Appropriations	(49,753,136,000)	(57,553,138,000)	(56,813,535,000)	(+ 7,060,399,000)	(- 739,603,000)
(By transfer)	(606,780,000)	(640,100,000)	(612,780,000)	(+ 6,000,000)	(- 27,320,000)
(Loan authorization)	(14,012,620,000)	(8,788,150,000)	(8,510,148,000)	(- 5,502,472,000)	(- 278,002,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(142,036,000)	(108,287,000)	(107,078,000)	(- 34,958,000)	(- 1,209,000)
RECAPITULATION					
Title I—Agricultural programs	6,940,232,000	13,916,292,000	14,316,921,000	+ 7,376,689,000	+ 400,629,000
Title II—Conservation programs	786,474,000	826,327,000	791,852,000	+ 5,378,000	- 34,475,000
Title III—Rural economic and community development programs	2,087,222,000	2,220,117,000	2,172,404,000	+ 85,182,000	- 47,713,000
Title IV—Domestic food programs	37,222,519,000	38,442,205,000	37,317,407,000	+ 94,888,000	- 1,124,798,000
Title V—Foreign assistance and related programs	1,725,715,000	1,112,172,000	1,198,669,000	- 527,046,000	+ 86,497,000
Title VI—Related agencies and Food and Drug Administration	990,974,000	1,036,025,000	1,016,282,000	+ 25,308,000	- 19,743,000
Total, new budget (obligational) authority	49,753,136,000	57,553,138,000	56,813,535,000	+ 7,060,399,000	- 739,603,000

¹ In addition to appropriation.² Budget proposes to fund this account under Conservation Operations.³ Budget proposes to fund technical assistance for WFPD under Conservation Operations.⁴ Budget proposes to include funding for these programs under the Commodity Assistance Program in fiscal year 1998.

Mr. COCHRAN. This is a revised comparative statement of new budget authority which corrects two errors in the "FY 1999 Estimates" column in the same table printed in the committee report that accompanies the bill.

Mr. President, I must also observe, before yielding the floor, that my good friend from Arkansas, who is the distinguished ranking Democrat on the

subcommittee on agriculture appropriations, is helping manage this bill this year, and it will be his last opportunity to exercise this important responsibility.

He has chosen not to seek reelection in the State of Arkansas for another term in the Senate. And I must say that it pains me to contemplate going through the process of developing and

helping to write an agriculture appropriations bill without his intelligent and thoughtful assistance. He has been a good friend to me since I have been in the Senate. We have worked closely together on a number of issues, not only in agriculture, in rural development, but in other areas as well.

I pointed out earlier in my statement that in recognition of his outstanding

service for the people of Arkansas in the U.S. Senate, and particularly for his work on agriculture research issues, there is included in this bill a general provision to designate the U.S. National Rice Germplasm Evaluation and Enhancement Center in Stuttgart, AR, the "Dale Bumpers National Rice Research Center."

The distinguished Senator from Arkansas has been a very effective advocate of agriculture research funds for this ARS Research Center. I think he is the father of that center. I believe it is most appropriate to name this facility in his honor.

Also, I want to express my appreciation to him and the members of his staff, and the other members of the subcommittee on both sides of the aisle, for their assistance and support and cooperation in developing this legislation. I hope the Senate will approve it.

Mr. BUMPERS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I am most pleased to join my very good friend, Senator COCHRAN, in bringing this bill to the floor. I think that, considering the constraints that Senator COCHRAN—who is really the crafter of this bill—considering the constraints that he was operating under, this is a remarkable bill.

We were allocated, and even in the President's budget request, \$1 billion less than we had last year. To try to craft a bill meeting the really mostly legitimate demands—or at least even funding or increased funding—under that kind of a burden was extremely difficult. I did not interfere—tried not to interfere very much in Senator COCHRAN's work because he was already burdened heavily enough in trying to fit all the pieces of this mosaic together. But he deserves the praise and the accolades of every Member of this Senate for what I think is a remarkable achievement.

Mr. President, Senator COCHRAN has outlined the levels of funding provided in this bill for various functions and programs under the jurisdiction of this subcommittee and I will not repeat them. Let me simply say Senator COCHRAN and I have done the best we could with limited resources to maintain the activities at USDA, FDA, and other agencies that are so important to the American people.

I wish I could be equally as pleased with the budgetary hand with which this subcommittee has been dealt, but the reality is that a budget request filled with user fees, initiatives, and other issues coupled with a 302(b) allocation that reduced our available resources well below last year's levels has produced very hard choices for us. As the Washington Post pointed out in an editorial earlier this week related to the fact that our bill freezes the WIC program at last year's level, until the overall budgetary parameters affecting this subcommittee are adjusted, there

is little this subcommittee can do. We can't provide more with less.

However, in my view, the bill before us, which Senator COCHRAN has crafted, makes the best of a bad situation. Would I suggest increases in certain programs if the resources were available? Of course I would and I believe Senator COCHRAN would agree with those increases. But it doesn't take a rocket scientist to conclude that when you have less to work with, something has to give. Unfortunately, this year is one in which avoiding the budget ax may itself be a victory.

