



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 29, 2000

No. 85

## House of Representatives

□ 1200

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

*Continued*

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, what I would also hope is that the government in Iran would give us just verdicts. Now, there cannot be justice for the 13 Jews who have been subjected to show trials over the last several months. They were arrested in March of 1999. Most of them have been in prison since then, all on the ridiculous charge of spying for the United States. In Iran, no Jew is allowed near anything of military significance, so to think that the CIA would turn to this small minority to hire our spies would be to allege a level of negligence to the CIA that not even the Chinese ambassador to Yugoslavia has asserted.

Ronald Reagan instituted a ban on the importation of agricultural products from Iran. This amendment, or pair of amendments, would restore that ban. We could then, in the months to come, evaluate the behavior of the Iranian government. And if, later on, the conference committee decided that these provisions were unnecessary, if there was justice for the 13 Jews being tried in southern Iran, we could modify our behavior as the Iranian government modifies its behavior.

For now, all we see in southern Iran is injustice and religious persecution. And the correct response of this House at this time is to prohibit the U.S. tax dollars that we control from being used to facilitate the importation of these products to the United States to compete with the products of American agriculture, when, instead, we should send the message to Teheran: no justice, no caviar.

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

Mr. SHERMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, I will be brief. I just want to reiterate one element of my colleague's remarks, and that is that wherever we may stand on whether or not we should be liberalizing our import and export policies with regard to Iran, this is an amendment that simply speaks to the timing.

And the timing is extraordinarily precarious. Although no one knows for sure, there is some speculation that this weekend, the 4th of July weekend, Independence Day weekend, is when the verdicts for the Shiraz 13 are going to be coming down. I am concerned that the statement of this House should be that we are watching, at the very least.

Even if this language is changed in conference, even if we choose to say to the President at a later date to release this money, to broaden our exchange with them because the moderate Iranian government is indeed that, more moderate and more committed to human rights, my concern is that if we do not act in this bill this is our last opportunity to send a message to the Iranian government that we are watching.

Regardless of where we may stand, if we think we should be harder than hard line, or we think we should start to moderate a little in response to their new government, these amendments are simply a chance for us as a body to take a symbolic deep breath and wait and see what happens with those verdicts, and to make it clear that this show trial that has been conducted in private has been and is being watched by the United States Congress.

Mr. SHERMAN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, and in closing, I would hope people would accept these amendments and send a message to Iran.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Chief Financial Officer, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed \$10,000 is for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$4,783,000: *Provided*, That the Chief Financial Officer shall actively market cross-servicing activities of the National Finance Center.

COMMON COMPUTING ENVIRONMENT

For necessary expenses to acquire a Common Computing Environment for the Natural Resources Conservation Service, the Farm and Foreign Agricultural Service and Rural Development mission areas, \$25,000,000, to remain available until expended, for the capital asset acquisition of shared information technology systems, including services as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 6915-16 and 40 U.S.C. 1421-28: *Provided*, That obligation of these funds shall be consistent with the Department of Agriculture Service Center Modernization Plan of the county-based Agencies, and shall be with the concurrence of the Department's Chief Information Officer.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ADMINISTRATION

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration to carry out the programs funded by this Act, \$613,000.

AGRICULTURE BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES AND RENTAL PAYMENTS

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For payment of space rental and related costs pursuant to Public Law 92-313, including authorities pursuant to the 1984 delegation of authority from the Administrator of General Services to the Department of Agriculture under 40 U.S.C. 486, for programs and activities of the Department which are included in this Act, and for the operation, maintenance, improvement, and repair of Agriculture buildings, \$150,343,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That in the event an agency within the Department should require modification of space needs, the Secretary of Agriculture may transfer a share of that agency's appropriation made available by this Act to this appropriation, or may transfer a share of this appropriation to that agency's appropriation, but such transfers shall not exceed 5 percent of the funds made available for space rental and related costs to or from this account.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H5533

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS MANAGEMENT  
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Department of Agriculture, to comply with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, 42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq., and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, 42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq., \$15,700,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That appropriations and funds available herein to the Department for Hazardous Materials Management may be transferred to any agency of the Department for its use in meeting all requirements pursuant to the above Acts on Federal and non-Federal lands.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION  
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For Departmental Administration, \$34,708,000, to provide for necessary expenses for management support services to offices of the Department and for general administration and disaster management of the Department, repairs and alterations, and other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for and necessary for the practical and efficient work of the Department, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed \$10,000 is for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be reimbursed from applicable appropriations in this Act for travel expenses incident to the holding of hearings as required by 5 U.S.C. 551-558.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. METCALF

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. METCALF:

Page 6, line 16, insert after the dollar amount "(decreased by \$40,000)".

Page 57, line 24, insert after the second dollar amount "(increased by \$40,000)".

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, in March 1999, following an investigation into reports that researchers at Tulane Medical School had developed a test that demonstrated a direct correlation between Gulf War illnesses and antibodies to squalene, the GAO recommended that the DOD immediately replicate the independent research results that revealed the presence of squalene antibodies in the blood of ill Gulf War veterans.

Unfortunately, the DOD, Department of Defense, has chosen to ignore this recommendation. Instead, it has embarked on an attempt to change the format of the test rather than validating the research data.

Because of the urgent need to determine if this test can be used as a diagnostic tool for those suffering from Gulf War illnesses, funding is needed for a review to build on the published science. This amendment will provide the money to validate the Tulane test. A mere \$40,000 will be shifted from the administrative budget of the Agriculture Department to the Food and Drug Administration. If this test is validated, it will give hope to thousands of Gulf War veterans who still suffer from their service in the Gulf War.

This amendment will allow FDA to convene a panel of three to four immunologists to visit Tulane Medical

School to review the data concerning the anti-squalene antibody assay and familiarize themselves with the test procedures. Subsequent to the visit, the panel will submit blinded samples from 50 Gulf War illnesses patients and 50 gender-matched healthy individuals for analysis of the assay. The results from the blinded test will then be submitted to the panel for unblinding and analysis. If the results are favorable to the FDA panel, then the test will be considered validated. This will fulfill the recommendation made by GAO more than 1 year ago.

The House-passed version of fiscal year 2000 defense appropriations bill included report language instructing the DOD to develop and/or validate the test for the presence of squalene antibodies. On January 31 of this year, 10 Members of this House sent a letter to Secretary of Defense Cohen requesting that he answer one question, and this is the question: "If the Tulane test is a good test, based on solid science, shouldn't we be using it to help sick Gulf War veterans?"

I would like to commend my colleagues, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES), the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER), the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH), the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) for their concern about this issue and for signing on to that January 31 letter.

I would also like to thank my colleagues, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) for their consistent support of the Gulf War veterans.

Congress is entrusted to take care of the veterans who sacrifice their lives to protect American freedoms. Thousands of veterans are suffering from Gulf War illnesses. This is one small thing Congress can do to give these veterans hope that one day effective treatments and cures will be found.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The gentleman's intention is to take \$40,000 from the Department of Agriculture and add it to the Food and Drug Administration so that FDA can validate a test, and this test does not fall within FDA's mission area. Let me quickly review the agency's mission regarding biological products, such as the test the gentleman has mentioned.

FDA reviews applications from a sponsor both at the investigation and clinical stages. FDA scientists evaluate laboratory tests and patient data. Inspectors visit manufacturing facilities and analyze data on medical errors. FDA's scientists would not themselves validate a test for a product under review but would analyze the validation data presented by the drug's sponsor.

The sponsor of the drug or biological product must initiate the review process by submitting an application with the agency. There is no fee for investigating new drug applications, the first phase of the process. For those products covered by the Prescription Drug User Fee Act, there is a fee for the new drug application review. However, waivers of the fee are available in case of need. And I would hope that the sponsor of this test, which I understand is Tulane University, would develop an application and submit it to FDA so that the test could be evaluated and approved.

I hope this information is helpful to the gentleman, and I repeat that I oppose the amendment since the request is outside the mission area of the Food and Drug Administration. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. NEY

Mr. NEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 18 offered by Mr. NEY:

H.R. 4461

OFFERED BY: MR. NEY

Page 6, line 16, insert "(reduced by \$34,000)" after "\$34,708,000".

Page 8, line 3, insert "(reduced by \$33,000)" after "\$8,138,000".

Page 8, line 14, insert "(reduced by \$33,000)" after "\$85,097,000".

Page 10, line 23, insert "(increased by \$100,000)" after "\$850,384,000".

Mr. NEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to this bill. However, first I would like to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SKEEN) and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), for their hard work and a job well done on this piece of legislation.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment holds enormous significance for the researchers who will be affected by it and for the Nation as a whole, so I want to make it clear this is not just something specific to the 18th district that I represent, but the fact that this is something that is very specific to the entire country.

The North Appalachian Experimental Watershed, known as NAEW, located in Coshocton, Ohio, is a nationally significant research facility whose mission is to conduct research on hydrology, surface runoff, groundwater quality and erosion in an agricultural context. It was established in 1935, and the research center has provided over 60 years of historic long-term data on small watersheds which has helped to develop a knowledge of basic water sediment and chemical movement. I personally have been to the facility,

and I can tell my colleagues that people come from all over the world, not just all over the United States, to look at the facility and the data.

This 60-year database of measurements has been collected from rain gauges, watershed flumes, and monolith lysimeters. Lysimeters, one of the facility's most unique features, measures surface runoff and percolating water, and provides the data necessary to understand the intricacies of land and water management as applied to agriculture.

Soon after the facility went into full operation, it garnered the attention of scientists from all over the world who came to view this "first-of-its-kind" large-scale watershed hydrology research program in soil and water conservation. Today, the NAEW maintains a total of 11 large monolithic lysimeters and is one of the few lysimeter sites in the U.S. that is located in rain-fed agriculture.

Having collected data from lysimeters since the 1930s, the NAEW has the longest water balance record of any U.S. weighing lysimeter site, the longest in the history of our country. The data collected from the lysimeters allow researchers to track nutrient movement.

Mr. Chairman, I am aware much of this information I am speaking about may not jump out and grab my colleagues, but let me give some practical ways in which the NAEW provides our country with valuable information on land and water conservation practices and general land uses.

One example is drought-risk assessment. The economic and environmental impacts of drought can be costly, as we all know, with billions of dollars spent during a drought. The National Drought Policy Commission, formed by Congress through the National Drought Policy Act of 1998, released its report and recommendations regarding the preparedness and response of drought. The overall recommendation of the Commission was for Congress to pass a national drought preparedness act.

An element of the Commission's recommendations was research into different aspects of drought. Research is needed on science-based methods of determining the risks and probabilities of drought at a given location and under different climates. Research is also needed on environmental consequences of and preparedness for drought with respect to land management, water quality, and erosion.

The NAEW has an archive of runoff, weather, soil moisture, lysimeter, and water quality data with which this research can be conducted. Some records, as I previously mentioned, are as old as 60-plus years. The existing runoff and weather monitoring infrastructure of the NAEW is invaluable for conducting watershed and weather-related research into these high-priority areas.

Another area of research done at the facility applies to food safety. The im-

portance of assessing the risks in plant and animal food safety and quality with respect to poisonous and carcinogenic substances has been acknowledged. As an example, the fungus producing aflatoxin grows in improperly stored nuts and grains, and thrives in crops such as peanuts during drought conditions, as well as from being under stress from prolonged wet periods.

□ 1215

Risk assessments must incorporate both climate and physical conditions at a location, and long climate records are not available at most U.S. locations. Therefore, science-based models using existing weather records need to be developed for these kinds of food-safety-climate-variations risk assessments.

The NAEW has a long-term weather database to collect this information and can provide the necessary research to assist in advancing food safety initiatives.

Data and research collected at the site also provide information on other topics such as how pesticide runoff affects groundwater, how runoff for Midwestern farms produces "dead zones" in the Gulf of Mexico, the environmental impacts of grazing systems, flood mitigation studies, and the environmentally friendly land application of animal waste.

Unfortunately, because of a flat-lined budget over the last several years, the facility has suffered severe setbacks in its ability to do research. Over 90 percent of its current funding goes to pay salaries and expenses at the station leaving very little money to fund the research that benefits the entire Nation. Several employees have already been forced to leave their jobs, and further layoffs are expected without this much needed increase.

These employees who have a long-standing relationship with the center will be lost, and along with their loss will be many years of expertise on the subject.

As if the loss of these employees' jobs were not enough, the fact is that valuable research opportunities will also be lost. And that is for the entire country. Portions of the NAEW research efforts will need to be terminated. Simply put, lost employees means lost research.

Although I am aware that there are other facilities around the Nation that are facing the same funding situations, I believe that the unique nature of this facility for the good of our country and the invaluable research it provides warrants the small increase for which I am asking.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this small but important amendment.

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

Mr. SKEEN. Reluctantly, Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the amendment of the gentleman is com-

mendable. He is trying to support an Agricultural Research Service laboratory in his district, the Northern Appalachian Experimental Watershed Research Station at Coshocton, Ohio.

I know that this research station does good work. That is not the question. The problem is that there are 103 other research stations within the Agricultural Research Service and they all do good work. If each of these locations had more money, they could do even more good work. This particular lab is funded at \$957,000 in the current fiscal year, and this amendment will increase that amount by about 10 percent.

In putting together this bill, we have had to balance the needs of all such locations. I think that we have done a good job.

So I must reluctantly oppose the amendment of the gentleman. I need to ask that his amendment be defeated and that we maintain the balance among all research stations.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 538, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) will be postponed.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. It is not that the gentleman does not have a good idea. The problem is that the ARS, which is doing a tremendous job, was underfunded in the budget by \$44 million under their request.

