



FOCUS - 15 of 18 DOCUMENTS

Congressional Record -- House

Monday, October 7, 1985

99th Cong. 1st Sess.

131 Cong Rec H 8297

REFERENCE: Vol. 131 No. 131

TITLE: FOOD SECURITY ACT OF 1985

SPEAKER: Mr. ALEXANDER; Mr. BADHAM; Mr. BEDELL; Mr. BENNETT; Mr. BEREUTER; Mr. BROWN of California; Mr. CHAIRMAN; Mr. COELHO; Mr. COMBEST; Mr. CONTE; Mr. CONYERS; Mr. DANNEMEYER; Mr. DASCHLE; Mr. de la GARZA; Mr. DINGELL; Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota; Mr. EMERSON; Mr. FAUNTROY; Mr. FAZIO; Mr. FRANK; Mr. FUSTER; Mr. GILMAN; Mr. GINGRICH; Mr. GLICKMAN; Mr. HAWKINS; Mr. JEFFORDS; Mr. JONES of Oklahoma; Mr. JONES of Tennessee; Mr. LELAND; Mr. LOTT; Mr. MADIGAN; Mr. MITCHELL; Mr. MORRISON of Washington; Mr. PANETTA; Mr. RAHALL; Mr. REID; Mr. RINALDO; Mr. ROBERTS; Mrs. ROUKEMA; Mr. ROYBAL; Mr. SKELTON; Mr. SMITH of Iowa; Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska; Ms. SNOWE; Mr. STRANG; Mr. TAUKE; Mr. THOMAS of Georgia; Mr. TRAXLER; Mr. WAXMAN

TEXT: Text that appears in UPPER CASE identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the House on the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 267 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2100.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2100) to extend and revise agricultural price support and related programs, to provide for agricultural export, resource conservation, farm credit, and agricultural research and related programs, to continue food assistance to low-income persons, to ensure consumers an abundance of food and fiber at reasonable prices, and for other purposes, with Mr. Bonior of Michigan in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, October 3, 1985, title XV was open for amendment at any point on which debate had been limited to 1 hour, equally divided between proponents and opponents.

Fifty-two and one-half minutes of debate remain on title XV; 29 minutes for the proponents, and 23 1/2 minutes for the opponents. Pending was an amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Emerson] and an amendment

to the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. Roukema].

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. Panetta].

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make an inquiry with regard to the time allotment. As I understand it, an hour has been assigned for this particular section of the farm bill. The question that I have is whether that time has been divided equally between the minority gentleman, Mr. Emerson, and myself, to control that time, or what is the approach taken with regards to that hour?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would state that the time has not been divided equally yet between Mr. Emerson and Mr. Panetta. But the Chair could so do.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I would then ask unanimous consent that the hour, excluding obviously the time that has already been used by the gentleman from Missouri, that that time remaining be equally divided between the minority gentleman, Mr. Emerson, the ranking minority member on the subcommittee, and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Emerson] will be recognized for 23 1/2 minutes and the gentleman from California [Mr. Panetta] will be recognized for 29 minutes.

As the Chair recalls, the last amendment that was read was the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. Roukema], and at this point she should be recognized.

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Chairman, did I understand the Chair to state that the gentlewoman from New Jersey would receive her time?

The CHAIRMAN. Since we have divided the time between Mr. Panetta and Mr. Emerson, she should get her time from Mr. Emerson.

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that because my concern is that I offered her that her time would be protected and that I would see to it that today she would have her time available. If that can be coordinated within the time yielded, then I would appreciate it in order that we might carry out our commitment to her when we last adjourned.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, we have an hour equally divided between the chairman and myself, but does not someone who has an amendment get 5 minutes on their own, separate and apart from the hour that we have?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment by the gentlewoman from New Jersey was not printed in the Record, and is an

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

amendment to the Emerson amendment. Now that all the time on title XV has been allocated equally, her time should come from the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. Roukema].

Mrs. ROUKEMA. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment has been read, and I would simply like to say that the amendment, as a point of clarification, is an amendment to the gentleman's amendment, and it retains the provisions in the committee bill to assist low-income elderly and disabled participants who have high medical expenses.

It is my understanding that the gentleman from Missouri has accepted the amendment.

I yield to the gentleman from his response.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I accept the gentlewoman's amendment.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to the gentleman's amendment. This amendment retains the provisions in the committee bill to assist low-income elderly and disabled participants who have high medical expenses.

As the ranking Republican on the Hunger Committee, I have studied the issue of elderly participation in the Food Stamp Program. Elderly poor with high medical expenses do not receive as high a benefit level as they need because the medical deduction threshold is too high. The poor disabled have the same problem. My amendment would provide higher benefits to approximately 130,000 elderly and disabled households per month at minimal cost to the Federal Government.

Most people do not realize that the Food Stamp Program is the country's largest elderly nutrition program. Every day, millions of older Americans rely on food stamps to pay their grocery bills. About 20 percent of all food stamp households have one elderly member. The program is also important in a similar manner for the disabled.

My amendment will assist low-income elderly or disabled citizens by lowering the medical deduction threshold used to determine food stamp benefits. Currently, an elderly or disabled household must spend at least \$35 per month on medical needs before this cost is deducted for the purpose of determining food stamp benefits. My amendment would lower this threshold for these households from \$35 a month to the lesser of 5 percent of gross income or \$35 per month.

Because the average income of an elderly household is currently about \$360 a month, the \$35 threshold constitutes almost 10 percent of its income. Since many households have incomes far below the average, this \$35 threshold works as a particular hardship on them. In addition, you should understand that this change will bring the Food Stamp Program more into line with the Federal Income Tax Code in terms of determining eligibility for a medical hardship deduction.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment which will be beneficial to many elderly and disabled households.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. Roukema] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Emerson].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

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

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Emerson amendment, as amended. I rise because I believe this is a key test amendment for the House of Representatives on the hunger issue in this session of Congress.

It is a test of whether we indeed recognize or hide from the facts about hunger. It is a test about whether we intend to only speak about the problem of hunger in our society or whether we intend to do something about it. It is a test of whether we stand by the commitment that the House of Representatives made last year in adopting H.R. 5151, the Hunger Relief Act, by a margin of 364 to 39.

The principal provisions of H.R. 5151 are contained in this section of the farm bill. These are the provisions that the Emerson amendment seeks to strike out. I would urge all Members to look at the facts regarding this amendment and its impact.

First of all, let me make clear to the Members that the provisions of this bill relating to nutrition are within the budget resolution adopted by the Congress -- adopted by the House, adopted by the Senate, and put into effect by this Congress. Indeed, Chairman Gray has made clear that the food stamp authorizations contained in this bill are fully consistent with the 1986 budget resolution adopted by the Congress.

As a former member of the Budget Committee, I recognized that in order to provide for needed authorizations to address the hunger problem in our society it was important to account for these programs in the budget resolution. That was the battle we fought on the House side. It was fought in conference between House and Senate conferees on the budget, and was ultimately adopted by the conference and included in the fiscal 1986 budget resolution. This resolution was adopted on the basis that we can indeed justify the minimal restorations included in H.R. 2100 when it comes to a program that impacts on hunger.

Make no mistake about it, the food stamp program has received more than its share of cuts over the last 4 years. This program was cut almost \$2 billion in each year for 4 years as a result of the 1981 reconciliation proposal. What we seek to accomplish here comprises only a minimum restoration, somewhere in the vicinity of \$400 million in fiscal 1986 for nutrition programs, and indeed even our proposal falls below that figure per year.

As I said, the budget resolution adopted by the House and the Senate allows for the provisions incorporated in H.R. 2100.

Second, this amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri has been portrayed as one that does not undercut current services. That is simply not so. Adopting this amendment will cut benefits by \$550 million over 4 years; it will cut benefits that flow to job-training programs, benefits that help poor families confronting the tough decision of heating or eating, and benefits for nutrition assistance program recipients in Puerto Rico. Make no mistake about it, this amendment does not maintain current services; it cuts domestic food assistance programs below current services by almost \$550 million.

The amendment would also eliminate a key provision of H.R. 2100 that provides for a thrifty food plan that keeps pace with food prices, by adding 2 to 3 cents to the cost of the average food stamp meal now totaling a meager 42 cents. The amendment would also eliminate a provision that helps the working poor, by increasing the income deduction from 18 to 20 percent of earnings. The amendment deletes a provision that helps working mothers by providing a child care deduction. If we are concerned about employment, the provisions of H.R. 2100 are essential to keep people working while providing some minimum benefits.

The amendment also removes adjustments in the assets limitations for the unemployed, and eliminates modest increases in the shelter deduction for the elderly and for many others who face the dilemma of heating or eating.

The facts about hunger are clear to everyone in this House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. Panetta] has expired.

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the facts on hunger, I think, are clear to everyone. I believe there is no one in this House who does not understand the full impact of the hunger issue in our society. We have conducted some 16 hearings in the subcommittee. Witness after witness in hearing after hearing confirms the fact that hunger is a problem that is on the increase in our society, doubling and tripling the services provided by soup kitchens and food pantries in recent years. The increase of hunger has been confirmed by the Conference on Mayors, it has been confirmed by the Governors Association, and it has been confirmed by the President's 1984 Task Force on Food Assistance.

The 1984 task force was established by the President to look for solutions to the hunger problem. And what did they recommend? They said that current food assistance are not enough; they said we need to provide additional benefits to the hungry in this country. It is important to note that many of the task force's recommendations have been incorporated in this legislation.

Let us look at the facts. What we are seeing today is increasing infant mortality, particularly in the first 12 months of life. We are seeing increasing symptoms of anemia time and time again, reflecting the fact that nutrition benefits are not reaching our children. One out of every four children in this country currently lives in poverty, and that is having a tremendous impact on our future.

These facts warrant taking some action. I recognize that it is nice to talk about the hunger problem. We hold concerts to bring attention to the hunger problem, we have a Select Committee on Hunger, and we declare days of fast and abstinence to deal with the hunger issue. And all of those are good. I do not want to undercut the sincerity of all who are interested in pushing forward those particular ways to show a proper concern about hunger. But it does not help the people who are hungry. This is the legislation that helps people who are hungry, and if we are seriously concerned about that problem, now is the time to provide assistance.

Last year, we made that commitment. The Members who voted for the 1984 Hunger Relief Act in the 98th Congress made a statement, and that statement was overwhelming. By a vote of 364 to 39 we said that we would adopt basic provisions to our domestic food assistance to help solve the hunger problem in our society. Since then, no legislation has been enacted into law. Nothing has changed. Only the problems has grown worse, if anything.

I ask Members to remember the commitment that was made last year, and request, at the very least, that we make the commitment again this year by adopting these provisions. We are talking about helping the poorest of the poor. If we are concerned at all about safety net issues, that is good reason to support food stamps. I ask Members to recognize that 95 percent of those receiving food stamps live below the poverty line and receive 98 percent of the benefits. These benefits serve the poorest of the poor.

The food assistance provisions of H.R. 2100 are not going to solve hunger in our society. They are not going to relieve the problem that still face millions of Americans in our society. If you vote for these provisions, it is not likely that you are going to receive recognition from a lobbyist or in the form of a campaign contribution, but at the very least voting for these provisions will provide a few cents to those who are hungry in our society.

So, Mr. Chairman, it is out of that sense of compassion that I ask the House to reject this amendment and to stand by the provisions contained in the bill.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague, the gentleman from California, yield?

Mr. PANETTA. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for his excellent statement.

One of the provisions that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Emerson] speaks to is the

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

thrifty food plan which is in the committee bill, and this is one of the things that allows people who are needy a more recent computation of food costs for the purposes of buying their food stamps. That is one of the things that strikes me as being at the heart of the amendments that the gentleman has brought before us today, that is, to give people an opportunity to value their food that they are buying with food stamps at as close to today's food prices as possible, rather than several months ago, which is where we go back to if the Emerson amendment is adopted.

Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct. The gentleman is a member of the subcommittee and has followed this issue closely.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. Panetta] has expired.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Glickman].

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, to explain further, what we tried to do is we retain the cost-of-living increase provided with the thrifty food plan, but the problem is that the present cost-of-living index is somewhere between 3 and 15 months behind. It is not that we are increasing the cost-of-living index; what we are trying to do is update it so that it does reflect what the cost of food is in a judicious and reflective way.

So this formula change would provide that update, and it would provide at a minimum something around 2 cents per person per meal in addition to what is currently being provided. Let me make it clear that if the cost of food goes down and if the thrifty food plan goes down, then the benefits go down. We have not changed that trigger in any way.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. Panetta], says that my amendment makes significant cutbacks in food stamp benefits, and he cites two examples -- energy assistance and the Job Training Program. What the gentleman fails to state is that my amendment does not make any reference to these two provisions. The cutbacks the gentleman from California mentions are in the committee bill. They are his provisions, not mine.

In addition, the gentleman from California talks about over \$500 million in cutbacks as a result of my amendment. Any savings attributed to my amendment result from paper savings due to the manipulation of the Puerto Rico grant. My amendment continues the current law of providing \$825 million for Puerto Rico for food assistance -- more than for any State except New York.

Yet this is described as a savings of over \$500 million by 1990.

The committee bill adds \$370 million for Puerto Rico, and yet this is described as a savings of \$208 million.

Now this is not a freeze amendment. Benefits and deductions increase according to current law. The thrifty food plan for a family of four is now set at \$264 a month. The Emerson amendment does not change the COLA which will allow an increase up to \$295 a month by 1988, which is a 12-percent increase in benefits.

The standard deduction will increase from \$95 a month to \$107 a month, or another 12-percent increase.

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

The shelter dependent care deduction will rise from \$134 a month to \$152 a month, or by over 13 percent.

So this is not a freeze amendment.

The committee bill increases deductions and benefits over and above the cost-of-living adjustments. The deduction for shelter dependent care is separated creating two deductions and the shelter deduction continues to rise.

The committee bill provides for an increase from the present level of \$134 a month to \$328 a month by 1988 for shelter and dependent care deductions. This is almost a 150-percent increase.

You have heard that these increases in food stamp spending are accommodated in the budget resolution. However, this is only half the story. Increases were accommodated only if the deficit was not increased. This was the agreement reached in the conference of the 1986 budget. The only reductions in spending in H.R. 2100 are for farm programs. Over \$7 billion over a 3-year period was saved from farm programs. Are we in fact reducing farm income so that we can increase food stamp spending over and above the cost-of-living adjustment?

You have heard some Members say that my amendment cuts benefits. It does not. It simply does not. I eliminate additional spending. That is what we are doing.

The committee bill does provide for some savings in the Food Stamp Program. Remember it is the committee bill that saves money in some few areas and not this particular amendment.

This bill before us today is not H.R. 5151 that passed last year. It is significantly different. There was no permanent change to the thrifty food plan in H.R. 5151. There is one in H.R. 2100 at a cost of almost \$500 million by 1988. The shelter dependent care deduction was not separated in H.R. 5151, and was allowed to more than double.

In H.R. 2100 there is almost a 150-percent increase in these deductions.

H.R. 5151 did contain a provision to require States to repay misspent Federal money over and above the 5-percent error rate tolerance level. This provision saved \$205 million by 1988. Now this is missing from H.R. 2100.

Over 8 percent of the food stamp funds are spent in error. Over 8 percent of the food stamp funds are spent in error at a loss to the Federal Government of over \$900 million a year. Only one State has ever repaid any money to the Federal Government.

The real cost of H.R. 2100 is masked. In reality, the committee bill will cost almost \$600 million more than is described in the committee report. Puerto Rico is provided an additional \$370 million, and yet the committee report shows this is a savings of \$208 million.

You have also heard that the President's task force recommendation was cited as a basis for the committee bill. However, there are some important missing pieces. Where is the task force recommendation to allow States to have the option of running a State-designated Food Stamp Program? It is not in H.R. 2100. Where is the task force recommendation to require States to repay the value of benefits issued in error in excess of 5 percent? It is not in H.R. 2100. Where is the task force recommendation to cash out food stamps for elderly and disabled participants? H.R. 2100 allows this for Puerto Rico, but for nowhere else. That task force recommendation is not in H.R. 2100.

The true costs of the food stamp expansion in H.R. 2100 are masked. In reality, Puerto Rico is provided additional money over and above the \$825 million included in the Food Stamp Act. An additional \$370 million over the life of the bill is provided, and yet this is counted as a savings.

Look at the bill. Section 1527, the money going to Puerto Rico is increased by \$37 million in 1987 up to \$149 million in 1990. That is almost \$600 million more over the life of the bill that is described, \$600 million more.

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California, the chairman of the Select Committee on Aging [Mr. Roybal].

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

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by Mr. Emerson deleting provisions from the food stamp portion of H.R. 2100. The Emerson amendment, even as amended by Roukema, would threaten the basic nutritional needs of hundreds of thousands of low-income older Americans throughout the country.

Presently, nearly 6 million older Americans -- or 23 percent of those over age 65 -- have incomes below 125 percent of the poverty standard. For many of these poor, ill, or isolated individuals, geriatric malnutrition has been found to be a severe problem. National surveys by the Human Nutrition Center on Aging have found that close to 50 percent of elderly Americans consume insufficient levels of calories, vitamins, and nutrients. What is more, much evidence has been accumulated showing a strong link between weakened disease resistance and poor nutrition.

Over 1 1/2 million households with a member aged 60 or older participate in the Food Stamp Program. Yet, only half of those elderly persons who are eligible for food stamps actually receive them.

Information provided to the Select Committee on Aging indicates that many older persons mistakenly do not believe they are eligible for the program, or simply do not understand the procedures for receiving this assistance. The amendment offered by Mr. Emerson even as amended by Roukema would compound this serious problem by deleting the provision which allows States to provide public information to elderly, disabled, or unemployed individuals who are potentially eligible for food stamps.

Another provision freezes the assets limitation, which has not been updated since the first time national standards were set in 1971, thereby excluding many truly needy persons from the program. This action would also prohibit single elderly persons from maintaining a minimal reserve of resources for burial.

Other provisions prevent benefits from remaining current with actual food prices, prohibit recipients from receiving the USDA's minimal nutritional diet, freeze the excess shelter deduction, reduce assistance for those on low-income energy assistance, reduce benefits for participants in the Job Training Partnership Act, and freeze for 5 years the nutrition block grant for Puerto Rico. Cumulatively, these changes would force hundreds of thousands of frail and low-income older Americans to choose between essential food, shelter, medicine, and heating needs.

Mr. Chairman, the impact of these provisions on low-income Americans is substantial. By lessening the availability and accessibility of basic nutritional assistance to older Americans and other needy individuals, we would be threatening their very health and well-being. I strongly urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 1/2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. Roukema], the ranking member of the Select Committee on Hunger and a member of the Education and Labor Committee, which has extensive nutrition jurisdiction of its own.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Missouri, the author of this amendment, and I rise in support of it.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to stress, first of all, that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Emerson] has made the case, not only forcibly, but with great clarity that this bill is not H.R. 5151, on which we voted last summer. It has significant differences.

I should also like to stress at the beginning that my amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

[Mr. Emerson] removes the limitation on assistance for low-income elderly and disabled in the medical expense area, so we can put that one aside; but I would also like to say to the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California, who asked the question in his presentation, at least two questions. What is different here than when we discussed the issue of H.R. 5151? Well, there are a number of things that are different, but in the brief time that I have left to me, I would like to make two points. One is that I, as the ranking member of the Select Committee on Hunger, would not now or ever suggest that we withdraw our commitment to food spending for the poor, and I want to stress that this bill does not withdraw our present commitment. It does not in any way reduce current spending levels. In fact, it does allow for the cost of living indexing, both in food stamps as well as in shelter and in dependent care, but it maintains our present commitment.

It does, in fact, do exactly what some moderate Republicans had suggested in the 92 Group budget, which was to maintain current services with the cost of living increase, so we are not withdrawing a commitment; but, Mr. Chairman, I think it must also be recognized that now we are speaking in the climate of a deficit crisis. Indeed, the airwaves and the print media were filled this weekend with the thought that we might have to adopt some extraordinary measures for a 5-year plan to reduce the budget deficit.

So I say, no, we should not withdraw one dime of our commitment to the poor and their food needs, nor is this the time to increase significantly, as the committee bill does, spending in this particular area.

Because the facts are, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Emerson] has laid out, this is a costly additional program. In fact, the USDA estimates that if this indexing proposal to the 100-percent thrifty food plan were applied over the past 3 years, there would have been costs overpaid by \$381 million in 1982, \$307 million in 1983, and \$119 million in 1984.

So the point is that shifting to this kind of an indexing, as proposed by the committee, would have in fact resulted in cost overruns, if you will, above and beyond the cost of inflation.

So I would conclude by stating very graphically that the budget deficit crisis has gotten to this extent, that right now, this year, we are paying \$155 billion in interest on the debt alone -- \$155 billion in interest on the debt alone, and that interest has not provided a dollar's worth of food stamp money nor a meal for a needy child.

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

Mrs. ROUKEMA. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

That has been taken into consideration in terms of the budget resolution. The budget resolution allows for exactly what is incorporated in here, and if the gentlewoman voted for the budget resolution, she essentially was voting to in fact provide this additional amount for nutrition.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. The fact is, I did not vote for the budget resolution because I felt that the numbers were fictitious, that the estimates were not real and that it was not a genuine step in the direction of a downpayment on the deficit.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 1/2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Leland], the chairman of the Select Committee on Hunger.

Mr. LELAND. Mr. Chairman, let me first commend my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. Panetta] for his outstanding leadership in this matter.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of titles XV and XVI as they are intact and in opposition, for sure, to the Emerson

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

amendment. I support the domestic food programs of H.R. 2100. I intend to support these provisions with all my heart and everything that I have got.

The Select Committee on Hunger, which I chair, has been investigating the adequacy and availability of existing food services in both urban and rural parts of the community throughout this country. At each of our hearings we have received testimony indicating that current services are inadequate. We have been told over and over again of families who are repeatedly forced to do without food because their benefits do not last through the months.

We hear horror stories about how some of our senior citizens have to sell their food stamps in order that they can pay their rent or pay their utilities, horror stories like this from poor people who cannot afford the sacrifice because of the so-called fiscal conservatism that we hear rampant throughout this Congress.

A few months ago we received poverty statistics from the Census Bureau which reported that 14.4 percent of the American population lives in poverty. That is about 35 million people in this country. We know there is a definite link between poverty and hunger and these census figures confirm that a consistently high number of low-income Americans remain vulnerable to hunger. In a country like ours, we cannot afford to not feed people, we cannot afford to cut programs.

In fact, we need more. I would like to come here and advocate more food stamps; but within the fiscal constraints of our budget that we have already dealt with, and I happened to vote against it, too, because we spend \$10 billion more for military expenditures than we did for human services, than we did trying to feed and house the poor of our Nation; little children that we have benefited in the Mississippi Delta that the gentlewoman from New Jersey and the gentleman from Missouri both visited with me, when we went to Mississippi and we saw those poor, desperate children. We saw them suffering.

We heard from doctors who said that there was rampant anemia, which is the first sign of hunger and malnutrition. We heard from the people in the programs saying that we just do not have enough food. We heard from the white poor senior citizen who said to us that she had to sacrifice certain things because she did not have enough food stamps to last her through the months.

Mr. Chairman, I envision a day when there is no more hunger in America, a day when no child or adult in the United States need face the prospect of going without food. This is not a fantasy for me. When I go home to my district, I see poor people. I live with them.

The infant mortality rate in the black community in this country is twice as high as it in the white community. Why is that? It is because we have a disproportionate number, a higher poverty rate in the black community. We do not have adequate food to feed those young potential mothers in the WIC program and in the food stamp program. These people are suffering.

Our children in the black and Hispanic and native American communities throughout this land and even the poor white communities are suffering from the ramifications of this hunger. Eventually their minds are affected and they become burdens on our society and we pay for them in billions of dollars in the future.

This amendment is not even cost effective. We might save a few million dollars here, but in the long term we are going to pay for it.

We have got to feed the hungry of this Nation and we cannot do it by claiming that we are going to save this amount of money because we are paying so much on our debt, so much interest on our debt.

This hurts me. I have an empathetic perspective on hunger. I grew up in a poor community. Now, I do not want to tell a good "old boy" story, but my people are suffering. People in Appalachia are suffering and we have got to do something about this.

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

We cannot afford to have this amendment pass. We have got to help our chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. Panetta] to save these titles. Too much fiscal concern is overshadowing the real human concerns that we ought to have for the people in our country.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

I want to first of all say to my dear friend, the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Select Committee on Hunger, that I do not disagree with anything the gentleman has said about the problems that need to be addressed; the problems of infant mortality and the other problems that the gentleman raises, I share his concern for them, but they are not going to be cured any more by what the gentleman from California [Mr. Panetta] has in the committee bill than they would be by my amendment.

More money for food stamps is not the answer or the cure for infant mortality and the other socioeconomic problems that the gentleman from Texas raises, and while I appreciate his impassioned plea, I do not think they really speak to the subject of my amendment.

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

Mr. EMERSON. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LELAND. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman understand that feeding pregnant women feeds the child that that pregnant woman is bearing and that in fact is the very essence of how we solve problem of low birth weight and eventually the problem of infant mortality?

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, if I may reclaim my time, indeed I do; but what I am saying is that the solution to that is not simply an increase in food stamps. It is a matter of education and a lot of other factors relating to nutrition that need to be addressed.

The gentleman and I have explored also in the Select Committee on Hunger the need for the one-stop shopping for people who are in need.

Mr. LELAND. But when they stop, then they cannot find the adequate food stamps that they have and it does not help at all, does it?

I understand the gentleman's concern for trying to streamline programs in the Government.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EMERSON. If I may reclaim my time, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to say, in consideration of my dear friend, the gentleman from Texas, and the point that he is making, but also the point that the gentleman from Missouri is making, of course, we are not solving the total problem of hunger here, but the two particular issues that the gentleman referred to, one in Mississippi and specifically the WIC Program, are not under this food stamp bill.

We most generously funded the WIC Program in reauthorization just within the last month. The problem of AFDC is as much a State problem in the particular situation. They are interrelated, of course, but they are not this gentleman's amendment.

Mr. LELAND. If the gentleman will yield further, I would just like to clarify my position on the issue.

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

When we went to Mississippi, the people talked about the need for more WIC funding and the need for more food stamp funding. They were talking about inadequate services to the little children in particular, if the gentlewoman will remember. I am not confused on the issue.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. For our colleagues, I want them to know that we are not talking about WIC and we are not talking about AFDC in the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Emerson]. We are talking about food stamps.

Mr. LELAND. We are talking about food stamps.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, if I may reclaim my time, let me say that my amendment does permit a COLA increase. We are, with my amendment, going to permit a full COLA increase in food stamps. My amendment does not cut anything. Nothing.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that point?

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

Mr. PANETTA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has said it over and over again, and it is simply not true. What he has done is selectively chosen between the pluses and the minuses in the legislation. He got rid of the pluses, he accepted the minuses, and what he has are cuts.

Mr. EMERSON. Let me say to the gentleman, they may be cuts from the budget adopted by the House but they are not cuts from the program. We have to keep our terminology straight here.

What we do not do is add the add-ons in my amendment. We do not cut. We just do not add the add-ons that are in the committee bill.

In response to the gentleman from California [Mr. Roybal] I want to say that the elderly are provided a maximum asset allowance of \$3,000. In addition to the \$3,000, the food stamp participants may, this is all included, keep their home and their property regardless of acreage, household goods, furniture, appliances, cash value of life insurance policies, pension funds, all cars used for producing income, and irrevocable trust funds.

This amendment does not cut. It is like the old argument going back to 1981 when they said we were cutting. We were not cutting anything. We were restraining the rate of growth and that is what my amendment does right here. We permit the COLA but we restrain the rate of growth.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EMERSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. I thank the gentleman from yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked the gentleman this question before since it was of concern to me.