We hear a lot these days about budget surpluses. We also hear a lot about how to spend those surpluses, such as providing tax cuts. We talk a lot about saving Social Security, but we still count those revenues coming into the Social Security Trust Fund as part of that glorious "surplus" which many are eager to divide up and share with their friends.

The other day, a group of people from a very poor part of the East Arkansas Delta were in office asking for help to reduce flooding in their communities. The flooding causes their septic tanks to back up, resulting in sewage floating down the streets of small rural communities and into the ditches throughout the county. When this bill was considered by the full committee, I explained this problem to Senator STEVENS and other members of the Appropriations Committee. Senator STEVENS and others pledged to help and I hope that we will be able to include an amendment to this bill that will provide necessary funds so these people in East Arkansas will have a few of the basic services that many of us take for granted. Still, this leaves Congress with the remaining problem of caps on domestic spending that is affecting the lives of everyday people all across this country.

The immediate future holds little promise for improvement. The Budget Act requires that the coming years will witness continuing declines in discretionary spending, which means the subcommittee's allocation will likely be less next year than this and Senator COCHRAN's headaches (not mine) will be even more severe than they have been these past few weeks. Having said all this, let me come back to the task at hand and simply state that Senator COCHRAN has done all excellent job in making the pieces fit into a very complex mosaic.

As I have suggested, the watchword for this year has been "maintain". This bill restores many of the worthwhile programs that were deleted in the President's budget request and even provides a slight increase in the formula base funds for research and extension activities that have been held steady for many years. Conservation and rural development programs are protected as best we can in spite of changes in loan subsidy rates that caused severe problems in maintaining last year's program levels. We protected rural water and sewer programs

which are among the best investments the federal government makes. We were also able to maintain many of last year's program levels for rural housing programs.

The WIC program is expected to average more than 7 million participants in fiscal year 1998. This bill provides funds necessary to maintain that caseload. I wish we were able to provide a higher level, but limited resources have left few options. I am willing to work with Senator COCHRAN and other Senators to find ways to provide higher levels for important programs such as WIC if reasonable offsets or additional resources can be identified.

For years, so called "budget hawks" have been telling Congress to "cut the fat". For this subcommittee, the "fat" was eliminated a long, long time ago. Today, we are cutting into the "lean." These cuts hurt farmers and they hurt our agricultural research base which is needed to make possible the means for this planet to avoid global starvation in years to come. These cuts hurt small rural communities and they hurt children. They deprive our nation of a cutting edge in maintaining a place in global markets. They place our food and blood supply at risk and, quite simply, they harm America. This is certainly not the fault of Senator COCHRAN, but these problems have fallen in his lap, and mine, and on us all. I only hope that in years to come, those who would cut the "fat" out of these programs first explain where the "fat" is.

I also feel it is important to make a quick reference to an item in the bill that has long been near and dear to my heart as I know it is to Senator COCHRAN. For longer than we have shared a place in the United States Senate, Senator COCHRAN and I have shared a common state boundary along the banks of the mightiest river on the continent. One hundred years ago, the highest form of travel in this country was to take a ride on a Mississippi riverboat. Ten years ago, I sponsored legislation to create the Lower Mississippi River Delta Regional Commission. Sadly, the focus of this Commission was not to highlight the gilded days of luxurious steamboat travel, or the glorious setting in the lobby of Memphis' Peabody Hotel, where legend holds the Delta begins, but to reverse the tragic decline in economic and social prosperity that has resulted in harsh impoverishment up and down this mighty river.

Today, the Chairman of this Commission which we formed in 1988 now sits at a desk in the Oval Office of the White House. President Clinton submitted a budget amendment to this subcommittee to create a Delta Regional Commission based largely on the findings of the Lower Mississippi Delta Regional Commission and in the combined spirit of us all to provide a better life for the most hard pressed of our citizens. The President's request called for \$26 million to establish and provide assistance to this worthy cause.

With the limited resources of this subcommittee, we were not able to create a new "agency" for the Delta, but we did provide the Secretary of Agriculture authority to work with local groups in the region to help them help themselves. USDA holds many programs important to the Delta such as rural housing, water and sewer programs, conservation, food assistance, research and education, and many, many more. This subcommittee, over the past several years, has provided funding for the Delta Teachers Academy which has been a highly successful program to improve educational opportunities in the region. The Delta Teachers Academy is an example of the progress in rural America that USDA can help foster. I am pleased that the President has added his voice to the call for rejuvenation of this region that two hundred years ago was the western border of our nation, but now lies at its heart.

In closing, I would be remiss not to state publicly my admiration for Senator COCHRAN and the honor I have enjoyed serving with him on this subcommittee. This is my last agriculture appropriations bill to be considered on the floor of the United States Senate, but I will always cherish the friendship and warm memories of my colleagues.