What the gentleman wants to do in his amendment, which I oppose, is he wants to take money from the Department of Agriculture's administration account, from the Office of Communication account, and from the Office of Inspector General. Each of those accounts is way below, \$6 million for the Department of Administration account below what they requested; \$800,000 below the Office of Communication, what they requested; and \$5.1 million below the administration.

So, in robbing Peter to pay Paul, they are just squeezing and squeezing and squeezing. What we really need to do is to have more money in the ARS account. Unfortunately, if the gentleman had not supported the small allocation figure given to the committee, we probably could have funded it. It is a project that I would support on merit if the money was there.

I think that we need to work, perhaps, in conference that we get higher figures on projects like that, but I do not think that his amendment is proper at this time because of the lack of funding.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

OUTREACH FOR SOCIALLY DISADVANTAGED FARMERS

For grants and contracts pursuant to section 2501 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279), \$3,000,000, to remain available until expended.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR CONGRESSIONAL RELATIONS  
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations to carry out the programs funded by this Act, including programs involving intergovernmental affairs and liaison within the executive branch, \$3,568,000: *Provided*, That no other funds appropriated to the Department by this Act shall be available to the Department for support of activities of congressional relations: *Provided further*, That not less than \$2,241,000 shall be transferred to agencies funded by this Act to maintain personnel at the agency level.

OFFICE OF COMMUNICATIONS

For necessary expenses to carry on services relating to the coordination of programs involving public affairs, for the dissemination of agricultural information, and the coordination of information, work, and programs authorized by Congress in the Department, \$8,138,000, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed \$10,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, and not to exceed \$2,000,000 may be used for farmers' bulletins.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Inspector General, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and the Inspector General Act of 1978, \$65,097,000, including such sums as may be necessary for contracting and other arrangements with public agencies and private persons pursuant to section 6(a)(9) of the Inspector General Act of 1978, including not to exceed \$50,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109; and including not to exceed \$125,000 for certain confidential operational expenses, including the payment of informants, to be expended under the direction of the Inspector General pursuant to Public Law 95-452 and section 1337 of Public Law 97-98.

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

For necessary expenses of the Office of the General Counsel, \$29,194,000.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise as a strong supporter of all the good agriculture work that is going on across America. But I am taking this moment to recognize that we have reached another milestone in American history, a milestone that we should celebrate as a people and a milestone for one person in particular, a former Member of this body.

The President has just announced the nomination of the first Asian-American to ever serve in the United States Cabinet. Former Congressman Norman Mineta has been nominated to be Secretary of Commerce. I think that is an important milestone for Mr. Mineta, as an individual, for this body, and for us as a people.

Mr. Mineta was an honored Member of this body; as well as chair of an important committee; the former Mayor of San Jose; and an executive in a private corporation; and, I might add, a fine mentor to me, someone who is brand new to elected office in this body.

In the words of the tech industry in the San Jose area, Congressman Mineta is fully plug and play. He is ready to go, ready to work, ready to work and lead and serve. I wanted to take a moment of this body's time to recognize this honor which has come to one of our own and another milestone in American history.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR RESEARCH, EDUCATION AND ECONOMICS

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education and Economics to administer the laws enacted by the Congress for the Economic Research Service, the National Agricultural Statistics Service, the Agricultural Research Service, and the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service, \$540,000.

ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE

For necessary expenses of the Economic Research Service in conducting economic research and analysis, as authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621-1627) and other laws, \$66,419,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225).

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS SERVICE

For necessary expenses of the National Agricultural Statistics Service in conducting statistical reporting and service work, including crop and livestock estimates, statistical coordination and improvements, marketing surveys, and the Census of Agriculture, as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1621-1627, Public Law 105-113, and other laws, \$100,851,000, of which up to \$15,000,000 shall be available until expended for the Census of Agriculture: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed \$40,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

For necessary expenses to enable the Agricultural Research Service to perform agricultural research and demonstration relating to production, utilization, marketing, and distribution (not otherwise provided for); home economics or nutrition and consumer use including the acquisition, preservation, and dissemination of agricultural information; and for acquisition of lands by donation, exchange, or purchase at a nominal cost not to exceed \$100, and for land exchanges where the lands exchanged shall be of equal value or shall be equalized by a payment of money to the grantor which shall not exceed 25 percent of the total value of the land or interests transferred out of Federal ownership, \$850,384,000: *Provided*, That appropriations hereunder shall be available for temporary employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed \$115,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*,

That appropriations hereunder shall be available for the operation and maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed one for replacement only: *Provided further*, That appropriations hereunder shall be available pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 2250 for the construction, alteration, and repair of buildings and improvements, but unless otherwise provided, the cost of constructing any one building shall not exceed \$375,000, except for headhouses or greenhouses which shall each be limited to \$1,200,000, and except for 10 buildings to be constructed or improved at a cost not to exceed \$750,000 each, and the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 percent of the current replacement value of the building or \$375,000, whichever is greater: *Provided further*, That the limitations on alterations contained in this Act shall not apply to modernization or replacement of existing facilities at Beltsville, Maryland: *Provided further*, That appropriations hereunder shall be available for granting easements at the Beltsville Agricultural Research Center, including an easement to the University of Maryland to construct the Transgenic Animal Facility which upon completion shall be accepted by the Secretary as a gift: *Provided further*, That the foregoing limitations shall not apply to replacement of buildings needed to carry out the Act of April 24, 1948 (21 U.S.C. 113a): *Provided further*, That the foregoing limitations on purchase of land shall not apply to the purchase of land at Corvallis, Oregon; Parlier, California; and Florence, South Carolina: *Provided further*, That funds may be received from any State, other political subdivision, organization, or individual for the purpose of establishing or operating any research facility or research project of the Agricultural Research Service, as authorized by law.

AMENDMENT NO. 57 OFFERED BY MRS. CLAYTON

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 57 offered by Mrs. CLAYTON:

H.R. 4461

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Page 10, line 23, insert after the aggregate dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$6,800,000)".

Page 13, line 17, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$4,000,000)".

Page 13, line 23, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$4,000,000)".

Page 15, line 22, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$2,800,000)".

Page 17, line 5, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(increased by \$2,800,000)".

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), and myself.

Several weeks ago, members of the Congressional Black Caucus and I introduced the USDA Accountability and Equity Act of 2000, which focuses on eliminating discrimination towards black farmers, black employees of USDA, and the 1890 Land Grant Institutions.

Our 1890 Land Grant Institutions continue to face discrimination. These institutions have been a prominent feature of the American higher education for more than 130 years. They continue to accomplish much with, at best, a modest level of financial support, while producing quality teachers, scientists, community leaders, businessmen, and women.

Statistics prove that although these institutions play a vital role in strengthening competitive agricultural systems, conducting research, and providing training opportunities and technical assistance in environmental science, the funding authorized under USDA Food and Agriculture Act of 1977 for research and extension continues to erode for these institutions, the very funding these institutions and universities depend on for their food and agriculture research programs.

The proposed appropriation of \$30.6 million for research and the \$26.8 million is the same amount appropriated to these institutions last year and the previous year. This amount continues to put these institutions in a position where their programs suffer, making it difficult for them to maintain an optimal level of program activity in advancing their land-grant mission.

Our amendment would bring the 1890 institutions closer to the level of funding they so desperately need and deserve to continue to provide quality education to millions of students and the intensive research nationally and internationally that has served so many over the years.

This amendment provides us with the opportunity to take one more step towards eliminating discrimination by leveling the financial playing field.

I urge, Mr. Chairman, a vote in favor of this amendment.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Jackson-Lee, Thompson, Clayton amendment to H.R. 4461, Agriculture Appropriations for FY 2001. Mr. Chairman, my congressional district is the home of Alcorn State University, the oldest Historically Black Land-Grant College in the country. For years Alcorn, along with other 1890 Historically Black Land Grant Colleges and Universities, have faced an uphill battle in acquiring adequate funding to provide research, technical assistance in environmental sciences, improve the production and preservation of safe food supplies, and train new generations of scientists in mathematics, engineering, food and agricultural sciences.

Although these schools have traditionally functioned with the status quo, over the past few years they have received less of the minimum amount of the federal and state funds they usually receive. Many of the 1890 HBCU's across the country are equipped with the experience to carry out the necessary research that is granted to larger 1862 Colleges and Universities, if given the financial support by the federal government.

The Jackson-Lee, Clayton and Thompson amendment will address this loss in federal support for 1890 universities. Specifically, this amendment will increase by \$6.8 million the formula funds (i.e., Evans Allen Research &

Extension Activities for the 1890 Land Grant Institutions) for the 1890 land grant institutions. The amendment will increase research activities by four million and extension activities by \$2.8 million for the 1890's land grant institutions. This \$6.8 million increase will be deducted from the Agricultural Research Service (ARS) funding included in the bill. The bill currently includes \$889.7 million for ARS related activities.

Mr. Chairman, lets work together to provide a lift for our 1890 Historically Black Land Grant Colleges and Universities.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge the house to adopt the Jackson-Lee, Clayton, Thompson amendment to H.R. 4461, Appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for FY 2001. This amendment will ensure the economic viability of 105 1890 Historically Black Land Grant Colleges and Universities.

These 1890 HBCUs are a part of a land grant system of 105 state-assisted universities that link new science and technological developments directly to the needs and interests of the United States and the world. In addition, to strengthening agriculture, the 1890 HBCUs conduct research, provide technical assistance in environmental sciences, improve the production and preservation of safe food supplies, train new generations of scientists in mathematics, engineering, food and agriculture sciences and promote access to new sources of information to improve conservation of natural resources.

Although these institutions have been able to operate from minimum federal and state funds in the past, over the last couple of decades these institutions have received less than adequate support to continue their historical mission of strengthening agriculture. I think this is a clear travesty and congress must do everything their power to address this oversight now.

These institutions have consistently requested additional federal support for several decades and they have been traditionally disproportionately funded. For instance, in my state of Texas, Prairie View A&M University (1890) receives about \$2.3 million in federal land grant funds, while Texas A&M (1862) receives an astonishing \$100 million annually. I make this point not to discredit Texas A&M, but to illustrate the clear disparity in funding for these Institutions. Furthermore, while Congress continues to increase appropriations for many agriculture programs in general, they have consistently failed to provide even marginal increases to these vital institutions.

The Jackson-Lee, Clayton and Thompson amendment will address this loss in federal support for 1890 universities. Significantly, this amendment will increase by only \$6.8 million the most critical funds for these universities. This slight increase will be historic, given the fact that these institutions did not receive any land grant funding prior to 1967 and have been level funded for the last several years. This amendment will be offset by deducting this \$6.8 million from the Agricultural Research Service. Currently, the bill includes \$889.7 million for ARS related activities.

Again, I urge you to support the Jackson-Lee, Clayton, Thompson amendment to H.R. 4461, and assist these institutions in their historic mission of strengthening agriculture in our nation.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman from New Mexico (Chairman SKEEN) might join me in a brief colloquy.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I will be happy to.

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring to the attention of the chairman a very significant emergency taking place right now in my home State of Iowa, and perhaps most prevalently in my district. I know our chairman is most certainly aware of it, as he also is a colleague from Iowa. But right now hundreds of farmers are suffering from a severe drought.

According to the National Weather Service, it has been 45 years since the Midwest has been in such a serious drought at this point in the year. According to weather service data, this past April was the fifth driest in Iowa in more than a century of record keeping.

Iowa, like most agriculture States, depends on abundant rainfall levels in April to help grow a bountiful crop during the summer. However, during this past April, rainfall was significantly below normal. This sustained lack of rainfall is devastating to farmers. The subsoil moisture levels are nonexistent or very low.

As a fellow farmer, my colleague might understand. I recently dug a post hole trying to repair a fence in a lot and it was powdery dry as far down as we went, and we went down about four feet.

Iowa's State climatologist has stated the 8-month period between September 1 and May 1 was the second driest on record in Iowa.

Although the National Weather Service says there is a slight chance of relief, soaring summer temperatures will increase evaporation and will bring a quick return to dry conditions.

I would like to call to the chairman's attention a provision drafted by Senator HARKIN and Senator BYRD in the Senate version of the Agriculture Appropriations bill. This provision will provide \$50 million for rural water needs to help farmers and those who live in the surrounding town to make it through this extremely dry time.

I would have liked to have offered a similar amendment on today's Agriculture Appropriation bill, but because this would be considered emergency spending, I understand it will not be allowed. So I would like to express my support for the Harkin-Byrd provision in the Senate appropriations bill and hope that we could work together to get relief for farmers who are struggling through this incredibly tough time.

□ 1230

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman's concerns and assure him that this measure will be adequately considered when we enter conference committee with the Senate and having been subjected to the kind of drought that is being talked about, where we have 12-year-old kids that have never seen a rain in New Mexico. So we have a real problem.

I do not know how else that we can do it, but we are going to take in and go after it.

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Chairman, I do know that the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) understands this, and I appreciate his concern. I look forward to working with him in any way that we can to bring relief to the farmers throughout the Nation, in my area, as well as his, that are suffering from drought.

I thank the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) again for his kind consideration and his hard work on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there additional amendments to this section?

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

None of the funds in the foregoing paragraph shall be available to carry out research related to the production, processing or marketing of tobacco or tobacco products.