Suppose the economy gets worse, I ask the gentleman from Missouri. What will happen to those additional people that will be in need, not presently on the food stamp rolls but who will be in need? Is it not correct under the gentleman's amendment that they will be entitled and included under his amendment?

Mr. EMERSON. That is absolutely correct. If you qualify, you qualify, and in that case which the gentlewoman suggests, I suppose the ultimate result would be that we would have to ask for a supplemental.

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Fazio] a member of the Select Committee on Hunger.

Mr. FAZIO. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to the Select Committee on Hunger, I also happen to serve on the Committee on the Budget and I want to begin my brief remarks by attesting to the fact that this was a clearly and fully debated issue in the conference that we had with the other body. In the adoption of the budget resolution, we clearly left this one domestic initiative contained in the House resolution, intact.

In concert with the Senate, we decided that the hunger problem that is so clearcut in our country needed to be attacked. It is understood that there would be a small increase in this year's domestic spending agenda for this purpose. In fact, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Emerson] would reduce below the current services baseline, and that is what I think he is referring to when he talks about COLA's, spending for food stamps over 5 years by \$543 million. We are not keeping pace here. We are cutting below the level required to keep on doing the same job -- moderate as it may be -- next year.

We are cutting below the level projected for 1986 by \$200 million. That is the total reduction in the Emerson amendment, a \$200 million reduction over the legislation that passed this floor overwhelmingly, authored by the gentleman from California [Mr. Panetta] and cosponsored by a broad, bipartisan consensus in this body. And these numbers are attested to by the Congressional Budget Office.

Why were we so much together on this issue? Because the data is clear. In Chicago, in Massachusetts, in Minnesota, not the poorest places in this country, studies show a clear increase in infant mortality, low birth weight children, tremendous health problems with cost implications for the taxpayers of this country in the years ahead. The gentleman from New York [Mr. Gilman] can make this point more clearly.

But I want everyone to understand that half of the people who get food stamps are children. We are currently finding that only 19.8 million people use food stamps when, in fact, there are 33.8 million Americans living in poverty. You can assume that half of the 14 million people who are eligible and not receiving food stamps today are children.

If we want to make a good investment in the future of our country, let alone in the future of the taxpayers who support it, we should begin by adopting the bill as adopted last year and again this year.

As a member of the Select Committee on Hunger and chairman of the Budget Task Force on Income Security, I have heard testimony from State and local health and welfare officials attesting to the growing numbers of American families whose daily diets are nutritionally deficient. Hunger in our country does exist and if we do not take steps to ensure that low-income families are provided with the means for adequate nutrition then hunger will persist in America.

The amendments proposed by the gentlemen from Missouri to maintain the Food Stamp Program under current law and to allow each State to operate its own food stamp program will drastically push back efforts to end hunger in this country. Food stamp eligibility determination would not be updated to reflect the real cost of living for the poor and many needy American families could be cut off the Food Stamp Program.

The President's Task Force on Food Assistance (1984) reported that:

The recessions of the past have resulted in an increase in the number of "new" poor families, many of whom are needy but have assets which disqualify them from eligibility to the food stamp program.

H.R. 2100 includes provisions recommended by the Task Force for providing food stamps to the new poor. The proposed amendment goes against the President's Task Force recommendations.

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

Millions of needy Americans are, under current law, unserved by the Food Stamp Program: Participants in the Food Stamp Program total 19.8 million, however, right now 33.7 million Americans are living in poverty.

If the Federal Government were to relinquish its national responsibility for the Food Stamp Program to the States -- the Emerson optional block grant proposal -- then those States unable to absorb the burden of the program due to unsteady economic conditions would be forced to reduce benefits and/or cut needy persons from the program.

Food is a basic human need. Access to adequate food should remain a right for every American. Any effort to reduce the Federal Government's commitment to this right would be an immoral catastrophe in our land of plenty.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for speakers at this time and would reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 1/2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Gilman], a member of the Select Committee on Hunger.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Emerson amendment and I commend the gentleman from California [Mr. Panetta] for his efforts in support of the Food Security Act.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Select Committee on Hunger, I have become acutely aware of the long-term consequences of hunger and malnutrition at home and abroad. I do not believe we can support a more worthy policy than assuring minimum nutrition to American families.

I am objecting to the Emerson amendment and urging my colleagues to vote against it for several reasons: First, the amendment eliminates the slight benefit increases adopted by the Agriculture Committee that will help the poor and unemployed feed their families. Second, the Emerson amendment would cut the Food Stamp Program below current services by approximately \$550 million in fiscal year 1990. Third, it would seriously affect poor children, single parents, the frail elderly, and other vulnerable groups by not recognizing extraordinary expenses for energy assistance, for child care, shelter, or burial savings in computing benefits against a meager budget.

The Agriculture Committee bill is modeled after the recommendations of the President's 1984 Task Force on Food Assistance and is similar to the Hunger Relief Act which passed with overwhelming bipartisan support in the House in 1984. The Emerson amendment deletes those provisions that was designed to ensure basic food benefits to keep pace with the costs of food in the next 4 years.

There is significant evidence that the problem of hunger in the United States is not new, nor is it diminishing. Health indicators such as infant mortality and low-birth weight are on the rise in rural America. Growth stunting among urban, poor children due to inadequate nutrition is also common today. The postneonatal death rate is on the upswing nationally for the first time in 20 years, and it is largely attributed to inadequate prenatal nutrition and care.

The overall affect of this vote will determine whether we make progress in combating hunger, malnutrition, and related health problems in our own Nation in the future. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to vote against gutting the antihunger effect of H.R. 2100 and to vote in opposition to the Emerson amendment.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute and 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Combest].

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. As I supported the amendment in committee, I will support the gentleman's amendment on the floor. I think it is important.

I do not look at defense spending or spending for farm programs or others in comparison with the Food Stamp Program. I do not feel we are taking money from the Food Stamp Program and giving it to the Defense Department or

any other agency. I think we have got to look at spending levels as they are and as they appear under each program.

This amendment does not call for a freeze at last year's level. It allows for cost-of-living adjustments. We are allowing for cost-of-living adjustments in other programs. It allows it to go up and it allows new increases of participants to come onboard.

I strongly support the amendment of the gentleman. I would have to look closely at it if it froze at last year's levels, but in fact, it does not. And I thank the gentleman again. I would like to reiterate the fact that it is not a freeze, it is not a cut, it is simply allowing the program to continue as was and not add those additional increases on.

I think while I did vote for the budget, there are many areas that under that budget resolution I may vote to cut the funding below that level. I do not believe we have got to limit it to that level, and if we can cut and save additional spending, I think we should do so. I do not believe we are cutting this program, or adding it to defense, or cutting this program and adding it to something else. I think we have to look at every potential program and to cut in the areas where we can. I think we can potentially make some changes here that will allow this program to still operate efficiently.

I appreciate the gentleman's amendment and will support it.

Mr. EMERSON. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 1/2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Mitchell].

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

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, of course. Everybody, everybody wants spending cut, and I want it cut, too. But I do not want it cut on the backs of those who are the least powerful in this Nation. It is just not decent, it is not right.

Today the U.S. Catholic bishops issued a statement trying to call the attention of this Nation to poverty in our midst. While I am glad they did that, I am somewhat ashamed that here in this House, where we should be representing all of the people, we did not take the initiative on this. We did not take the initiative in addressing poverty.

No, we took the initiative in banging it on the backs of the poor, those who are the poorest, the more powerless, those without a voice, time and time again in the budget process over the last 4 years, those who have suffered the most, not the military budget, not those favored programs of people, but you bang on the poor, and the alienated, and those in desperate straits in this country.

The other thing that annoys me so much is that we have the gift of glib words to try to cover over with words the real things that we are doing. This is a cut. Spell it out any other way you want to, it is a cut.

The argument has been raised that somehow or another all that we are doing is preventing some add-ons. Well, even if that were true, when the condition changes and the need arises, is it not the responsibility of this House to address that need?

No, let us just kill this amendment, for the Lord's sake. It is time to stop banging and flogging the poor of this Nation in the name of deficits. Let somebody else contribute to the deficit reduction.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

You know, it strikes me that we can call a duck a giraffe, but that does not make it one.

Now, all I hear is cut, cut, cut. This is not a cutting amendment. We do not permit the increase for Puerto Rico. We

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

stabilized the grant for Puerto Rico at a set amount per year over the next 5 years, and somehow that is construed as a savings of \$208 million.

But the fact of the matter is my amendment would permit a COLA, it would permit increases in the cost of deductions. We just do not add the add-ons. It is not cutting.

As I said earlier, it is like the argument back in 1981 when we were not cutting, we were restraining the rate of growth essentially, and that is what we are doing here.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. Jeffords].

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

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I know that it is well-intentioned and that it is offered in the hope of saving money.

I think it is important to realize what we are doing here. There were tradeoffs made, in this bill this year. Some things were cut which I did not exactly agree with in order to provide funds for other purposes.

What does this amendment do after those tradeoffs have been made? It takes the benefit side of the tradeoffs and eliminates them.

Depending on how you look at it, that may or may not be a cut in spending. If you make a deal in which you are going to give something, and take away something, and then you take away what you have given, it is not a very good deal. This is particularly true for those who are trying to see some improvements in the Food Stamp Program in this bill.

As already pointed out, this bill as reported by the committee is substantially the same as the Hunger Relief Act of 1984. Anybody, in this body concerned about consistency who would like to say what I voted for last year when it comes time to implement it, I did what I said I was going to do, should be very concerned about were they in favor of this amendment.

Also, it has been pointed out that there are a lot of confusing statistics being bounced around here. Let us take a look at a family of four, with income at the poverty level, average benefit, not the overall average benefit. There is a big difference. Let's take a look at what has happened to the average family. Such a family of four over the last 4 years has fallen behind relative to current services. In fact, the CBO says that this year we are about \$2 billion behind current services when compared to 1981.

Furthmore, the Physicians Task Force on Hunger did a recent study showing that up to 20 million Americans go hungry each month. This is an intolerable situation.

In H.R. 2100, we have authorized slight increases in the Food Stamp Program to help stem the rising tide of hunger. This bill makes adjustments in the thrifty food plan formula so that it better reflects the true cost of food for our neediest citizens. It authorizes the first increase in the overall asset limitation level since it was established in 1971 and provides greater incentives for food stamp recipients to work by returning the earned income deduction allowance to 20 percent. This bill also extends the authorization for pilot projects allowing seniors in several States, including Vermont, to continue cashing out their food stamps.

During the Agriculture Committee markup of this bill the committee joined with me to correct a longstanding inequity in the eligibility determination process. As you know, a high proportion of seniors living alone are below the poverty level. In 1982, 15 percent of all elderly were below the poverty level. Twenty-eight percent of the seniors living alone had incomes below the poverty level. Even higher proportions of elderly women and a majority, 66 percent, of

black women living alone were below the poverty level. In Vermont, over 70 percent of the elderly poor live alone or with unrelated individuals. Clearly the elderly living alone are in need of assistance.

In recognizing that seniors have special concerns and expenses, higher resource limitations for food stamp eligibility purposes have been established. In existing law, the asset limitation level for households with two or more members, one of whom is age 60 or over, is \$3,000. All other food stamp households have a far lower asset threshold. In other words, seniors living alone are currently ineligible for the higher elderly asset level. A very simple provision in H.R. 2100 corrects this inequity.

All in all, H.R. 2100 authorizes an additional \$155 million for the Food Stamp Program in 1986. There is no doubt in my mind that this increase is both necessary and fully justified. In my home State of Vermont I see families who must regularly tap the resources of emergency food shelves and soup kitchens because they are unable to feed their children during the final week of the month. A recent report released by the U.S. Conference of Mayors shows that the number of families and children requesting emergency food aid increased by over 35 percent in 1984. I have constituents who call my district offices, literally in tears, when they find that, due to a weekend or holiday at the end of the month, their stamps will arrive a day or two late. I am particularly concerned about seniors and disabled individuals, unable to leave their homes, that have little access to outside food resources once they have exhausted their food stamps. Living on the edge in this way has become all too commonplace across the country. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the important increases in food stamp benefits contained in this bill. Action is needed now to help mend the growing holes in this vital safety net program.

While I support this bill, there are problems that this legislation does not address. One area where I have a great deal of concern is in our current food stamp quality control system. As you know, in 1980 Congress established, and in 1982 stiffened, a quality control system that makes States financially liable for errors resulting in benefit overissuances. Starting this year, fiscal year 1985, States have a 5-percent target error rate. Errors in excess of 5 percent will result in fiscal sanctions that will take a hefty chunk out of many States' administrative budgets. In fact, if error rates for 1985 remain at 1983 levels, most recent data available, almost every State would be faced with a sanction. Even if error rates continue their downward trend as projected by both the CBO and USDA, States will still be assessed \$69.5 million for fiscal year 1984 and over \$198 million for fiscal year 1985.

There should be no complacency over errors in any Federal program and it is imperative that we continue to work to improve the administration of the Food Stamp Program. If our goal is indeed to improve quality however, imposing higher and higher fiscal sanctions at the same time that States are lowering their error rates just does not make sense. Shifting administrative costs from Federal to State coffers under the guise of quality control is at best irresponsible and at worst could actually jeopardize adequate administration of the Food Stamp Program in States that cannot afford to pick up this slack.

This is a problem that is not going to go away by itself. I believe that reforming our current quality control system should be a priority for the Agriculture Committee and the House as we continue to work on improving the Food Stamp Program.

As a final point, I strongly support the purposes outlined in the food stamp title of this legislation.

I would urge Members to carefully weigh this bill and to vote against this amendment. The bill as it stands is an attempt to balance the needs of people in urban areas as well as people in rural areas. If we adopt this amendment, we will unbalance this bill.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. Roukema].

Mrs. ROUKEMA. I thank my colleague. I just wanted to comment on the consistency aspect of this.

I do not view the issue the same as H.R. 5151, but I do know that when the 92 group of moderate Republicans

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

adopted their budget this year, this was the precise program for food stamps, current services plus an allowance for inflation. That is what the basis of the 92 group budget was.

So if we are looking for consistency, that is one area we should look at. It was very precise.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would state that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Emerson] has 4 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California [Mr. Panetta] has 2 1/2 minutes remaining.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The Chair would state to the gentleman from Missouri that the gentleman from California [Mr. Panetta] has the right to close the debate.

The EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I would say that the bill before us today simply is not H.R. 5151 that passed last year with my support. It is very significantly different.

There was no permanent change to the thrifty food plan in H.R. 5151. There is one in H.R. 2100 at a cost of almost \$500 million by 1988.

The shelter dependent care deduction was not separated in H.R. 5151 and allowed to more than double. In H.R. 2100, there is almost a 150-percent increase in these deductions.

So I would just repeat for emphasis that my amendment is not a cutting amendment. It just does not add the add-ons, and it is a responsible amendment that gives a full COLA for the cost of food as anticipated under the law, and a full COLA for allowable deductions.

It just does not add the add-ons, and I think Members ought to be critically aware of that fact. It is not, as it has been described, a cutting amendment at all.

I would go back to repeat that in the debate in the budget over Social Security, it was not, are we going to expand Social Security or are we going to have a COLA. It was, is there going to be a COLA or is there not going to be a COLA.

The debate here today is, is there going to be a COLA or is there going to be a vastly expanded food stamp program. I submit that we ought to vote for the Emerson amendment, permit the COLA and the deductions, but not expand the program at this critical time, considering the deficits that we face.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. de la Garza].

Mr. de la GARZA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully ask my colleagues, once again, to stay with the committee. I want to mention something very briefly about food stamps; that there is still some talk and some insinuation that somehow they are bad, that there is too much fraud and abuse. I want to categorically state to you that if any person receives food stamps that

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

he is not entitled to, only two things could have happened: The person did not tell the truth, or someone made a mistake. Otherwise, we have got the rules drawn so tight that no one can categorically state that they can abuse the program.

Second, we are getting bogged down too much with figures here, but I think I can simplify the numbers: Had it not been for the cuts of 1981 or the change in the legislation in 1981 and 1982, we would be at 100. But we are at 50. So we add on trying to get to about 80. The gentleman from Missouri says that the amendment does not cut. We are not cutting; but we are not at the 100 I spoke of. What the committee bill does is try to get up to the 80 and the amendment keeps us at the 50, COLA and everything. That is the gist of it.

The fact is also that we cannot legislate in a vacuum on this type of legislation. We made our cuts, nearly \$8 billion, in the committee. The whole bill saves a net of \$7.9 billion; but we balance spending and savings; we balance the bill. We add here on the food stamp, but cut in another area. Our bill is balanced. You cannot strike out solely at the poorest of the poor just because the committee added a little bit. It is true that we added, but we add to bring the program back up to 80, we did not try to go to the whole 100, to restore the program to 100 percent of pre-1981 levels. I wish that somehow we would not even need food stamps. This is the greatest country in the world. We should not be talking about feeding hungry people, but they are there, they are out there in my area, in rural America, and in your area, in the inner cities. That is where they are at. We should not say, "No," to them at this time.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield back the balance of his time?

Mr. EMERSON. No; I reserve my time, Mr. Chairman.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that this division of time relates to the entire title of the bill and there may be other amendments. Would my reservation of time apply to the other amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair stated a few minutes ago, the gentleman managing the bill on behalf of the committee has the right to close debate on the amendment.

Mr. EMERSON. I understand.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman's question that if he reserves the 2 minutes, he will have an additional 2 minutes on an amendment that may be forthcoming?

Mr. EMERSON. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. That is appropriate.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to close on this amendment, and I yield myself the remaining time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. Panetta] is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. PANETTA. Let me say very simply this program has taken its cuts; \$2 billion a year were cut from the program over 4 years. What we try to restore here is about 20 percent in terms of many restorations that were

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

recommended by the President's Commission on Hunger.

Let me also say that the people that we hurt will involve long-run costs in the future. If we do not provide adequate nutrition now, we will pay for it in increased Medicaid costs, in increased costs in terms of education.

Vote against this amendment. We need to invest in the future.

Mr. FUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to Congressman Bill Emerson's amendment to H.R. 2100 which would have a very detrimental and discriminatory effect on the needy American citizens of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico whom I represent in Congress. This amendment would, among other things, freeze for an additional 5 years the current funding level of the Nutritional Assistance Program of Puerto Rico [NAP], which was established in 1982 in lieu of food stamps and which has been frozen since then at a level that represented a cut of 25 percent of the amount Puerto Rico was getting under the National Food Stamp Program.

My opposition to the Emerson amendment stems from my concern that the growing erosion in actual buying power of the poor in Puerto Rico due to the accumulating effects of inflation over a 9-year period will have a very adverse and highly discriminatory impact upon my already very disadvantaged constituents.

Right now, the maximum nutrition assistance benefit to needy families in Puerto Rico is only 72 percent of what is paid to a food stamp family on the mainland, this in spite of the fact that Puerto Rico has substantially higher food costs, and despite the fact that needy families in Puerto Rico have substantially lower incomes and lower levels of other Federal assistance than comparable families on the mainland. The Emerson amendment would, in effect, result in a further, severe cutback of the food assistance benefits in Puerto Rico, since it would keep the 1982 cap through 1990, and deny us even a nominal increase to partially offset rising food costs.

According to CBO estimates, if the Puerto Rican program remains frozen indefinitely, as Mr. Emerson proposes, the overall benefit reduction for my needy constituents will reach about 40 percent by fiscal year 1990. In other words, two of every five food assistance dollars will have effectively disappeared in the Puerto Rican program if the Emerson amendment prevails. While the National Food Stamp program has been enjoying yearly increases to account for inflation, the Puerto Rican program has been suffering yearly reductions. There is a very large gap between what needy Puerto Ricans get in nutrition assistance and what their counterparts in the mainland get yet the Emerson amendment would keep that unfair gap growing. The poor in Puerto Rico get an increasingly inadequate amount of funds for food assistance and yet the Emerson amendment would further cut back the benefits they receive.

This is why the Agriculture Committee of the House, in providing for an update in NAP funding levels to partially reflect increased food costs, stated, and I read from its report on H.R. 2100 (Rept. 99-271, part 1)

The Committee believes that a continued freeze in authorized funds for the NAP would impose an inequitable burden on the poor in Puerto Rico. Without an increase to reflect changes in food prices, Puerto Rico would be forced to further reduce benefits and limit eligibility. In the view of the Committee, Puerto Rico has already borne significant reductions in its primary food assistance program. Any further cuts in spending authority could impair the nutritional status and long-term health of its population. The Committee thus supports nominal increases in the authorization ceiling for the Puerto Rico Nutrition Program to reflect changes in food prices.

Mr. Chairman, let me stress the multifaceted nature of our predicament: First, we begin with a lower level of nutrition assistance; second, then, in addition, we have had no indexing for inflation even though food prices go up every year in Puerto Rico just as they do in the mainland; third, our food costs are much higher in Puerto Rico than in the mainland, and further, the poor in Puerto Rico are in fact not only poorer than those in the mainland, but also have less access to other sources of help than those in the mainland. Currently, for example the maximum income allowed to a needy family to qualify for NAP is \$8,000 a year while a comparable mainland family may qualify for a higher food stamp benefit even with income as high as \$13,260 a year. Likewise, my constituents are either not eligible or else receive substantially less amounts of funds in Federal programs such as the Supplemental Security Income, AFDC,

Medicaid, and other programs that help the disadvantaged.

The bottom line, Mr. Chairman, is that poor American citizens who live in Puerto Rico are not only much worse off than those in the mainland, but also that the food assistance they get is grossly inadequate to meet their nutritional needs.

The nominal increase in funds authorized by the Agriculture Committee which Mr. Emerson opposes will help insure that the nutritional status and long-term health of the Puerto Rican needy will not be further impaired by more cuts in the actual buying power of their food assistance program. Its defeat will prevent that large gap which already exists between the needy in Puerto Rico and those on the mainland from further disproportionate widening.

I urge you to oppose Mr. Emerson's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Emerson], as amended.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were -- ayes 171, noes 238, not voting 25, as follows:

(See Roll No. 338 in the ROLL segment.)

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. McCandless for, with Mr. Barnes against.

Ms. MIKULSKI changed her vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. GROTBORG, DeLAY, NICHOLS, and VOLKMER changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment, as amended, was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JEFFORDS

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

The CHAIRMAN. Was the amendment printed in the Congressional Record of September 24?

Mr. JEFFORDS. The amendment was printed in the Record, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Jeffords: Page 388, beginning on line 7, strike out "Low Income Home Energy Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 8621 et seq.)," and insert in lieu thereof "Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

(42 U.S.C. 8621 et seq.) other than energy crisis intervention assistance provided under section 2604(a) of such Act,".

Page 390, beginning on line 1, strike out "Low Income Home Energy Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 8621 et seq.)" and insert in lieu thereof "Low-Income Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8621 et seq.)".

Page 390, beginning on line 17, strike out "Low Income Home Energy Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 8621 et seq.)," and insert in lieu thereof "Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8621 et seq.) other than energy crisis intervention assistance provided under section 2604(a) of such Act,".

Mr. JEFFORDS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the agreement, the gentleman is entitled to 5 minutes for his amendment. If there is opposition, the opposition is entitled to 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. Jeffords].

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Chairman, let me explain what will occur. These are relatively important matters and they deal with the jurisdictions of more than one committee. First of all, I am offering this amendment for the sole purpose of entering into a colloquy with respect to the intent of certain provisions of the food stamp bill relative to an employment training program.

I then intend to offer three other amendments, one dealing with low-income home energy assistance and two dealing with the Job Training Partnership Act. I would ask the indulgence of the Members for these amendments.

I would like to enter into a colloquy with the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking Republican of the subcommittee, to clarify some of the issues relative to cooperation between the Job Training Partnership Act and the programs as set forth in this bill relative to training under the Food Stamp Program.

I would like to clarify an issue regarding the Employment and Training Program, section 1514 of this bill. I agree with the gentleman that one objective of this program should be to assist individuals who are receiving food stamps to become gainfully employed. It is clear that this section of the bill is necessary to implement effective and innovative training and job search programs for food stamp recipients in order to facilitate their move into unsubsidized jobs.

Am I correct in assuming though that the gentleman intends that these programs should not duplicate, where feasible, existing programs that could serve this population?

Mr. EMERSON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Is it also true that the gentleman intends that where feasible there should be coordination, not duplication of effort, between other available employment and training programs such as the Work Incentive Program, the Job Training Partnership Act, and the Employment Services?

Mr. EMERSON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Additionally, under other employment and training programs, labor market information is collected. Does the gentleman intend that this program utilize that information as it relates to this program?

Mr. EMERSON. I expect that States will use all available information in setting up employment and training

programs in food stamp participants.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Further, if the services of other employment and training programs are utilized, does the gentleman intend that funds available under this section be used to provide these services?

Mr. EMERSON. States will make appropriate reimbursement to other agencies when employment and training services are utilized.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Finally, it is my hope that the report from the Secretary regarding the findings from these programs be made available to the Committee on Education and Labor in the House and the Committee on Labor and Human Resources in the Senate.

I thank the gentleman for his answers, and look forward to working with him during the conference on this bill to further refine these concepts, and to strengthen the intent of this program.

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

Mr. JEFFORDS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

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

Mr. EMERSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this program is to help certain food stamp participants move into regular employment by providing training and experience and improving the employability of the participants. It also allows the State to coordinate employment and training activities under both the Food Stamp and AFDC Programs.

A State will have considerable latitude in designing its program. State flexibility is important if the program is to succeed. Each State can designate other agencies to administer parts of its program, such as those agencies administering the Job Training and Partnership Act [JTPA] programs or State public employment offices. The program itself may encompass, at the discretion of a State, job search training and support programs, such as job finding clubs, training in employment techniques, job placement, or other training and support activities aimed at improving the employability of participants.

It is my intention that programs set up to help food stamp participants return to full-time employment be coordinated with all other employment and training programs for this group of people, including WIN, Job Training Partnership Act, and the Community Work Experience Program. In addition, should the food stamp agency use the services of these programs, appropriate reimbursement would be made. Should there be any further issues of coordination that need to be worked out, I am confident that these can be accomplished in conference.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Chairman, it is also my understanding that the chairman of the subcommittee has no objection to this colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JEFFORDS

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

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

The CHAIRMAN. Has the amendment been printed in the Congressional Record of September 24?

Mr. JEFFORDS. The amendment has been printed, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Jeffords: Page 388, strike out lines 6 through 10.

Page 388, line 11, strike out "(ii)" and insert in lieu thereof "(i)".

Page 389, line 7, strike out "(iii)" and insert in lieu thereof "(ii)".

Page 390, strike out lines 9 through 20, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(5) effective February 1, 1986, in clause (A) of the last sentence, striking out "\$35 a month" and inserting in lieu thereof "the lesser of \$35 a month or 5 per centum of monthly household income after any exclusions and before any deductions provided for in this section".

Mr. JEFFORDS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment on behalf of myself, the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee [Mr. Hawkins] and the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee [Mr. Dingell]. I rise to offer a small amendment to correct what I think is a serious problem with the bill as it was reported by the Agriculture Committee.

The bill as written would fundamentally alter the treatment of energy assistance payments for food stamp purposes. In stark contrast to congressional intent in reauthorizing the energy assistance program only last year, the bill before us would require, in some cases, that some people have their food stamp benefits cut because they received energy assistance benefits.

Congress never intended for this to happen, and I do not think that we should permit it to happen now. My amendment would simply strike the energy assistance language from the bill.

We often hear of people faced with the "heat or eat" dilemma. I can think of no instance when this dilemma has been clearer. I certainly do not think we should be in the position of sanctioning it.