Let me conclude by saying that I do not know of anybody in the Senate for whom I have a higher regard and more respect than I have for Senator COCHRAN. I was chairman of this subcommittee until the Republicans took over in 1995. Senator COCHRAN has chaired it since that time. He was my ranking member when I was chairman. And I daresay, with no reflection on any other chairman and ranking member of any of the subcommittees on appropriations, or I daresay any other committee of the Senate, I doubt that any of them have enjoyed better cooperation with each other than Senator COCHRAN and I have enjoyed, and that is based on the tremendous respect I have for his ability and his understanding of these programs. I concede he understands some of these agricultural programs a lot better than I do.

But having said all of that, Mr. President, I just say it has been a genuine joy to work with Senator COCHRAN. Let me say, again, there is no Member of the Senate for whom I have a higher regard and greater respect. It has been a great honor. I will miss times like this when we come before the Senate to present this bill. I will miss working with Senator COCHRAN on issues that we both care deeply about, but it is time for me to move on. I want to thank Senator COCHRAN for his always generous and laudable remarks that he made about me.

So with that, Mr. President, I hope that Senators who have amendments will come to the floor so we can dispose of this bill as expeditiously as possible. We did very well on the water and energy bill. I would like to think we

could do as well on the ag bill. If Senators would come to the floor and offer their amendments, we will.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COATS). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into a period of morning business for the purpose of my making a statement on an unrelated issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator is recognized to speak as if in morning business.

Mr. BIDEN. I thank the President.

THE SEARCH FOR MODERN CHINA: THE PRESIDENT'S CHINA TRIP

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, President Clinton, as he prepares to depart for China, carries with him an obligation, which I am sure he will fulfill, to do his best to advance U.S. core interests with Beijing and to communicate the values of the American people directly to the Chinese people.

But what is also at stake, I think, is that there is a concomitant responsibility on the part of the U.S. Senate and the U.S. Congress to adhere to a practice that has been in place for the 25 years that I have been in the U.S. Senate; that is, when a President is abroad, for the Congress to refrain, if only temporarily, from acting on matters that would affect the country which the President is visiting.

There were a number of times when President Reagan was President, when President Nixon was President, when President Ford was President, and when President Bush was President that I had sharp disagreements with their foreign policy initiatives. But never once did I, nor can I remember any of us in either the Republican or the Democratic Party, vote on legislation that would directly affect and impact upon the relationship of the United States and the country which the President was visiting.

So I ask my Republican friends, in the spirit of bipartisanship in the conduct of American foreign policy, to refrain from offering amendments to the DOD bill, if it comes up, that are designed to sanction and/or publicly criticize China at the very moment the President of the United States will be in China. I hope that we could return to that period in our relationship when both parties adhered to that practice.

There is a list of at least 12—maybe as many as 20—China sanction amendments, some of which may very well be justified, that would be attached to, or attempted to be attached to, the defense bill, which I am told is likely to come up on Tuesday of next week.

I make a personal plea to my colleagues to return to the practice that has been honored here on the floor of the U.S. Senate of not engaging in legislative action that impacts upon, or can impact upon, the relationship with the country where the President of the United States, be he a Republican or Democrat, is presently in place. I will be sending a letter to all of my colleagues asking that they do that.

But to continue, Mr. President, the President's mission is not going to be an easy one any more than the first time President Nixon went to China, or President Bush, or any other President who has engaged China.

It comes amid a sometimes rancorous debate over China policy in this country, and the debate is totally appropriate, I might add. I am not suggesting there should not be a very serious debate, and I have no doubt, because of the consequences of the actions we will take as a Nation, it will likely get rancorous at some point.

I have myself asked this Congress to move into special secret session, a rare occurrence, not so many years ago to debate the extension of most-favored-nation status to China. I did so because of my concerns about Chinese proliferation activities, proliferation of missile and/or nuclear technology. And so I am not suggesting the debate will not be heated, and I am not suggesting it should not be thorough. I am not suggesting that it will not have political ramifications. That is all appropriate, normal and reasonable. But the President's mission is going to be made more difficult as a consequence of the debate that is underway.

There is no clear consensus in America, nor, in my view, no clear consensus in the Senate, on how to best advance American interests in the Far East. The Governments of China and the United States will not always see eye to eye, and while the people of the United States and the people of China have much in common—a love of family, a thirst for knowledge, and perhaps most importantly, a desire to see our children and grandchildren live in a world more peaceful and prosperous than our own—we also have profound differences that cannot be overlooked.

In his incisive history, entitled, "The Search for Modern China," Yale historian and prominent Chinese scholar Jonathan Spence writes that China is not yet truly a modern nation."

Spence defines a modern country as "one that is both integrated and receptive, fairly sure of its own identity, yet able to join others on equal terms in a quest for new markets, new technologies and new ideas." He concludes that the "search" for modern China is an ongoing act.

I think Spence is right, and the United States cannot afford to be a spectator in this drama. We need to be active on the world's stage, engaging China as it undergoes a period of extraordinary change.