In the current fiscal year, the agency is authorized to charge fees, commensurate with the fair market value, for any permit, easement, lease, or other special use authorization for the occupancy or use of land and facilities (including land and facilities at the Beltsville Agricultural Research Center) issued by the agency, as authorized by law, and such fees shall be credited to this account and shall remain available until expended for authorized purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. TIERNEY

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 22 offered by Mr. TIERNEY: Page 12, after line 24, insert the following: Of the funds made available by this Act for the Agricultural Research Service, \$500,000 shall be available for the report required under this paragraph. Not later than September 30, 2001, the Secretary, acting through the National Academy of Sciences, shall complete and transmit to Congress a report that includes recommendations for the following:

(1) The type of data and tests that are needed to sufficiently assess and evaluate human health risks from the consumption of genetically engineered foods.

(2) The type of Federal monitoring system that should be created to assess any future human health consequences from long-term consumption of genetically engineered foods.

(3) A Federal regulatory structure to approve genetically engineered foods that are safe for human consumption.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) reserves a point of order.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks a National Academy

of Sciences study to examine three things: if the tests being performed on genetically engineered foods to ensure their safety is adequate and relevant; what type of monitoring system is needed to assess future health consequences from genetically engineered foods; and what type of regulatory structure should be in place to approve GE foods for human consumption.

The reason for this amendment is simple. The growing public awareness of genetically engineered food has led to questions about their long-term health and safety. We have seen in Europe an example of what happens when the public loses confidence in the safety of food products. In Great Britain there has been a massive backlash which has effectively eliminated the use of GE ingredients in foods sold in grocery stores and restaurants there.

There are significant differences, of course, between the situations in the United States and Great Britain. Due to past outbreaks of food-borne illnesses, consumers there lack faith in the regulatory abilities of their government when it comes to food safety. In the United States, we have maintained public confidence in our food regulatory system because we have been able to avoid and prevent such disasters from occurring.

However, GE ingredients can be found in many of the foods that we commonly eat, including potato chips, oils, corn, soda and baby food.

The Grocery Manufacturers of America estimate that 70 percent of the grocery store food may have been made with biotechnology crops.

We cannot afford to coast on the past success of our regulatory system. We need to feel confident about the safety of GE products.

The current system of testing GE products for their health and safety is overseen by the Food and Drug Administration. The FDA does not conduct its own testing of GE products. Instead, the FDA provides guidelines and then relies heavily on the companies that produce GE products to test their safety.

Until last month, that was a voluntary compliance where the company shared the results with the Food and Drug Administration. Under new rules proposed in May by the administration, companies will now have to give 120 days notice to the FDA before introducing a new GE product into the market.

Even with these new rules, it remains the responsibility of the companies that create the market for those products to be tested for safety.

To make a compelling argument for the safety of GE foods, we need to be sure that the tests required of new products are adequate and appropriate. To assure the public that these foods are safe to eat, this is the least that we should be doing.

In addition to ensuring that our testing methods are adequate, we need to ensure that our regulatory system is

also adequate. The current system is based on the 1986 coordinated framework for the regulation of biotechnology under which the United States Department of Agriculture, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Food and Drug Administration share oversight of GE products.

The National Academy of Sciences in a recently released report on genetically modified pest-protected plants said simply, a solid regulatory system and scientific base are important for acceptance and safe adoption of agricultural biotechnology, as well as for protecting the environment and the public health.

We need to ensure that the current framework is still the best regulatory system to ensure the safety of GE products.

Mr. Chairman, we are already seeing the effects of a lack of confidence in GE foods in the United States. Gerber and Heinz have announced that they will not be using GE products in their baby foods. McDonald's has even requested that suppliers not use GE potatoes, and Frito-Lay will not be using GE ingredients in its corn chips.

This reasonable amendment seeks nothing more, Mr. Chairman, than a study to ensure that we are properly examining GE products, in terms of testing and in terms of regulatory oversight. We do that in order that we can adequately address the concerns of the public and the concerns of the food producers about these genetically engineered foods.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) continue to reserve a point of order?

Mr. SKEEN. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Basic Research, we have spent the last year and a half examining the safety of the new biotech foods. Safety is extremely important. In our final report, called "Seeds of opportunity" we concluded that not only a great positive benefit to consumers all over the world, but they are safe.

Our regulatory system in the United States is the strictest in the world. Between USDA, the Food and Drug Administration, as well as EPA, the Environmental Protection Agency, we have the kind of regulatory review and testing of these biotech products that has been acclaimed by many in the scientific community as being over adequate.

There are strong suggestions that we are over regulating and therefore stifling the development of products that have so much potential to safely help people.

There are now over 1,000 GMO products, genetically modified products, that have been approved that are on the market. The consequences of stifling this innovation by overregulation, and scare tactics is real and serious.

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make the point that this is not overregulation. This is simply asking the National Academy of Sciences to determine what the best process would be. I do not think there is any doubt that there is a lot of skepticism out there in the American public and that we need confidence in these GE foods if we are really going to have them, have all the advantages that the gentleman speaks to.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Reclaiming my time, the National Academy of Sciences has just released a very intensive report where they come to the conclusion, as we did in our report from the Subcommittee on Basic Research, that essentially the food products that are derived by the new genetic modification are as safe, if not safer, than the traditional products and plant products that are derived from cross-pollination and cross-breeding.

There are approximately 25,000 genes in a plant. When two such plants are crossed, what one ends up with is unknown offsprings because they do not know what genes are going to mutate in the process of that cross-breeding and which genes end up in the new plant.

With genetic modification, one can pick out and isolate one or two genes and know their characteristics. The results of that kind of biotech alteration can be predicted and the advantages and the safety are attested by the scientific community.

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. TIERNEY. What this does is to say that the Academy of Sciences would do a study. This is for a study for three things, whether or not the tests are being performed.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Reclaiming my time. Did the gentleman have a chance to see the study that just came out in April?

Mr. TIERNEY. In fact, I quoted from it in my report; and it also talks about the need to make sure that our regulatory system is, in fact, adequate to give confidence to these foods that are coming out and to make sure that the public has confidence. All this does is say that the National Academy of Sciences would help us by reviewing what would lift that level of confidence, what types of studies would be adequate, who should do the studies and how should they be conducted and what type of regulatory system should we have, because whether we like it or not there is a large part of our population out there and a great part of our market who do not have confidence in the current regulatory scheme.

It either needs to be reaffirmed, or it needs to have some proposal out there

that will allow everybody, not just the scientists, not just us and everybody else, but to have confidence in the system.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Reclaiming my time, the National Academy of Sciences in their report did say that proper oversight is good, but they also said, and I quote:

"In general, the current U.S. coordinated frame work has been operating effectively for over a decade." For your information that is on page 19 of this report.

Biotechnology has been used safely for many years to develop new and useful products used in a variety of industries. More than a thousand products have now been approved for marketing, and many more now being developed. They include human insulin for diabetics, growth factors used in bone marrow transplants, products for treating heart attacks, hundreds of diagnostic test for infectious and other agents, including AIDS and hepatitis, enzymes used in food production, such as those used for cheese, and many others.

And this is just the beginning. In agriculture, new plant varieties created with this technique will offer more foods with better taste, more nutrition, and longer shelf life, and farmers will be able to grow these improved varieties more efficiently, leading to lower costs for consumers and greater environmental protection.

As you are aware, agricultural biotechnology has come under attack recently by well-financed activist groups determined to stop it in its tracks. The controversy revolves around three basic questions: Are agricultural biotechnology and classical breeding methods conceptually the same? Are these products safe to eat? And are they safe for the environment? I have concluded that the answer to all three questions is a resounding "Yes." In fact, modern biotechnology is so precise, and so much more is known about the changes being made, that plants produced using this technology may be even safer than traditionally-bred plants.

Far from causing environment problems, agricultural biotechnology has tremendous potential to reduce the environmental impact of farming. Crops designed to resist pests and to tolerate herbicides and environmental stresses, such as freezing temperatures, drought, and high salinity, will make agriculture more efficient and sustainable.

Biotechnology will be a key element in the fight against worldwide malnutrition. Deficiencies of vitamin A and iron, for example, are very serious health issues in many regions of the developing world. Biotechnology has been used to produce a new strain of rice—Golden Rice—that contains both vitamin A and iron.

The merging of medical and agricultural biotechnology has opened up new ways to develop plant varieties with characteristics to enhance health. Work is underway that could deliver medicines and edible vaccines through common foods that could be used to immunize individuals against a wide variety of enteric and other infectious diseases. These developments will potentially save millions of children in the poorest areas of the world.

I oppose actions that would stifle this technology based on unfounded fears. To deny its benefits to our Nation and to those who need it most, the children of the developing world who are concerned about where their next meal will come from.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Mexico continue to reserve a point of order?

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to just stand and to commend the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY) for his concern, genuine concern, about genetically modified foods. As a result of his initiatives and his constant prodding of the committee, I want to just put on the record that in the report that accompanies this bill we are calling for the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Food and Drug Administration to work together to improve the methods of testing and reviewing genetically modified foods, as well as providing more information to consumers.

We think that it is important that these two major agencies work together and though we probably have not done enough to completely satisfy the gentleman, I want to reassure him and the people of the State of Massachusetts that he represents, that there could be no more vigilant leader here on trying to protect the public's safety in food consumption with adequate information. I wanted to publicly state that and to thank the gentleman for coming to us and for leading us forward in our own efforts.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for her kind remarks and for her interest, as well as the committee's interest, in this matter, the subcommittee also.

I think the problem I am trying to get at here is that there are a large number of people, and some producers and end users, who are not sure that the method by which we are testing right now, allowing the companies to test and having that then reviewed by the governmental agencies, is enough to give them a level of confidence. I think if NAS did a study to determine that that, in fact, was the best way to proceed, it might lift the level of confidence.

If it decided that it was not the best way to proceed and set up a different type of regulatory structure, decided what was going to be the monitoring system that was used to assess the health ramifications, people would have a higher comfort level on that.

I note that what the report really said about it was that there was a priority that should be given to the development of improved methods for identifying potential allergens and pest-protected plants, specifically the development of tests with human immune systems end points and of more reliable animal models.

So the NAS really does think that there has to be some improvement of

the methods. I think this kind of review would be healthy. I think this particular motion does not take it as a friend or an enemy of the system, but says, look, let this group that I think most people will trust come in and determine what we should do on a regulatory matter, either confirm what is going on or where they have raised questions, go after it and set up a structure that people have confidence in.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. My concern is the implication that the review process is not adequate and the implication that somehow there is some kind of danger with genetically modified products. That is totally incorrect. I think you heard the quote from the National Academy of Sciences suggesting that USDA, EPA and FDA have a good coordinated system to review and regulate agricultural products. The potential scare, from un-scientific accusations does a great disservice not only to the scientific community but to the agricultural producers of this country.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) for staying within the 30 seconds and would just say that the Academy of Sciences report issued on June 14 did state that more awareness of the regulatory process is needed, maybe not necessarily of what happens after that. But that is why we have tried to get USDA, as well as the Food and Drug Administration, to come up with a unified approach.

I think the gentleman is pushing us in the proper direction, and I just wanted to state that publicly for the record. I do have a bit of a concern about an across-the-board, an unspecified cut in the agricultural research service because we have so much trouble in that account anyway.

I think that the gentleman is obviously one of the leaders in this Congress on this whole question of giving the public absolute certainty about the food that they are eating and having some light shone on the regulatory process itself, and I think the gentleman has moved us along as a committee and is moving the country along. I wanted to commend the gentleman publicly for that.

□ 1245

#### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY). The amendment violates clause 2(c) of rule XXI of the House, in that it proposes the inclusion of legislative or authorizing language in an appropriations bill.

Specifically, the amendment proposes to use funds made available under the act to require and fund a new study not currently authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other Members who wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, just on that point of order. I recognize and appreciate the point of order that is made and just say this was not about scare tactics, this was just the opposite about that; that is, trying to alleviate the concern that is out there and provide a mechanism by which that could be done so that everybody could have confidence in the process and eventually confidence that we all hope will be something that we can all benefit from.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that the amendment proposes new duties on the Secretary of Agriculture, and, as such, it constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2(c) of rule XXI. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For acquisition of land, construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities as necessary to carry out the agricultural research programs of the Department of Agriculture, where not otherwise provided, \$39,300,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b): *Provided*, That funds may be received from any State, other political subdivision, organization, or individual for the purpose of establishing any research facility of the Agricultural Research Service, as authorized by law.

#### COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND EXTENSION SERVICE

##### RESEARCH AND EDUCATION ACTIVITIES

For necessary payments to agricultural experiment stations, for cooperative forestry and other research, for facilities, and for other expenses, \$477,551,000, of which the following amounts shall be available: to carry into effect the provisions of the Hatch Act (7 U.S.C. 361a-i), \$180,545,000; for grants for cooperative forestry research (16 U.S.C. 582a-a7), \$21,932,000; for payments to the 1890 land-grant colleges, including Tuskegee University (7 U.S.C. 3222), \$30,676,000; for special grants for agricultural research (7 U.S.C. 450i(c)), \$74,354,000; for special grants for agricultural research on improved pest control (7 U.S.C. 450i(c)), \$13,721,000; for competitive research grants (7 U.S.C. 450i(b)), \$96,934,000; for the support of animal health and disease programs (7 U.S.C. 3195), \$5,109,000; for supplemental and alternative crops and products (7 U.S.C. 3319d), \$750,000; for the 1994 research program (7 U.S.C. 301 note), \$1,000,000, to remain available until expended; for higher education graduate fellowship grants (7 U.S.C. 3152(b)(6)), \$3,000,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b); for higher education challenge grants (7 U.S.C. 3152(b)(1)), \$4,350,000; for a higher education multicultural scholars program (7 U.S.C. 3152(b)(5)), \$1,000,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b); for an education grants program for Hispanic-serving Institutions (7 U.S.C. 3241), \$3,500,000; for a secondary agriculture education program and 2-year post-secondary education (7 U.S.C. 3152(h)), \$600,000; for aquaculture grants (7 U.S.C. 3322), \$4,000,000; for sustainable agriculture research and education (7 U.S.C. 5811), \$9,000,000; for a program of capacity building grants (7 U.S.C. 3152(b)(4)) to colleges eligible to receive funds under the Act of August 30, 1890 (7 U.S.C. 321-326 and 328), including Tuskegee University, \$9,500,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b); for payments to the 1994 Institutions pursuant to section 534(a)(1) of

Public Law 103-382, \$1,552,000; and for necessary expenses of Research and Education Activities, \$16,028,000, of which not to exceed \$100,000 shall be for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. HEFLEY

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. HEFLEY: Page 13, line 17, insert "(reduced by \$200,000)" before "; of which".

Page 13, line 24, insert "(reduced by \$200,000)" before "; for".

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would cut \$200,000 for International Asparagus Competitiveness from the special research grants. Before I get bombarded with the asparagus contingent like George Bush did with broccoli, let me say this, I am not saying I do not eat asparagus, and I am not saying asparagus does not have the right to be competitive in a national market. In fact, I like asparagus. Mr. Chairman, I want to stand on that here today.

I am saying the Federal Government should not be paying for specialized pork projects like this. Money would go towards building a harvesting machine for asparagus, it is currently picked by hand, and various other research projects.

The asparagus industry is far from beleaguered. They earned \$43 million in the first half of 1999. In 1998, U.S. exports of fresh asparagus totaled 15,601 tons at a value of \$46 million. In May 1999, fresh asparagus exports to Japan were up to 422 percent from the previous year.

As the industry is doing very well, why should the Government pay to build them a harvesting machine? While I highlighted this section of the bill, let us look at some of the other wasteful projects which are included in this bill. There is \$400,000 for an agriculture-based industrial lubricant research, \$5 million for research into citrus canker, \$150,000 for blueberry research, \$500,000 for peanut allergy reduction, and it goes on and on, Mr. Chairman.

The asparagus issue is simply an indication of what we get in this bill. All industries listed above, including asparagus, make enough money to subsidize their own research and development. Congress should be working to solve farmers' problems with the drought, the industrial farm competition, the estate taxes, but these small pork projects like this really do add up.

Mr. Chairman, total special research grants for this year would be \$74,354,000. The gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) and I had a very good friend, still have a very good friend, Dan Schaefer, who was a Congressman from Colorado, and I remember one year when Dan did have legitimate competition in his congressional race, the opponent used his support of this type of asparagus program.



I remember the brochure she used, and she had asparagus sprouts all wrapped in a little ribbon on the front page of this brochure showing this is the kind of thing that Congress does and it needs to be stopped. Of course, she was going to come here and stop that kind of thing that Dan supposedly supported.

This is something that it is a minor thing, it is not a big deal, but illustrative, I think, of some of the things that we do in here. I give a porker of the week award every week for some kind of government foolish spending, and I have to tell my colleagues, the Agriculture Department gets the porker of the week award more than its share. It gets it for things just like this.

Mr. Chairman, I would encourage support of the amendment.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) a question, the proponent of the amendment, and ask in whose congressional district does this project lie?

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have no idea.

Ms. KAPTUR. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, in which State?

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have no idea. That is not a point with this at all.

Ms. KAPTUR. It is our understanding that this is the State of Washington? I do not know if there are any Members that would like to comment, but I just thought for the record we ought to state that.

Mr. HEFLEY. Will the gentlewoman continue to yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. Yes, I continue to yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentlewoman makes my point for me, which State does this lie? Is there a Member from that State here who wants to defend this project? That should not be the reason we make these decisions. We should make those decisions based on real issues.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I am stating we do not know whether it is at a research station, whether it is in cooperation with the land grant university. The gentleman from Colorado is offering sort of an unspecified cut. We have many, many worthy research projects that occur across this country that try to save crops, that try to produce better crops.

I just thought it would be important for the offerer of the amendment to place on the record exactly where this is. And USDA conducts many activities; I think it is very important for us to understand the full impact of what the gentleman is proposing.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 538, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time and ask for the indulgence of the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) to enter into a colloquy. I would like to bring a very serious matter to the attention of my colleagues, which is the devastating effect the drought is having on Texas and its residents.

We are well aware of the economic impact it has had on agriculture production. Our colleague, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL) was speaking in terms of what was happening in his State and other parts of the country. The prolonged drought is now threatening an essential human need, drinking water.

Let me give my colleagues a few examples: Sylvester, McCaulley, West Odessa, Rhineland, Mirando City, and Bruni's water supply comes from wells. Because of the drought, the water tables have dropped and the water quality is poor. In addition, they face the real potential of their wells running dry.

Stamford, Texas has about a 1-year supply of water. The water quality is poor. Solutions have been delayed by bureaucratic indifference. Without assistance to divert water into the lake, any rainfall will be lost.

Throckmorton, Texas, a population of 1,036 whose sole source of water is a lake, has approximately 117 days of water left. They are working with State and Federal agencies for resources to fund a pipeline to a neighboring community about 30 miles away. This is an emergency situation.

Mr. Chairman, within USDA, there are rural utility programs that are designed to address problems such as these. Section 381E(d)(2) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act describes several programs that can alleviate the dire circumstances that these small rural communities face.

For example, the Emergency Community Rural Water Assistance Program provides grants for communities in these dire situations. Unfortunately, the program has not been funded since fiscal year 1996.

I would like to ask for the help of the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) and to work with the gentleman and others on this committee as this bill moves through the legislative process to find funding for these programs so these communities can re-

ceive the critical assistance that they need.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to assure my colleague that I will work with him to identify the funding sources for these programs and get these communities the help that they need either as this bill moves through the conference or other legislative vehicles arise. It is a very serious problem in that part of the country, and I understand that.

Mr. STENHOLM. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) for his help, and I look forward to working with him and the ranking minority Member, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) on this issue of gravest circumstance.

Mr. Chairman, I would take the remaining part of my time, and again, highlight something that I said a couple of nights ago when the HUD bill was on the floor. The bureaucratic indifference to the problems of these communities is becoming a very, very real problem, so I would hope that all of the committees, the authorizing committees of jurisdiction, would work with us as we attempt to work with the various agencies in order that we might have a little common sense applied to these emergencies and not have projects delayed needlessly as we continue to dot every "I" and cross every "T" on many of the myriad of hindrances that Congress has put in the way of dealing with emergency situations.

I would hope that as we work through this difficult situation in all communities, all over the United States, that we might have the kind of sympathetic, common sense concern to address the problems.

AMENDMENT NO. 49 OFFERED BY MR. SANFORD

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 49 offered by Mr. SANFORD: Page 13, line 17, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$14,406,000)".

Page 13, line 24, insert after the dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$14,406,000)".

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would simply hold at the fiscal 2000 year level special research grants. The reason I think that this is important is because there has been basically a \$14 million increase in overall research grants, which represents a 24 percent increase in this category of spending within this bill, and that is significant, because that is about eight times the rate of growth in inflation. It is about eight times the rate of growth in overall government expenditure.

Mr. Chairman, one of the reasons that this occurred was that there are

\$15 million in new research grants over the last year. They were not part of the fiscal year 2000 budget. They were not requested by the President. They were not appropriated by the Senate. In short, they were simply pork for Members within the agricultural committee.

I do not blame them one bit for doing this. They were watching out for their district, but if my colleagues look at the last component of cooperative State research education extension grants, they are to be focused on a national mission. This just flat out is not the case as we look down to these grants. What I see is \$1.25 million for efficient irrigation in New Mexico and Texas. I see \$300,000 fish and shellfish technologies in Virginia. I see \$300,000 for nursery, greenhouse and turf specialties in Alabama. I see \$200,000 for International Asparagus Competitiveness in Washington that was just recently talked about. In fact, I see a number of increases on all kinds of different things, red snapper research up by 37 percent. Vidalia onions up by 200 percent. Wood utilization, I think this is just plain crazy one, if we look at wood utilization research, it is there to help in speeding the process from timbers' exit from the forest to the mill. Yet there is nothing more efficient than a redneck out in the woods of South Carolina with a chain saw. He is getting bit up by ticks and mosquitoes and red bugs. He is going to find the most efficient way to move the tree from the stump to the mill. He does not need a Federal Government grant to teach him how to do that.

It is with that in mind that the USDA only requested \$6.3 million of this type of research, because they, in fact, wanted broader research, research that was national in nature.

□ 1300

In fact, on this very front, if we look, competitive research grants were cut by about \$23 million while these non-competitive grants have been added to. It is for this reason that I think this amendment makes sense, because not to have competitive grants means that Oklahoma, Vermont, South Dakota, Delaware got zero in research grants. In fact, two big farm States, Indiana and Tennessee, got one each.

So I urge this amendment's adoption.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

Special research grants do not represent "pork barrel spending." Special research grants have strong constituent support and provide the Nation with vital research alternatives to critical issues facing the American agricultural endeavor.

Freezing special research grants at last year's level or eliminating new projects, as the gentleman's amendment proposes, will have a devastating consequence on vital research needed for eradicating citrus canker, preventing inventive species, combating

exotic pests such as the glassy-winged sharpshooter that carries Pierce's disease, and improving agricultural and environmental technologies.

The following three new projects highlight the significant nature of the special research grants funded in this year's appropriation bill:

Citrus canker currently threatens the \$8.5 billion citrus industry in Florida. \$5 million is provided for much needed research on citrus canker and invasive species prevention and detection and eradication methods.

Two, exotic pests are introduced into California at a rate of 1 every 60 days. The bill provides \$2 million to establish a research center devoted to the study of short- and long-term alternatives in combating exotic pests.

Number three, Pierce's disease, carried by the glassy-winged sharpshooter, currently threatens the \$12 billion wine industry in California. \$2 million is provided for short- and long-term research on Pierce's disease and the glassy-winged sharpshooter.

Historically, special research projects sponsored by Members of Congress have made significant contributions to American agriculture and have provided an opportunity for special oversight. Each year, the Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service is required to report to the appropriations subcommittee on the national, regional, and local needs for the projects and the goals and the accomplishments to date. This year's detailed description for special research grants begins on page 513 of part 4 of the subcommittee's hearing record and concludes on page 775. Research conducted through the competitive grant process does not receive the same detailed oversight by Congress because the USDA does the selection process.

Individual Members have submitted nearly 800 requests in support of the special research grants funded through this appropriation bill. Although we are not able to fund every request, we did evaluate the benefits of each project before we included it in the appropriation.

The process associated with the appropriation process is long and includes oversight hearings and evaluations of many proposals. The funding presented in the special research grant proposal represents the combination of many months of work by the subcommittee, and the gentleman has not been specifically involved in the process. Furthermore, the gentleman's amendment moves to arbitrarily cut or freeze funding without any consideration to the merit or value of the research needs facing American agriculture. This approach ignores the methodical process the committee used to fund the specific projects, and it brings into question the sentiment of where the gentleman's support actually lies.

Does the gentleman support American agriculture or foreign imports? Because if vital research such as those related to citrus canker and Pierce's

disease is not performed, then the American citrus and wine industries and other agricultural industries supported by special research grants are in serious jeopardy.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to defeat the gentleman's amendment.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, along with our very able chairman, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), I rise in opposition to this amendment in the area of research. One of the great gifts that America has given the world is our agricultural research. There is no more productive Nation agriculturally on Earth than our own. This has not happened by accident. When the country was founded and we tried to master the plains and people moved westward and so forth, even until today, we try to understand the ecosystem and its function; and we know we could never really control it, but we try to live in harmony with it.

I am always someone who is a very strong supporter of research for the Nation, whether it is medical research, whether it is research related to space science, or certainly in the area of living tissue, whether that be plant tissue or, in fact, human tissue research. My record is very clear on that.

The gentleman has picked one set of accounts called Special Research Grants, and for the record, I just wanted to point out that if we look at all research within the U.S. Department of Agriculture and all agriculture programs, there is, indeed, a prejudice toward row crop production, corn, wheat, feed grains, that runs through the general performance of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. There are many, many crops and many issues that are left out of that general prejudice, and these include many of our vegetable crops and they include many of our fruit crops; many items that would be smaller in terms of actual presence in the economy.

Take maple sugar production, for example. This is an area that is covered under special research. The area of molluscan shellfish, granted, it is not something that everyone in America thinks about; but on the other hand, we have all managed to indulge at dinners and so forth in some of the products produced in that research. If we look at peanuts, it sounds like a simple thing to do, produce peanuts. One has to have the right climate, the right fertilizers, the right soils.

What happens with peanut research? We have discovered, that, my goodness, there are allergens associated with peanuts and some people can die from eating peanuts. My district does not produce peanuts. I certainly do not want anyone to die, and yet with the general research, it is important that we as a country understand what is going on there and that food safety and investment in research related to peanuts occurs.

Citrus canker. I do not have oranges and limes in my district in Ohio, although I certainly buy them at the grocery store. My heart goes out to all of the producers in Florida that are losing their shirts because of citrus canker. It is important for the Nation, if we are going to have citrus crops, to find answers to controlling, if we can, the devastation that is going on in those groves.