Moreover, I am concerned that the Agriculture Committee's action strays into the jurisdiction of the other committee on which I serve, Education and Labor, and into that of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. I am joined in support of the pending amendment by my distinguished colleagues, Chairman Hawkins and Chairman Dingell, and the chairmen of each of the three subcommittees with jurisdiction over this issue. I am also joined by ranking Republican Tom Tauke, who is lucky enough to serve on both the Education and Labor and Energy and Commerce Committees.

As I mentioned, Congress only last year reenacted the Energy Assistance Program and again included the language prohibiting energy assistance benefits from being counted as income or resources for any purpose under any Federal or State law. Despite this clear intent, the Department of Agriculture is currently trying to include energy assistance payments in the calculation of food stamp benefits.

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

To date, USDA's policy has been challenged in three courts. USDA has lost each case, and is prohibited in those States affected from enforcing this policy. I think the court's interpretations are correct, and I think they should ultimately be adopted nationwide. My purpose here is to allow the courts to continue to decide this issue, rather than allowing one committee, which is not the committee with jurisdiction over the energy assistance program, to decide the issue.

The amendment I am offering is not costly -- only \$5 million in 1986 and \$20 million over 3 years -- but it will correct a serious inequity in the bill. It has broad support, not only within Congress, but outside it as well.

Let's not force people to heat or eat. Let's continue to recognize energy assistance as a supplemental program. And let's not undo what we did only last year and what we will probably do again next year. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to give their full support to this amendment.

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

Mr. JEFFORDS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, we have reviewed this particular amendment. This is obviously a complicated area in dealing with vendor energy assistance payments, but it would help clarify the situation with regards to those payments. I would like to accept the amendment, at least for the purpose of bringing it into conference in the hopes of clarifying this issue.

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

Mr. JEFFORDS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EMERSON. Does the gentleman have a cost estimate on this amendment?

Mr. JEFFORDS. Yes. The first year cost would be \$5 million, and \$20 million over 3 years.

Mr. EMERSON. If the gentleman would yield further, this title currently has a price tag of \$22 billion over the life of the bill, and the gentleman wants to add \$20 million to that?

Mr. JEFFORDS. I want to put the law back where it is now which would result in a loss, and if you want to put it that way, of savings of \$20 million.

Mr. EMERSON. So this is another add-on to the committee bill?

Mr. JEFFORDS. If you want to put it that way, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. EMERSON. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. Jeffords].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JEFFORDS

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is identified as "JEFFORDS 006."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will inquire if the amendment has been printed in the Record.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Yes, the amendment has been printed in the Record, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Jeffords: Page 387, line 16, insert "for more than 6 months" after "participating".

Mr. JEFFORDS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Chairman, although I do not believe that this amendment will be accepted, I want to explain it and make sure Members know what we are doing. I do not intend to ask for a record vote on the amendment, but I do believe it is important that we let everyone know what is happening here.

Three years ago we passed the Job Training Partnership Act. This bill is currently in force. It is working well. One of the provisions of that law is that if someone goes into training, for example, an on-the-job training program, the small amount of money that person receives while being trained is not counted as income for the purposes of determining food stamp eligibility. The reason for this provision is to insure that we do not discourage people from going into training in order to obtain employment. In H.R. 2100, one of the savings included in the bill changes this policy to now say, that if you do receive on-the-job training funds, you may lose your food stamps.

My amendment to H.R. 2100 is straightforward. It provides for a grace period of 6 months before the earnings of an individual participating in an on-the-job [OJT] training program under the Job Training Partnership Act [JTPA] are considered earned income for the purposes of the Food Stamp Program.

What is my intent in offering this amendment? To reduce the disincentive for participation in OJT programs that the current language in the bill creates for disadvantaged individuals.

This is an important concept, and I hope that the Members will pay attention, because this is really establishing a barrier in front of people who want to participate in job training. They will be faced with the situation of knowing that if they participate in on-the-job training, they may well lose food stamp benefits.

First of all, this seems somewhat ironic and contradictory for the food stamp bill this year, to create a whole new training program to be run by the States. I have some problems with this contradiction. I hope we can work these differences out so that there will be coordination between Federal and State programs. But if the emphasis of this bill remains to put people to work on the one hand, and on the other hand to place a barrier for those same people to participate in on-the-job training programs, we are working at cross purposes which makes no sense. I would like to provide some perspective on the language contained in H.R. 2100.

The Job Training Partnership Act was enacted 3 years ago with the purpose of providing job training to economically disadvantaged individuals. Under the act, the private sector and local governments working with schools, employment service agencies and community based organization for example, develop programs that train program participants for unsubsidized employment. A local plan is developed which reflects the labor market needs, the education needs and the training needs of the area. From this assessment programs are provided to enable economically disadvantaged individuals to enter unsubsidized jobs. To date, 95 percent of the participants in JTPA programs are disadvantaged. The overall placement rate for those individuals who complete training is 68 percent. Secretary Brock recently stated, "JTPA has been the centerpiece of this administration's commitment to meaningful job training."

On-the-job training is one type of JTPA training program. It actively involves the employer in training and

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

placement. Under JTPA, just about 25 percent of the participants are placed in OJT positions with a 78 percent, or nearly 4 out of 5, placement rate.

As a member of the Education and Labor Committee, I worked closely on the authorization of the Job Training Partnership Act. The section of that law -- section 142(b) -- that H.R. 2100 seeks to supersede was discussed thoroughly and included in JTPA for specific reasons. Those reasons include:

First, the rigorous limits placed on the percent of funds that can be utilized for support services and administrative costs under JTPA. The law mandates that 70 percent of the funds be used directly for the provision of training. There are no wages for trainees. This requirement is a radical departure from previous Federal employment and training programs. It was in part accepted by the members of the conference committee because JTPA was developed as a training bill, and other programs were available to provide the necessary support services to the program participants. I do not believe that the Members who worked on JTPA would have been so willing to adopt the strict limitation on support services if the participants were not going to be able to receive benefits from other Federal programs.

Second, the recognition that the participants in JTPA programs would continue to rely upon other sources of support while they were being trained. Language was included in section 142(b) to assure that allowances, earnings and payments under JTPA shall not be considered as income. We did not want to penalize individuals by their participation in training programs, and we did not want the threat of the loss of other forms of support for the whole family of these participants to be a disincentive to their participation. After all, the objective of participation in JTPA was to place the individual into an unsubsidized job -- to become a productive, taxpaying citizen.

The current language in H.R. 2100 ignores the basic assumptions that we used in writing JTPA. Further, it ignores them with respect to the one training program -- OJT -- that most directly involves the private sector in the training process and that has the highest placement rate.

The language does not differentiate between adults and youth who participate in OJT. H.R. 2100 as it now stands would penalize the whole family of an economically disadvantaged youth who participate in OJT. How can we in good conscience create such a disincentive for participation in OJT when youth unemployment continues to be more than twice that for adults?

According to CBO, this provision in H.R. 2100 saves the Food Stamp Program \$28 million. This figure does not take into account the loss we will experience if fewer individuals participate in OJT programs. That loss cannot be measured.

My amendment allows participation in an OJT program under JTPA for 6 months before any earnings would be considered as income. This period of time would accommodate the timeframe during which most individuals are learning on the job. The 6 months is really not a working period, but rather a training period. They are not as productive in their jobs and they are utilizing employer time by requiring training and greater supervision. The employer is experiencing a loss in productivity, absorbing 50 percent of the costs of the program and providing necessary guidance. After this initial period, most trainees are contributing to the company rather than taking from it. They have learned the job and are productive workers. Without the incentive of the OJT funds, many employers would not take the risk of hiring the disadvantaged. To penalize an individual for participating in a training program goes against the very purpose of JTPA. Without this amendment, H.R. 2100 may provide some short-term savings, but the long-term consequences could wind up being much more expensive.

I urge you to support this amendment.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly rise in opposition to this amendment, for several reasons.

One, because we try to apply consistent standards here. The fact is that while these are earnings, these earnings are counted against AFDC, and they are counted with regard to other programs as well, and that was the reason that we now

count these full-time earnings with regard to food stamps.

In addition to that, these are as I stated full-time earnings. We do provide exceptions with regard to stipends, training allowances, and other education benefits..

And last, the full cost of this amendment would be about \$83 million over 3 years, and for all of those reasons, we would oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. Jeffords].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JEFFORDS

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is identified as "Jeffords 007."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will inquire, has the amendment which the gentleman is now offering been printed in the Congressional Record as of September 24?

Mr. JEFFORDS. The amendment has been printed in the Record, Mr. Chairman, and I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that it be printed in the Record at this point.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Jeffords: Page 387, strike out line 19 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

food stamp program, except in the case of any individual who is a youth, as defined in section 203(c)(1) of the Job Training Partnership Act, participating in any such program for a period not to exceed 6 months."

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

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Chairman, I understand the rationale as to why my previous amendment could not be adopted. Although it was costly, I think what remains in the bill is bad policy.

I have a second amendment which may overcome some of the objections to my last amendment dealing with the JTPA deduction from income under section 1508. To date, youth constitute 40 percent of the 1,125,000 participants served under the Job Training Partnership Act [JTPA]. Fourteen percent of those youth who participate are in on-the-job training programs [OJT]. The unemployment rate for youth continues to remain unacceptably high at 17.3 percent.

The language in this bill under section 1508 with respect to the income deductions and OJT participation under JTPA does not differentiate between adults and youth in its application. That is, if a youth participates in an OJT program under JTPA, the income earned is considered part of the family income for the purposes of determining food stamp eligibility. Therefore, by participating in an OJT program, a youth may trigger family ineligibility.

We should not place those young people who desire to participate in an on-the-job training program, in the position of having their families say, "You cannot go to work because if you go to work, your income will cut our benefits or deny us food stamp benefits."

This is not the kind of barrier that we want to put in front of our young people who want to learn how to work and obtain a job.

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

This amendment will make the bill consistent with the way we handle AFDC income under the summer youth employment program. I would hope that since this amendment is a relatively inexpensive one -- \$8 million per year, \$24 million over 3 years -- the Members would accept this amendment so that we do not deny an opportunity to young people who want to work.

My amendment has two purposes:

First, to specify that the definition of youth, for the purposes of this income deduction, is the same as that under JTPA.

Second, to allow participation in an OJT Program under JTPA for 6 months before any earnings received by a youth would be considered as income.

Without this amendment, we are discouraging young people from participating in OJT programs. Three out of four disadvantaged youth who complete training under OJT enter employment. To discourage their participation in training programs at this stage of their lives only assures that as adults these youth will be among those unemployed and dependent on Government assistance. Rather than discouraging participation in training programs, we must provide ways by which disadvantaged youth can become productive adults.

I encourage your support for this amendment.

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

Mr. JEFFORDS. I am happy to yield to the chairman of the subcommittee.

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

Mr. Chairman, on this particular amendment, it does deal with young people from age 18 to 21 who are in the Job Training Partnership Act, and that is one of the reasons I take a slightly different view of it, because it does involve young people who are trying to get jobs for the first time. This would give them that opportunity to be able to make it without having this count in terms of food stamp benefits.

There is some question as to whether it is consistent with AFDC, but there is some record that indeed this may be the practice with regard to AFDC and other benefits as well.

It does involve young people. There is a cost here of approximately \$24 million over 3 years. For that reason, I can assure the gentleman that it is going to be retained in conference, and I would like to take this amendment into conference, and then hopefully it would be helpful in terms of negotiating with the other body on the whole Food Stamp Program.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, we would accept this amendment.

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

Mr. PANETTA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, could the gentleman give us a cost estimate on this amendment?

Mr. JEFFORDS. Yes. It would be \$8 million in the first year and \$8 million each year for 3 years altogether. So the amount is \$24 million.

Mr. EMERSON. So this is another \$24 million.

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Vermont.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. Jeffords].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JEFFORDS

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will inquire of the gentleman, has the amendment been printed in the Record as of September 24,

Mr. JEFFORDS. Yes, Mr. Chairman, this amendment has been printed in the Record as of September 24.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Jeffords: Page 390, line 8, insert the following before the close quotation marks.

A State agency shall consider payments made on behalf of a household under the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8621 et seq.) to be pro rated over the entire heating or cooling season, regardless of the frequency with which such payments are made.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RAHALL TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JEFFORDS

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Rahall to the amendment offered by Mr. Jeffords: Section 1509(a) of H.R. 2100 is amended by adding the following new paragraph at the end thereof:

(6) After the last sentence insert the following: "All households shall be allowed a deduction for the actual and reasonable expenses, other than expenses paid on behalf of the household by a third party, paid for transportation of members of the household to and from school and for the purchase or rental of school books for such members."

Mr. RAHALL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved on the amendment. There is no debate in order on the amendment.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Rahall] may have 2 minutes to explain the amendment to the amendment.

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Rahall] is recognized for 2 minutes on his amendment.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate his opportunity to offer my amendment which will alleviate, to some extent, the burden that has been placed on food stamp recipients. My amendment, which will be effective as of October 1, 1986, will allow a deduction for the actual and reasonable expenses, other than expenses paid on behalf of the household by a third party, paid for transportation of members of the household to and from institutions of higher education in which such members are enrolled and for the purchase and rental of school books for such members, but not to exceed \$25 per month for each such member. I would like to note that it is my intent that this expense deduction be prorated over the school term that the student is enrolled for, just as other income for Pell grant recipients is prorated. While the terms of this amendment are quite restrictive due to my desire to comply with the cost restraints placed on the Agriculture Committee and the entire House of Representatives, I believe that this amendment is much needed means of addressing a flaw in the Food Stamp Act of 1977 which penalizes low-income families when student loans are provided to pay for book and transportation costs incidental to attending school. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Domestic Marketing, Consumer Relations, and Nutrition, Mr. Panetta of California, and the ranking minority member on the subcommittee, Mr. Emerson of Missouri, for their assistance in this effort.

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

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

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

This is an issue that we intend to take a look at in the subcommittee. It does involve some consistency with other benefits, but it is an area that frankly we have not looked at closely enough. It does involve about a \$73 million cost figure and for that reason we cannot accept it, but I appreciate the gentleman offering to withdraw the amendment at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Rahall] wish to withdraw his amendment?

Mr. RAHALL. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Rahall]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. Jeffords].

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title XV?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GINGRICH

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

The CHAIRMAN. Has the amendment been printed in the Record as of September 24?

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

Mr. GINGRICH. Yes, Mr. Chairman, it was printed prior to the deadline.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gingrich: Beginning on page 396, strike line 24 through line 5 on page 404, and insert in lieu thereof the following new section:

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAM

Sec. . (a) Section 6(d) of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2015(d)) is further amended by --

(1) amending paragraph (1)(ii) to read as follows:

"(ii) refuses without good cause to participate in an employment and training program under paragraph (4) of this subsection, to the extent required under paragraph (4), including any reasonable employment requirements as are prescribed by the State agency in accordance with paragraph (4): PROVIDED, That the period of ineligibility shall be two months;"

(2) adding at the end of paragraph (1) the following new sentences: "Any period of ineligibility for violations under this paragraph shall end when the household member who committed the violation complies with the requirement that has been violated.";

(3)(A) striking out "eighteen" in the material preceding clause (i) in paragraph (d)(1) and inserting in lieu thereof "sixteen"; and

(B) in paragraph (d)(2) --

(i) striking out "a work registration requirement" in clause (A) and inserting in lieu thereof "requirements for employment related activities";

(ii) striking out in clause (B) "a dependent child under age six" and all that follows to the end of the clause and inserting in lieu thereof "(i) a dependent child under age six, except that a State agency may, at its option, require such parent or guardian to comply with the work requirements if the child is age three or over and adequate child care is available, or (ii) of an incapacitated person;" and

(iii) adding a new clause (F) at the end of the paragraph to read "(F) a person between ages sixteen and eighteen who is not a head of household or who is attending school on a full-time basis; and

"(4) adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4)(A) Each State agency shall implement an employment and training program designed by the State agency in accordance with guidelines established by the Secretary for the purpose of assisting members of households receiving benefits under this Act in gaining skills, training, or experience that will increase their ability to obtain regular employment. For purposes of this Act, an "employment and training program" means a program, approved by the Secretary, that shall contain a job search program with terms and conditions comparable to those prescribed in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 402(a)(35) of part A of title IV of the Social Security Act, except that a State agency shall have no obligation to incur costs exceeding \$25 per participant per month, as provided in subparagraph (B)(vi) of this paragraph, and a State agency shall be required to apply employment requirements prescribed under this clause to program applicants at the time of application, and shall also contain one or more of the following components:

"(i) job search training programs that include reasonable job search training and support activities that may consist

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

of jobs skills assessments, job finding clubs, training in techniques for employability, job placement services, or other direct training or support activities, including educational programs, determined by the State agency to expand the job search abilities or employability of those subject to the program;

"(ii) programs designed to improve the employability of household members through actual work experience or training, or both, and to enable individuals employed under such programs to move promptly into regular public or private employment. The facilities of the State public employment offices and agencies operating programs under the Job Training Partnership Act may be used to find employment and training opportunities for household members under the programs. Employment or training experience assignments shall be limited to projects that serve a useful purpose in fields such as health, social services, environmental protection, education, urban and rural development and redevelopment, welfare, recreation, public facilities, public safety, and day care. To the extent possible, the prior training, experience, and skills of the participating member shall be used in making appropriate employment experience assignments. An employment or training experience program established under this clause shall --

"(I) not provide any work that has the effect of replacing the employment of an individual not participating in the employment or training experience program;

"(II) provide the same benefits and working conditions that are provided at the job site to employees performing comparable work for comparable hours; and

"(III) reimburse participants for actual costs of transportation and other actual costs that are reasonably necessary and directly related to participation in the program, but not to exceed \$25 in the aggregate per month; and

"(iii) as approved by the Secretary, other programs, projects, and experiments, such as a supported work program, aimed at accomplishing the purpose of the employment and training program; and

"(iv) workfare programs operated under Section 20 of this Act.

"(B)(i) Each State agency shall place all persons subject to employment and training requirements under subsection (d)(1) in a job search program or in an alternative employment and training program authorized under subsection (A)(i), (ii), (iii), or (iv) of this section.

"(B)(ii) Each State agency shall place in employment and training program activities authorized under subsection (A)(i), (ii), (iii) or (iv) of this section not less than twenty-five percent of the persons subject to employment and training requirements under subsection 6(d)(1) for any month in the fiscal year beginning October 1, 1986, fifty percent of such persons for any month in the fiscal year beginning October 1, 1987, and seventy-five percent of such persons for any month in the fiscal year beginning October 1, 1988 and each fiscal year thereafter.

"(iii) The Secretary shall use State agency reports in conjunction with findings of the quality control system to monitor the compliance of State agencies with the requirements of this paragraph. If it is determined that a State agency has failed to comply with such requirements, the State agency shall be subject to penalties as determined by the Secretary which may include a reduction in the funds provided to the State agency under subsection 16(a) in accordance with the procedures set forth in subsection 16(d). If such procedures are applied, the State agency shall be considered to have issued erroneous payments for the number of households by which it failed to meet the appropriate standard established in subsection (B)(1) or (B)(2) of this section, with each such erroneous payment being equal to the average allotment for all households containing a member who is required to participate in employment and training program activities."

"(C)(i) The State agency may provide that participation in an employment and training program may supplement or supplant other requirements imposed on those subject to the program.

"(ii) In complying with the performance standards established in subsection 6(B) and subject to guidelines

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

established by the Secretary, each State agency may exempt from participation in any program under this paragraph categories of household members to which the State agency determines that the application of such requirements is impracticable as applied to such categories due to factors such as, but not limited to, the availability of work opportunities and the cost effectiveness of the employment requirements. In making such a determination, the State agency may designate a category consisting of all such household members residing in a specified area of the State. The State agency may also exempt or suspend from such requirements individual household members not included in any such category but with respect to whom it determines that such requirements are impracticable because of personal circumstances such as, but not limited to, lack of job readiness and employability, the remote location of work opportunities, and unavailability of dependent care.

"(iii) The total hours of work in an employment and training program carried out under this paragraph required of members of a household, together with the hours of work of such members in any other program carried out under section 20 of this Act, in any month collectively may not exceed a number of hours equal to the household's allotment for such month divided by the higher of the applicable State minimum wage or Federal minimum hourly rate under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. The total hours of participation in such program required of any member of a household, individually, in any month, together with any hours worked in another program carried out under section 20 of this Act and any hours worked for compensation (in cash or in kind) in any other capacity, shall not exceed one hundred and twenty hours per month.

"(iv) Each State agency shall establish requirements, determined by the State agency to be appropriate, for participation by individuals not exempt under clause (ii) of this paragraph in one or more employment and training programs under this paragraph (which requirements may vary among participants), but may operate programs under this paragraph in which individuals elect to participate. The State agency shall permit individuals not subject to the requirements described in the previous sentence or who have completed or are in the process of complying with such requirements to participate in any program under this paragraph.

"(v) The Secretary shall promulgate guidelines that, to the maximum extent practicable, enable a State agency to design and operate an employment and training program under this paragraph that is compatible and consistent with similar programs operated within the State.

"(vi) A State agency shall reimburse participants for actual transportation costs and other actual expenses incurred by participants in the employment and training program, except that the State agency may limit such reimbursement to each participant to \$25 per month."

(b) Section 11(e) of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2020(e)) is amended by --

(1) striking out the period after paragraph (21) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(2) adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(22) the manner in which the State agency will carry out the employment and training program under section 6(d)(4) of this Act."

(c) Section 16 of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2025) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h)(1) Effective October 1, 1984, the Secretary shall allocate in each fiscal year, from funds appropriated for such fiscal year under section 18(a)(1) of this Act, the amount of \$40,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, \$50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, \$60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1988, and \$75,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending September 30, 1989, and September 30, 1990, which amount shall be used to pay to each State agency the full cost (except as otherwise provided in this subsection) of carrying out the employment and training program under section 6(d)(4) of this Act.

"(2) If, in carrying out such activities, a State agency incurs costs that exceed the amount payable to the State agency under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall pay such State agency an amount equal to the 50 per centum of such additional costs in accordance with subsection (a).

"(3) The Secretary shall, in accordance with subsection (a), reimburse each State agency in an amount equal to 50 per centum of the total amount of payments made or costs incurred by the State agency in connection with actual transportation costs and other actual expenses reasonably incurred by participants in the employment and training program, except that such total amount shall not exceed an amount representing \$25 per participant per month.

Mr. GINGRICH (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, let me say first of all that I appreciate very much that the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Missouri have made major progress in developing a transition to a workfare program; however, it is my intention with this amendment to offer an amendment which is much closer to the Reagan administration proposal on workfare.

This amendment is designed to ensure that an increasing number of recipients will indeed be required to participate in a workfare program.

In particular, this amendment sets a series of stages, year by year, by which the program would move toward a workfare provision and it provides that the Secretary can enforce those transitions by withholding funds from those States which he or she finds to be not in compliance.

This is a discretionary power that the Secretary can use. I think it means that the States would be required and would be under pressure to make real changes toward a workfare program at a faster rate than in the committee bill.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates for the Federal Government are that this program would save money. It would candidly require more money at the State level for administration, but even under the Congressional Budget Office provisions, it is clear that this program would save the Federal Government money and would speed up the process of moving toward a workfare program.

Finally, the amendment also makes several changes in the pool of work registrants, subject to the employment and training program.

The amendment extends the work registration and new employment training program to 16- to 17-year-old heads of households, unless they are full-time students. In other words, it says if you are going to be getting food stamps and you are the head of a household, but you are not in school, then you need to have the work experience.

This change establishes consistency with the AFDC Program and recognizes that such young heads of households who are not in school and not working would especially benefit from such activity, work experience, assignments, and job search training.

Now, the essence of what I am saying here is that if you vote "yes" for this amendment, you are voting for a much closer approximation of the Reagan administration proposals on workfare. You are voting for a much more rapid transition to a workfare program in this country and you are voting to give the Secretary discretionary power.

It does not mandate that in an impossible situation any State would have to make that transition, but it would put considerable pressure on every State to have that kind of transition at a much faster rate than the committee requires.

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment, for several reasons. One, the gentleman from Missouri and myself carefully worked out a provision in this bill which for the first time requires all States to set up a work program to provide relief to those who are on food stamps.

It is the first time we have required of the States that they set up these programs; but the difference between what we have done and what the gentleman offers is that we allow the States to design work programs that fit their particular needs.

The problem is that if we just mandate a certain program for all States, what this becomes is a full employment program for bureaucrats. It adds paperwork. It adds bureaucracy and it fails to allow the States to develop a program that is most meaningful for their particular States or for their food stamp recipients.

In addition to that, I would point out that the CBO indicates that while there are some minimal savings at the Federal level, the cost of this proposal to the taxpayers, to the States, would be over \$240 million above the costs of H.R. 2100.

So it is for those reasons that we would oppose this amendment. We think that we have developed a work program which makes sense, which is efficient, and which meets the needs of the States and the people involved in the food stamp programs.

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

Mr. PANETTA. I am pleased to yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, may I rise in support of what the gentleman from California has said.

The Gingrich approach would deviate completely from the accepted approach under the Job Training Partnership Act. Under that act, as we well know, and I would submit it would work much better under this provision as a provision under this act. JTPA leaves up to the States to decide the approach which best suits them. What works in Massachusetts does not necessarily work in California, and vice versa.

I think the flexibility provided under the committee bill retains the best provision of the job search provision for the recipients of food stamps.

I do not think we should tamper with it by some novel new approach that imposes on the States an added burden which certainly we should not do at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I greatly recommend that we follow the approach as submitted by the committee and stick with that, rather than deviate from the accepted provision under the Job Training Partnership Act.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. PANETTA. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. EMERSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia because I think we do share the very same objective. I think we probably all do.

State flexibility is an essential part of this program because the best employment and training programs are those to which the State administrators are committed and which they design themselves. For example, the program operating in

San Diego, CA, which the chairman and I have, personally, inspected and held extensive hearings about is one very good example of an innovative program designed to meet the needs in that area.

We believe that most States will welcome this program and will operate efficient and effective employment and training programs. That is why State flexibility and program grants are a part of this program. Nevertheless, we do expect that the Secretary will use the authority the act provides to insure that all States design a program that is in keeping with the purposes of the act. I think if they do not, it would be at that point that we would consider the language of the gentleman from Georgia.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned earlier, the Secretary has the discretionary power if, in his judgment, a State is not moving rapidly enough. It is not automatically mandated and our purpose in offering this, and I concede that it is a new legislative proposal but a very idea, I say to my friend, the gentleman from California, is to simply move on a nationwide basis to have us move more rapidly toward workfare.

Mr. Chairman, I move the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Gingrich].

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count for a quorum. One hundred seven Members are present, a quorum.

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were -- ayes 183, noes 227, not voting 24, as follows:

(See Roll No. 339 in the ROLL segment.)

Mr. KLECZKA and Mr. SAVAGE changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

Mr. PETRI and Mr. CHAPMAN changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to title XV?

The Clerk will designate title XVI.

The Clerk designated title XVI.

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SKELTON

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

The CHAIRMAN. Has the amendment been printed in the Record as of the 24th of September?

Mr. SKELTON. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The text of the amendment as printed in the Record is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Skelton: Insert in Section 1605 (which amends Section 204 of the Temporary Emergency Food Assistance Act) a new paragraph:

(4) Funds from section 204(c)(1) shall be available to the extent that they are matched on an equal basis by State appropriated funds. The provision shall apply to a State beginning October 1 of the calendar year in which the State legislature next meets.

Mr. SKELTON. The amendment has been printed, Mr. Chairman. However, I ask unanimous consent to modify the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modification to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Skelton].

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification of amendment offered by Mr. Skelton: Page 425, line 19, strike out the close quotation marks and period following such marks.

