



22 of 134 DOCUMENTS

Congressional Record -- House

Thursday, October 3, 1985

99th Cong. 1st Sess.

131 Cong Rec H 8222

REFERENCE: Vol. 131 No. 127

TITLE: FOOD SECURITY ACT OF 1985

SPEAKER: Mr. ANTHONY; Mr. BEDELL; Mr. BEREUTER; Mr. BRUCE; Mr. CHAIRMAN; Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri; MRS. COLLINS; Mr. DASCHLE; Mr. de la GARZA; Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota; Mr. EMERSON; Mr. EVANS of Iowa; MR. FAUNTROY; Mr. FRANKLIN; Mr. GEJDENSON; Mr. GLICKMAN; Mr. GUNDERSON; Mr. HAYES; Mr. JEFFORDS; Mr. JONES of Tennessee; Mrs. KENNELLY; Mr. KLECZKA; Mr. LEWIS of Florida; Mr. LIGHTFOOT; Mr. MADIGAN; Mr. MARLENEE; Mr. MICHEL; Mr. MILLER of California; Mr. MORRISON of Washington; Mr. PANETTA; Mrs. ROUKEMA; Mr. SKELTON; Mr. SMITH of Iowa; Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska; Ms. SNOWE; Mr. STENHOLM; Mr. TALLON; Mr. TOWNS; Mr. VOLKMER; Mr. WALKER; Mr. WHITTEN; Mr. WOLPE

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. 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 consumer 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 earlier today, all time for debate had expired on section 1141 and all amendments thereto.

Are there further amendments to section 1141?

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

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Whitten] is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, our colleagues on the Committee on Agriculture have done as good a job on this bill before us as is possible in view of restrictions and other problems we all face.

Since I have been in Congress, among other work, I have spent months each year on the activities of agriculture -- the Department and the industry.

Many of our problems, including the \$214,000,000,000 debt of agriculture, need not have happened if the executive branch had retained our export markets and kept the program of supports paid for by the user.

I believe we must return to a farm program that maintains both volume and price. On September 11, 1985, I introduced House Joint Resolution 380, which included a section to return us to a proven farm program which worked. Such a program, which our Government changed, would have prevented the current condition from occurring and, if used, will help us to overcome the present deplorable financial condition of many farmers and their creditors.

Section 107 of House Joint Resolution 380 reads as follows:

Sec. 107. Pending the enactment of general farm legislation, the Secretary of Agriculture shall use his authority under existing law to provide for nonrecourse loans on agricultural commodities at such levels as will reflect a fair return to the farm producer above the cost of production, and to issue such regulations as will carry out this provision and as will provide for payment by the purchaser, rather than by appropriation, for commodities sold for domestic use, and the Secretary of Agriculture shall issue such regulations as will enable producers of any agricultural commodity to vote to limit their production to the volume estimated to be needed for domestic consumption, to maintain the pipeline, and to regain and retain by competitive sales our normal share of the world market.

To return to such a workable program is a must for today.

PRESENT PROGRAM A FAILURE

American agriculture is \$214 billion in debt. Farm profits on basic commodities are nonexistent. Land values continue to plummet. Farm land secures much of the \$214 billion debt. Of that debt, the Production Credit Associations and the Federal Land Banks of the Farm Credit System hold about \$67 billion; commercial banks and insurance companies hold about \$61 billion; the Government holds about \$34 billion; and individuals and businesses hold the remaining \$51 billion.

This debt comes largely from faulty Government policy of embargoes, threats of embargoes and failure to sell at competitive prices -- which is a very real embargo -- all used against the farmer.

Since World War II, the share of the consumer dollar that goes to industry and labor has increased from 49 to 73 percent by reason of protective laws while the farmer's share has declined from 51 percent down to 27 percent. Under existing farm programs, this shift in the consumer dollar under the law has forced the farmer to look for his income from the Treasury rather than from the purchaser of his commodities.