On behalf of my own State I have to say, with tomato production, it seems that we can all grow a tomato plant, but how do we grow enough tomatoes to feed a Nation to make sure that we can move it from field to shelf.

So I oppose the gentleman's amendment simply because it really throws a dagger at the heart of our special research grants which do not have the kind of support that we get in the major feed grains but, nonetheless, are very important to integrated production in this country. I think the gentleman has a worthy objective, but I really do not think he has chosen the right place to express himself.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman, and I understand completely what she is saying.

I guess my only question about this is those very needs that the gentlewoman is talking about could be addressed through a competitive basis. My problem with the special grants is that they are on a noncompetitive basis so that many States are left out and some of the very needs that the gentlewoman is talking about are not addressed because they are not on a competitive basis.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, if I might say to the gentleman, he knows the problem with the Small Business Administration, why do we even have one? It is simply because so many people fall between the cracks because we as a country are more able to deal with large institutions. It is no different than smaller producers, for example. Most farmers who might raise something like asparagus or tomatoes, they do not know how to apply for competitive research grants. Oftentimes this is done in conjunction with our land grant universities who do work with many of our smaller producers; raspberry producers, for example, who have to worry with viruses on their crops. We have a lot of internal review that is done by the academic institutions working with these crops and with the individuals who grow them. Also, the USDA Cooperative Research Service works and makes sure that we are getting our money's worth.

So I think the gentleman is trying to do something worthy, but I think he has chosen the wrong vehicle to do it, and I oppose the amendment.

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the gentleman's amendment. I want to remind the Members, Mr. Chairman, that the reason this money is in there is because we, because of our trade policy and the opening of our markets and our ports, we have many very serious invasive pest issues that we are dealing with in this country. I will give a couple of specific examples.

In Florida right now we are under severe attack from citrus canker. The source was a tree that was brought in through the Miami airport. Right now, this Federal Government is going to be spending millions and millions and millions of dollars to try to eradicate this disease. The only way that we can get rid of it is destroy the tree. It is spreading in at a very rapid pace. In the process, it is destroying the citrus industry in Florida and bankrupting many of the folks who have been in the citrus business down there for hundreds and hundreds of years.

There are other examples, as I am sure have been referenced in this debate. Pierce's disease in the grape industry, plum pox in the Northeast, the African hot water tick is another example of an invasive pest which has been found in this country which has the capability of destroying totally the livestock industry, including the wild deer population.

I need to remind the gentleman that we did not become the world's greatest economy, including agriculture and other industries, by sitting on our hands when it comes to research; and this basic research to solve these problems has to be done by the Government. One of the things that we have done in the last 5 years that has not served us very well is to cut back in many of these areas within the Department of Agriculture and its funding.

So I would very strongly oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. BOYD. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for the way he has been a consistent advocate for farmers in general and farmers specifically within his district.

However, my concern here is that people have mentioned a lot of strange diseases, canker sores on the sides of citrus trees and whatnot; but again, based on the research grants themselves, if we actually break them out, what they are correlated to is not the diseases on the citrus trees, but they are correlated to who sits on the Committee on Agriculture.

So while these are interesting points, that is not where the research grants are going, and that is why I think they ought to be made on a competitive versus not-competitive basis.

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman, and I would remind the gentleman and others who have the same interest that this is one Member who sits on that

committee and would be glad to work with anybody from any part of the country if they have a specific problem. We intend to earmark a lot of this money, and rightfully so; and we have taken into consideration those folks, like the gentleman, who have specific problems.

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

Mr. BOYD. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, on that point, I fully recognize the fact that while this particular Member may well do that with farmers from anywhere across the Nation, as a whole, at the end of the day, what comes out of this process is not that happening. In fact, again, we see a direct correlation between simply sitting on that committee and the research grants.

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would like to say that unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, I do not control the whole process. I would be glad to work with the gentleman to solve his specific problem.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYD. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say, as ranking member of this committee, our responsibility is to serve the country; and we have Members that come to us, for example, from New York City and from Chicago who are not on the Committee on Agriculture who are suffering under the Asian long-horn beetle infestation where all of those hardwoods are having to be cut down. We serve the country. We try to provide answers through this section of research in special grants and special research efforts all across this country. We do not just serve people on the agriculture committees. Our job is to serve the membership and, through them, serve the Nation.

So I would object a little bit to the way the gentleman characterized the performance of the committee. We are very proud of the work we do in serving the Nation.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

□ 1315

I come from Southern California. We are being attacked by what is called the glassy-winged sharpshooter, which is capable of totally destroying the wine industry.

I want to make one point, Mr. Chairman: Insects do not wait. They do not wait for a competitive grant, they do not wait for a competitive investigation of whether one insect is more deserving of investigation or research than another. We do not have time. When an insect first hits the ground, it starts reproducing at a rapid rate. They become endemic very quickly.

We have found in California if we do not respond, for instance, to the fire ant that was found recently, or the Formosa termite, which was literally eating its way across San Diego, or the Medfly, and continue to have research on that most destructive insect, I think everyone would agree in the United States, which totally destroyed, by the way, the citrus industry in Florida many years ago, that these research grants need to be responded to immediately. They cannot wait. We do not have the time. We have to give the responsibility to people to make those types of decisions.

I would say that I join my friends on both sides of the aisle in opposition to this amendment. I would hope for the sake of the produce industry, certainly something very important in California, that this amendment is voted down.

We do not get subsidies on our crops in Southern California. We are produce farmers: strawberries, fruits and vegetables. Our farmers really have to succeed on the price of their produce. The only thing that we have to get us in some kind of a competitive advantage is good research. I want to stand for research and in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just think the gentleman makes some good points. I have great respect for my friend, the gentleman from South Carolina. But coming from a farm State and being part of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations, we do look carefully at the problems that come up in different parts of the country and try to address the needs where they can best be addressed, at the universities or land grant universities who have an ongoing research program.

It is popular to say, "This has a funny name, jointed goat grass research," for example, "Let us try to strike it;" or asparagus research, like my friend from Colorado had an amendment which I opposed.

But it really, I think, diminishes a bit the work of the members of the subcommittee on the Committee on Appropriations who look at all of these challenges in agriculture research and try to use their best judgment to make sure that problems are addressed for farmers, so we can sell crops and grow them, and grow them healthfully.

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

Mr. CALVERT. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. I would just make the point that the gentleman raises some areas of acute need. I would recognize those acute needs. The problem is, the money is not being spent here. I

see \$5.5 million on wood utilization research; \$3 million on vidalia onions, we do not have a crisis there; red snapper research, I do not see a crisis there.

Mr. CALVERT. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I do not know the instances in these various products, but I have confidence that the appropriators have looked into this.

I have confidence that the USDA does not have time to look sometimes into the minutiae of what the gentleman is trying to do. They must respond immediately, not only with research but with dollars to back up that research, or we are going to have an epidemic on our hands with various produce and products in this country.

I would like to say one thing, produce is extremely important to this country. Fresh vegetables are important to this country, not just to the farmers but to the people who consume them. We need to have the research and the response as quickly as possible in this country to make sure that we continue to have the best produce at the best possible price for the consumers in this country.

In that sense, I would absolutely oppose the gentleman's amendment, and would urge all our Members to vote against it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, there are a lot of problems with this bill, but I want to take just a moment to question the presumption that somehow the public interest is served if the Congress never exercises its own judgment about where a dime of taxpayers' money ought to go.

There are a lot of occasions on which I oppose individual requests of Members to add items to appropriation bills. Many times I oppose them because essentially those requests have been marred by lobby groups in this town. I think Members ought to be able to represent their own districts without having to be plagued by a middleman who is simply trying to make money off the deal.

But the gentleman from Washington said something which I wanted to emphasize when he talked about the tendency of some people in this institution to sometimes go after projects just because they "sound funny."

I remember about 15 years ago when a research project at the National Science Foundation was ridiculed on this House floor, on the Senate floor, and in most of the newspapers across the country because it was a research project involving Polish pigs. Everybody had a big laugh about the research that was being done on Polish pigs.

The fact is that out of that research came one of the new, modern drugs for control of blood pressure.

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

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I

just want to make a point of clarification. The gentleman suggested that I thought Congress should never be involved in this decision-making.

Mr. OBEY. I did not mention the gentleman.

Mr. SANFORD. Not me, but I am just saying generally. What is interesting is, I leave in place \$60 million for special research grants. All this amendment goes after is the increase of \$14 million, so Congress would very much be involved in the process of making special research grants.

Mr. OBEY. I would simply say this, we have an economy that is second to none in the world. We have an agricultural community which is second to none in the world. We did not get that way by putting green eyeshades ahead of our own judgment.

Sometimes the Congress has the temerity to think that there ought to be an increase in a program because there is some other value that is served by investing that money.

I would simply say that it is very easy for one Member who has not sat through hearings, who has not gone over the individual Member requests, who has not weighed the requests of one Member versus another, given the very tight squeeze on money that we have around here, it is very easy for a Member to come to the floor and just say, knock off the increase in this program, or knock off that category of grants.

The reason Congress has survived as the strongest legislative body in the world is because Congress specializes, and Members are expected to learn their trade. They are expected to learn about the subject matter under the jurisdiction of their committee.

If we cannot have some expectation that that committee is to be trusted to use good judgment, then we become a zoo where the amendments are adopted on the basis of what some staffer in some Member's office thinks is a clever tack. I do not think that serves the interests of the taxpaying public.

Mr. SANFORD. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Chairman, I want to be clear, this is not about a green eyeshades analysis or nonspecialization. In other words, when I look at the wood utilization grants, I will bet I am the only Member of Congress who raises pine trees. I have been out there in the woods with a McCullough chain saw cutting timber, watching loggers do the same.

It is based on that experience that says to me that the wood utilization program is a waste of money.

Mr. OBEY. That is fine, but this is an institution that makes collective judgments. With all due respect to the gentleman, I think the committee spent more time examining this problem than the gentleman has.

Mr. SANFORD. The question is how much time Members have spent in the woods.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I just wanted to express opposition to this amendment. As someone who is not on the subcommittee and someone who has not necessarily been advocating, although I certainly advocate for special projects research, but I have seen the value of these projects, whether I have advocated for them or not, in not only responding to special projects that someone else, not understanding it, may see it as something completely beyond what is practical and reasonable.

Part of the ingenuity of research is to begin to not only speak to crises but speak to opportunities for research, opportunities for greater production, opportunities for enhancing the quality of food and the products that we grow. Having this and the judgment to respond both to crisis and opportunity is a unique value that we should not lose in the austere position of balancing the budget.

If we are going to err, we ought to err on the side of looking at research in the sense that research really is a searching for the unknown, searching for the possibilities. I want to suggest that if we are to be practical, we also ought to have a future. Research is about the future. Sometimes we do not know all the practical crises of those situations.

I urge that we vote against this amendment.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to get in this debate, but one of the things I heard that really bothered me is an assumption that the American people should not take as fact. There is no shortage of money. Discretionary spending from this Congress last year rose almost 9 percent, three times the rate of inflation in this country.

So dare we not make the case that money is tight. Our pocketbooks that we are spending of taxpayers' money is growing three times the rate most of them are seeing increases in their own budget.

The second contention that I would make is that it is okay to fund research that is not necessarily legitimate, because sometimes something positive comes out of it. I am reminded of the research that was appropriated when the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) was chairman of the committee that studied the flatulence of cows. There has been nothing positive that has come out of that approach.

It is ironic that we would be so resistant to a lessening of programs that are not necessarily cogent and reasonable that are necessarily related to regional politics and reelection.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, since the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) is indiscriminately attacking important programs in this bill without much discussion about the impact of the pro-

posed cuts, I want to take a minute to talk about the program that he is attacking with this amendment.

The Cornell University program on breast cancer and environmental risk factors was launched in 1995 in response to the abnormally high incidence of breast cancer in New York. The program investigates the link between risk factors in the environment, like chemicals and pesticides, and breast cancer.

The BCERF program takes scientific research on breast cancer and translates it into plain English materials that are easy to understand, and disseminates this information to the public. They have a web site that is filled with information on BCERF's activities, breast cancer statistics, scientific analyses of environmental risk factors, and links to other sources of information. They sponsor discussion groups that provide a public forum to discuss breast cancer.

This amendment would destroy our ability to bring the important work of the BCERF program to more people around New York and around the country.

Let me make this very simple. If Members oppose efforts to educate the public about breast cancer, and if they think we have done enough to prevent breast cancer in this country, then vote for this amendment. But if Members agree with me that we need to do more about stopping the terrible scourge of breast cancer, if Members agree with me that we cannot sit by while one in eight women are diagnosed with breast cancer over the course of their lifetimes, if it outrages Members that approximately 43,000 women will die from breast cancer, and 175,000 women will be diagnosed with breast cancer this year alone, then join me in voting no on this terribly misguided amendment.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

□ 1330

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I just I want to make very clear that this amendment simply gets at the overall funding category, the 24 percent increase in funding. It in no way goes specifically after your very worthy research project.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I wanted to point out the importance of this use of that source of funds. Because I think we have to be very careful in this body about indiscriminately cutting back on an account that may have very important uses for those dollars, and I wanted to point out one of the very important uses of these dollars so that I think we have to be careful.