Page 425, after line 19, insert the following:

"(4) It is the sense of the Congress that, if there is appropriated to carry out this subsection for a fiscal year an amount in excess of the amount authorized to be appropriated for such fiscal year, no part of such excess amount should be made available to a State unless the aggregate value of the in-kind contributions and services provided, and the funds appropriated, by the State and units of local government of the State for such fiscal year for the distribution of such commodities is not less than the amount of funds made available under this subsection to the State for such fiscal year."

Mr. SKELTON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the modified amendment be considered as read and printed in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I will not take a great deal of time.

I have discussed this substitute amendment at length with the gentleman from California [Mr. Panetta] and also with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Emerson].

What it does is, it expresses the sense of Congress that States which, together with their local government entities, fail to make contributions for the operation of their TEFAP Programs equal to the amount of Federal administrative

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

funds they receive under title XVI should not receive any additional administrative funds that are made available through a subsequent supplemental appropriation. The purpose is to provide a stronger incentive than exists at the present time for any State to contribute its share toward administration of the TEFAP Program.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Panetta].

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

As the gentleman knows, we have discussed this amendment. It is my view that this \$50 million ought to go to the States for purposes of TEFAP and if any more is going to go to the States, the States have to show some signs of good faith that they are trying to work on their end to provide additional supplements and help with regard to the Emergency Feeding Program.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the amendment of the gentleman. It does provide a sense of urgency here that the States have to help cooperate with regard to this program.

I thank the gentleman, and we would accept the amendment.

Mr. SKELTON. The gentleman is correct. It does not prohibit the \$50 million going to the various States, but it does give them incentive should there be a supplemental. There may not be, but should there be, it gives them incentive to do the best they can in good faith.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. EMERSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from California in accepting the amendment and say further that both the gentleman from Missouri and I are aware of food banks in Missouri and other States that are very active in distributing surplus commodities to the poor. The people operating these food banks would like to initiate a system in which they would receive surplus commodities directly from the Federal Government. This plan is being forwarded to us, and I intend to look at it very carefully to see if we can implement such a concept.

Those running these food banks indicate they can pick up and distribute these commodities at no cost to the Federal Government, and this is an idea that I look forward to pursuing with my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. SKELTON. Yes; I think it is an excellent idea, and we are thinking of the same thing.

I think that is an area to explore that would save the taxpayers money in the long run.

I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Skelton], as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate title XVII.

The Clerk designated title XVII.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate title XVIII.

The Clerk designated title XVIII.

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JONES OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Jones of Oklahoma: Immediately after section 1895 of the bill as reported on September 18, 1985, insert the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 1896. STUDY OF LEADED FUEL IN AGRICULTURAL MACHINERY.

(a) Study. -- The Secretary of Agriculture shall conduct a study of the use of fuel containing lead additives in gasoline engines which --

- (1) are used in agricultural machinery, and
- (2) are designed to combust fuel containing such additives.

The study shall analyze any mechanical problems (including but not limited to valve recession) which may be associated with the use of other fuels in such engines.

(b) Contracts and Other Arrangements. -- For purposes of the study under this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to enter into such contracts and other arrangements as may be appropriate to obtain the necessary technical information. All testing of engines carried out for purposes of such study shall be reflective of actual agricultural conditions to the extent practicable, including revolutions per minute and payloads.

(c) Findings and Report. -- The Secretary of Agriculture shall publish in the Federal Register not later than January 1, 1987, his proposed findings pursuant to such study. After notice and opportunity for hearing, but not later than January 1, 1986, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a final report containing the results of the study under this section, together with any public comments received and recommendations on the need for lead additives in gasoline to be used by agricultural machinery.

(d) Agricultural Machinery. -- The Secretary of Agriculture shall specify the types and items of agricultural machinery to be covered by the study under this Act.

(e) Regulation of Lead Additives During Study. -- No regulation under any provision of law regarding the control or prohibition of lead additives in gasoline may require an average lead content per gallon which is less than 0.1 gram per gallon until the date 3 months after the report required by subsection (c) has been submitted to Congress.

SEC. 1897. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

For fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1985, there is authorized to be appropriated \$250,000 to carry out section 1 of this Act.

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

(Mr. JONES of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, in just a minute, I wish to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

Iowa [Mr. Tauke], who has a substitute amendment which has the same aim as my amendment: to ensure a plentiful supply of leaded gas for farm machinery. I commend the gentleman for his work in this substitute, and urge its adoption.

Very simply, our amendment prohibits the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from promulgating any regulation which would require the use of gasoline with less than 0.5 grams of lead additive in farm machinery, until an official study of the effects of unleaded gasoline on farm machinery can be carried out.

With the catastrophic financial situation facing our farmers today, we feel we must do everything possible to see that they are given the breaks needed to continue their struggle to preserve America's agriculture industry.

Currently, the EPA plans to reduce lead levels to zero over the next 3 years. Tests conducted by Phillips Petroleum yield conclusive proof that older farm machinery will suffer extensive damage if farmers are forced to use unleaded fuel.

We are not disputing the EPA regulation of lead additives in a general sense, but we feel today's farmers are in a unique economic position and this is one available means we have to help ease their plight.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TAUKE AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JONES OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. TAUKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Tauke as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. Jones of Oklahoma: Page 509, after line 13, insert:

LEAD ADDITIVES IN FARM FUEL

Sec. 1896. (a) Except as provided in subsection (f), any regulation issued under any provision of law before or after the date of enactment of this section regarding the control or prohibition of lead additives in gasoline shall be amended to provide that the average lead content per gallon of gasoline distributed and sold for use on a farm for farming purposes shall not be less than 0.5 grams per gallon. The purpose of such amendment shall be to ensure that adequate supplies of gasoline containing sufficient lead additives to protect and maintain farm machinery will be available in all States for use on farms for farming purposes. Nothing in this section shall affect the control of lead or lead additives in gasoline distributed and sold for other uses. For purposes of this section, the term "gasoline used on a farm for farming purposes" has the same meaning as when used in section 6420 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

(b) The President, acting through the Secretary of Agriculture and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, shall promptly initiate a study of the use of fuel containing lead additives in gasoline engines which

--

(1) are used in agricultural machinery, and

(2) are designed to combust fuel containing such additives.

The study shall analyze any mechanical problems (including, but not limited to value recession) which may be associated with the use of other fuels, including fuels without lead additives in such engines.

(c) For purposes of the study, the appropriate lead agency designated by the President is authorized to enter into

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

such contracts under applicable law and other arrangements as may be appropriate to obtain the necessary technical and other information. All testing of engines carried out for purposes of such study shall be reflective of actual agricultural conditions to the extent practicable, including revolutions per minute and payloads.

(d) The results of the study shall be published in the Federal Register not later than January 1, 1987 for written comments, and shall be submitted to Congress within 90 days after such publication. The report shall contain the results of the study under this section, together with a summary of any public comments received, and recommendation on the need for lead additives in gasoline to be used by agricultural machinery. The report shall also be transmitted to the Committees on Agriculture of the House and Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House and the Committee on the Environment and Public Works of the Senate. Such report shall be submitted only while both Houses are in session.

(e) The Secretary of Agriculture shall specify the types and items of agricultural machinery to be covered by the study under this Act.

(f) Effective not earlier than 4 months after the date on which the report is submitted to Congress under subsection (d), in lieu of subsection (a) of this section, the regulations which (beginning on January 1, 1986) are generally applicable to the control the level of lead additives in gasoline shall apply to gasoline used on farms for farming purposes whenever the administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency publishes a notice thereof unless it is determined by such Administrator on the basis of the study under this section that a level of 0.5 grams per gallon (or some other level) is appropriate in the case of gasoline used on a farm for farming purposes to protect and maintain agricultural machinery specified by the Secretary of Agriculture.

(g) There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the study required by this section and such sums shall remain available for such purposes until expended. In order not to delay such study the agencies referred to in this section should take immediate action with available funds to initiate such a study.

Mr. TAUKE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan reserves a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not have any reason to believe it will be necessary for me to insist on the point of order. I make the reservation of objection for purposes of a colloquy with my three distinguished friends, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Madigan], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Tauke], and of course my dear friend from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, Mr. de la Garza.

I understand when this matter reaches the conference stage that you have agreed to keep the Committee on Energy and Commerce -- --

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman, Mr. Dingell, will suspend for 1 second, please.

The Chair would respectfully advise the gentleman that he cannot proceed with the debate on a reservation of a point of order. If the gentleman from Iowa wishes to yield to the gentleman for that purpose, he has the time.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Tauke] is recognized for 5 minutes.

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

Mr. TAUKE. If I could explain the amendment first, then I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, then I withdraw that portion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Tauke] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TAUKE. I thank the chairman, and I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for his cooperation in developing this amendment, and all of the others who have participated in this effort.

Mr. Chairman, this substitute is designed to prevent an impending crisis in the farm community. Recent tests conducted by a major fuel refiner indicate that a substantial number of farm engines, primarily older farm engines, will suffer extensive damage -- and require expensive repairs -- if run on unleaded gasoline. Currently, we are phasing out leaded gasoline, and this substitute requires us to look at this issue before it becomes a problem. This substitute takes a commonsense approach and does, basically, two things: First, it requires the Department of Agriculture and the Environmental Protection Agency to study the impact of eliminating leaded gasoline on the farm economy; and second, until this study is completed this substitute maintains the current lead content in leaded gasoline today -- which is 0.5 grams of lead per gallon.

According to this substitute, the level of lead in leaded gasoline will remain at 0.5 grams per gallon for farmers while this study is conducted. The results of the study must be printed in the Federal Register not later than January 1, 1987, and shall be submitted to Congress within 90 days after such publication. Four months after the report is submitted to Congress, the lead level in gasoline used for farming purposes may change to an appropriate level as determined by the EPA.

Mr. Chairman, this is a straightforward amendment. It has been worked out with the assistance of Mr. Madigan, Mr. Waxman, Mr. Dingell, and Mr. Jones. In addition, this approach is supported by the American Farm Bureau and the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. I urge my colleagues to support this substitute.

Mr. Chairman, I would be pleased now to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Dingell]

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

Mr. DINGELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, my purpose is a brief colloquy with my three dear friends, the gentleman from Iowa, the gentleman from Texas and, of course, my dear friend from Illinois [Mr. Madigan].

Gentlemen, I understand that when this matter reaches conference stage, the Committee on Energy and Commerce will be kept informed of amendments to this provision from the other body and that our good friends on the Agriculture Committee will not agree to such amendments without consulting our committee, am I correct in that appreciation?

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAUKE. I yield to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inform my colleague that we will be very happy to keep him informed of the process should this amendment be enacted and be an item in conference.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank my dear friend.

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

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

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

Mr. MADIGAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would assure the gentleman from Michigan, the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, that we not only will stay in touch with him, but if an attempt would be successfully made in the conference to expand this provision beyond what the gentleman is agreeing to on behalf of the farmers and ranchers of America, that I will join with the gentleman from Michigan in opposing the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank my dear friend.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure my colleagues understand the concern that I utter here today, and that is the question of jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce over the matter of clean air, leaded gasoline, and matters that relate to that. I am sure here that there is no attempt by my good friends and colleagues to impair that. With that understanding, I will raise no objection to the amendment, and indeed I find the amendment has merit. I commend the gentleman for offering it.

MR. CHAIRMAN, MR. JONES OF OKLAHOMA AND MR. TAUKE HAVE CONSULTED THE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE CONCERNING THE AMENDMENT NOW OFFERED BY MR. TAUKE. IT IS, AS JUST NOTED, A MATTER THAT RESTS SOLELY IN THE JURISDICTION OF OUR COMMITTEE AND NORMALLY, I WOULD OBJECT TO ITS CONSIDERATION IN THIS MATTER. BUT SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIRMAN WAXMAN, THE RANKING MINORITY MEMBER ON THE SUBCOMMITTEE, MR. MADIGAN, AND THE RANKING MINORITY MEMBER ON THE FULL COMMITTEE, MR. BROYHILL, AND MYSELF ARE PERSUADED THAT THIS LIMITED AMENDMENT IS NEEDED AND MERITORIOUS. WE BELIEVE IT WILL NOT DETER THE NEED, FOR HEALTH REASONS, TO REDUCE LEAD IN GASOLINE. BUT IT WILL REDRESS A PROBLEM, PENDING A STUDY, BY ASSURING A SUPPLY OF LEADED GASOLINE FOR AGRICULTURAL MACHINERY.

IT IS DESIGNED TO DEAL WITH THIS ISSUE FOR ALL FARMERS IN ALL STATES. IT RECOGNIZES THAT EPA MUST WORK OUT GASOLINE REFINING AND DISTRIBUTION PROBLEMS WITH THE REFINERS AND PIPELINES AND OTHERS TO PROVIDE LEADED GASOLINE FOR ALL FARMERS IN ALL STATES, INCLUDING FARMERS WHO MAY NOT HAVE BULK SUPPLIES ON THEIR FARM BUT BUY GASOLINE AT THE LOCAL GAS STATION. IT DOES NOT OPEN THE DOOR FOR ALL VEHICLES.

I AM CONCERNED THAT THE AMENDMENT ONLY DEALS WITH FARMERS, BECAUSE OTHERS IN MICHIGAN AND ELSEWHERE HAVE EXPRESSED CONCERN ABOUT THIS MATTER. BUT I REALIZE THAT THEY HAVE SPECIAL PROBLEMS AND THIS IS A FARM BILL. I AM CONCERNED BECAUSE I FEAR THE ISSUE WILL NOT GO AWAY IN THE CASE OF SOME OTHER USERS, LIKE THE RECREATIONAL BOAT OWNER USERS. IN THIS REGARD, I HAVE RECENTLY WRITTEN TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY ASKING QUESTIONS ABOUT ITS CONSIDERATION OF ALL SUCH USES AND THE IMPACTS ON ENGINES OPERATING SAFELY AND PROPERLY WITH LITTLE OR NO LEAD. THAT CORRESPONDENCE FOLLOWS:

ADMINISTRATOR'S STATEMENT

TODAY, WE ARE TAKING ACTIONS TO SUBSTANTIALLY DECREASE THE AMOUNT OF LEAD EMITTED INTO THE ENVIRONMENT.

FIRST, I HAVE SIGNED A FINAL REGULATION REQUIRING A TWO-STAGE REDUCTION IN THE AMOUNT OF LEAD PERMITTED IN LEADED GASOLINE. THE CURRENT LEAD STANDARD ALLOWS 1.10 GRAMS OF LEAD PER GALLON OF LEADED GASOLINE. ON JULY 1 OF THIS YEAR, THE LIMIT WILL BE REDUCED TO 0.50 GRAMS PER GALLON. BEGINNING JANUARY 1, 1986, THE STANDARD WILL DROP

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

AGAIN TO 0.10 GRAMS PER GALLON. THESE STEPS WILL BRING A 91 PERCENT REDUCTION IN THE AMOUNT OF LEAD USED IN GASOLINE.

THERE IS NO DOUBT IN MY MIND THAT LEAD IN THE ENVIRONMENT IS STILL A NATIONAL HEALTH PROBLEM AND THAT GASOLINE IS A MAJOR CONTRIBUTOR TO LEAD EXPOSURE. THESE STANDARDS WILL SIGNIFICANTLY REDUCE THE ADVERSE HEALTH EFFECTS THAT RESULT FROM USING LEAD IN GASOLINE AND WILL REDUCE THE MISUSE OF LEADED GASOLINE IN VEHICLES DESIGNED FOR UNLEADED FUEL.

IN ADDITION TO THESE REDUCTIONS, WE ARE ISSUING A SUPPLEMENTAL NOTICE INVITING PUBLIC COMMENT ON INFORMATION NOW AVAILABLE RELEVANT TO A TOTAL BAN ON LEAD IN GASOLINE.

LEADED GASOLINE IS RESPONSIBLE FOR ABOUT 80 PERCENT OF ALL LEAD EMISSIONS INTO THE AIR. THERE IS A DIRECT RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEAD IN GASOLINE AND THE AMOUNT OF LEAD IN HUMAN BLOOD. LEAD IMPAIRS THE PHYSICAL AND MENTAL HEALTH OF OUR CHILDREN, ESPECIALLY THOSE WHO LIVE IN THE LARGE CITIES. RECENT STUDIES INDICATE THAT IT MIGHT ALSO CONTRIBUTE TO HIGH BLOOD PRESSURE IN adults. The evidence continues to mount demonstrating adverse health effects from lead at levels previously thought to be below the threshold of risk. Just last month, the Centers for Disease Control lowered the level of blood lead it deems to indicate a need for treatment.

The lower standard of 0.10 level was chosen because it would achieve significant health benefits while still allowing a lead level adequate to protect engine valve seats. The change was also intended to curb the illegal use of lead fuel in cars designed for unleaded by changing the cost relationship between leaded and unleaded gasoline.

After reviewing over 1,500 substantive comments on the proposal made either at our public hearing or in written submissions, we are convinced that such a standard is both necessary and achievable.

Since our proposal last summer, EPA also has carefully considered comments concerning the refining industry's ability to meet this standard. We have reviewed our analyses of the industry capacity to meet these standards in light of these comments and remain convinced that the standard is attainable. We also agree with those who said the standard can be strengthened by requiring a two-step approach which includes the 0.50 grams per gallon standard beginning July 1, 1985.

EPA has also reviewed in detail the issue of the amount of lead needed as a valve lubricant in older cars and engines. We have evaluated the many comments from vehicle, truck, boat, and farm equipment owners concerned that a tenth of a gram of lead per gallon is insufficient to lubricate valves in these engines. Our research indicates that this level of lead is sufficient for these engines when operated at reasonable speeds and loads. In fact, there are several studies that have come to our attention during the rulemaking that suggest that lead may not be required at all for these engines. Therefore, we remain convinced that 0.10 grams of lead per gallon leaded gasoline will furnish adequate protection for vehicles and engines which may need it. We will, however, continue to study this issue with respect to a total ban -- as I'll discuss in a minute.

EPA's latest survey of vehicles in the field has shown that fuel switching continues to be a persistent problem despite an active effort to stop it. In fact, latest survey results show a 16 percent fuel switching rate, compared to 13 percent at the time of the proposal.

For all these reasons, EPA is proceeding to issue these stringent final rules today. We are eager to reap the health benefits of the standard and we are optimistic that the level of fuel switching will be substantially decreased as a result of its implementation.

I'd like to take a moment now to discuss the economics of this final rule. EPA has conducted an extensive

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

evaluation of the costs and benefits of the new rule. The net benefits of the .10 gallons per leaded mile standard are predicted to be over a billion dollars per year for the period of 1986 to 1992, with the 0.50 grams per gallon standard for the second half of 1985 alone resulting in over \$250 million dollars in net benefits. These analyses included the benefits of savings from reduced health problems from lead and other automotive pollution as well as reduced vehicle maintenance compared to the cost of the additional refining needed to furnish adequate gasoline to the market. A billion dollars a year is substantial savings, and these estimates are likely to understate the true benefits. If the new information concerning the relationship between blood lead and blood pressure in fact holds true, the value of these regulations could increase by several billion dollars more per year. This is a good regulation then from both the health and economic point of view.

The second of the two packages we are announcing today is a supplemental notice soliciting future comments on implementing a total lead ban as early as 1988. In the August 1984 rulemaking the Agency proposed consideration of a ban on lead in gasoline during the mid 1990's. During the intervening period, studies analyzing the relationship between blood lead and blood pressure were published. These studies suggest a strong correlation between blood lead and blood pressure, and that reductions in blood lead levels would result in substantial additional health benefits. Further, several studies of fleets of vehicles in actual use indicated that vehicles might not need any lead as a value lubricant. Finally, we are concerned that the 0.10 grams of lead per gallon standard might not be fully effective in eliminating the fuel switching problem.

These facts suggest that a ban on lead in the near term might be both desirable and feasible. We are interested in having the scientific and medical communities review the information relating blood lead and blood pressure.

We also are soliciting additional comments on the need for lead as a value lubricant for engines and on the extent of a continuing fuel switching problem. We intend to work with chemical manufacturers to ascertain the possibilities of alternative additives, should they be necessary, as well as working with other interested groups on ways to prevent valve damage should we find a ban appropriate and necessary.

One additional point is worth noting. We recently proposed a rule which would allow banking of lead rights, retroactive to January 1, as a way of enhancing the flexibility to meet the new standards. We expect the rule to be made final within the next few weeks.

In summary, we believe today's final rule will have a marked and positive impact on the nation's health, and we will continue to study the desirability and feasibility of a total ban on the use of lead in gasoline.

Committee on Energy and Commerce,
Washington, DC, July 15, 1985.

Hon. Lee M. Thomas,
Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, Waterside Mall -- West Tower, Washington, DC.

Dear Mr. Thomas: Enclosed are letters I received from my constituents who are concerned about the impact of your agency's recent actions concerning lead in gasoline. Their concerns are real. While I recognize the health effects of lead on people and the apparent need to curb such lead as quickly as possible, I am concerned about the adequacy of your agency's consideration of the impacts of your actions.

I request that you address the questions raised in the letters concerning motor vehicle, marine equipment and lawn mower equipment that use leaded gasoline. What studies did you conduct concerning the impact on already purchased vehicles, boats, and equipment? What were the results?

Also, enclosed is a July 8, 1985 letter from the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee on

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

Agriculture concerning the impact of your actions on agricultural equipment. What studies did you conduct regarding the impact on this type of equipment? What were the results?

With best wishes.

Sincerely,
John D. Dingell,
Chairman.

June 17, 1985.

Hon. John D. Dingell: I wish to express my protest of the reduction of regular grade gasoline.

I am a senior citizen living on a fixed income.

My car, lawn mower, and outboard motor are old and need the regular gasoline, other fuel would damage them.

To replace them would be a real hardship.

Yours,
James Rea.

U.S. Environmental

Protection Agency,
Washington, DC, August 14, 1985.

Hon. John D. Dingell,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Dear Mr. Chairman: Thank you for your July 15, 1985 correspondence forwarding letters from your constituents concerning our proposal to ban leaded gasoline as early as 1988. They are concerned that operation on low-lead or unleaded gasoline may be harmful to engines designed for leaded gasoline.

We are certainly aware of your constituents' concerns. However, we believe that the low-leaded standard of 0.10 gram per leaded gallon offers sufficient valve protection to those engines which may need lead under reasonable speeds and loads.

In response to your request, I have enclosed the Federal Register notices, regulatory impact analysis, responses to comments document, summary of comments document, and a final contractor report entitled, "The Effects of Low-lead and Unleaded Fuels on Gasoline Engines." These review the studies we evaluated and the data we have on the effects of lead phasedown on a number of different engine types. We believe that these data are representative of the effects that can be expected. However, we do not have extensive information on some of the specific types of engines (e.g., outboard motors) or uses (e.g., agricultural) that are referenced in your letter.

We are continuing to investigate the need for lead in some engines and the possibility of alternative additives that are less environmentally harmful than lead. We are paying particular attention to the concerns of the agricultural community and are investigating thoroughly the use of unleaded gasoline in farm machinery that was designed for leaded gasoline. We have reviewed information from eight additive manufacturers claiming to have developed additives

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

which would act as valve lubricants should lead be eliminated from gasoline. Several of these look promising. We are working to get the farm community and these additive manufacturers together for in-use demonstration programs to test the efficacy of their additives.

Please feel free to contact me or Charles L. Elkins, Acting Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation, at (202) 382-7400, if you have any further suggestions.

Sincerely,
Lee M. Thomas,
Administrator.

Committee on Agriculture,
Washington, DC, July 8, 1985.

Dear Colleague: On March 4, 1985, the Environmental Protection Agency issued final regulations to reduce the permissible amount of lead in gasoline by 90 percent by January 1, 1986. The new standard will limit the lead content of gasoline in two stages. The first stage was a reduction to 0.5 gram per leaded gallon (gplg) required on July 1, 1985. The second stage is a reduction to 0.1 gplg to be accomplished on January 1, 1986. The current lead standard is 1.1 gplg.

As part of its March 4 announcement, EPA also extended a system that allows refineries to "bank" lead credits if they can reduce lead below allowable limits this year. They can then use these credits in 1986 or 1987 when the limit of 0.1 gplg is imposed. As a practical matter lead banking will result in gasoline with an average lead content of 0.2 gplg being marketed through 1987.

However, EPA appears to be moving toward a total lead ban, perhaps as early as 1988. Our concern is that they are taking this step without a clear understanding of the impact it will have on machinery used on the farm.

We are writing to invite you to be a cosponsor of legislation we have introduced to require the Environmental Protection Agency to study the effect a lead ban will have on agriculture machinery before such a ban can be proposed.

The American Farm Bureau is currently conducting a survey, but their preliminary reports are that there are an average of ten engines in use on the farm today that require the use of leaded gasoline. Deere & Company estimates that there are more than two million large farm tractors, built before the 1970's and equipped with gasoline engines designed to run on leaded fuel, still in use on farms today.

The legislation we have prepared will require the Environmental Protection Agency, in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture, to conduct a study on the effect a lead ban will have on engines used in agriculture. The study must reflect typical farm work. The completed study would be published in the Federal Register by January 1, 1987. EPA will also be required to hold public hearings and file a final report to Congress by January 1, 1988. Lead could not be banned until EPA's study and recommendations are complete. This legislation has been developed in cooperation with the American Farm Bureau and the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.

To date we have a bipartisan group of 24 cosponsors of H.R. 2795. If you would like to add your name to the list, please contact Judy Dungan at 5-2371, or Glenda Temple at 5-2171.

Sincerely,
E (Kika) de la Garza,
CHAIRMAN.
Edward Madigan,

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

RANKING MINORITY MEMBER.

 Rockwood, MI.

Hon. John D. Dingell,
 U.S. Representative.

Retirees nightmare: When you take all the leaded gasoline off the market or reduce it so low 0.1 grams of lead per gallon, what are we to do with our investments?

Example No. 1: I purchased a 1979 Pace Arrow motorhome in 1982 price 22 thousand, I'm still making payments on this vehicle, it was purchased as a retirement home to travel the U.S.

Example No. 2: In 1973 I purchased a fishing boat 120 hp mercruiser on the engine it specifies use leaded gas only, another investment down the drain. I have also a riding lawnmower a push mower all use leaded gasoline. If there's not enough lead in the gasoline we will burn up the valves and valve seats of these engines. Who's to blame for this disaster? The automobile manufacturer, the gasoline companies or our own government? How do I and millions of other people get reimbursed? Those purchases were made in good faith. If this ban goes on leaded gasoline and we have to run on gasoline not suited for our engines then I feel the government, automobile manufacturer and gasoline company's should compensate us for our losses.

It makes sense to me to stop manufacturing of all engines that take leaded gasoline also we probably can live with 0.5 grams per gallon but not with 0.1 grams per gallon as proposed by the E.P.A.

I don't know how many vehicles and engines the government and armed forces are going to be affected but I suspect many of them will still take leaded gasoline. What a cost to the taxpayers if all of them have to be destroyed or replaced. If the E.P.A. bans leaded gasoline also millions of boaters will be affected plus recreational vehicles.

I think the state of Michigan will be hurt in the tourist industry if nobody can travel who already owns vehicles that take leaded gas.

Can you do anything about this ban on leaded gasoline?

Respectfully,
 Robert W. Huff.

 Committee on Energy and Commerce,
 Washington, DC, September 30, 1985.

Hon. Lee M. Thomas,
 Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, Waterside Mall -- West Tower, Washington, DC.

Dear Mr. Thomas: Thank you for your August 14, 1985, reply to my July 15 letter concerning the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) rule reducing lead in gasoline to 0.10 grams per gallon in January and your proposal to ban such lead entirely in 1988. Your reply was interesting, but it raised more questions than it answered.

1. You state that the EPA "data" are "representative of the effects" of the phasedown "that can be expected". What does EPA mean by "representative" insofar as the engines mentioned in my July letter are concerned? What are those data? How and when were they acquired?