Some 30 years ago the then Secretary of Agriculture refused to sell in world trade at competitive prices U.S. commodities surplus to domestic needs. This resulted in tremendous storage costs. The press reports on storage costs were used against the farm program. Finally, we got the Secretary to let the Commodity Credit Corporation fulfill its function of selling competitively. Public opposition subsided. The program kept agriculture on a sound basis, financed on the domestic market by the purchaser, which is much, much less costly than what we have now.

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

Now, the administration, perhaps without meaning to, has destroyed the farm program by refusing to use the Commodity Credit Corporation, a \$25 billion Corporation, to export at competitive prices basic commodities that we have and don't need domestically, which all other countries do. They have failed to use the authority which exists to have the Secretary set a fair price relative to cost, to be paid by the domestic purchaser. They leave the farmer dependent upon a payment from the Treasury.

Mr. Chairman, a balance between industry, labor and agriculture -- the three basic parts of our society -- is absolutely essential to the economic welfare of our country.

This has been proven many times. Yet today, agriculture, our largest industry, is no longer an equal partner in that triad.

When we fail to sell at competitive prices, we hold an umbrella over world prices, allow other nations to undersell us, and end up being the residual supplier.

ACTION NEEDED NOW

If we are to avoid the real danger of an all-out depression brought on by the collapse of American agriculture, its supporting financial institutions, and the hundreds of thousands who are employed in supporting businesses, with the resulting drastic reduction in land value, we must restore a prosperous agricultural income and we must do it now. I point out, that the drastic reduction in land values will continue unless we act now, and such a drop will bring us all down. The declining value of land used as collateral to secure existing loans will make much of the existing debt uncollectible, regardless of who is the lender.

We must do something to stretch out or otherwise deal with that \$214 billion debt which could lead to massive foreclosures this year.

We must improve the price the farmer receives relative to his cost.

We must regain our fair share of world markets, either by using private firms or by using the Commodity Credit Corporation which was created for that purpose, and let the world know we expect to retain these markets. All other countries do that.

Farm land values have dropped an average of 25 percent -- 50 percent or more in some areas -- and foreclosures will lead to further reductions as happened in the 1930's.

The pending farm bill would reduce volume and hold the line on price. Insofar as basic commodities are concerned the bill offers no hope of increased net income. Further reductions in land values are certain. Foreclosures speed the decline. Banks, Production Credit Associations, Federal Land Banks, insurance companies and other private lenders are pulled down. In fact, history shows such massive foreclosures would spread throughout the economy, bringing all sectors down.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

I introduced a bill in 1981, 1983 and again on February 19, 1985, H.R. 1147, to recreate the Reconstruction Finance Corporation [RFC]. It is pending before the Banking and Finance Committee which held hearings last year. The RFC was created by Congress during the Great Depression to squeeze the inflation out of uncollectible debts and let the lenders and borrowers get together on a new start. It worked to help us recover from the Great Depression because it kept both creditor and debtor in business by taking over the debt for what it was really worth. It played a major role in pulling the country out of the terrible depression of the mid 1930's. We need to try it again. It should help to prevent a major depression that appears to be in the making.

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

While Congress acts to recreate the RFC, the Secretary of Agriculture should suspend repayment of principal and interest on Government loans as he has the authority to do. Other lenders should be urged to do the same and let the farmer obtain a new start.

COMMITTEE FACED WITH DIFFICULT DECISIONS

Mr. Chairman, my friends on the Agriculture Committee have been faced with an exceptionally difficult challenge this year in drafting a farm bill. Many affecting factors are beyond their jurisdiction. Because of this, I do not intend to offer amendments to their bill, but rather to urge that my proposal to return to a workable program be attempted in conference.

The administration's proposal says, "If we drive the price down low enough, the farmer will produce less." To meet reduced prices the farmer has always increased volume. It's the only way to offset a drop in price. Of course, most farmers cannot make it now and for those that are left, a lower price or volume would surely finish them off.