I am just stressing this to the gentleman that to cut out a whole account, we could put a program like this in danger.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman would continue to yield, I

would simply say on that point, that is why I think it is so important to go after some of the others that I think have far less merit, like the wood utilization program.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, again reclaiming my time, I would like to state again to my colleagues that I think we all have to be careful in this body about cutting money from a general account when, frankly, the impact of those cuts could impact a very important program such as this one.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time. The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) just said that there were some Members standing on this floor who were saying it was okay to use taxpayers' money for research which is of no value. Nobody is saying that. I mean, the gentleman's comments I think simply do not accurately reflect what Members have said.

What we are saying is that it is nice if there are people in this place who recognize the value of something as well as its cost. That goes to the very essence of research. We do not know ahead of time what value there will be, but we do know that there will be a very large cost if we do not engage in that research, whether it is in the case of human disease or even, I might add, if it is in the case of bovine flatulence which produces methane which has an impact on atmospheric gases.

Mr. Chairman, I see nothing against the national interest in trying to determine whether an adjustment in bovine diet can lead to less impact on the Earth's atmosphere, so that we do not have to focus all of the squeeze in creating a cleaner environment on industry which has a negative impact on jobs.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, again reclaiming my time, and in conclusion, I think that points out once again that the reason that I am using this as an example is to explain to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD), my good friend, that the impact of his cuts, although it may be unintentioned, could severely affect very important programs such as I have mentioned here.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I rise in opposition precisely because of the nature of the amendment in which the gentleman from South Carolina, my good friend, reduces arbitrarily the amount of money set aside. And I do so without apology on spending or defense of this particular category.

When we look at the total amount of money that is being invested in agriculture on food, then it should be relatively easy to oppose an amendment that arbitrarily strikes \$16 million

without saying where we will strike it. I trust the judgment of the committee that has spent literally hours in determining the priority of projects. And I say that as one who has had some of my own requests turned down this year because there was not sufficient money available to fund all of the projects.

Mr. Chairman, I respect that, as much as it hurts me to say that, because I happen to believe some needs that we were supporting in Texas and in other areas should have been considered, but were not able to be considered under the tight budget restraints. But to come in and arbitrarily cut an additional \$16 million seems to me to be a little harsh, because when we look at things like bovine tuberculosis in Michigan, a very, very serious problem that we do need to have a special rifle-shot attention being done for it.

We have already heard about the citrus canker in Florida. Designing foods for health, very important. Potentially, something might be wasted, but by the same token, trying to find answers through our food supply of dealing with the very serious disease of cancer.

I can list others. We have already heard the California problem in the wine industry, et cetera. But I remember not too many years ago in which, on this floor I am sure, but I heard it on talk shows, radio hosts who ridiculed a program that this Congress had appropriated dollars for, to study the sex life of a fly. If we let our mind wander for a moment, anyone who would hear that as we were spending taxpayer dollars and suggest what fun one could have with that.

But, Mr. Chairman, it turns out that program was the Screw Worm Eradication program. That was a program that has now successfully eradicated the screw worm not only from the livestock industry in the United States, but also in Mexico. We are hoping to continue to move it completely off the face of this Earth. It has also benefited the wildlife industry tremendously. How many fawns have lived because there was no screw worm to take their life?

So I would ask the indulgence of the body to stick with the committee. They have done a good job. I can criticize the \$74 million as not being enough, but that is not what we are here today to do. But I would respectfully say to the gentleman from South Carolina, I know his intent, and he and I have joined on many occasions to reduce spending. But I would use this opportunity to point out to the entire House, we have done a pretty darned good job. We are now down to where we are going to be discretionary spending something like less than 17 percent of the available funds.

At some point in time we who call ourselves conservatives have got to acknowledge that and begin to look seriously at whether or not additional cuts are going to do real harm. I respectfully oppose the amendment, because

when we look at the 16 million, if some of these projects would come out, we could do some real harm that I know the gentleman from South Carolina, my friend, would not want to do.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I would make two comments. One would be the semantics between "cut" and "freeze." And we might say this differently. I would view this as more of a freeze at last year's level, rather than a cut from a proposed increase.

Secondly, I would make the point that if there is anything arbitrary about what is in here, it is the degree of correlation between not the diseases that are being talked about but the degree of correlation between the grants themselves and membership on the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that. But from the standpoint of freeze, I would hope the gentleman would look at it from the total perspective of agriculture, not a particular program. Because if we look at it from the total and the needs that we have, and those needs that were not able to be funded, I believe perhaps the gentleman would have some sympathy for those of us who say it is a cut.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would again yield, that is fair enough and a point well taken.

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I stand in opposition to this amendment. While I have enjoyed the company and support on other measures with the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD), I have to stand in opposition to this amendment. I feel that it is important for me to be here to probably tell the rest of the story.

The funds for the wood utilization research go to land-grant institutions in nine States. Maine is one of them. The money does not go to teach loggers how to cut trees more efficiently. Money is used to generate the new knowledge and technologies that are necessary to balance the sustainable use of our timberlands and forest resources with the need to maintain a vigorous forest products industry.

The quality of the science performed with the help of these funds can be shown by the patent applications, the research awards, and the use of the awards by the industry itself.

A couple of examples: it has helped with the environmental improvements in the pulp and paper industry, which I am sure has a presence in the State of the gentleman from South Carolina. The funds have been used to assist in the development of pulping and bleaching technologies that use oxygen delignification instead of chlorine. It is

the use of chlorine in the process that creates dioxin.

Last year, the University of Maine received about \$890,000 in Federal funds, matched that with \$500,000 in program support and industry provided in-kind support of over \$250,000. This ongoing research has helped, because as we try to make sure that we are having a sustainable forest program, that we are able to use less-valued timber to be able to make sure that we could create a wood composite so that it would have the same strength and value of a higher grade of timber that could be used in the home construction industry to keep houses affordable and construction costs affordable for small businesses and working families, and at the same time to be able to better create a balanced, sustainable forestry program.

Mr. Chairman, this research is necessary to do that. I do not remember or recall people talking about reducing the research that the NIH was doing that was providing the basic elemental science for the pharmaceutical industry to create drugs which are going to help people with MS and other diseases to better cope with it. I do not remember anybody proposing an amendment to cut those dollars that are providing that research that is going on in the pharmaceutical industry.

But I notice as it pertains to agriculture, and I notice as it pertains to land-grant institutions and the research that is going on there that is helping industry provide and support alternative approaches to creating the opportunities for more economic development and jobs, I see the attacks coming in those directions.

So as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture who represents the largest physical district east of the Mississippi, I stand here to defend these programs and the research that has gone on.

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

Mr. BALDACCI. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman raises very valid points in terms of the overall net effect of what is done in terms of research. My question would be on some of the things that the gentleman mentioned. On the New York Stock Exchange we find Boise Cascade and International Paper and Westvaco. And given the fact that these are multimillion-dollar corporations, and given the gentleman's advocacy for people in need, and given the fact that there are scarce dollars in Washington, all I am suggesting by this amendment is given the fact that we have publicly traded companies that can do this basic research, why not let them do it, rather than having them subsidized by people who frankly are not so well off in these research projects?

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the gentleman

makes a very good point. But the research is not being done. The resources are being either clear-cut or overharvested, which is creating ripple impacts, which I know the gentleman cares about, in natural resources and in the quality of the environment. In order for us to be protective of our natural resources, creating a sustainable forestry program that is balanced, we need to publicly do the research. And by the ability to enfranchise and have the support of private industry with private dollars, we are able to use a public-private partnership to both protect our public resources and at the same time provide an opportunity for business and industry to create the jobs and opportunities here in this country. So I think it goes hand in hand.

I appreciate the direction that the gentleman is coming from, but I think it is very important that this research go on.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak briefly on the amendment previously offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY), which was defeated by a voice vote. I urge my colleagues to also vote "no" on that amendment when it comes before us later on.

Mr. Chairman, I want to speak specifically because the asparagus industry, while it is a small specialty crop, is very important in my district.

Let me briefly walk through the asparagus industry. It is a small specialty crop. They assess themselves somewhere around a million dollars for research and market promotion and those monies are obviously spent wisely. But the problem they are having overall is that the foreign competition from other countries comes at a price to our domestic growers, because in large part they are subsidized by their governments.

That has a negative impact on our asparagus industry, because harvesting asparagus is very, very labor intensive, and therein lies the crux of the problem.

□ 1345

Now, I have talked to my growers in my district a number of times, and they said just give us a level playing field and we will compete with anybody because of the quality of their product. And I believe them.

But one of the problems within the asparagus industry that is not new just this year, but going on some 20, 25 years and probably longer than that, is how one can harvest asparagus me-

chanically because it is very, very labor intensive.

Part of this modest appropriation that was made to this industry was to find ways to reduce the cost of production through alternative production and harvesting. The key word here being harvesting.

So this industry, simply being a specialty industry, is simply not large enough to fund the needed research, and this is a start to try to find what I tell my growers is the elusive automatic asparagus harvester.

So I would hope that my colleagues would join me in voting no on the Hefley amendment, because this is the start where I think ultimately will be, and I cannot tell my colleagues whether it is going to be 1 year, 5 years or 10 years down the line, but with our ability to create technology in this country, I think we will find the means to find a way to harvest asparagus mechanically rather than a manual basis.

So I urge my colleagues to vote no on the Hefley amendment when it comes to the floor later on when we come back to rolled votes.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, just to reinforce the Hefley amendment that takes the research money away from asparagus, I mean, I do not know how many people in this Chamber like asparagus, but have my colleagues noticed the increased quality of that asparagus?

Right now our asparagus farmers throughout this country are facing the competition of losing their ability to produce because of the imports coming in.

Vote against the Hefley amendment. Keep the research going for asparagus. This is a very, very small start.

Additionally, let me say that Michigan is third in the nation in asparagus production, growing on over 16,000 acres at an average annual value of over \$20 million.

The asparagus industry is a small farm specialty crop with an average farm size of 65 acres. Asparagus is a very labor intensive crop as it must still be harvested by hand. During the growing season asparagus must be picked by hand daily with the selection of ripe shoots done by hand labor.

When Peru was allowed to export asparagus into the U.S. as a result of the Andean Trade Pact, the U.S. asparagus industry was put at an unfair competitive advantage. While U.S. growers pay at least minimum wage, Peru's average wage is \$4 a day. The U.S. industry needs a mechanical harvester to reduce the costs of harvest so they can be competitive with foreign competition. Because asparagus is a minor crop, there is little interest or incentive for private industry to develop a mechanical harvesters.

Until the U.S. asparagus industry can find a way to reduce its dependence on hand labor, it is in danger of surviving due to competition from foreign markets. With cooperative assistance from Washington State University and Michigan State University, this funding will help develop mechanical harvesting technology to succeed in a very competitive marketplace.

Without our assistance, this small but essential industry could disappear from the United States.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the full committee.

In the Supplemental Appropriations bill that the House passed in March, \$393,193,000 was included in programs within the jurisdiction of this subcommittee. The Supplemental Appropriations bill, which is coming to the floor sometime this evening apparently, or whenever the final differences of the House and the Senate can be resolved, contains only about \$56 million of that amount.

It is my understanding that those items were deleted without prejudice in order that the two bodies might reach agreement on urgently needed funds for the Army and for firefighting in the Western States before the July 4th district work period.

I ask the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), is that the correct intent of where we stand?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding to me. I thank the gentleman for his question.

As he knows, the House did pass this bill with the agricultural interests included in March, and it has taken us this long to reach some kind of a conclusion with the other body. We are prepared with a bill, a supplemental bill that has been scaled down somewhat.

But I would say to the gentleman from Wisconsin, he is exactly correct. We have to move the supplemental as early as possible. The money has already been spent for the Defense Department in Kosovo and other parts of the world. So it is essential that we move the supplemental quickly.

I would say to the gentleman, in response to his question, that I agree with his interpretation. I agree with his intent. There are agricultural matters of interest that were in the supplemental that are of great interest to the State of Florida. We do intend to make sure that we meet those obligations as we go through the further process.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), chairman of the subcommittee, if he can assure the Members of the House that the agriculture items contained in the supplemental will represent the House position when we take the regular fiscal year 2001 appropriation bill to conference with the other body?

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN).

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for

yielding to me, and I would assure him that we worked very hard in developing these priorities in the agriculture section of the supplemental. We recognize that the need for these items is still great. We will make certain that they are addressed in the conference with the Senate.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful for the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of full committee, for coming to the floor and trying to clarify what is happening here.

As my colleagues know, when our bill was sent to the Senate and we were later called to become conferees, though we were appointed as conferees, we never met as conferees. We never had a chance to sit together. We were not even allowed to work our will on the bill, and many House items fell out as the Senate worked its will. We could not represent the interests of this House and our Members.

I would just like to state for the record that funding for some important programs like Conservation Technical Assistance under the Natural Resources and Conservation Service that help our farmers apply for necessary programs like Wetlands Reserve, Conservation Reserve Program, Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program were dropped. Hopefully, we will be able to restore that so we can get people to apply and to meet the deadlines necessary. One cannot do that without field people out there helping farmers across the country.

Remediating citrus canker, which we had put in the House bill, at nearly \$40 million for tree replacement and compensation to growers, was eliminated for some reason; the funds for APHIS to address Pierce's Disease, that is affecting the grape crop in California; were dropped; funds were also removed for the Inspector General, one part of USDA that brings in money as we arrest thieves around the Nation and those who are cheating and committing fraud in these various programs. Further, money was eliminated for our water and waste water grants. We have got people lined up all over the country applying for USDA utilities programs, unable to be served. Through the conference committee that we were not allowed to participate in, over 28 million more dollars removed from that program.