2. You state that EPA does "not have extensive information on some of the specific types of engines (e.g., outboard motors) or uses (e.g. agricultural)". What does that mean? What information do you have? What safety problems exist regarding gasoline and gasoline mixtures for recreational boats and what is being done about them?

3. You state that the 0.10 gram standard "offers sufficient valve protection to those engines which may need lead under reasonable speeds and loads." What is the basis for this statement? Does the term "engines" include the engines referenced in my letter? What evidence do you have that gasoline at this level will, in fact, be produced, distributed, and sold after January 1 in the rural agricultural areas of Michigan and other States, taking into consideration the pipeline distribution system in these areas. For example, is this view shared by such groups as the National Petroleum Refiners Association? If you are wrong, what will be the impact after January 1 on the agricultural community, taking into account the enclosed survey by the Farm Bureau. Please explain banking and its impact.

4. You state you are "paying particular attention to the concerns of the agricultural community and are investigating thoroughly the use of unleaded gasoline in farm machinery that was designed for leaded gasoline." When was this investigation begun? What is its status? When will it be completed? Please describe the investigation. Does it cover gasoline at a level set for January 1?

5. Your letter also indicates that you are examining the "possibility of alternative additives" and that some "look promising." You mention a demonstration program. Your letter suggests that such additives are not expected to be readily available soon. But if leaded gasoline is not available in January and additives are also not available, what will be the results? When will additives be ready?

I share your concern about the health effects of lead from gasoline, paint and other sources. Reduction is clearly wise. But it is not clear to me that EPA has done a sound job in understanding the impacts of the January 1 reduction or a ban before reaching these conclusions. It appears that your research was once again incomplete. That concerns me. It should concern you as well.

I request your reply to the above matters by October 18, 1985.

Sincerely,
John D. Dingell,
Chairman.

RESULTS OF FB SURVEY ON LEADED GAS (3,166 Responses)

1. Of the total gallons of fuel used on your farm in farm equipment (trucks, tractors, mowers, etc.) what percentage would you estimate you use of each? This includes fuel purchased off the farm at a station for farm use.

Farm Unleaded Gasoline: Average: 16% (464 est. gallons/year).

Farm leaded Gasoline: Average: 84% (2,372 est. gallons/year).

2. How much equipment on your farm was originally designed to burn leaded gasoline and is still burning leaded gasoline?

NOTE: This table is divided, and additional information on a particular entry may appear on more than one screen.

Average farm	Number of units	
	1972 and newer	1971 and older
30 HP and up	2.1	3.4

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

29 HP and under	2.9	2.1
Average farm	Percent of time units run at 80 to 100 percent of maximum rpm	Estimated cost to buy all this equipment new today
30 HP and up	70%	\$90,604
29 HP and under	81%	7,577

3. How much equipment on your farm was originally designed to burn no-lead gasoline and is still burning no-lead gasoline?

Number of Units 30 HP & Up -- 0.8, Number of Units 29 HP & under -- 0.5.

4. How much longer would you expect your leaded gas-burning equipment to remain in service on your farm if leaded gas continues to be available?

2% less than 2 years, 10% 2 to 5 years, 39% 5 to 10 years, 49% use indefinitely.

5. Could most of the lead burning equipment on your farm be modified to burn unleaded gas?

5% Conversion could be accomplished, 56% Conversion would not be economically feasible, 39% Don't know.

6. Have you burned unleaded gasoline in an engine designed to burn leaded?

5% It worked fine, 12% It would not burn quite right without adjustment to engine, 8% Didn't work at all, 75% I have never tried unleaded fuel in an engine designed for leaded fuel.

7. (The current EPA standard is 1.1 grams of lead per gallon). What amount of lead would be required for satisfactory operation of your lead burning engines?

82% Don't know, 14% Need greater than 0.5 grams of lead per gallon, 3% Reduce allowable amount of lead to 0.5 grams/gallon, 1% reduce allowable amount of lead to 0.1 grams/gallon (as EPA's new rule).

8. How would the total elimination of leaded gas affect your farming operation?

70% It would really disrupt our fuel situation, 15% It would cause a few problems, but we would cope, 3% It wouldn't bother me at all, 12% Other.

9. What is your preferred method of keeping leaded gasoline available to agriculture?

32% Exemption, 25% Keep at 1.1 grams, 28% No answer, 15% Other.

I want to protect the public health through lead reduction in gasoline. But that must be done wisely and on the basis of sound research by EPA. I am not satisfied that in the case of some engines like agricultural machinery, EPA has conducted that research. Thus, I think the issue will not go away merely by passage of this amendment. Our committee may still have to address it by oversight at least.

Mr. TAUKE. I thank the gentleman, and I want to emphasize to the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from California that if for some reason some change will be made in the agreements that have been made, I, too, would be compelled to oppose any changes in conference on this issue.

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

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

Mr. WAXMAN. I want to commend the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from Illinois for raising the issue that is embodied and resolved, I think satisfactorily, by this particular amendment. It is narrow; it deals with a very real problem which you have brought to our attention. I appreciate the commitment, should others see this as an opportunity to expand it in ways that will be adverse to public health, to join us in opposing it. But for this limited purpose, I want to commend you for working out this amendment and I join in support of it.

Mr. TAUKE. I thank the gentleman for his cooperation.

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

Mr. TAUKE. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for the initiative he has taken in offering this amendment. It could prove to be a vital step in changing our current policy, which is dependent upon petroleum products entirely, to switching to an alcohol fuels economy.

I continue to be concerned about the need for our Nation to shift to a greater reliance on alcohol fuels as a way of reducing the burgeoning trade deficit. This year, the trade deficit is expected to reach a record \$150 billion. One-third of that deficit is due to the cost of imported oil. If the United States could exploit the vast amounts of grain and corn that our farmers produce, we could make a significant dent in the trade deficit and help our economic position at home and abroad.

We can reduce the trade deficit if our Government would only follow the recommendations of the U.S. National Alcohol Fuels Commission and the example of Brazil.

The Alcohol Fuels Commission issued an important report in 1981 which discussed in great detail how a coordinated public and private national effort to produce alcohol fuels would move the United States toward energy independence. It issued sensible recommendations to achieve this. Unfortunately, those recommendations have been ignored.

The Brazilian experience demonstrates how alcohol fuel can be an effective alternative to petroleum fuels. I recently saw firsthand that Brazil's public and private sectors have already established widespread production and distribution systems for alcohol fuels. They have in place automotive manufacturing operations which devote more than 90 percent of their production to alcohol fueled automobiles. They have in place a system for converting older vehicles to alcohol fuel operation. One-third of Brazil's automobiles currently operate on alcohol fuels. In 1984, our southern neighbor shaved \$2 billion from its import bill through use of alcohol fuels.

The United States can and should follow Brazil's example. We should vigorously promote alcohol fuel development. By doing this, we would not only reduce our trade deficit by reducing substantially the importation of foreign oil, but we would put the farm surpluses being produced at a record rate to productive use.

Currently, the U.S. alcohol fuels industry produces approximately 500 million gallons a year. This is insufficient to meet our needs. Last year, we imported \$100 million worth of alcohol fuels. The demand in our country will be even greater as lead is phased out as an octane enhancer from gasoline consumed in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, the time is late but we must start now to make alcohol fuels an integral part of U.S. energy policy and of our assault on the trade deficit.

Mr. TAUKE. I thank the gentleman.

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Tauke] has expired.

(On request of Mr. Madigan and by unanimous consent, Mr. Tauke was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. MADIGAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I wish to commend the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from Oklahoma for their initiatives in this regard. But especially I want to thank the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Michigan, the subcommittee chairman of the Health and Environment Subcommittee and the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, for their assistance in letting this committee deal with this very serious problem for the farmers and ranchers of America.

Mr. TAUKE. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. It is the Chair's understanding that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Dingell] withdrew his point of order.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, only to repeat again that the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Illinois, and the gentleman from Texas, are cognizant of the problem that we face with this amendment. It had been addressed in proper form. A bill was introduced by the gentleman from Illinois, and the gentleman from Texas, and it was not our intention to burden the farm legislation with amendments of this nature in respect for the jurisdictional concerns of the gentleman from Michigan. But we have no control over amendments that might be introduced, and we appreciate now the gentleman reaching this agreement with us. But in the beginning, when the issue was addressed, it was not intended to in any way interfere with the jurisdiction of the committee which the distinguished gentleman leads.

MR. BEREUTER. MR. CHAIRMAN, I RISE IN SUPPORT OF THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY THE GENTLEMAN FROM IOWA. I HAVE JUST ONE POINT THAT I WISH TO CLARIFY FOR THE RECORD.

AFTER THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY ANNOUNCED ITS INTENTION TO PHASE OUT LEAD IN GASOLINE, MANY OF MY CONSTITUENTS IN NEBRASKA EXPRESSED CONCERN TO ME ABOUT THE EFFECT THAT A TOTAL BAN ON LEADED FUEL MIGHT HAVE ON THEIR FARMING OPERATION. BECAUSE OF THIS CONCERN, I SUPPORT THE AMENDMENT WHICH THE GENTLEMAN OFFERS TODAY.

I WOULD POINT OUT THAT THIS SAME STUDY WAS INTRODUCED AS LEGISLATION IN THE HOUSE, EARLIER THIS YEAR AND I COMMEND THE GENTLEMEN FOR MOVING THE INTENT OF THAT LEGISLATION FORWARD BY OFFERING IT AS AN AMENDMENT TO THIS FARM BILL.

UNFORTUNATELY, SOME OF MY CONSTITUENTS IN NEBRASKA AND THE REPRESENTATIVES OF SOME FARM ORGANIZATIONS HAVE INCORRECTLY PERCEIVED ANY STUDY SUCH AS THIS AS AN EFFORT TO HALT THE INCREASED USE OF ETHANOL IN GASOLINE. I THINK IT IS THE CLEAR INTENTION OF THIS BODY, AND I THINK I SPEAK PARTICULARLY FOR MEMBERS FROM AGRICULTURAL DISTRICTS, THAT WE DO SUPPORT THE INCREASED USE OF ETHANOL IN GASOLINE NOT ONLY BECAUSE IT CREATES AN ADDITIONAL NEW MARKET FOR GRAIN, BUT ALSO FOR ENVIRONMENTAL AND HEALTH REASONS.

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

HOWEVER, BEFORE THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY MAKES ANY MOVE TO COMPLETELY BAN LEAD IN GASOLINE, WE MUST HAVE A CLEAR UNDERSTANDING OF THE IMPACT SUCH A BAN WOULD HAVE ON FARMERS AND THE MACHINERY THEY USE ON THE FARM. GIVEN THE CURRENT STATE OF OUR AGRICULTURAL ECONOMY, IT IS INDEED DESIRABLE THAT WE EXAMINE WHETHER A BAN ON ALL UNLEADED GASOLINE WOULD FURTHER EXACERBATE CONDITIONS ON THE FARM.

A RECENT STUDY OF THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU SHOWS THAT ON AVERAGE, THERE ARE AS MANY AS 10 TO 14 MOTORS REQUIRING LEADED FUEL ON EVERY FARM. UNLESS THERE ARE ADEQUATE MEANS FOR ADOPTING THE USE OF UNLEADED GASOLINE IN THESE MOTORS, AN AVERAGE FARMER COULD SPEND THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS IN REPLACEMENT COSTS. BEFORE FARMERS ARE FORCED TO ABANDON THE VEHICLES THEY ARE USING NOW, WE MUST CONSIDER THE COST TO THE FARM ECONOMY, AND IF NECESSARY, CONTINUE TO MAKE SOME LEADED GASOLINE AVAILABLE FOR OLDER MOTORS.

AGAIN, I WOULD STRESS THAT THIS AMENDMENT IS NOT INTENDED TO PRECLUDE THE FUTURE USE OF ETHANOL IN GASOLINE, OR STUNT THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ETHANOL INDUSTRY. INSTEAD, THIS STUDY WILL HELP GUIDE BOTH CONGRESS AND THE ADMINISTRATION TO IMPLEMENT A LEAD PHASEOUT POLICY WHICH DOES NOT IMPOSE AN UNREASONABLE BURDEN ON OUR ALREADY FINANCIALLY STRAPPED AGRICULTURAL ECONOMY.

I URGE ADOPTION OF THIS AMENDMENT.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Tauke] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Jones].

The amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Jones], as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GLICKMAN

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Has the amendment been printed in the Record as of September 24?

Mr. GLICKMAN. It has been, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Glickman: On page 503, after line 7, insert the following new section:

"NEW GRAIN CLASSIFICATIONS

Sec. 1873. The Secretary shall direct the Federal Grain Inspection Service and the Agricultural Research Service to cooperate in developing new means of establishing grain classifications taking into account characteristics other than those visually-evident and shall report to the House Committee on Agriculture and the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry not later than December 31, 1985, on the status of those cooperative efforts as they relate to

more accurately classifying types of wheat and other grains now in use."

Mr. GLICKMAN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered by Mr. Roberts and myself. The title is "New Grain Classifications." We have a serious problem out in wheat country with respect to classifying grain. With new technology we have been able to come up with new classes of grain, which functionally are the same, for example, as hard winter wheat, a classification called ARCAN, but visually, since it looks like soft wheat, it has been classified as such, which results in a lower price for Kansas farmers. This amendment would just merely direct the Federal Grain Inspection Service and the Agriculture Research Service to cooperate in developing new means of establishing grain classifications, taking into account characteristics other than those visually evident and reporting back to the committee of Congress as to the status of those cooperative agreements as they relate to more accurately classifying types of wheat and other grains now in use.

I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Roberts].

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

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. This amendment addresses a problem we are having in wheat country that today is only a problem but could turn into a crisis at harvest time next year.

The Federal Grain Inspection Service was created by Congress over a decade ago to grade and insure that buyers of U.S. grain are receiving a uniform standard quality of grain. The cornerstone to this process is grain grading based upon visual determinations of hardness or softness of the kernel. Visual examination of the kernel of wheat is currently the only acceptable method for identifying a class of wheat for grading.

However, through the miracle of modern science and advances in plant breeding, high yielding varieties have been released for farmers to grow. Many of these varieties commonly exhibit kernel characteristics of more than one class of wheat thereby causing difficulties in wheat classing. Some of the new varieties released by the plant breeders in the Great Plains have kernels that display both hard red kernels and soft red kernels.

The percentage of hard red winter wheat varieties exhibiting nontypical kernel characteristics is expected to increase in 1986 as more of the hybrid wheat varieties are released and grown. This means that a larger percentage of the 1986 wheat crop could fall under the wrong classification. The current system, in place since 1914, is totally inadequate for the modern wheat varieties that are being developed.

It is time for Federal Grain Inspection Service to develop a new testing and grading system that will address the problems created by the new varieties of wheat. This amendment would require that FGIS and the Agricultural Research Service report back to Congress on what they are doing to address this problem. While this amendment is a good first step there are those who feel that we should mandate that Federal Grain Inspection Service and the Agricultural Research Service be given a specific time limit in which to come up with a new testing procedure. I won't advocate that at this time but I do want to serve notice we will have hearings on that subject.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. It is time we let the folks at Federal Grain Inspection know that

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

Congress is serious on this issue. FGIS must come up with a new testing procedure that is in step with the technology of the eighties. Relying on a seventy year system of visual inspection is totally unacceptable to the grain trade, farmers, and our customers.

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLICKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. de la GARZA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to inform the gentleman that the chairman of the Grain Subcommittee, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Foley], informs me that they have no objection to this amendment. Accordingly, on this side, we would have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Glickman].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JEFFORDS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Jeffords: Title XVIII, page 509, after line 13 insert the following:

FARMLAND PROTECTION

"Sec. 1986. (a) Section 1546 of the Farmland Protection Policy Act (7 U.S.C. 4207) is amended by striking out the words "Within one year after the enactment of this subtitle," and substituting therefore "On January 1, 1987, and at the beginning of each subsequent calendar year,".

(b) Section 1548 of the Farmland Protection Policy Act (7 U.S.C. 4209) is amended by striking the words "any State, local unit of government, or" and inserting before the period at the end of the sentence ": PROVIDED, That the Governor of an affected state where a state policy or program exists to protect farmland may bring an action in the Federal District Court of the district where a federal program is proposed to enforce the requirements of section 1541 of this subtitle and regulations issued pursuant thereto".

Mr. JEFFORDS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe this amendment has any controversy. I have talked to the ranking members of the subcommittees and the committee and the chairmen of the subcommittee and committee. It is a much-scaled-down version of what I offered in committee to take care of the objections that were raised at that time

What it merely says is that those States, of which there are 11, that have a farm land protection act, can if necessary, get the Federal Government to enforce their own regulations on farm land protection which merely state that they should consider the loss of farm land in implementing Federal programs. It does not have any teeth in it really.

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

This says that if they even refuse to do that, that the Governor of a State can get the courts to force them to at least do their own regulations.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JEFFORDS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to this amendment. The Department of Agriculture has been uncooperative and unresponsive to the Congress in administering the Farmland Policy Protection Act and this amendment would at least force them to report to us.

Additionally, I believe this amendment provides some authority to Governors of States which are trying to assist themselves to be more active in forcing Federal cooperation.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I thank the gentleman. I would point out that the other part of the amendment is only to have a report annually.

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

Mr. JEFFORDS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BEREUTER. I thank the gentleman for his initiative. I certainly support it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. Jeffords].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BENNETT

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

The CHAIRMAN. Has the amendment been printed in the Congressional Record of September 24?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes; it has, Mr. Chairman.

The clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bennett: Page 509, after line 6, insert the following:

STRATEGIC STOCKPILE AUTHORITY

Sec. 1896. Of the commodities in the Commodity Credit Corporation or otherwise under the Department of Agriculture stores, one-half thereof as of January 1, 1986, shall be available for sale or barter with the proceeds to be used to furnish materials for the Strategic Stockpile without further appropriations therefor. Such sales or barter can be made within the United States or abroad and may be undertaken between the United States and other sovereign countries. To the extent that the assets of the Commodity Credit Corporation are reduced by this process, the full faith and credit of the United States shall be substituted therefor. The Commodity Credit Corporation shall take appropriate action to protect fully the assets of the Commodity Credit Corporation on the basis of the established value at the time of transfer of the assets for sale or barter. In such sales or barter the commodities need not be sold or bartered at a profit and no such sale or barter shall be effected which in the judgment of the Commodity Credit Corporation will seriously adversely affect production or prices in the United States or elsewhere.

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

Mr. BENNETT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is needed to put directly into the National Defense Stockpile -- of strategic and critical materials -- all such strategic and critical materials acquired by barter or sale of agricultural commodities owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The language in the bill allows sales and barter for such defense materials but places the warehousing, ownership, and management of such acquired defense materials in the Agriculture Department. With this amendment the bill can go to conference in a way in which all of these warehousing, ownership, and management matters will be in, and with, the established strategic stockpile authorities without duplication, bureaucracy, and waste. And the Commodity Credit Corporation will be protected by the full faith and credit of the Government, this being substituted for the materials and values otherwise owned by that corporation. In the bill in conference this will allow a better result than the bill now provides. I sincerely hope the amendment will be approved.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Bennett].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MS. SNOWE

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Chairman, I have two amendments at the desk to title XVIII, and I ask unanimous consent that the two amendments be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maine?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Have the amendments been printed in the Congressional Record of September 24?

Ms. SNOWE. Yes; they have, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Ms. Snowe: Page 437, after line 2, insert the following:

POTATO INSPECTION

Sec. 1805. The Secretary of Agriculture, in order to achieve a significant reduction in the volume of substandard imported Canadian potatoes entering through ports of entry in the northeastern United States, shall require the Agricultural Marketing Service to perform random spot checks in accordance with other law and on a continuing basis on a significant portion of potatoes entering through those ports of entry. The Secretary of Agriculture shall periodically report to the public and to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives the results of such spot checks and increase their frequency or take other actions as necessary to achieve and maintain the significant reduction of such substandard imported potatoes.

Page 509, after line 13, insert the following:

POTATO ADVISORY COMMISSION

Sec. 1896. It is the sense of Congress that --

(1) the Secretary of Agriculture should take actions based on the recommendations of the potato advisory committee established by the Secretary on an ad hoc basis;

(2) such actions should address industry concerns including trade, quality inspections, and pesticide use;

(3) such committee should meet biannually; and

(4) the recommendations and actions of such committee should be reported to the Chairmen of the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, and to the public.

Ms. SNOWE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered as read and printed in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Chairman, my first amendment simply instructs the Agricultural Marketing Service of the Department of Agriculture to continue current efforts to reduce the volume of substandard quality Canadian potatoes from entering United States markets through Maine and other Northeast ports of entry.

This amendment is intended to reinforce the demands of Maine's potato industry that imported potatoes meet grade and marketing requirements, and be certified as such when these imported loads come into the country. Last year, at my request, the Agricultural Marketing Service began to perform random spotcheck inspections on Canadian imported potatoes. From mid-December until mid-May, the end of the shipping season, 20 percent of the 370 loads inspected were found to be substandard.

My amendment is simple. The Agricultural Marketing Service would be instructed to perform an adequate number of inspections, and take other steps as needed, to significantly reduce the volume of loads found to be in violation of U.S. marketing standards. My amendment contains no time limit or specific requirements other than the requirement that the results of these inspections be periodically reported to the public and to the House and Senate Agriculture Committees.

The purpose of this amendment, Mr. Chairman, is to give Maine's potato industry greater assurance that imported potatoes are meeting the same quality requirements that they are now required to meet. Judging from the results of last year's inspections, an obvious quality problem exists. I believe this is a problem which merits more concerted attention from the Agricultural Marketing Service.

My amendment requires the Department to make more of an effort to assure that the quality of the potatoes imported through Maine meets existing standards. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to improve the Maine potato industry's ability to compete fairly with our Canadian neighbors.

Mr. Chairman, my second amendment will require the Department of Agriculture to take actions based on the recommendations of the Potato Advisory Commission to assist this industry.

This commission, an ad hoc group composed of representatives of the potato industry and representatives of the Department of Agriculture, was formed earlier this year to address the concerns of the potato industries in Maine and other States, and to bring potato industry officials in closer contact with the Secretary and other department officials on economic and trade issues.

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

Secretary Block announced the formation of this Advisory Commission in December 1984, to bring industry representatives here to Washington on a periodic basis to develop policies to better assist potato producers. The Commission has met on three occasions -- in March, June, and most recently on September 25.

My amendment is a sense-of-Congress resolution that the Secretary of Agriculture should act, based on the concerns and recommendations of the Advisory Commission, to provide greater assistance to the potato industry. In addition, my amendment states that the Commission should meet at least twice a year, and that the results of these meetings should be reported by the Department to the House and Senate Agriculture Committees.

Potato producers, nationally, and especially Maine potato producers, are facing difficult problems on account of cheaper, subsidized imports, which are underselling our potatoes in our own markets. The Potato Advisory Commission has begun to look at these issues, and to make recommendations to the Department of Agriculture. In addition, the committee has been concerned about gaining a better understanding of pesticide regulations in Canada and the United States, and about differences between the two countries on systems of quality inspection. Through this exchange with the Department on issues of specific concern to the potato industries, I think we can make great strides in helping our producers make a living on the farm.

Despite the demonstrated value of the Commission over the past 12 months, there is room for improvement. Being strictly advisory, however, doesn't give this Commission an opportunity to recommend policy changes and to see the Department take real concrete steps to respond to their recommendations. My amendment simply urges the Department to take advantage of this forum to address the real concerns of an important agricultural sector: the potato industry.

My amendment does not make this advisory panel a permanent body, or place undue restrictions on the format or conduct of their actions. What my amendment will do is reinforce the importance of the Commission, thereby bolstering the efforts of the Department and Congress to address the needs of this industry.

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

Ms. SNOWE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PANETTA. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we have discussed these amendments. It is my understanding that these amendments basically say to the Department, "Do what you are supposed to do under the law. Do the random checks; implement the protections that are built into the law as it exists now.

For that reason, we would have no objection on this side to accepting those amendments and reemphasizing what indeed the law says in the potato area.

Ms. SNOWE. I thank the gentleman for his comments with respect to the amendments. That is precisely what they would do. The Potato Advisory Commission, again, is to take actions based on the recommendations of that Commission because there are a number of problems not only facing the Maine potato industry but also our Nation's potato industry. I think this kind of exchange is the best way to go about it in addition to having the inspection services as well.

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

Ms. SNOWE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EMERSON. We on this side have examined the gentlewoman's amendments and find them perfectly acceptable and commend her for her efforts and are glad to accept the amendments.

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

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

Ms. SNOWE. I yield to the gentleman.

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

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendments offered by the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. Snowe] assisting our beleaguered vegetable farmers in their continuing efforts to remain competitive with our trading partners. I commend the gentlewoman for her thoughtful approach to this sensitive trade issue, and for her hard work on behalf of our domestic agricultural industry.

Importation of certain vegetable commodities into American markets has had a devastating effect upon our domestic producers. In that regard, I introduced legislation once again in this Congress, imposing a temporary surtax on certain of these commodities in the event that they enter the United States in such volume and at such reduced prices as to cause injury to American farmers. My bill, H.R. 110, requires the Secretary of Agriculture to monitor cabbages, carrots, celery, lettuce, red and yellow storage onions, potatoes, and radishes to determine from volume and benchmark prices the extent of economic impact on our domestic growers. I am pleased to note that my legislation enjoys the support of the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. Snowe] as well as several other concerned Members of Congress from the afflicted Northern States. The fight to save our domestic vegetable market from continued erosion is a cooperative effort -- I am pleased to be able to speak in support of Ms. Snowe's amendments.

The gentlewoman's amendments will reinforce our efforts to keep the U.S. vegetable industry competitive. This past December the Secretary of Agriculture John Block, recognized the unfair trade situation facing our domestic producers when he established the Ad Hoc Potato Advisory Committee. Comprised of industry representatives drawn from across the United States, the ad hoc committee has met three times over the past 10 months to discuss the continuing problem of imports undercutting our domestic product. While I commend the Secretary for his December initiative, I would like to take this opportunity to express my strong support for the extension of this program to embrace other troubled commodities.

I represent an area of New York known as the "black dirt region." Some of this country's finest onions are grown in this sector of Orange County. I can assure you that my farmers are hurting and that they would benefit immeasurably from the creation of an Ad Hoc Advisory Committee on Onions. Accordingly, I strongly urge the Secretary of Agriculture to consider extending this model program.

The amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Maine clarifies the role of the Ad Hoc Potato Advisory Committee by requiring that: First, the Ad Hoc Potato Advisory Committee meet at least twice a year; second, the Secretary of Agriculture take action to relieve the burden on our domestic producers based on the ad hoc committee's recommendations; and third, that the Secretary of Agriculture should report publicly to both the House and Senate Agriculture Committees on actions taken by the ad hoc committee.

Compounding the difficulties facing our American farmers in their constant battle to remain competitive with imported commodities, is the importation into his country of substandard products bearing USDA approvals. The Agricultural Marketing Service has been conducting random spot checks at the U.S. border to ensure that potatoes entering this country are up to prescribed standards. The second amendment offered by Ms. Snowe expresses the support of Congress that the Agricultural Marketing Service should continue these random spot checks and that they should increase the frequency of these checks in an effort to maintain significant reductions in the movement of substandard product into this country. I encourage the Secretary of Agriculture to enlarge the scope of the random check program to include other affected commodities.

Events of the past several weeks have made clear to all of us that U.S. trade policy needs to be reviewed and reformed. The time to act is now. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support the Snowe amendments.

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

Ms. SNOWE. I thank the gentleman for his comments. I think both of these endeavors certainly can complement what the gentleman is suggesting in trying to address other commodities that are facing similar problems with respect to imports from Canada. I think the kind of advisory commissions established by the Department of Agriculture for the potato industry could be extended to other commodities as well.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. Snowe].

The amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DASCHLE

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

The CHAIRMAN. Has the amendment been printed in the Record of September 24?

Mr. DASCHLE. Yes, it has, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Daschle: Page 434, line 3, insert "(a)" after "Sec. 1803."

Page 434, after line 23, add the following:

(b) Section 20(f) of the Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 620(f)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(g) The Secretary may prescribe terms and conditions under which cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, and other equines that may have been administered an animal drug or antibiotic not approved for use in the United States may be imported for slaughter and human consumption. If the Secretary determines that the use of an animal drug or antibiotic in any of such livestock is harmful to the health of man and that it is impossible to determine the livestock being imported do not harbor any residue of such animal drug or antibiotic, the Secretary may issue an order forbidding the entry into the United States of such kind of livestock from any country that allows the use of such animal drug or antibiotic in the production of such livestock in such country. No person shall enter cattle, sheep, swine, goats, horses, mules, and other equines into the United States in violation of any order issued under this subsection by the Secretary."

Mr. DASCHLE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am offering today will strengthen our meat inspection laws with regard to the importation of live animals, by providing the Secretary with direct, discretionary authority to deal with imported slaughter animals suspected to be unfit for human consumption. This amendment addresses the question of the use of nonapproved animal antibiotics in the production of imported slaughter animals.

Current statute allows the Secretary the authority to ban the importation of carcasses, meat or meat products that are considered to be "adulterated." While it is not impossible for the Secretary to broaden this section to include live animals, no specific reference is made to live animals, and how these products might be considered to be adulterated. Herein lies the problem.

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

My amendment gives the Secretary the direct, discretionary authority to address this issue by prescribing the terms under which live animals may be imported for slaughter and human consumption. Under my amendment, this authority extends to imported slaughter animals which may have been administered an animal antibiotic not approved for use in the United States.

If the Secretary determines that it is impossible to detect residues of such nonapproved drugs or antibiotics in the live animals, and that the use of that nonapproved drug is harmful to the health and welfare of the consuming public, the Secretary may ban the importation of that class of animal. This ban would apply to every country allowing the use of this drug in the production of that class of animal, until such time as that country no longer permits the use of that drug in the production of that class of animal.

Livestock producers in this country have a legitimate complaint. On one hand, our Government forbids the use of a particular drug or antibiotic in the production of our domestic slaughter animals. Many times the use of these drugs is not approved because of the severe health hazards their use may cause to consumers of these meat products. At the very same time, this same Government permits live animals to be imported from countries which permit the use of the very same drugs we prohibit our own producers from using because of health reasons.

Producers ask, and rightly so, why the use of these drugs are not a health hazard in foreign imports, but is in our own domestically produced animals. This amendment will give the Secretary the unqualified authority to answer those producers.

Concern with the use of nonapproved animal drugs is as much a consumer issue as it is a producer issue. Consumers have every right to know that their meat products are safe for human consumption. By providing the Secretary with the clear authority to ban those imported animals that might be suspect to contain hazardous drugs, we are ensuring that he has the legal authority to make certain that consumers are, in fact, enjoying the safest possible meat products. I urge the inclusion of this amendment in the 1985 farm bill.

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DASCHLE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding, and this is to advise him that we have examined the amendment on our side and would have no objection to its adoption.

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

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

Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding. I am looking at the amendment, and I just do not find any basis upon which to raise an objection to it, so I think we are going to accept it on this side.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DASCHLE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Nebraska.

(Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague from my neighboring State of South Dakota, Mr. Daschle.

As my colleague has pointed out, this amendment is needed to extend the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

to impose limits on the importation of live animals that contain levels of chemicals that could cause a health hazard to our consumers. As the gentleman points out, current authority allows for addressing problems with processed products, and this added authority is needed, as well.

Earlier this year, live hogs were being imported from Canada into the United States that may have contained dangerous levels of chloramphenicol and other substances that have been banned in this country. It places our producers on a particularly unlevel playing field when we import live animals from countries that do not have high environmental and cleanliness standards, and yet do not allow our own producers access to these same chemicals and technologies.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this amendment to level the playing field for America's agricultural producers.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Daschle].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Chairman, America's cattlemen are facing their worst market in 17 years. Since January, feed cattle prices have dropped 25 percent, and many producers, from cow-calf operators to feedlot owners, are being forced into bankruptcy.

Despite these hard times, cattlemen are not asking for Government assistance. Instead, they are asking us to give them the opportunity to help themselves. The Beef Promotion and Research Act would give them that opportunity.

By enabling cattlemen to initiate a \$1 per head checkoff, we allow them to raise the money for much needed research, education, new product development and promotion programs. But this bill does not supercede existing State and national beef promotion programs. In fact, Mr. Chairman, up to one-half of the funds collected could be under State control. And rather than create a new bureaucracy, this bill utilizes and reinforces the existing industry structure.

Cattlemen desperately need, and want, the Beef Promotion and Research Act. A recent survey by an independent research service showed that more than three-fourths of the Nation's cattlemen believe that a checkoff is an important investment in their business. The average checkoff recommended was just over \$1 per head -- the same amount that the Beef Promotion and Research Act calls for. And this bill has strong, industrywide support.

The cattle industry has served us well through the years in providing a safe and wholesome source of nutrition. It's time for us to help the industry through these trying times. Mr. Chairman, the Beef Promotion and Research Act does not solve all the industry's problems, but it is a start. We owe them that much.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask if Willie Nelson is around and can rush to our assistance. I think we

may need some aid before the evening is over or before this farm bill is disposed of or the small farmer is disposed of completely.

I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, what has happened to all the amendments that were put in to assist the family farmer, whom I have joined with an urban-rural coalition to help save? Could the committee chairman respond briefly to that question, please?

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I would be very happy to respond to the gentleman and point out that we have addressed that issue. As a matter of fact, we accepted a series of amendments offered by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Brooklyn, NY, Mr. Towns, that addressed that issue in part.

Our concern extends beyond that. As we work through this legislation, we do not depart in any way whatsoever from the fact that we must address the issue of the family or the small farmer.

There have been attempts to divide or to strike at the big farmer or strike at the small farmer. But I think the gentleman should be proud of the way our committee has addressed that issue. Specifically, again I go back to our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Towns]. I point out that the gentleman from Brooklyn, the inner city of Brooklyn, has developed enough expertise to offer amendments to this legislation.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman saying, then, that I should be able to face in public the small farmers in America, because if they understood what the gentleman knows is in this bill, they would be proud of my support for this measure?

Mr. de la GARZA. I would assert to the gentleman in the affirmative, that certainly he should support it, and if he would, I would stand alongside him.

Mr. CONYERS. Then let me ask the committee chairman another question.

I am one who has been troubled in this House for many years about these several conditions in food: First of all, we have 35 million people living in poverty in America, many of them suffering from malnutrition. Second, we pay billions of dollars to farmers not to grow. Third, we are now faced with the world's worst famine, the worst famine in history, where 21 nations in Africa are in peril.

Is there some way I can explain to reasonable Americans why we are still paying people for being too efficient, why we are still driving thousands of small farmers into bankruptcy and into the cities, and why people are starving not only in America but in the world? Does this measure in any way address those questions?

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee, my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. de la Garza].

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Chairman, if I were to address the question of the gentleman in its proper form and give the answer which it merits, it would take hours. All I can attest to the gentleman is that we have addressed the issue and know that we do not specifically pay billions of dollars for someone not to plant. But there is a combination of very intricate but yet troubling problems of legislation.

The problem with famine is not that the food is not there; it is that it is in the wrong places, and sometimes the problem is with the government, like with the famine in Sudan and Ethiopia. It is not that we were not willing to send. They have problems with their governments. They have marketing problems, storage problems, and transportation problems.

Here in America it is the same way. There is food, but something else went wrong. It was not the fault of the

farmers. It is that the man does not have a job, there was a disaster in the inner city, or there was unemployment, low employment, and underemployment. That is the problem.

But the gentleman should be proud of the fact that our legislation has afforded the American constituency food at the least amount of disposable income per family for food. It is only 1 percent of the total budget. It is not all those billions; it is 1 percent of the total budget. But something else went wrong. If a fellow does not have a job, then we need to address that issue in other legislation, not here.

For 1 percent of the total budget we have given the American people the best-quality food in the world for the lowest amount of disposable income of any country in the world. But there are other things that impact it, and we cannot handle it all in this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Conyers] has expired.

(On request of Mr. Alexander, and by unanimous consent, Mr. Conyers was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

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

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the gentleman for sponsoring the bill which he and I joined together to introduce and which is designed to save the family farm and to also save the American taxpayer from the enormous burden placed upon the taxpayer by the current farm policy which the bill under consideration tends to continue.

I advise the gentleman, together with all the other Members, that at the conclusion of the debate on titles I will offer the farmers' solution to the farm bill as an amendment in the nature of a substitute and give to the gentleman, together with all other Members, the opportunity to save the family farmer in America.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to know that, and I will be there cheering and rooting for you. But does that turn upon a unanimous-consent request?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Conyers] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. Alexander, and by unanimous consent, Mr. Conyers was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, there is a perfecting amendment that will be offered to the amendment in the nature of a substitute which will seek permission from the House to adopt all of the actions heretofore entered into during deliberations by the Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union, so that the only provision that will be under consideration as presented by my amendment in the nature of a substitute will be Provision No. IV-A, which will achieve the goals that the gentleman from Michigan wishes to achieve to save the American farmer.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, did the chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. de la Garza], wish to respond? I yield to the gentleman.

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just wanted to advise the gentleman that apparently the legislation which the gentleman has cosponsored will increase the cost to the consumers, to the poor in the neighborhoods throughout urban America.

Mr. CONYERS. In other words, we are going to cut the consumer and the inner city -- --

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Conyers] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Conyers was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, in other words, the gentleman is telling me that if I support small farmers, the family farmer, through the substitute legislation that has been referred to, that I will then be in some concert to raise the price of food for consumers and people in the inner city.

Let me just say to the gentleman that as I understand it, as the family farmer is being driven off the land, it is the corporate farmer that is taking up huge acreages and they in concert, as corporate farmers are given to do, are going to be in control of the prices, and no matter what we are going to pay through this amendment, we are going to pay more ultimately when farming becomes a corporate enterprise in its totality.

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

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is entirely correct. But on the question of increase in consumer prices, under the gentleman's -- --

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Conyers] has again expired.

(At the request of Mr. Alexander, and by unanimous consent, Mr. Conyers was allowed to proceed for 30 additional seconds.)

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

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, the increase in consumer prices projected by my amendment which I will offer, which the gentleman sponsored, will be 1 percent of the Consumer Price Index. That translates into a 2-cent increase in the price of a loaf of bread.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BADHAM

Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment that was printed in the Record as of September 24.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Badham: Page 432, strike out line 18 and all that follows thereafter through page 433, line 4, and redesignate the succeeding sections accordingly.

Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment which I have offered has been played in the press, to be modest about it. It is an amendment that has had a great deal of smoke put forth around it. This is the so-called egg-breaking amendment. It is not very complicated, but it has been made somewhat complicated.

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

A constituent of mine woke up some weeks ago one morning and found out by reading the newspaper, without any prior knowledge or information or request to testify, that the company that he started some 5 years ago to produce an egg-separating or egg-breaking machine had been put out of business by a two-line amendment in the agriculture bill that had been marked up, without hearing, without debate, and by a voice vote. He sought properly to get redress for this action, which he considered not too politic or congressional, with the Congress of the United States and for this purpose he called on his Congressman. For that purpose then, being his Congressman, I have learned more about eggs and salmonella and egg-breaking machines and the USDA and the content of eggs, their transport and processing of eggs, than I honestly ever wanted to know; but I do want to take the time of this House to set right the wrong that has been perpetrated on the consumer, on progress, on technology, and the agriculture producers of our great country.

There are at least two or three different kinds of hen eggs. Eggs sold into commerce can only be grade B or better, which means that they must be sanitized. They must be whole. They cannot have any cracks or chips or smells. They cannot have any manure on the outside of them. They are able to be sold into commerce and they are clean and they are fresh.

The problem comes when people in restaurants, people in bakeries who go for higher quality produce merchandise, want to use eggs that are fresh, wholesome and grade B or better in their cooking and in their baked products.

One of the catches in there that enables people to use whole fresh grade B or better eggs is the difficulty and the length of time and the cleanliness involved by breaking eggs by hand in a restaurant or a bakery, both of which are governed or licensed or inspected -- not by the USDA, but the Food and Drug Administration for cleanliness and handling.

Just recently, 50 people in the local area got sick from salmonella poisoning, 50 people. They traced it -- where, to a restaurant. To a machine? No, to hand-breaking eggs, because the hands of the people breaking the eggs were dirty and it caused disease.

Now comes a man who invents a machine, call it Egg King, Egg Master or whatever. This machine is a centrifuge that operates with perforated cylinders inside and going at 3,400 r/min's, a pretty fast machine, and will break literally scads of eggs per minute. All of a day's production can be broken in about 1 hour and perfectly separated and therefore there is no shell remaining in the egg liquid. The egg liquid is cooked, and I stress that, because it is pasteurized in accordance with the instructions on the machine and the egg material, the egg liquid, is pasteurized. It is removed from the shell and any salmonella that could possibly be present, and these go from refrigerator to separation to liquid within literally seconds. There is no salmonella because it has been pasteurized or cooked or baked, according to the instructions on the machine.

The State of Hawaii tested this machine time after time. They discovered that it was not only good, it saved money and ended up with a cleaner product.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. Badham] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Badham was allowed to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.)

Mr. BADHAM. The State of Hawaii is somewhat at stake at this amendment because it has put its whole department of health on the line in saying that this machine is good.

The Food and Drug Administration, again which I reiterate is the only outfit that licenses, inspects, and regulates the kinds of industries that use the machine: namely, bakeries and restaurants. There are some 700 of these machines in operation throughout the country, some 700 over the past 5 years.

Mr. Chairman, there has never been one complaint or one showing of any salmonella coming up in these, because you just cannot get salmonella poisoning material that is grade B or better, sanitized on the shell, and it has been

pasteurized or cooked.

It may come up in the debate, if there is a debate against this very simple bill, to allow progress to go ahead in this country by technology, lowering prices to consumers and lowering prices to restaurants and bakeries for higher quality products. It may come up that the University of Nebraska ran some sort of a test. I talked to the people at the University of Nebraska. The test that they used that might be shown in their letter was done on a grade lower than B that could have dirt on the shell. There is a less polite word for dirt on an egg shell, but that is what we are talking about, dirt on an egg shell lower than grade B. The eggs were not sanitized. It was also done in a manner that the eggs were left standing, and naturally salmonella being an airborne virus, can do it.

It did not say the eggs had to be cooked, so you can get salmonella that way in laboratory testing; however, at the same time that the people at the University of Nebraska were talking to us, the head of the food services at the University of Nebraska called us and said, "Please, don't let them do anything. We use this machine and it is a wonderful labor saving device. Please don't let the science department tell you something that just isn't plain true. We see no salmonella."

The USDA somehow got into this act. In October 1983, the machine was approved by USDA. On March 29, 1984, the approval was rescinded. On March 13, 1985, the machine was again reinstated as approved by USDA. On June 18, 1985, the USDA offered a paper saying they agreed with the so-called Thomas amendment that I am trying to remove.

On September 12, 1985, the Assistant Secretary, Mr. Ray Lett, was met with and he said the Department should withdraw its support of the Thomas amendment. Sometime shortly after that they went back to supporting the amendment. On October 3, 1985, conversations with my office indicated that they were formally withdrawing support of the amendment and were so advising Mr. Thomas. On the same day, after 6:30 that night, they flipfopped again, according to a Wall Street Journal reporter.

So there is a little something going on here. But ladies and gentlemen, however you vote on my amendment to allow a machine to be used that is used in USDA-licensed egg-breaking plants, that I will get into in a moment, do not think for a moment that the subject is health or salmonella. It just plain is not. This machine, as used in an authorized and regulated-by-USDA establishment, has to use grade B or better, the material has to be pasteurized, no salmonella, no doubt.

The USDA does come up with one argument, because they say that the shell can commingle with the liquid and, therefore, can be subject to salmonella. Again, it cannot if it is pasteurized, and cooking pasteurizes it. But I want my colleagues to know that in the regulations involving USDA-licensed egg-breaking plants, where eggs are broken by human hands, separated, the shells go one way in just about all cases and the liquid goes another way, until they find out, just like you do at home and just like you do at Denny's, you get little pieces of shell in there. The USDA recommends that to remove those segments of shell from an egg-breaking plant licensed by USDA which do not use grade B or better, they use C or lower, which have egg dirt on them, that that liquid, before it is frozen or powdered, if you like frozen or powdered eggs, be run through a separator, a clarifer, or a centrifuge before it goes into the freezer or powder, be purposely run in there to what -- to commingle with the egg shell and get them out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. Badham] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. Brown of California and by unanimous consent, Mr. Badham was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BADHAM. Just a couple more points.

Remember, colleagues, we are not talking about salmonella. We are talking about progress and the restriction of it by somebody who does not want a machine in competition. We are also talking about the bakers of our country, the restaurant people, the hotel people of our country, who want this machine because it allows them to give a better and

higher grade product.

So we are talking about an amendment that was slipped into the bill by voice vote, without hearings, and I am asking my colleagues in the name of progress and justice to undo that wrong that was done.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BADHAM. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BROWN of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for bringing this matter up. I recall it being discussed in the committee and being adopted. I raised some questions in the committee at the time as to what the purpose behind this was. I have certain objections to restrictions on technology myself. I believe I was reassured by what I thought was the position of the Department of Agriculture at that time. I did not realize that the matter had gone through several variations, as the gentleman has indicated here.

It seems to me this subject is an idea candidate for further study and hearings by the full committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. Badham] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Badham was allowed to proceed for 4 additional minutes.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BADHAM. I would be happy to continue to yield to the gentlemen from California.

Mr. BROWN of California. I think obviously from what the gentleman has said there are factors behind this that warrant further investigation. There may be a legitimate case for the language, but it has not been demonstrated to me yet and I hope that the House will see the wisdom of the gentleman's amendment and allow the committee to study this further before bringing back a more desirable amendment in the future.

Mr. BADHAM. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I think the U.S. Department of Agriculture might even have the good sense to want to study this device. They have flipflopped on it so many times, it is about time they decided whether it was good or whether it was bad. I am satisfied to stand by the operation of this machine in any test that anyone can devise, using the method of operation as instructed on each and every machine, which is made of stainless steel and has to be cleaned every 4 hours.

Again, ladies and gentlemen, let me stress that this is not a matter of salmonella. There is not going to be any salmonella in a pasteurized egg. The breadth of this amendment also is such that no matter what USDA says and whatever the proponents of the amendment might have us believe, the amendment prohibits any egg use in a public place, inspected by the USDA, unless the insides of the egg are examined before cooking.

Ladies and gentlemen, there go our hard-boiled eggs, our soft-boiled eggs and our pickled eggs.

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

Mr. BADHAM. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. STRANG. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, does this mean a restaurant would have a problem in serving a hard-boiled egg?

Mr. BADHAM. If they did not want to go afoul of USDA or FDA, absolutely.

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

Mr. STRANG. I mean under the gentleman's amendment would this create a problem?

Mr. BADHAM. Under my amendment, things would be exactly as they are now in the 37,000 restaurants, I believe, that are using the 700 machines licensed by FDA. They would continue just as they are now, no salmonella, grade B or better eggs.

Mr. STRANG. I am sure the gentleman, like me, has been in restaurants where the only thing one felt safe eating was a hard-boiled egg which one peels himself. Would this affect that?

Mr. BADHAM. Not in any way if my amendment passes.

Mr. THOMAS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Badham].

Certainly I admire my colleague for speaking out on behalf of his constituents, but I must oppose my distinguished colleague on this issue because there are several points that I believe the House must consider and then reject this amendment.

Let me say very loud and clear that the technology that we are talking about is a hazard to public health. The U.S. Department of Agriculture said so and the egg producers themselves say so as well. It is a hazard to public health because it is an egg-crushing processor, not an egg-breaking process. Eggs are literally dumped into the machine along with traces of blood, chicken manure, dirt, rot and fragments of paper egg cartons.

The USDA says that there are now safeguards that can prevent that. Let me say that again: Eggs can be dumped into the machine along with traces of blood, chicken manure, dirt, rot and fragments of paper egg cartons. The entire mess has been crushed together and mixed together before the shell fragments are removed. That is what USDA has said and that is why this technology has been banned from egg processing plants since 1970.

If my colleagues have any doubts about USDA's opinion on this issue, then I would simply point out one other fact. The more this process is used, the more eggs will be used and the more money the egg producers will make, but guess what, the egg producers themselves are opposed to this amendment and to the use of this egg-crushing machine. They are opposed because they know that is it just a matter of time until someone gets seriously ill or perhaps dies from salmonella poisoning as a result of the use of this very process.

Let me say that again: The issue here is that it is just a matter of time before someone gets seriously ill or perhaps dies from salmonella poisoning as a result of the use of this process that, follow me closely, was outlawed in 1970.

Let me get something straight here. Hearings were held. They were held in 1970 on this very issue, more than 15 years ago, and that is why, my friends, Congress passed the Egg Producers Inspection Act and that is why this egg-crushing process was outlawed by USDA in egg processing plants.

This type of egg-crushing process was not then used in businesses such as bakeries and restaurants and hotels, and so forth, and so the regulations were not extended into such establishments. Thus, the loophole that allowed this dangerous, old technology -- it is not new technology -- to be extended into new uses was not banned. Now we must act, in my opinion, to close this loophole.

I respect my distinguished colleague from California, but I must call for the position of USDA itself and the committee to be upheld in order to protect the public health.

Let me conclude my comments with a couple of other remarks. Those standards that were set there some 15 years ago provided first for one thing: that it was in the best interest of the public, for sanitary reasons and health reasons, that in the process of cracking eggs that the shell and the interior of the egg not be mixed and, of course, this is exactly the

way the machine works, to crush the entire egg and shell in the process.

It presents a second and very important thing that was set down in those provisions in 1970, and that was after all the steps that could have been taken and had been taken to put a clean egg there before the cracking machine, that there was one last step, and what it was was simply to crack the egg and look at it, to separate the shell and the egg and to visually observe, and from what is called organoleptic inspection of sense, of smell, and sight, to determine at last phase if there were no rot, or bloods, or any other imperfections in the egg, or for that matter, any matter on the outside of the shell of the egg, and to give it that last inspection. Of course, this machine, where plates of eggs are dumped into the machine at the rate of 360 a minute, that is 6 per second, that, therefore, that process is totally precluded.

Now let me tell you, FDA has not rendered any position on this machine as to its being acceptable. USDA has, and I want to read, since my colleague has brought about some question of USDA's position, let me read you USDA's position from their own hand.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Thomas] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Thomas of Georgia was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. THOMAS of Georgia.

Dear Congressman Thomas: This is to reaffirm our support for your amendment to the Egg Products Inspection Act.

Now listen closely:

We want to emphasize that we have never waived on our support of your amendment as it relates to plants operating under our jurisdiction. There did arise the question as to the propriety of our taking a position on that portion of the amendment under the jurisdiction of FDA. In reviewing our position more closely, we fully support your amendment.

One other letter that I would like to submit from the Department of Agriculture is dated October 4:

This is to clarify the impact your amendment to the Egg Products Inspection Act would have.

I want to read this because my colleague would have you believe that possibly this is the end of ordering a hard-boiled egg or a pickled egg in a restaurant, and of course, this provision as it stands in the committee at this time would have absolutely no effect on that. Cooked eggs are not considered processed eggs and, therefore, are totally out of this provision.

Let me go back and again read this letter:

This is to clarify the impact your amendment to the Egg Products Inspection Act would have on firms that hard-boil, soft-boil, and pickle eggs.

Your amendment would have no impact on the processing and marketing of these eggs. The EPIA specifically regulates the "processing" of liquid, frozen, and dried egg products. "Processing by definition in the EPIA, means "manufacturing egg products, including breaking eggs or filtering, mixing, blending, pasteurizing, stabilizing, cooling, freezing, drying, or packaging egg products." "Processing" does not include "cooking." Therefore, the EPIA is not amenable to the processing of cooked shell eggs.

This concludes my comments. I would ask the Members of this body to consider very carefully those points that I have made, and at this time I would be happy to yield back my remaining time.

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

Mr. REID. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in support of the amendment offered by my colleague from California. We have worked together as members of the Congressional Travel and Tourism Caucus and I appreciate his bringing this amendment to the floor of the House.

I must admit that I am somewhat perplexed as to the intent of the language in the bill. For example, the bill states:

No person shall process for commerce, any eggs for human consumption that (1) does not allow examination of the content of individual eggs being processed.

Does this mean that a customer may not go into a restaurant and order a hard or soft-boiled egg? Certainly the content of such an egg cannot be examined unless the proprietor is to stand and watch each egg as it is cracked by the customer. I can imagine the problems this would create in the case of room service.

Additional language states:

No person shall process for commerce, any eggs for human food in any manner that allows egg content to comingle with the egg shell or shell membrane during the process.

What is the problem? Is it the personnel or the equipment? In either case, I submit it is not a problem for the Federal Government. It is a matter more appropriately handled by the business and the public health services of the local governments who inspect health conditions of commercial establishments, including facilities, equipment, and personnel.

In my home State of Nevada, we have over 20 major hotels currently using automated egg cracking processors. The processors are efficient, time-saving, labor-saving, economical devices. As in any business, the hotel industry is constantly looking for ways to reduce costs and avoid waste. The egg cracking processor can crack up to 900 eggs per minute. The hotel industry is extremely concerned and careful about the health of their customers. Nothing can be more devastating to the food service industry than a case of food poisoning. This equipment is safe and can only become unsafe if it is improperly maintained, which is the case with any equipment. Keeping it clean is the job of management.

In closing, let me say not only is this equipment safe, but I submit that the safety and health of the customer is so critical to the hotel and food industry in my State, that they would not use it if it were not. Further, it is not only safe, economical, labor-saving, but it allows the food service industry to bring to the customer what he or she wants most -- a product made with fresh eggs.

I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. THOMAS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, just for brevity's sake, I think I just finished reading in my remarks there from the EPIA the fact that cooked and processed eggs have absolutely nothing to do with this amendment, and that the committee's position on this would in no way affect cooked or processed eggs.

Mr. REID. I think that is debatable.

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

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

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

Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Chairman, the author of the amendment in committee, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Thomas] would have you believe that the law as he proposes it to be really does not mean what the law really says. It means what the Department of Agriculture might say it means in a letter. But they have flip-flopped every few days on this, and the gentleman knows that.

I would like to correct the gentleman and thank him for yielding, that you do not have dirt or blood spots or cracks. A grade B or better egg cannot be sold in commerce unless it is free of all of those things. It cannot be sold into commerce if it does, so there is no salmonella because it is pasteurized.

Mr. REID. Reclaiming my time, I would also state, Mr. Chairman, I think if you read the letters as they were written, they talk about not processing the foods at the retail level, as I am concerned about, in a hotel or restaurant. I think it could be read that it only applies to that in a commercial venture such as processing eggs prior, and that they were meant to cover this in the amendment before the committee.

Mr. THOMAS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. THOMAS of Georgia. I simply would like to make this point here that I think we need to review. Certainly there are requirements for certain grades of eggs, and the requirement that they must meet in order to get that grade standard. But you must realize there is absolutely no guarantee that that can be carried out to 100 percent. Everyone works, of course, to the best of their ability to do so, and that is what this machine does, in my opinion. Its great danger is that it precludes what could be the last saving inspection, that organoleptic inspection by eye and sense of smell.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. Reid] has expired.

(On request of Mr. Thomas of Georgia and by unanimous consent, Mr. Reid was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. THOMAS of Georgia. If the gentleman will continue to yield, my point is that this is what we must understand. Certainly everyone does everything they can to deliver a clean egg. But the normal sanitization process that is used does not result 100 percent, or even close to it in the destruction of salmonella bacteria that can be embodied deeply in the pores of the egg.

And that can occur even on an egg that appears to be very clean and very sanitary. But when you dump it into that large hopper, the centrifuge-type machine, without having inspected or separated it, then you expose the entire content of those eggs and all the eggs in the hopper to that salmonella bacterium. That is a real and prevalent thing.

Mr. REID. Reclaiming my time, I think the point made by the gentleman from Georgia amplifies the points that have been made in support of this bill. Namely, this is something that should be maintained by local governments, and I would also state that it appears quite clear that the Committee on Agriculture should have hearings on this matter. I do not think it should go forward on the basis it has been presented to this committee.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from Georgia did not misspeak himself gravely when he said that if you have salmonella bacteria which are airborne, which can come to roost on an eggshell, if the eggshell is left out in the ambient air, as they are at some fast food restaurants for a long time, they cannot burrow into the shell; the fact is, if the liquid is pasteurized, cooked, or baked, no salmonella. The gentleman implied that there would be. I believe he is wrong on that point.

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

Mr. THOMAS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. REID. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. THOMAS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Certainly that is the case, but my point is that if the salmonella bacteria is embedded in the porous surface of the egg and the egg is cracked without that final visual inspection, it is then mixed and it is not cooked for some reason, and there are certain recipes that do not require cooking till 140 degrees in a restaurant, then certainly the salmonella bacteria would not be destroyed. That is my very point.

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

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

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

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, you know, a Supreme Court Justice once said that government is to be feared the most when its purposes are benevolent.

This case illustrates that maxim very well.

Pity the lot of the producer of class C eggs in America today; can't sell them commercially, he is relegated to selling them for the purpose of making egg powder.

Now if you are in the restaurant business, you always seek to build a better mousetrap to have people come to your restaurant. That is competition. To the extent that you have fresh eggs in your products to attract customers. If you are seeking to buy class A and class B eggs and crack them one by one, your labor goes out of sight. So what do you do? You get a machine that somebody has invented that permits the machine cracking of the eggs in the shell and utilization of it to give the product that people eat the flavor of fresh eggs as opposed to powdered eggs. If you are in the business of selling powdered eggs, you find that machines are beginning to take your business. You do not like losing your business. So what do you do? You come to this distinguished Member of the House representing his area, and you get an amendment offered, but you need a plausible reason as to why this should fly. So you erect a flag flying under protecting the public health by alleging the name of salmonella. Never mind the fact that the instructions on the machine say that you heat the product after mixing the egg in the shell to 140 degrees for 3 1/2 minutes, which every biologist says kills the salmonella. Nobody is claiming here that anybody has ever consumed or contracted salmonella as a result of eating this food product. This flag of flying under the public health flag sounds pretty good, but it just won't wash. If we want to have progress in our culture, if we want to have our system evolve where somebody can build a better mousetrap to answer the need of a commercial situation, I think we should permit the producer of this machine to stay in business. There is no damage to the public health. Let competition work its way as to whether or not the restaurant owner is going to use a machine with eggs to put into his product or whether he wants to use powdered milk. I do not think we should be attempting to resolve that on the floor of the House.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. THOMAS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Certainly we all represent our own interests as best we can; but I do want to point this out, that if it was a matter of selling grade A eggs which are the eggs that the user, the maker of this machine, recommends, the egg producers in this country make more money from the sale of grade A eggs than they do from the sale of grade C eggs. It would be greatly to their advantage. And I must say, the one person who has introduced the economic factor really has been the manufacturer of the machine.

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

Mr. DANNEMEYER. I withdraw my time and conclude with this point: The producer of the class C eggs is the one that feels the competition from this machine. This machine is being properly utilized, nobody is claiming otherwise that I am aware of. The seller of powdered eggs is feeling the loss of business, the threatened loss of business. Otherwise, we would not be discussing this. I think the seller of the machine ought to have a chance. There is no damage to the public health.

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

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I really did not intend to get into this, but as the author of the original Egg Inspection Act I would like to point out a few things. Right after we passed the Wholesome Meat Act in 1967 we started looking at eggs and poultry.

What we found was not very appetizing. I will not even describe some of the nauseating conditions. They were breaking dirty eggs and cracked eggs into 5-gallon cans, letting them sit around where the temperature was improper. It was just really a bad situation. So we developed an Egg Inspection Act.

Now to start with, one should assume that every egg laid might have salmonella on the shell. You can assume that because it is transferred in the feed. The same thing with beef. It only takes a searing on the outside of a steak to take care of that problem. But if it is mixed into the eggs, it takes 140 to 143 degrees for 3 or 3 1/2 minutes to pasteurize it.

What is involved here in the subject matter before us is not a health problem with salmonella. If they pasteurize the egg, that solved that danger.

When I go to the restaurant, if I buy scrambled eggs, I make them crack 2 grade A eggs and mix them right there. I do not buy scrambled eggs made from liquid eggs. But a lot of restaurants buy liquid eggs. They buy them in a 5-gallon can.

Now these big egg handlers like it the way it is because the whites bring more than the yolks and they sell whites to bakers. When you go to a restaurant, did you ever notice how yellow the scrambled eggs are sometimes? Some liquid eggs they purchase are mostly yolk. That is the reason. Big egg handlers like it this way. They do not like for people to buy whole eggs, run them through this machine, because that reduces the opportunity for handlers to sell liquid eggs that are mostly yolk and they cannot have the opportunity then to sell them all those yolks for the price of class B eggs.

So I think there is a lot to be said here about the amendment to strike the prohibition in the bill. That is why I think the Committee should look into this carefully before acting.

To start with, there is not a salmonella problem. But there is a wholesomeness problem.

The one thing I agree with, with the gentleman from Georgia, is I would like to see each one of them cracked separately so one could see whether or not there is a blood spot in any of the eggs or something like that. I like that idea. That is the reason why we originally proposed the language that is in the act. On the other hand, it is not because it cannot be pasteurized to keep it from having salmonellosis.

So I think that there is more involved here than what you can deal with just by eliminating the right to use this machine. The Committee should look at what the industry is doing now as well as whether or not this machine ought to be used, and people ought to know what the consequences are.

Mr. THOMAS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Yes, I will yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

Mr. THOMAS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I do not understand how the gentleman can make the statement that there is no danger from Salmonella poisoning in view of some of the recent real instances which have just occurred. One that the proponent of this amendment pointed out where 50 people became ill from salmonellosis from eating cooked eggs in a restaurant.

The incident of the processed cheese out in California was a tragic event of Salmonella poisoning.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Here is one way that can happen: The egg, if it were cooked, the Salmonella was destroyed. But if they had a plate there that had Salmonella on it or the cook had Salmonella on his or her hand and put the egg on the plate, then you can get salmonellosis from it.

Mr. THOMAS of Georgia. If the gentleman will yield again, would not the gentleman agree that when you go through a process where you mix the eggshell, which is a prime carrier of Salmonella bacteria, when you intentionally throw egg and all together in the same vat and crush it, you are certainly extending the chance.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. If it was washed and sterilized, as it is supposed to be, the answer is "No."

Mr. THOMAS of Georgia. Well, the gentleman disagrees with the USDA and the FDA.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. No, I do not disagree with them. I do not think they disagree with that.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BROWN of California. I appreciate the fact that he has had the experience that he has on this subject and makes the statement, which I think is quite correct, that there is no possibility of salmonella here. The statement just made by the gentleman from Georgia about salmonella in cheese in California happens to be true but it is utterly irrelevant. What happened in that particular plant was, they did not pasteurize.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. They did not pasteurize it.

Mr. BROWN of California. And that, therefore, allowed salmonella to enter. That was milk, not eggs, anyway; so it is hardly relevant to this debate.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. There is a difference between saying it is a health problem and talking of wholesomeness. We called the Meat Act passed in 1967 the Wholesome Meat Act because it involved wholesomeness. One can take meat out of a dead animal and cook it long enough and it will not hurt one to eat it, but I do not want to eat it. It's not a matter of just health, but also wholesomeness.

I really urge the Committee to look at the whole subject matter, look at what the egg processors and handlers are doing at the present time, in addition to what should be done about this machine.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Smith] has expired.

(On request of Mr. Badham and by unanimous consent, Mr. Smith of Iowa was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

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

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BADHAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

Mr. Chairman, I really do not want to see the gentleman from Georgia end up with egg on his face on this. The problem in the recent thing where 50 people were made sick, I stress, was not from the eggs, not from the liquid; it was from the hands of the workers.

Mr. THOMAS of Georgia. If the gentleman will yield, has that been documented?

Mr. BADHAM. If the gentleman will yield, that is the way it is, that the people were infected by the workers' hands, not by the eggs.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. In virtually all kitchens there is salmonella. It can come from the meat, it can come from poultry or eggs, but if they do not keep their hands clean, if they do not wash the block or table off that they are using, if they do not wash and sterilize everything, the customer can get salmonellosis. But this is not a health problem here. There are a lot of other things involved. For that reason I really urge the Committee to go back, take a look at what the egg handlers are doing at the present time, in addition to any problems with this machine, and determine what really needs to be done in the way of an amendment to this Egg Inspection Act.

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

Mr. Chairman, I agree we want to get to a vote. But as a Member of the Committee on Agriculture who has tried to support the committee all the way through, I think we should understand that this was something that was added to the bill where at least some of us were not real knowledgeable about the full consequences. At least this gentleman did not know we would put a small businessman out of business if we passed this particular amendment.

It is my understanding, also, that you are required under this machine to use grade A or B eggs which have to, first of all, be pasteurized; is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Georgia. It is recommended that you use these, but you must remember that these requirements on the machine in a restaurant are not laws, they are not statutes, they are merely suggestions by the manufacturer.

Mr. BEDELL. Is there any reason in the world that the FDA could not, if they saw that there was any danger, require, if they were to use this for purposes other than cooking, that they had to use grade A or B eggs in this machine?

Mr. THOMAS of Georgia. It is my understanding that the FDA does not set the regulations. They are without regulations at this time. This is precisely my point, that we have allowed something to come up that has circumvented the very findings of the hearings held in 1970 to discuss every issue we have discussed right here, and we have allowed a machine now to come up through a loophole.

Mr. BEDELL. If I might say so, many of us are not real privy to what may have happened in hearings in 1970. This is 1985. That is 15 years ago.

The gentleman wants to do whatever is correct here, but I do think that before we go ahead and say we are going to legislate this small businessman out of business, that maybe we ought to be darn sure of what we are doing. I was not darn sure that that was going to be the effect of an amendment that was passed by a voice vote in our committee.

It would seem to me that if there is a problem that the FDA should be in a position to answer that problem without putting this guy out of business, that they ought to be able to say that if you are going to use the processed product of this machine that you have to then pasteurize it if you are not going to cook it in an area that would kill salmonella.

Mr. THOMAS of Georgia. Will my good friend yield?

Mr. BEDELL. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. THOMAS of Georgia. I would simply say -- and this is why I have been as serious and ardent in my endeavor

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

to understand this issue as I have been -- I have known full well the implications on this businessman, but I also know the dangers. And I must say that it should have been the responsibility of the manufacturer of this machine to look very closely and carefully at the regulations before the machine was perfected. Certainly I would not have perfected a machine that did something in a maner that went totally against regulations and laws tha were in place. We are setting a double standard. We are requiring the USDA grading plants to go by one standard and allowing those standards to be totally circumvented through the use of this machine in another area.

Mr. BEDELL. I want to understand, what is it of the machine that is violating the law now? If it was violating the law now, you would not be able to sell it and there would not be that problem.

Mr. THOMAS of Georgia. No, you are wrong. This machine has been perfected and put on the market since this law was written in 1970. At that time the machine was not being sold in bakeries and hospitals and restaurants, and so there was no provision in there to provide for this. This is a matter of a simple loophole we are talking about. I really appreciate the indulgence of my friend, but let me make one last comment, and then I am going to sit down on this. When we come up here and we have one day what can be a very real tragedy as a result of this, the Members here, rather than talking about a businessman who has obviously sustained some lumps, are going to be talking about a loss of human life, and that is what this body better weigh very carefully.

Mr. BEDELL. I know we are taking too much time, but certainly this gentleman does not want to endanger human life. On the other hand, I believe we do need to know what we are doing when we move forward.

Mr. BROWN of California. If the gentleman will yield briefly, I wanted to speak to that point about the danger to human life.

This machine has been in use for roughly 5 years. There is about 1 million eggs a day being cracked with this machine. By an stretch of ordinary arithmetic, I calculate there are several billions of eggs that have been processed through this machine. There is not yet one substantiated case of danger to human health, not one case of salmonella, not one problem, and yet the whole basis of the argument of the gentleman seems to have been that this is a threat to public health. If he has evidence that it is a threat to public health, that should be brought before the Committee and we can act accordingly.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

I oppose the amendment because it appears to make a mockery of the Egg Products Products Inspection Act. In my district an egg producer called to inform me that even if they wanted to use a machine such as the EggKing, or the Egg Master centrifuge separater, they are precluded from using one even though they have four USDA inspectors on duty, full-time inspecting the eggs that are cracked and processed at the plant.

This amendment if adopted would continue to prohibit the use of centrifuge separators in egg processing plants, but permit their continued use in such places as hotels, restaurants, and other food processing industries where hundreds, if not thousands of eggs are used each day with no Government inspection whatsoever.

In other words, if we adopt this amendment, we would continue to penalize those egg processors who have inspectors, and yet do nothing to ensure sanitary or safety standards in those businesses or industries that currently use these machines, but who are not subject to USDA egg inspections.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to this body that what is sauce for the goose, is sauce for the gander. If we are going to prohibit the use of these machines by egg processors, then we should not circumvent the Egg Products Inspection Act law by permitting their use by food processors or if the sanitary and safety record of the centrifuge egg separator is as good as the gentleman from California has stated today, then it use should be made available for egg processors as well as food processors and others who use large numbers of eggs.

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

I urge the defeat of this amendment and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Badham amendment which would strike section 1801 amending the Egg Products Inspection Act. This is a major provision of the Farm bill, and it is extremely important that we follow up on the work of our colleagues who passed the Egg Products Inspection Act in 1970. We are being asked to close a loophole in that act which has arisen as a result of a technology which has been adapted for use in an unanticipated way.

It is clear that eggs should not be broken by a centrifuge machine. The practice is unequivocally unsafe even under the best of circumstances.

In actual use, the centrifuge egg breaker permits you to dump the whole egg, shall and all, into a drum to be crushed and then separated. Mixing the shell with the egg liquid is a disaster waiting to happen. As Congressman Thomas pointed out in his recent "Dear Colleague," USDA and FDA have documented cases of centrifuge users dumping broken, leaking, low grade, and otherwise inedible eggs into the centrifuge for processing. In fact, one internal USDA document quotes one bakery manager as saying he knew of instances where he had dumped rodent droppings, rotten eggs, and miscellaneous filth into the machine by following instructions from the manufacturer to invert the trays of eggs intact.

In voting to prohibit the use of these unsafe practices we are not requiring additional regulatory resources from USDA, FDA or any other State or local agency. This provision is budget neutral. Restaurants and bakeries, etc. are currently routinely inspected by USDA, FDA, and State and local health departments. Should the provision prohibiting these egg breaking practices be enacted, violations would be detected easily and dealt with in the course of routine inspections. Food manufacturing establishments would simply be put on notice -- use of the centrifuge for egg breaking is prohibited. There would be no need for additional manpower or money.

Finally, USDA is joined by the egg industry in opposition to this amendment. The egg industry spends approximately \$5 million per year to promote a wholesome image of their product. Egg producers have worked diligently to earn and preserve consumer confidence in their product. Egg producers oppose the use of centrifuges for egg breaking because producers are well aware of the health hazards associated with their use and feel that the continued use of these practices and the potential consequences constitute a threat to the wholesome image of the egg. This is a legitimate concern.

I urge you to consider USDA's position and the egg industry's concerns and vote to defeat Mr. Badham's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Badham].

The question was taken; and the chairman being in doubt, the committee divided, and there were -- ayes 29, noes 20.

Mr. THOMAS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was refused.

So the amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRANK

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

The CHAIRMAN. Has the amendment been printed in the Congressional Record?

Mr. FRANK. It was, Mr. Chairman, on September 24.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Frank: Page 509, after line 13, insert the following:

HONEY LOAN MAXIMUM

Sec. 1896. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture may declare that, with respect to nonrecourse loans a person may receive for honey under a program under the Agricultural Act of 1949 for a crop year, the outstanding principal balance of such loan shall not exceed \$250,000, and that any outstanding balance exceeding that amount shall be a recourse loan in nature. The Secretary shall make rules to carry out this section and such rules shall conform as nearly as practicable to the rules made to carry out section 405(b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949. The Secretary shall not make a declaration under this first sentence of this section if the Secretary determines that the application of this section upon such declaration would have an undue ill effect on the structure of the honey industry or on agricultural interests that depend on commercial bee colonies for pollination.

Mr. FRANK (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that was originally filed in the Congressional Record by the gentleman from North Dakota. He has decided not to offer it, but I decided to offer it, which is permitted under the rule.

I think the honey subsidy is one of the least useful expenditures of Federal funds. At a time when we are talking about far-reaching changes in the entire structure of our Government affecting the distribution of power between the President and Congress, to continue to spend money on the honey subsidy does not seem to me to be a very good idea.

I believe this amendment would be better than the present situation, but I am informed that my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, the senior member on the Republican side of the Appropriations Committee, has an even better way to deal with this. At this point, I am going to yield back the balance of my time, because it is my understanding that the gentleman from Massachusetts has an amendment to the amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CONTE TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRANK

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Conte to the amendment offered by Mr. Frank: At the end of the amendment offered by Mr. Frank, strike the "." and insert the following in lieu thereof: ": PROVIDED, That (1) Section 201 of the Agriculture Act of 1949, 7 U.S.C. 1446, is amended by striking in the first sentence the word "honey." and (2) Subsection (b) of such section is hereby repealed."

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte].

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

Mr. CONTE. I would say to the gentleman, in order to save time, can the gentleman make his point of order? I have another amendment in case the point of order is sustained.

Mr. de la GARZA. I wanted to allow the gentleman to offer it.

Mr. CONTE. That is all right. I have another amendment.

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Chairman, under the situation, I would not want to preclude the gentleman from offering his amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation; I will not make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman reserving his point of order?

Mr. de la GARZA. No; I am not making a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK. I believe the time for a point of order has now passed, the gentleman having withdrawn his reservation. So no point of order will lie.

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. de la GARZA. I hope I do not make the gentleman nervous. No, I did not object to the gentleman proposing his amendment. I think it is a bad amendment, and I will argue in due time. I was just here stretching because I was tired of sitting.

Mr. CONTE. I will get you a Coca-Cola box next time. I thought you were sitting.

Mr. Chairman, a tiny, little bee lit on my shoulder on my way back from the floor last week when my amendment to strike the honey program went down on a point of order. This little bee buzzed in my ear and said "Don't give up Silvo -- you stick right in there because the good name of bees is being besmirched all over this great country -- especially in North Dakota where one honey producer got \$1 million in support payments. The little bee told me that Congressman Frank would try to stop this supersweet deal by placing a limit of \$250,000 on the amount of payments to the big bees in the honeycomb business. There is no limit today. My amendment goes Mr. Frank one better and does away with the entire program. This little bee had all the facts. He told me that the nonrecourse loan rate for honey is at over 60 cents while the price we pay for imported honey is at 40 cents, so we are importing more and more honey.

The GAO has looked at this program and they say we are getting stung. We are spending nearly \$100 million to store 100 million pounds of honey each year in order to benefit only 2,500 commercial producers. At the same time we are importing 100 million pounds put on grocery shelves. You'd have to have bees in your bonnet not to see how far out of line this situation is.

I think everyone gets stung once or twice in their life, but this country is getting stung over and over again. Now the bees are getting in the act. Why just last week in Hollywood, FL, when the bees found out about how the Americans are being robbed by this program they got out of their keeper's truck and refused to pay the toll on the Florida turnpike. I tell you these little fellers are in revolt over the way we raise the price on their diligently created product. Help me

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

restore some dignity to the little bee and let's swat this program once and for all.

Since 1980 our imports have grown from 50 million pounds to 130 million pounds -- that's a 250-percent increase. In that same time the CCC acquisition costs have risen from \$9 million a year to over \$90 million -- that is a 1,000-percent increase.

You would think that the Commodity Credit Corporation was being run by a family of black bears based on the millions of pounds it is buying from our U.S. honey producers.

Keeping this program flies in the face of logic. We will have spent over \$250 million in the last 4 years in Government payments while putting more and more imported honey on the shelves of our grocery stores. You can hardly find any domestic honey for personal consumption. Encouraged by the stinging facts from my little bee friend, I decided to come right back over here to fight this battle again. Just as the Africanized bee is swarming its way up into our country so is the honey oozing up from our Southern neighbors. Mr. Chairman: That poor little bee could not come back over here with me today because he knew he would be in mortal danger in the company of the honey-snatchers in this body who support this program.

But as he flew away, he once again entreated me to save his little pollen-covered pride by allowing the honey that he and his fellow bees produce in good old American hives to once again find its way to our grocery stores. With all that is riding on the flight of this little bee, the least we can do is support my amendment and put an end to this blot on the dignity of U.S. bees.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there are some elements of levity that crept into my colleague's performance, and I often feel when I have helped my colleague from Massachusetts get the floor that I should be entitled to an agent's fee.

There is a very serious core here. We are talking about a proliferation of subsidies that get bigger and the inconsistency at some point has to be clear to people to increase the amount we spend subsidizing bees. Now, I know I have been told by several of my colleagues that there is a national security aspect to agriculture. We were told that the Downey-Gradison amendment undermined national security, presumably because we would not have enough sugar to put in the Russians' gas tanks when they came over here.

I was told by my friend from Oklahoma that we would be endangering national security by reducing target prices. Maybe there is somewhere a division of killer bees that is being trained to do counterinsurgency work for us. I can tell you that is the only plausible rationale I would accept for this program, and I do not think it is empirically validated in this case.

We cannot continue to have Members vie with each other to declaim how much we have got to reduce the budget deficit and change Government structure to do that, and continue to proliferate this kind of program. We have been asked, the gentleman from Massachusetts and I, why we get involved in these issues. First, we both have agricultural areas in our parts of Massachusetts. We thought actually that we were more involved in the last one, because we misunderstood. Some of us thought the egg-breaker ban was an attempt to ban leg breakers, which would have had more of an employment impact in some parts of our district.

But in this particular case, we are talking about a proliferation of Federal subsidies for issue after issue in the agricultural area, and this is how you get budget deficits. Budget deficits do not exist in general; they exist in particular. The gentleman from Massachusetts has offered a very sensible way to begin to reduce by saving money in an area of unnecessary subsidy. I hope his amendment to my amendment is adopted.

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

Mr. Chairman, this is a very serious matter. We have an industry in the United States that we call the bee industry or the honey industry. Like many other areas of agriculture, it had a support program to assist it as a sort of a safety net, but in about 1980, the roof fell in and imports started coming in from many other countries in the world at a lower price, and as well-intentioned as this program was to offer a safety net, this lower priced honey then undermines the price at which we had stabilized or supported the honey production.

It has been mentioned, and I would attest to the fact, that the bee is a very important factor in the pollination process. It provides 18 billion, 19 billion, or 20 billion dollars' worth of effort in the pollination in that it enhances fruit and vegetable production and in fact reduces the cost. But we have now from the People's Republic of China -- Communist China -- from Argentina, from Canada, and from many other areas of the world honey coming in at lower prices. But yet it has not affected the price to the consumer except when you just buy the honey. We have already heard how much honey is used in confectionery or in baked goods or in candy, and it has not lowered the price that the consumer pays for the items that have the honey. But yet they are buying it from other countries at a much lower price.

It all comes down to this, my colleagues: American jobs. Without a honey industry, the jobs that are lost, that are transferred to another country, that is what it is going to be. That is the name of the game, jobs, jobs, jobs. Do we want them here with some involvement of Government? I think it is legitimate. Maybe we need to restructure. Maybe we need to lower. Maybe we need to wait for a better day. But to strike out entirely, we are transferring jobs out of this country.

Yes, there is a national security interest and yes, there is a need to protect the taxpayer, because one without a job, everyone knows the unemployment, the food stamps, the aid to dependent children, we are just adding to it.

So this amendment to the amendment, and I say this respectfully, is shortsighted. It may have some degree of emotion.

Yes, I have read the GAO report. It is not as factual as it could be. It deals in a vacuum. I found arguments that I could challenge in some areas of the GAO report.

But the basic fact again is, do you want the honey produced in this country at a Government-subsidized level, or do you want to knock it out and bring it all from abroad? That is the bottom line. That is the bottom line -- jobs in another country, items coming in or out of business. That is the bottom line.

I attest to you that all other arguments really would not address the issue. Yes, I will cede to the issue of cost to the Government. I do not challenge that. The figures are there and no one can deny that. But why we got there, why was the intent of the program thwarted? Because of the imports coming in.

I would hope that every time someone offers an amendment, every time someone offers an amendment that attempts to erase an industry or a segment of an industry, we should provide that that amendment also incorporates how we protect ourselves from what is going to come from the outside. It should be a two-tiered amendment: What is the protection we are going to afford to the few survivors?

Mr. MORRISON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to stand in support of the chairman of our Agriculture Committee on behalf of the honey program.

Admittedly this program is in a state of transition. While I could support the Frank amendment as before us which basically provides a cap on the payments to any individual honey producer, I cannot support the amendment to strike entirely this honey program at this time.

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

The Chairman I think has spoken eloquently of the importance of pollinization with a total of \$19 billion in crop value. I would just say at this difficult time for agriculture all across the country let us not pull this necessary support mechanism out for the fruit, nut, vegetable, forage, and oil seed crop industries.

I would remind this House that last year the Congress addressed the honey problem, and I believe we have to give that proper time to work. We passed the Honey Research Promotion and Consumer Information Act of 1984. This promises to lead to improved marketing and the effort by the industry in an industry-support program of promotion to expand U.S. per capita consumption.

We find this is a market that has been neglected through the years, and the beekeepers of America want to contribute to a fund. We are just beginning to see this get organized. I think we should allow it to work.

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

Mr. MORRISON of Washington, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, I just ask is my friend, the gentleman from Washington, a supporter of the deficit reduction, the balance the budget procedure that is being discussed in the other body right now?

Mr. MORRISON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, yes, I certainly am. But let us not take on this particular industry and undercut them at this time in this particular effort.

So let us give this program that we passed, and I am sure that the gentleman from Massachusetts voted for it last year, let us not undercut that at this particular point.

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MORRISON of Washington. I yield to my Chairman, the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I again repeat that our legislation meets the budget requirements. We have met what has been imposed by the budget. In what we submitted to the budget we did a balancing act. So this legislation is incorporated into what we recommended to the Budget Committee. It is not an add-on and we have been responsible and we have made our cuts.

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

Mr. MORRISON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Agriculture Committee is correct. He is responsible. He is responsible with his colleagues for a great big part of the deficit. This is the problem I have when I ask the gentleman from Washington if the gentleman supported this budget reduction.

The gentleman from Texas says, "See, this is within the budget." But during 1-minute today, all my friends on the Republican side were saying that budget is no good and we have to have drastic reductions down from it and, not only that, we have to have the new provision with impoundments and sequestrations, et cetera. We cannot have it both ways. We cannot reduce the budget deficit without voting against the program.