Homeownership loans, resulting in a loss of loan volume of over \$296 million, were dropped from the bill. Our mutual and self-help housing grants, assistance to migrant and seasonal farm workers, the replacement of our FDA, Food and Drug Administration, building in Los Angeles—all were dropped out, sometime in the dead of night. We in the House did not have a chance to work our will. Many emergency conservation authorities were removed.

I guess I would just say that I will place in the RECORD a statement that has come to us today from the Clinton administration, the Executive Office of the President and the Office of Management and Budget, that if we do not fix the Supplemental bill, the President's advisors have recommended vetoing this bill. Thus, I am so grateful for the chairman of the full committee and the chairman of the subcommittee standing here today and entering into this colloquy with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member. It is absolutely essential that these items be restored.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. OBEY was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN).

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, we will address all of the items contained in the agricultural section of the supplemental which passed the House.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to add that the position that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and others, as well as the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), indicated that we want the position of the House to prevail.

I appreciate the support and the strong leadership that the chairmen, both of the committee and of the subcommittee, have given to maintain the crisis in which we found ourselves in Eastern North Carolina, and we find that the drainage in Princeville has been eliminated.

I am very appreciative that they are willing to consider that and to maintain that position, because the House voted on that. In the colloquy we had with the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), he said he would work with us to maintain that at least the drainage that is so desperately needed in a town which was completely flooded would be provided.

This was not new monies. These were just the ability to use monies already appropriated. So the emergency was not creating new drain on the Treasury, it was just giving the authorization for them to use the money that had been appropriated years in the past.

So I want to express both my appreciation to everyone who understand that this is a crisis, and we should do the right thing by responding to it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I think it is important to recapitulate that what occurred on the supplemental is that the majority party at the staff level had determined that there was a very large amount of money that both the Senate and the House were asking to

be included in this bill for everything from citrus canker to dairy supplemental payments to you name it on the agriculture side.

The decision was made by the majority negotiators to eliminate all of those items before anyone else was even brought into the conversation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. OBEY was allowed to proceed for 30 additional seconds.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, at this point, I think it is important for people to understand that we consider those items to be merely deferred, not eliminated, because people are smoking something that is not legal if they think we are going to be able to get out of here without dealing with these problems, because the collapse in farm prices is simply not going to go away, and the Congress is going to have to respond to that.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman kindly yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I want to reexpress my appreciation to the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) and the gentleman from New Mexico (Chairman SKEEN) for trying to restore regular order in this House and permitting the Members to exercise their will. The legislative will of the House and its membership must be retained both here on the floor and in the conference committee, and no special set of leaders who may have a higher title than any Member that stands on this floor should have a right to write our conference bill.

We thank them for restoring the power back to the membership where it belongs and to the regular order of the committee process.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

None of the funds in the foregoing paragraph shall be available to carry out research related to the production, processing or marketing of tobacco or tobacco products.

#### NATIVE AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS ENDOWMENT FUND

For establishment of a Native American institutions endowment fund, as authorized by Public Law 103-382 (7 U.S.C. 301 note), \$7,100,000: *Provided*, That hereafter, any distribution of the adjusted income from the Native American institutions endowment fund is authorized to be used for facility renovation, repair, construction, and maintenance, in addition to other authorized purposes.

#### EXTENSION ACTIVITIES

For necessary payments to States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, Micronesia, Northern Marianas, and American Samoa, \$428,740,000, of which the following amounts shall be available: payments for cooperative extension work under the Smith-Lever Act, to be distributed under sections 3(b) and 3(c) of said Act, and under section 208(c) of Public Law 93-471, for retirement and employees' compensation costs for extension agents and for costs of penalty mail for cooperative extension agents and State extension directors,



\$276,548,000; payments for extension work at the 1994 Institutions under the Smith-Lever Act (7 U.S.C. 343(b)(3)), \$3,060,000; payments for the nutrition and family education program for low-income areas under section 3(d) of the Act, \$58,695,000; payments for the pest management program under section 3(d) of the Act, \$10,783,000; payments for the farm safety program under section 3(d) of the Act, \$4,000,000; payments for pesticide applicator training under section 3(d) of the Act, \$1,500,000; payments to upgrade research, extension, and teaching facilities at the 1890 land-grant colleges, including Tuskegee University, as authorized by section 1447 of Public Law 95-113 (7 U.S.C. 3222b), \$12,000,000, to remain available until expended; payments for the rural development centers under section 3(d) of the Act, \$908,000; payments for youth-at-risk programs under section 3(d) of the Act, \$9,000,000; for youth farm safety education and certification extension grants, to be awarded competitively under section 3(d) of the Act, \$1,000,000; payments for carrying out the provisions of the Renewable Resources Extension Act of 1978, \$3,192,000; payments for Indian reservation agents under section 3(d) of the Act, \$1,714,000; payments for sustainable agriculture programs under section 3(d) of the Act, \$3,309,000; payments for cooperative extension work by the colleges receiving the benefits of the second Morrill Act (7 U.S.C. 321-326 and 328) and Tuskegee University, \$26,843,000; and for Federal administration and coordination including administration of the Smith-Lever Act, and the Act of September 29, 1977 (7 U.S.C. 341-349), and section 1361(c) of the Act of October 3, 1980 (7 U.S.C. 301 note), and to coordinate and provide program leadership for the extension work of the Department and the several States and insular possessions, \$16,188,000; *Provided*, That funds hereby appropriated pursuant to section 3(c) of the Act of June 26, 1953, and section 506 of the Act of June 23, 1972, shall not be paid to any State, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, or the Virgin Islands, Micronesia, Northern Marianas, and American Samoa prior to availability of an equal sum from non-Federal sources for expenditure during the current fiscal year.

#### INTEGRATED ACTIVITIES

For the integrated research, education, and extension competitive grants programs, including necessary administrative expenses, \$39,541,000, as follows: payments for the water quality program, \$12,000,000; payments for the food safety program, \$15,000,000; payments for the national agriculture pesticide impact assessment program, \$4,541,000; payments for the Food Quality Protection Act risk mitigation program for major food crop systems, \$4,000,000; payments for the crops affected by Food Quality Protection Act implementation, \$1,000,000; payments for the methyl bromide transition program, \$2,000,000; and payments for the organic transition program \$1,000,000, as authorized under section 406 of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7626).

#### OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR MARKETING AND REGULATORY PROGRAMS

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs to administer programs under the laws enacted by the Congress for the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, the Agricultural Marketing Service, and the Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, \$618,000.

#### ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE SALARIES AND EXPENSES (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, including those pursuant to the Act of Feb-

ruary 28, 1947 (21 U.S.C. 114b-c), necessary to prevent, control, and eradicate pests and plant and animal diseases; to carry out inspection, quarantine, and regulatory activities; to discharge the authorities of the Secretary of Agriculture under the Act of March 2, 1931 (46 Stat. 1468; 7 U.S.C. 426-426b); and to protect the environment, as authorized by law, \$470,000,000, of which \$8,065,000 shall be available for the control of outbreaks of insects, plant diseases, animal diseases and for control of pest animals and birds to the extent necessary to meet emergency conditions: *Provided*, That no funds shall be used to formulate or administer a brucellosis eradication program for the current fiscal year that does not require minimum matching by the States of at least 40 percent: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for field employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed \$40,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for the operation and maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed four, of which two shall be for replacement only: *Provided further*, That, in addition, in emergencies which threaten any segment of the agricultural production industry of this country, the Secretary may transfer from other appropriations or funds available to the agencies or corporations of the Department such sums as may be deemed necessary, to be available only in such emergencies for the arrest and eradication of contagious or infectious disease or pests of animals, poultry, or plants, and for expenses in accordance with the Act of February 28, 1947, and section 102 of the Act of September 21, 1944, and any unexpended balances of funds transferred for such emergency purposes in the preceding fiscal year shall be merged with such transferred amounts: *Provided further*, That appropriations hereunder shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2250) for the repair and alteration of leased buildings and improvements, but unless otherwise provided the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 percent of the current replacement value of the building.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 65 OFFERED BY MR. WEINER

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 65 offered by Mr. WEINER: Page 19, line 4, insert after the first dollar amount the following: "(reduced by \$15,510)".

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, I do not expect to take the full 5 minutes. First, I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SKEEN), chairman, and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), ranking member, of the subcommittee and their staffs for their commitment to our sound agriculture policy.

But this is an opportunity with this amendment to use the matrix between agricultural policies and our human rights policies in how we deal with other countries to have, hopefully, a positive impact on a very important matter.

As we speak, and, frankly, since March of 1999, 13 prisoners have been held on charges of spying by the Iranian government. There has been a trial that has consisted mainly of a kangaroo court where the prosecutor

was the same person as the judge who was the same person as the appeals court, et cetera. It is expected that this weekend, there will be a verdict coming down in that case.

What my amendment does is very simple. It strikes a small amount, \$15,510 from this section of the bill from the over \$400 million, I believe, section of the bill that is APHIS, that is used to deal with imports and imports only from Iran.

What we are saying with this amendment is that Members are watching very closely what happens with those 13 prisoners. What we are saying is that, regardless of how we feel about the policies of Iran, whether we think they are moderating or not, that this case is one that we are watching very closely. We are withholding, albeit temporarily, we are withholding additional benefits for Iranian imports.

I would encourage my colleagues to support this amendment. This is an opportunity for us to, frankly, say the right thing and do the right thing in a symbolic way.

I want to thank the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), the subcommittee chair, and his staff for his assistance in preparing this amendment.

As I said, I do not anticipate taking my entire 5 minutes. This is an amendment that I have offered.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) in the interest of preserving time.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support for the Weiner amendment to cut \$15,510 from the Animal and Plant Inspection Service, APHIS.

□ 1400

This symbolic cut represents the amount that has been spent over the last 10 years on the importation of Iranian goods. While only a small cut, this will help send a message to the Iranian government in protest of the sham trial of the 13 Iranian Jews.

Numerous Members of this body and the international community have come forward to express their outrage at this travesty of justice. I join them in their anger. These 13 Jews have been wrongfully imprisoned, and some have been forced to confess to the imagined crime of spying for Israel.

When the president of Iran was elected, it was on a platform of moderation and reform supported by the Iranian people. In response to his election, the United States made good will overtures towards Iran, including the lifting of restrictions on Iranian foodstuffs, like pistachios and carpets, as well as easing the travel restrictions on Iranians. Yet despite the rejection of hard-liners in the last election, the leaders of Iran are still on the wrong track.

At a time when the U.S. has sought to improve relations with the Iranian people, the government of Iran must reciprocate and respect fundamental

human rights and act as responsible member of the world community. When travesties such as this trial continue, it should concern all of us as to our policy towards Iran.

While the State Department pursues its pistachio diplomacy, innocent people in Iran are suffering. The Iranian government must put an end to this sham trial, free the 13, and let them and their families live in peace. Unless they do this, our policy towards Iran will have to change.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and keep pressure on Iran. The Jewish community in Iran, especially the 13 Iranian Jews, must know that the United States Congress supports them in their time of need.

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

Mr. WEINER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, the trials are going on now. The 13 Jews charged with spying for the CIA may hear their verdicts on the 4th of July.

This amendment sends a strong message that America is watching. No justice, no caviar. Or at least no caviar imported from Iran.

I want to thank the distinguished subcommittee Chair for, as I understand, his willingness to accept the amendment.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise not in opposition to the amendment, but I just wanted to note that as well as these 13 Jews there are also Muslims. There are also Muslims on trial, and I think we should note that.

I am not standing to say I am opposing this amendment, but standing to offer just a few words. I lived in Iran during the last year when the Shah was in power in Iran. If we look back at the history of the two countries, we have to also realize that the United States of America, after Dr. Mossadeq was in charge in Iran, the United States of America pulled a coup on Dr. Mossadeq. The United States, through the CIA, pulled a coup on Iran; and, in fact, we reinstalled the government of our choice. The Iranian people had a revolution, of course, of the Shah, and that can be debated for the next 20 years. But since that period of time, we have had zero contact.

Now, I am not saying this is not a bad move to do, but I will tell my colleagues that we only fool ourselves in this U.S. House of Representatives and the United States Senate when we continuously pass other resolutions and we talk about strictly sanctioning Iran. Iran now has a freely elected parliament, where 78 percent of the people that were running were reform-minded. It has a freely elected president.

We talk about doing business with China, where they hold Catholic priests and bishops in prison; yet we extend every option of trade avenue, and we are told we can reform them by engaging. All I am saying in regard to this

amendment is not that I am opposing this amendment, but I am just simply saying that the day shall come when we wake up and realize that there are sins on our side, meaning the U.S., towards years of policy in Iran, and there are some sins on the Iranian side, obviously. At some point in time these two countries have to communicate, and then I think we can change each other's thinking in the sense of how we think towards each other. But maybe also we can change behavior through engagement.

I have also seen and heard talk about the fact that if someone wants to talk to Iran, something is wrong with them. I think there are people on both sides of the aisle that realize the time has long come. We can hopefully help a lot of people on a humanitarian basis if we keep in mind that we need to communicate. So I think this amendment is done in that particular spirit.

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

Mr. NEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman's words. I think that there is legitimate disagreement about how to encourage these moderate voices that we have heard about to emerge.

One thing we do have to keep in mind, though, as the gentleman points out, is that there are people whose lives quite literally hang in the balance at this moment in time. But I certainly think that being in support of this amendment someone can legitimately hold a position on either side.

We are just saying let us take a symbolic deep breath, step back, and hope we can encourage the behavior we would like.

Mr. NEY. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, that is the thrust of my point. This amendment, in fact, does not mean that we are necessarily not going to open up avenues someday of communicating so all the Iranian people and all the American people can share a peaceful world.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has raised a serious issue which all Americans should be aware of, and I congratulate him for it. I would prefer that this cut would come from the budgets of other Federal agencies which are responsible for our import policy. APHIS, of course, is bound by law to inspect cargo wherever it comes from. However, I understand the extreme importance of this issue, and urge all my colleagues to consider the gentleman's words.

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the amendment offered today by Mr. WEINER that will reduce funding for the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service by over 15,000. This amount is more significant than its number, because it represents the APHIS budget that is used to administer Iranian agricultural imports to the United States.

Mr. Chairman, thirteen Iranian Jews were arbitrarily arrested in March, 1999, and are

about to be sentenced and condemned by the Iranian Revolutionary Court for crimes they did not commit. Now is not the time to send Iran symbolic victories. Not while the Iranian Court prepares to sentence the thirteen Iranian Jews who are on trial for their religious beliefs, not for anything they have done wrong.

As my colleagues have pointed out, this sham trial was orchestrated by the Iranian government which refused to allow members of the Jewish community, diplomats, or human rights activists to be present in the courtroom and observe the trial. This sham trial undermines the progress we have been anticipating as a result of the recent Iranian elections—which raised our hopes and led to our lifting of sanctions on carpets, caviar, nuts, and dried fruits. Now is not the time to go further.

We must not reward Iran for persecuting religious minorities including Jews, Bahai's and Christians. We must not reward the Iranian government for being the world's leading sponsor of terrorism. We must not reward them for doing everything in their power to destroy the Middle East peace process. And we must not reward the Iranian government for their intensive effort to build weapons of mass destruction. Now is the time for Iran to send the world a positive message.

Mr. Chairman, we have an opportunity right now on the Floor of the House to send a clear message to the Iranian government that their treatment of the thirteen Iranian Jews is unacceptable and will not be rewarded.

If Iran is to become a respected member of the international community, she must immediately end this show trial, release the Iranian Jews, and begin protecting the religious rights of all of her citizens. Until such time, Iran will remain a pariah nation. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important amendment.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, which will send a strong message to the government of Iran and the world that the United States Congress will not tolerate Iran's blatant disregard for basic human rights.

We have heard about the so-called "moderation" of Iran, about the power struggle between the hard-line clerics and the reformists led by President Khatemi. I invite my colleagues to examine carefully the face of this moderation:

13 Iranian Jews are currently awaiting sentencing on charges of spying for the United States and Israel. These 13 have been denied due process, were coerced into confessing on Iranian TV, and are being prosecuted, judged, and sentenced by the same Revolutionary Court judge.

Since late May, over 20 newspapers and magazines associated with the reformists have been shut down by the Iranian government, silencing the voices of the independent press in that country.

And just yesterday, two prominent human rights lawyers in Iran were sent to prison, without trial, on charges of insulting public officials.

No reasonable person could call this "moderation."

Mr. Chairman, Iran is not ready to join the community of nations. Each day, Iran produces more and more evidence that the terms of membership in this community—including respect for basic human rights, due process, and freedom, are not terms it can accept. Each day, Iran sends unmistakable messages

to the world that it is not willing to embrace the mores of reasonable society. Each day, Iran continues to threaten its neighbors and pursue the development of weapons of mass destruction.

We have heard these messages loud and clear. And we should react accordingly. This is not the time to make concessions to Iran. This is not the time to open up our markets to Iran, to allow the government to fill its coffers with dollars from the sale of Iranian goods to the United States. This is not the time to give Iran one iota of legitimacy in the international community. Legitimacy must be earned, and Iran has earned nothing.

I urge my colleagues strongly to support the Weiner amendment, which would deny funding for the importation of agricultural products from Iran. We owe this to ourselves, as the premiere defenders of democracy throughout the world. And we owe it to the Iran 13, the independent journalists, the human rights lawyers, and all the people of Iran who are still not free.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to join with my colleagues to condemn Iran for the arrest, imprisonment and current trial of thirteen Iranian Jews on charges of spying for Israel and the United States. These thirteen rabbis, teachers, students and other citizens were arbitrarily arrested in March of last year and held for seventy days without any charges filed against them. In June of 1999, Iran charged them with spying for Israel and the United States.

Finally, in April of this year, the trial of these thirteen Jews began. However, what is currently taking place in Iran is not what any American would recognize as a trial. The judge is acting not only as the judge but also as the prosecutor. The accused were not allowed access to any attorney, court-appointed or otherwise, until just hours before their trial started. Finally, access to the courtroom has been denied to the press, human rights workers and most importantly, to the families of the accused.

The Iranian government has a long history of mistreatment of several of its minorities including the Baha'is, Sunni Muslims, Christians and Jews. More than half the Jews in Iran have fled the country since the Islamic Revolution in 1979, due to the intense religious persecution. Numerous written and unwritten laws exist in Iran limiting the activities of all minorities. Forbidding Iranians to visit Israel and denying the Baha'is access to higher education, government employment and pensions are just two examples of the discrimination which is commonplace throughout Iran.

I am extremely concerned that the Iranian government is treating the thirteen Jews currently being tried with the same disregard for human rights and due process that it has treated so many minorities in the past. Our administration and the international community must do all it can to see that this does not continue. The time for Iran to begin to live up to the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, including religious freedom, has come.

I commend the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) for the leadership he has taken on this issue and the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) for his amendment to the Agriculture Appropriations Bill today. The U.S. government should not be lifting any restrictions on trade with Iran until these men are

free, and Iran shows the international arena that it is serious about living under that rule of law and respecting basic human rights. I hope and pray that soon we can celebrate the release of these thirteen individuals.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In the current fiscal year, the agency is authorized to collect fees to cover the total costs of providing technical assistance, goods, or services requested by States, other political subdivisions, domestic and international organizations, foreign governments, or individuals, provided that such fees are structured such that any entity's liability for such fees is reasonably based on the technical assistance, goods, or services provided to the entity by the agency, and such fees shall be credited to this account, to remain available until expended, without further appropriation, for providing such assistance, goods, or services.

Of the total amount available under this heading in the current fiscal year, \$87,000,000 shall be derived from user fees deposited in the Agricultural Quarantine Inspection User Fee Account.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word for purposes of entering into a colloquy with the distinguished chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee, as well as the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BLAGOJEVICH).

Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin by praising the leadership and bipartisan spirit brought to this subcommittee by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN). His work in promoting the needs of agriculture, forestry, and domestic nutrition programs will be long hailed in this Chamber and throughout our Nation well into the future.

As the Chairman and ranking member know, the Asian Longhorned Beetle has done tremendous damage to trees and parkland areas throughout both New York City and the Chicago metropolitan areas. In my congressional district, which is comprised of a diverse swath of middle- and working-class neighborhoods in Queens and the Bronx, New York, many of the few trees we do enjoy have either fallen victim to or remain seriously threatened by the Asian Longhorned Beetle.

Specifically, the neighborhood of Ridgewood, Queens, in my congressional district has seen a virtual destruction of many of their trees, very treasured trees, from this unwelcome pest. Therefore, it is of great concern to my constituents that the adequate resources are allocated for the elimination of this invasive species before it strips our entire city bare of its trees and greenery.

Last year, this subcommittee, under the leadership of the chairman, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), and ranking member, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), provided both a direct appropriation to the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, otherwise known as

APHIS, to combat the Asian Longhorned Beetle, as well as language granting the Secretary of Agriculture the authority to use Commodity Credit Corporation emergency funds and Emerging Plant Pest funds to address this issue.

These funds serve as an important investment in my congressional district, and I am extremely grateful that the subcommittee has again included similar language in this bill regarding CCC and Emerging Plant Pest funds for New York City.

Having stated that, I would like to request the assistance of the chairman and the ranking member in conference to work for an increase in direct funding for APHIS for its Asian Longhorned Beetle project so that they may continue their efforts in working to rid America of this destructive invasive species.

Additionally, I have grave concerns about the pace at which the Office of Management and Budget is releasing these emergency CCC funds for invasive species emergencies throughout the United States when the Secretary has already requested them. I recognize and appreciate the fact that the House report accompanying this measure addresses this problem. I am hopeful that working with both the Senate and the administration we will be able to rectify the situation.

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

Mr. CROWLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BLAGOJEVICH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I want to commend the gentleman on his leadership. New York and Chicago have a great deal of things in common. Unfortunately, this is another thing that New York City and Chicago have in common.

Chicago, Mr. Chairman, is a great city. We have great trees, we have great parks; and the last time I checked, we still had Sammy Sosa. But 2 years ago in Chicago, residents of the Ravenswood community, in my congressional district, discovered that the trees in their neighborhood had fallen pry not to the New York Yankees but to the Asian Longhorned Beetle.

This Asian Longhorned Beetle, Mr. Chairman, is a pest which destroys trees by burrowing into their trunks. Within weeks many of the trees which had shaded neighborhoods for years had to be removed to stop the spread of the Asian Longhorned Beetle.

The Asian Longhorned Beetles are not natives to the United States. They are stowaways who came here in packing crates from Asia. These beetles infest our trees by burrowing inside and hatching larvae. This destroys the tree's structure from inside out. And once the tree is infected, Mr. Chairman, there is no way to save it except that it must be destroyed in order to prevent it from infecting other trees.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN)

to recognize that the Congress has in the past provided funding to contain the Asian Longhorned Beetle, and I would hope that the chairman's leadership can secure funding again this time around.

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

Mr. CROWLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Illinois for their comments and would like to take a moment to recognize them for their work on behalf of their constituents to address the problem of the Asian Longhorned Beetle and work for its eradication. That is why the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) and I have included language, both this year and last year, stating the destructive nature of the Asian Longhorned Beetle, as well as directing the Secretary to use CCC emergency and Emerging Plant Pest funds to address this situation.

I will make my best effort in conference for the inclusion of additional resources for the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, known as APHIS, as they have done good work in addressing not only the problem of the Asian Longhorned Beetles but with a variety of other invasive species as well.

Additionally, I will work for increased resources to assist the Asian Longhorned Beetles project at APHIS. I recognize that if left unchecked the destruction of our Nation's trees, parks, and forests by the Asian Longhorned Beetle could cost tens of billions of dollars. Furthermore, I will continue the work the committee began to seek redress in the procedures used by the Office of Management and Budget in releasing emergency CCC funds requested by the Secretary.

Again, I thank the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Illinois for their comments.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and want to continue a bit on this colloquy on the Asian Longhorned Beetle.

I, too, would like to join with the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), and state that I will work in conference for increased funding for the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service so it has the resources to effectively battle such invasive species as the Asian Longhorned Beetle, the citrus canker, and the Glassy-Winged Sharpshooter, among others.

And I want to say to our colleagues, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BLAGOJEVICH), that we know what leadership they have taken here in the Congress in bringing our attention to the problems that their home communities are facing. I hear that in New York City this week there have been additional sightings of the beetles near Central Park. And having traveled

to New York and Chicago, I can only imagine your park directors and what they are going through, because we have no known predator for this creature. The only solution we have is to basically cut down the trees and burn them.

Of course, we know that these creatures came in in packing crates from China, both in the wood and in the cardboard inside, unfortunately; and we are now trying to take more precautions to fumigate those crates when they come in here, but this is a very, very serious problem. And because there is no known predator, adjacent States that have agricultural production, for example in maple sugar and maple syrup, those forests are threatened, those groves and stands of trees are threatened by this very same insect.

So we hear the concerns of both the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BLAGOJEVICH), and we will absolutely be bringing this to the attention of the conferees.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, the one thing I would like to say, and the gentleman just made reference to it, I would like to put in people's minds the picture of Central Park. It is one of the treasures of not only New York City, New York State, but really of this country. It is probably one of the most famous parks in all the world. Imagine what it would look like without any hard wood trees. Unimaginable.

□ 1415

But the threat does exist and it is there.

I want to thank the gentlewoman and the gentleman for their work and I want to thank them in advance for their efforts very, very much.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, we thank both the gentlemen for coming down and leading the entire Congress and country in trying to resolve a problem that may have started in their community but is spreading just as the gypsy moth did many, many years ago.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington) assumed the Chair.

#### FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4762. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require 527 organizations to disclose their political activities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

#### AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MS. KAPTUR

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 14 offered by Ms. KAPTUR:

Page 21, after line 4, insert the following new paragraph:

For an additional amount to prevent, control, and eradicate pests and plant and animal diseases, \$53,100,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount under this paragraph shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided further*, That the entire amount under this paragraph is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, the amendment we are proposing today would provide an additional \$53.1 million in emergency appropriations to the Department of Agriculture's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service to deal with emergency situations we have been talking about today dealing with pests and diseases.

The additional amounts would bring total funding up to what the President's 2001 budget request had asked for in four critical lines within what we call APHIS, the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, budget. These include emerging plant pests, invasive species, fruitfly exclusion and detection, and the contingency fund itself.

The bill, as reported by the subcommittee, provides \$57.1 million less than requested for the first items listed and very partially offsets this shortfall by providing \$4 million more than requested for the contingency fund. Our amendment eliminates the \$53.1 million shortfall in this very, very important account.

Now, these budget items are used by the Department of Agriculture to combat serious outbreaks of pests and diseases. People should think about their communities and some of the little green and yellow boxes that are put up on trees to detect what is happening across this country. We have just heard from two very distinguished Members from Illinois and from New York on the Asian longhorned beetle infestation