Mr. MORRISON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, if I may reclaim my time, I would say to the gentleman that if all agencies involved in this Government had been as responsible as the approach taken by the Agriculture Committee, we would not have the problems that we have to address in the deficit reduction program.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

Mr. MORRISON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, let me just briefly say it is a pleasure once again to see the gentleman from Massachusetts back down providing leadership on agricultural issues, this time with a friend.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, somebody has to.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, let me just say that the amendment that is being offered, the base amendment was noticed in the Record by myself, and under this rule it can be offered by another Member and then amended which is the process we are in today.

I noticed the amendment because I would like to see a change in the Honey Support Program. I do not support, however, the amendment to the amendment that I put in the Record. I do not think that with the little thought that has been given here that we ought to abolish that program.

The reason I did not offer it, incidentally, after I noticed it in the Record is that I decided that probably a better approach to limiting the loans, which I intended to do in the amendment, to \$250,000 was probably to evaluate the structure of the Honey Program in the Agriculture Committee rather than have the Agriculture Secretary down at USDA do that. So I decided not to offer the amendment to this section hoping and expecting that the Agriculture Committee will do that in the coming couple of years.

But I want to make it clear that I do not support this amendment that has been offered today. I also want to be clear that I do not think the kind of loans that are going out at the levels they are going out ought to continue either. I would like to see something done about that.

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

Mr. MORRISON of Washington. I thank the gentleman from North Dakota for his comments, and I will yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COELHO. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I just wanted to comment on the statement of the gentleman from North Dakota, that as chairman of the subcommittee that has jurisdiction on this, what we have noticed is that over the last 3 years the tremendous number of imports that have come in, at the same time that the imports have increased dramatically, and let me give some figures here.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. Coleman of Texas). The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Morrison] has expired.

(At the request of Mr. Coelho, and by unanimous consent, Mr. Morrison of Washington was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. MORRISON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COELHO. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

In 1980, we were importing in 49 million pounds of honey. Today we are importing in 109 million pounds of honey and it has caused the increase in the cost of the program.

We talk about exporting jobs and we talk about trade being a major issue. This is a program where you can point right to it and say that trade is killing us on this one.

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

I think what we need to do, we need to look at the program and I am committed to the gentleman from North Dakota that we will get into the Honey Program. We will hold some hearings. We will get in and find out what is actually going on. We will make the necessary modifications that need to be made; but let us not punish the people here in the United States for what the people in other nations are doing to this program.

Second, let us also be understanding of the fact that -- I know the gentleman from Massachusetts knows about the birds and the bees, and if the gentleman really understands the process of the birds and the bees, we do not really want to eliminate the bees in this country from doing the job that they need to do to keep our industries alive that are dependent upon bees. I know the gentleman from Massachusetts would not support eliminating all the bees in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the gentleman yielding.

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON of Washington. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I just appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I am standing here, and I must say that I do not know that we can grasp what this amendment can do to the fruit and vegetable industry throughout the United States. It is not only the honey producers, but the fruit and vegetable industry.

There is timber, as my colleague behind me, the gentleman from Michigan, says.

It is something very serious. It is not anything that we should pass lightly. We are dealing with jobs, American jobs, with the fruit and vegetable industry, with the timber industry, with an industry that has a stake itself in this up until a few years ago and I think that in the national interest we owe it to ourselves to turn this amendment down.

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

Mr. MORRISON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

The gentleman from North Dakota is a little unhappy that people not in agricultural districts primarily get involved in these programs. One of the reasons we do is this. This is what the gentleman gives us. My friend, the gentleman from Texas, is now describing a program that is of relatively recent duration as the only thing standing between us and a renewal of the Great Depression. We start off subsidizing bees and what do we get into but fruits, vegetables, and timber.

I am grateful that national security was not invoked, but everything else has been.

My other friend, the gentleman from California, wanted to talk about the birds and the bees and, of course, last week we had the gentleman from California over here giving us very graphic descriptions about AIDS. What it is that is motivating our California comrades to get on this sex kick, I am not sure, but it does not have a great deal to do with the program before us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Morrison] has again expired.

(At the request of Mr. Dorgan of North Dakota, and by unanimous consent, Mr. Morrison of Washington was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

Mr. MORRISON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

I just want to point out that the gentleman does a service by coming to the floor to discuss agriculture. I did not mean to suggest the gentleman should not be here. It is the gentleman's extensive background in agriculture that I was commenting on.

I think that we need to discuss where we go with this honey program. For example, we have a \$1 million loan payment in my State. That should not happen; but that ought not to be an excuse for us to say today, this minute, let us dump the whole program. I do not think that is making public policy the right way and that is the only thing I was trying to say.

Mr. MORRISON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I will reclaim my time only to say that we have in action taken last year helped direct this industry to move I think as this Congress would ask, to be self-supporting, promote increased per capita consumption of your products, and if not, obviously we will make decisions in the future to modify this program.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am only going to take a couple moments to say once again, to reiterate the fact that the problem that we have in honey today is not the program itself, but the very trouble that we have not only with honey, but with so many other subsidized agricultural products. There is a flood of imported products coming into the United States that alone is displacing what otherwise would clearly be a sufficient supply necessary to meet the needs of our domestic economy; so I think that is really the issue.

How do we deal with this flood of subsidized imports? How do we deal effectively with coming about with a program that will insure fair competition among honey producers? That is why I think once we deal with that issue, we can deal more effectively with the honey program and why this amendment would be premature at this time.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte] is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I hear from the gentleman and I hear from my good friend, the gentleman from Texas, and all the others and my good friend, the gentleman from California, that imports are devastating the honey producers, here in the United States.

Now there is a trade bill coming out of the Ways and Means Committee, is that not the place to handle the import problem, or do we go off and pay a guy up in North Dakota \$1 million for support prices for honey? Is that conscionable, I ask you, is \$257 million for support prices for honey in 4 years conscionable?

As my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts knows, we are having trouble with the imports of shoes. Why do we not amend this bill and set up some warehouses and store billions and billions of pairs of shoes? What does the gentleman think about that? Will the gentleman join me in that?

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CONTE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. FRANK. Well, Mr. Chairman, it would have a certain advantage over some of these other commodities in that the spoilage rate would presumably be less and I think it would have certain advantage.

I appreciate the gentleman's argument, because there is no equivalence here. We do not for other commodities do this.

I do have to comment to my friend, the gentleman from North Dakota. He said that he agrees this program has worked and we ought to deal with it, but not when the House is voting on it and probably not what the committee did. The gentleman is all in favor of contemplating it, we ought to say, but he is not in favor of taking any action with regard to it, because he apparently finds the floor of the House or the committee inappropriate.

The gentleman from South Dakota says, "Yes, we have to work on this when you have reported out the bill." We are now on the floor of the House and we are going to get a lot of conversation and a lot more hundreds of millions of dollars.

I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

Mr. CONTE. Yes; I am glad to yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Chairman, we are getting into a very sticky situation here.

Mr. CONTE. We sure are.

Mr. DASCHLE. There just is not a relationship between shoes and honey and I think the gentleman has to make sure that the House understands the difference.

Mr. CONTE. I am quite sure they do, because before this program they had another bee program, which I finally killed. It took me about 10 years to kill it. That program was paying beekeepers for dead bees. They never had one autopsy on any of those bees to see whether they died of a heart attack or arthritis.

Everybody knew that they were paying these same beekeepers millions of dollars because of dead bees. I finally killed the program and now we have this program to contend with, which is worse than the other program, because now they pay them for live bees.

This is ridiculous. Let us bring a little sanity into the honey industry.

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

Mr. CONTE. Yes; I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

I think we ought to get a vote on this so Members can vote to continue to subsidize beekeepers and then show us how much they are for a balanced budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Frank].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Frank].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Conte) there were -- ayes 20; noes 21.

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were -- ayes 340, noes 65, not voting 29, as follows:

(See Roll No. 340 in the ROLL segment.)

Mr. LELAND and Mr. CRAIG changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. NICHOLS, JONES of Oklahoma, HEFNER, CRAIG, STRANG, SABO, BUSTAMANTE, ORTIZ, RICHARDSON, HERTEL of Michigan, BREAU, TRAXLER, and SCHEUER changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, on October 3, the House voted in an amendment to H.R. 2100, the Food Security Act, offered by Mr. Glickman and Mr. Wolpe. The amendment (rollcall No. 337), struck the exemption to the "sodbuster" provisions, and requires farmers who plowed highly erodible land between 1981 and 1985 to have until 1995 to apply conservation plans to continue to be eligible for farm programs. I voted against this amendment in error, and I would like the Record to reflect that I had intended to support this amendment.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of title XV of the Food Security Act of 1985, which would amend both the Food Stamp Act of 1977 and the provisions of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 relating to the Commodity Supplemental Food Program. These amendments are deserving of our support. Title XV reauthorizes a very important program, one that touches on our responsibility to see that all Americans have access to a well-balanced diet. The Food Stamp Program is vital in that it ensures that the entire Nation has access to food security.

Moreover, I am particularly pleased that under title XV of this act provisions would be made for those individuals in our society who are homeless to have access to the benefits of this program.

More specifically, my support comes from the benefits that the residents of the District of Columbia have received from this program. As of February of this year, 73,561 persons have benefitted from the Food Stamp Program in Washington, DC. This figure represents 29,773 families. Of these persons, 36,976 were children. These figures represent 12,888 families that have other forms of public assistance aid, and 16,885 families who receive no other form of public assistance. The average benefit per person per month in the District is \$105.62. This assistance brings the incomes of thousands of individuals to the poverty level.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues to support title XV and refrain from any amendments that would reduce this vital program.

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker, having resumed the chair, Mr. Bonior of Michigan, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2100), to extend and revise agricultural price support and related programs, to provide for agricultural export, resource conservation, farm credit, and agricultural research and related programs, to continue food assistance to low-income persons, to ensure consumers an abundance of food and fiber at reasonable prices, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ROLL:

[Roll No. 338]

AYES -- 171

Archer	Arney	Badham
Barnard	Bartlett	Barton
Bateman	Bates	Bennett
Bentley	Bereuter	Bilirakis
Bliley	Boehlert	Boulter
Broomfield	Brown (CO)	Broyhill
Burton (IN)	Byron	Callahan
Campbell	Carney	Chandler
Chappell	Chappie	Cheney
Coats	Cobey	Coble
Coleman (MO)	Combest	Craig
Crane	Daniel	Dannemeyer
Daub	DeLay	DeWine
Dickinson	DioGuardi	Dornan (CA)
Dreier	Dyson	Eckert (NY)
Edwards (OK)	Emerson	Evans (IA)
Fawell	Fiedler	Fields
Frenzel	Gekas	Gibbons
Gingrich	Goodling	Gregg
Grotberg	Gunderson	Hammerschmidt
Hansen	Hartnett	Hendon
Henry	Hiler	Hillis
Holt	Hopkins	Hunter
Hutto	Hyde	Ireland
Kasich	Kemp	Kindness
Kolbe	Kramer	Lagomarsino

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

Latta	Leach (IA)	Leath (TX)
Lent	Lewis (FL)	Lightfoot
Livingston	Lott	Lowery (CA)
Lujan	Lungren	Mack
Madigan	Marlenee	Martin (IL)
McCain	McCollum	McEwen
McGrath	McKernan	McMillan
Meyers	Michel	Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)	Molinari	Monson
Montgomery	Moore	Moorhead
Morrison (WA)	Myers	Nichols
Nielson	O'Brien	Oxley
Packard	Parris	Pashayan
Penny	Petri	Porter
Quillen	Regula	Ritter
Roberts	Robinson	Rogers
Roth	Roukema	Rowland (CT)
Rudd	Saxton	Schaefer
Schuetze	Schulze	Sensenbrenner
Shaw	Shumway	Shuster
Siljander	Skeen	Skelton
Slaughter	Smith (NE)	Smith, Denny (OR)
Smith, Robert (NH)	Smith, Robert (OR)	Snyder
Solomon	Spence	Stallings
Stangeland	Stenholm	Strang
Stump	Sundquist	Sweeney
Swindall	Tauke	Taylor
Thomas (CA)	Vander Jagt	Volkmer
Vucanovich	Walker	Weber
Whitehurst	Whittaker	Wolf
Wylie	Young (FL)	Zschau

NOES -- 238

Akaka	Alexander	Anderson
Andrews	Annunzio	Anthony
Applegate	Aspin	Atkins
AuCoin	Bedell	Beilenson

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

Berman	Bevill	Biaggi
Boggs	Boland	Boner (TN)
Bonior (MI)	Bonker	Borski
Bosco	Boucher	Boxer
Breaux	Brooks	Brown (CA)
Bruce	Bryant	Burton (CA)
Bustamante	Carper	Carr
Chapman	Clinger	Coelho
Coleman (TX)	Collins	Conte
Conyers	Cooper	Coughlin
Courter	Coyne	Crockett
Davis	de la Garza	Dellums
Derrick	Dicks	Dingell
Dixon	Donnelly	Dorgan (ND)
Dowdy	Downey	Duncan
Durbin	Dwyer	Dymally
Early	Eckart (OH)	Edgar
Edwards (CA)	English	Erdreich
Evans (IL)	Fascell	Fazio
Feighan	Fish	Flippo
Florio	Foglietta	Foley
Ford (MI)	Ford (TN)	Fowler
Frank	Franklin	Frost
Fuqua	Gallo	Garcia
Gaydos	Gejdenson	Gephardt
Gilman	Glickman	Gonzalez
Gordon	Gradison	Gray (IL)
Gray (PA)	Green	Guarini
Hall (OH)	Hall, Ralph	Hamilton
Hatcher	Hawkins	Hayes
Hefner	Heftel	Hertel
Horton	Howard	Hoyer
Hubbard	Huckaby	Hughes
Jacobs	Jeffords	Jenkins
Johnson	Jones (NC)	Jones (OK)
Jones (TN)	Kanjorski	Kaptur
Kastenmeier	Kennelly	Kildee
Kleczka	Kolter	Kostmayer

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

Lantos	Lehman (CA)	Lehman (FL)
Leland	Levin (MI)	Levine (CA)
Lipinski	Lloyd	Long
Lowry (WA)	Luken	MacKay
Manton	Markey	Martinez
Matsui	Mazzoli	McCloskey
McCurdy	McDade	McKinney
Mica	Mikulski	Miller (CA)
Mineta	Mitchell	Mollohan
Moody	Morrison (CT)	Murphy
Murtha	Natcher	Neal
Nowak	Oakar	Oberstar
Obey	Olin	Ortiz
Owens	Panetta	Pease
Pepper	Perkins	Pickle
Price	Rahall	Rangel
Reid	Richardson	Ridge
Rodino	Roe	Roemer
Rose	Rostenkowski	Rowland (GA)
Roybal	Russo	Sabo
Savage	Scheuer	Schneider
Schroeder	Seiberling	Sharp
Sikorski	Sisisky	Slattery
Smith (FL)	Smith (IA)	Smith (NJ)
Snowe	Solarz	Spratt
St Germain	Staggers	Stark
Stratton	Studds	Swift
Synar	Tallon	Tauzin
Thomas (GA)	Torres	Torricelli
Traficant	Traxler	Udall
Valentine	Vento	Visclosky
Walgren	Watkins	Waxman
Weaver	Weiss	Wheat
Whitley	Whitten	Williams
Wilson	Wirth	Wise
Wolpe	Wortley	Wright
Wyden	Yates	Yatron
Young (AK)		

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

NOT VOTING -- 25

Ackerman	Addabbo	Barnes
Clay	Darden	Daschle
LaFalce	Lewis (CA)	Loeffler
Lundine	Martin (NY)	Mavroules
McCandless	McHugh	Moakley
Mrazek	Nelson	Pursell
Ray	Rinaldo	Schumer
Shelby	Stokes	Towns
Young (MO)		

[Roll No. 339]

AYES -- 183

Andrews	Archer	Arney
Badham	Barnard	Bartlett
Barton	Bateman	Bentley
Bereuter	Bevill	Bilirakis
Bliley	Boehlert	Boulter
Breaux	Broomfield	Brown (CO)
Broyhill	Bruce	Burton (IN)
Byron	Callahan	Campbell
Carney	Carper	Chandler
Chapman	Cheney	Clinger
Coats	Cobey	Coble
Coleman (MO)	Combest	Coughlin
Courter	Craig	Crane
Daniel	Dannemeyer	Daub
DeLay	DeWine	Dickinson
DioGuardi	Dorgan (ND)	Dornan (CA)
Dreier	Duncan	Durbin
Dyson	Eckert (NY)	Edwards (OK)
English	Fawell	Fiedler
Fields	Franklin	Frenzel
Gallo	Gekas	Gibbons
Gingrich	Goodling	Gordon

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

Gradison	Gregg	Grotberg
Hall, Ralph	Hammerschmidt	Hansen
Hartnett	Hendon	Henry
Hiler	Hillis	Holt
Hopkins	Hubbard	Hughes
Hunter	Hyde	Ireland
Kasich	Kemp	Kindness
Kolbe	Kramer	Lagomarsino
Latta	Leath (TX)	Lent
Lewis (FL)	Livingston	Lloyd
Lott	Lowery (CA)	Lujan
Lungren	Mack	Madigan
Marlenee	Martin (IL)	McCain
McCollum	McEwen	McGrath
McKernan	McMillan	Meyers
Michel	Miller (OH)	Miller (WA)
Molinari	Monson	Montgomery
Moore	Moorhead	Morrison (WA)
Myers	Nelson	Nichols
Nielson	O'Brien	Olin
Oxley	Packard	Parris
Pashayan	Petri	Porter
Quillen	Regula	Reid
Ritter	Roemer	Rogers
Roth	Roukema	Rowland (CT)
Rudd	Saxton	Schaefer
Schuette	Schulze	Sensenbrenner
Shaw	Shumway	Shuster
Siljander	Slaughter	Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)	Smith, Denny (OR)	Smith, Robert (NH)
Snowe	Snyder	Solomon
Spence	Stangeland	Stenholm
Strang	Stump	Sundquist
Sweeney	Swindall	Tauke
Tauzin	Taylor	Thomas (CA)
Torricelli	Vander Jagt	Vucanovich
Walgren	Walker	Weber
Whitehurst	Wolf	Wortley

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

Wylie	Young (FL)	Zschau
	NOES -- 227	
Akaka	Alexander	Anderson
Annunzio	Anthony	Aspin
Atkins	AuCoin	Bates
Bedell	Beilenson	Bennett
Berman	Biaggi	Boggs
Boland	Boner (TN)	Bonior (MI)
Bonker	Borski	Bosco
Boucher	Boxer	Brooks
Brown (CA)	Bryant	Burton (CA)
Bustamante	Carr	Chappell
Chappie	Coelho	Coleman (TX)
Collins	Conte	Conyers
Cooper	Coyne	Crockett
Daschle	Davis	de la Garza
Dellums	Derrick	Dicks
Dingell	Dixon	Donnelly
Dowdy	Downey	Dwyer
Dymally	Early	Eckart (OH)
Edgar	Edwards (CA)	Emerson
Erdreich	Evans (IA)	Evans (IL)
Fascell	Feighan	Fish
Flippo	Florio	Foglietta
Foley	Ford (MI)	Ford (TN)
Fowler	Frank	Frost
Fuqua	Garcia	Gaydos
Gejdenson	Gephardt	Gilman
Glickman	Gonzalez	Gray (IL)
Gray (PA)	Green	Guarini
Gunderson	Hall (OH)	Hamilton
Hatcher	Hawkins	Hayes
Hefner	Heftel	Hertel
Horton	Howard	Hoyer
Huckaby	Hutto	Jacobs
Jeffords	Jenkins	Johnson

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

Jones (NC)	Jones (OK)	Jones (TN)
Kanjorski	Kaptur	Kastenmeier
Kennelly	Kildee	Kleczka
Kolter	Kostmayer	Lantos
Leach (IA)	Lehman (CA)	Lehman (FL)
Leland	Levin (MI)	Levine (CA)
Lightfoot	Lipinski	Long
Lowry (WA)	Luken	MacKay
Manton	Markey	Martinez
Matsui	Mazzoli	McCloskey
McCurdy	McDade	McHugh
McKinney	Mica	Mikulski
Miller (CA)	Mineta	Mitchell
Mollohan	Moody	Morrison (CT)
Murphy	Murtha	Natcher
Neal	Nowak	Oakar
Oberstar	Obey	Ortiz
Owens	Panetta	Pease
Penny	Pepper	Perkins
Pickle	Price	Rahall
Rangel	Richardson	Ridge
Roberts	Robinson	Rodino
Roe	Rose	Rostenkowski
Rowland (GA)	Roybal	Russo
Sabo	Savage	Scheuer
Schneider	Schroeder	Seiberling
Sharp	Sikorski	Sisisky
Skeen	Skelton	Slattery
Smith (FL)	Smith (IA)	Smith, Robert (OR)
Solarz	Spratt	St Germain
Staggers	Stallings	Stark
Stratton	Studds	Swift
Synar	Tallon	Thomas (GA)
Torres	Traficant	Traxler
Udall	Valentine	Vento
Visclosky	Volkmer	Watkins
Waxman	Weaver	Weiss
Wheat	Whitley	Whittaker

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

Whitten	Williams	Wilson
Wirth	Wise	Wolpe
Wright	Wyden	Yates
Yatron	Young (AK)	

NOT VOTING -- 24

Ackerman	Addabbo	Applegate
Barnes	Clay	Darden
Fazio	LaFalce	Lewis (CA)
Loeffler	Lundine	Martin (NY)
Mavroules	McCandless	Moakley
Mrazek	Pursell	Ray
Rinaldo	Schumer	Shelby
Stokes	Towns	Young (MO)

[Roll No. 340]

AYES -- 340

Anderson	Andrews	Annunzio
Applegate	Archer	Armey
Aspin	Atkins	AuCoin
Badham	Barnard	Bartlett
Barton	Bateman	Bates
Beilenson	Bennett	Bentley
Bereuter	Bevill	Biaggi
Bilirakis	Bliley	Boehlert
Boland	Bonker	Borski
Bosco	Boucher	Boulter
Breaux	Brooks	Broomfield
Brown (CO)	Broyhill	Bryant
Burton (CA)	Burton (IN)	Bustamante
Byron	Callahan	Campbell
Carney	Carper	Chandler
Chapman	Chappell	Cheney
Clay	Clinger	Coats
Cobey	Coble	Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)	Collins	Combest

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

Conte	Conyers	Cooper
Coughlin	Courter	Coyne
Crane	Crockett	Daniel
Dannemeyer	Darden	Daub
DeLay	Dellums	Derrick
DeWine	Dickinson	Dicks
DioGuardi	Dixon	Donnelly
Dorgan (ND)	Dornan (CA)	Dowdy
Downey	Dreier	Durbin
Dwyer	Dymally	Dyson
Early	Eckart (OH)	Eckert (NY)
Edwards (CA)	Edwards (OK)	Emerson
Erdreich	Fascell	Fawell
Feighan	Fiedler	Fields
Fish	Flippo	Florio
Foglietta	Foley	Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)	Fowler	Frank
Franklin	Frenzel	Frost
Fuqua	Gallo	Garcia
Gejdenson	Gekas	Gibbons
Gilman	Gingrich	Glickman
Goodling	Gordon	Gradison
Gray (IL)	Gray (PA)	Gregg
Grotberg	Guarini	Gunderson
Hall (OH)	Hall, Ralph	Hamilton
Hansen	Hartnett	Hawkins
Hayes	Hefner	Heftel
Hendon	Henry	Hertel
Hiler	Hillis	Holt
Hopkins	Horton	Howard
Hoyer	Hubbard	Hughes
Hunter	Hutto	Hyde
Ireland	Jacobs	Jeffords
Jenkins	Johnson	Jones (NC)
Jones (OK)	Kanjorski	Kaptur
Kasich	Kastenmeier	Kennelly
Kildee	Kindness	Klecicka
Kolbe	Kolter	Kramer

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

Lagomarsino	Lantos	Leach (IA)
Lehman (CA)	Lehman (FL)	Lent
Levin (MI)	Levine (CA)	Lewis (FL)
Lipinski	Livingston	Lloyd
Lott	Lowery (CA)	Lowry (WA)
Luken	Lungren	Mack
MacKay	Madigan	Manton
Markey	Martin (IL)	Martinez
Mavroules	Mazzoli	McCain
McCloskey	McCollum	McDade
McEwen	McGrath	McHugh
McKernan	McKinney	McMillan
Meyers	Michel	Mikulski
Miller (CA)	Miller (OH)	Miller (WA)
Mineta	Molinari	Mollohan
Monson	Montgomery	Moody
Moore	Moorhead	Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)	Murphy	Myers
Natcher	Neal	Nelson
Nichols	Nielson	Nowak
O'Brien	Oakar	Oberstar
Obey	Olin	Ortiz
Owens	Oxley	Packard
Panetta	Parris	Pease
Penny	Petri	Porter
Rahall	Rangel	Ray
Regula	Reid	Richardson
Ridge	Ritter	Roberts
Rodino	Roe	Roemer
Rogers	Roukema	Rowland (CT)
Roybal	Rudd	Russo
Sabo	Savage	Saxton
Schaefer	Scheuer	Schneider
Schroeder	Schuette	Schulze
Seiberling	Sensenbrenner	Shaw
Shelby	Shumway	Shuster
Sikorski	Siljander	Sisisky
Slattery	Slaughter	Smith (FL)

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

Smith (NE)	Smith (NJ)	Smith, Denny (OR)
Smith, Robert (NH)	Smith, Robert (OR)	Snowe
Snyder	Solarz	Solomon
Spratt	St Germain	Stark
Stenholm	Strang	Stratton
Studds	Stump	Sundquist
Sweeney	Swift	Swindall
Synar	Tauke	Tauzin
Taylor	Thomas (CA)	Torres
Torricelli	Traficant	Traxler
Udall	Vander Jagt	Vento
Visclosky	Volkmer	Walgren
Walker	Watkins	Weiss
Wheat	Whitehurst	Whittaker
Williams	Wirth	Wise
Wolf	Wolpe	Wortley
Wyden	Wylie	Yates
Yatron	Young (AK)	Young (FL)
Zschau		

NOES -- 65

Akaka	Alexander	Anthony
Bedell	Boggs	Boner (TN)
Bonior (MI)	Boxer	Brown (CA)
Bruce	Chappie	Coelho
Craig	Daschle	Davis
de la Garza	Dingell	Duncan
English	Evans (IA)	Evans (IL)
Gaydos	Gephardt	Gonzalez
Hammerschmidt	Hatcher	Huckaby
Jones (TN)	Leath (TX)	Leland
Lightfoot	Long	Lujan
Marlenee	Matsui	McCurdy
Murtha	Pashayan	Pepper
Perkins	Pickle	Price
Quillen	Robinson	Rose
Roth	Rowland (GA)	Skeen

131 Cong Rec H 8297 Monday, October 7, 1985

Skelton	Smith (IA)	Spence
Staggers	Stallings	Stangeland
Tallon	Thomas (GA)	Valentine
Vucanovich	Waxman	Weaver
Weber	Whitley	Whitten
Wilson	Wright	

NOT VOTING -- 29

Ackerman	Addabbo	Barnes
Berman	Carr	Edgar
Fazio	Green	Kemp
Kostmayer	LaFalce	Latta
Lewis (CA)	Loeffler	Lundine
Martin (NY)	McCandless	Mica
Mitchell	Moakley	Mrazek
Pursell	Rinaldo	Rostenkowski
Schumer	Sharp	Stokes
Towns	Young (MO)	

SUBJECT: FOOD STAMPS (79%); FOOD PRICES (59%); AGING (59%); LEGISLATIVE BODIES (59%); AGRICULTURAL MARKETING (59%); TAX DEDUCTIONS (59%); NUTRITION (59%); LEGISLATION (59%); MALNUTRITION (59%); DISABLED PERSONS (59%); FOOD CHARITIES (59%);