Then the Agriculture Committee is called on to live within an overall budget ceiling which would easily be met if we returned to the former policy of requiring that the purchasers pay a reasonable price to the producer. Agriculture is the foundation of our economy. If you let the farmers of this country go down the drain, it won't matter how much you're allocating to other programs because history shows the rest of the country will follow agriculture into depression. Remember, it was the agricultural depression of the 1920's that led to the Great Depression of the 1930's. The same goes for all other depressions.

As a result of the pressure their committee faced, the bill before us provides for further reductions in volume and does nothing to improve price. It does nothing to add to farm income nor to relieve this oppressive debt that the farmer faces.

PROGRAM WHICH WORKED

Mr. Chairman, section 107 of House Joint Resolution 380, which I read earlier, would embody many of the provisions of the pending bill but would also maintain both price and volume. My proposal would simply return us to time-tested farm programs that worked so well for years.

It would require the Secretary of Agriculture to use his authority under existing law to provide for nonrecourse loans on basic agricultural commodities at such levels as will reflect a fair return above the cost of production to farm producers.

In determining that price, the Secretary would be required to determine a base period which reflects a period when the price of a given commodity was in balance with the cost of other farm inputs. That base period should be an appropriate interval during the years 1960 to 1980. Most people today can no longer relate to the concept of parity when it is based on the period of 1909 to 1914.

The Secretary would also be required to use his authority under existing law to issue such regulations as will enable producers of any basic agricultural commodity to vote to limit their production to the volume estimated to be needed for domestic consumption, to maintain the pipeline, and to regain and retain the United States' normal share of world markets.

Perishable commodities, where 1 year's surplus generally does not carry over into the next year, were and still are supported by section 32 funds -- 30 percent of tariff receipts on imports. These funds are used to buy up surpluses for use in the School Lunch Program, feeding programs for the needy, and other such outlets. Unfortunately, in recent years there have been attempts in Congress to transfer cash directly rather than commodities or to divert the fund to other uses, thereby defeating the intent of the program and its essential price support benefits.

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

Finally, the Secretary would be required to offer commodities, which are surplus to domestic needs, for sale for export to the highest bidder in such amounts and quantities as are necessary to assure our normal share of world markets as was done for many years.

Most sales would continue to be made by the export companies, many of which are international corporations, but the use of CCC -- or the potential use of CCC -- helps to keep the pressure on and keep U.S. commodities moving.

NEED TO KEEP FARMERS FARMING

Mr. Chairman, in view of this year's record harvest and commodity prices that are below the cost of production, it will be essential that the Secretary use his authority under existing law to provide for a moratorium on repayment of principal and interest. We must keep the farmer farming while the Congress enacts a new farm bill. We must restore the Reconstruction Finance Corporation so we can provide relief from that oppressive debt of \$214 billion.

Mr. Chairman, my proposal provides for nothing radical or unusual. It merely reestablishes a proven farm program that is already available under permanent law. Mr. Chairman, when the conferees on this bill meet in conference, I hope they will keep my recommendations in mind. It's a proven approach that works.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BEREUTER

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

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman's amendment been printed in the Congressional Record as of September 24, 1985?

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bereuter: Page 275, after line 11, insert the following new section:

TRANSFER OF RESPONSIBILITIES

Sec. 1142. (a) Section 5(f) of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act (15 U.S.C. 714c(f)) is amended to read as follows:

"(f) Export or cause to be exported, or aid in the development of foreign markets for, agricultural commodities; except that no funds or assets of the Corporation may be used to pay for, or otherwise finance, the ocean freight charges for any such export to the extent that such charges are higher than would otherwise be the case by reason of a requirement that the commodity be transported in United States-flag vessels."

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Maritime Administration shall pay the ocean freight charges for the export of agricultural commodities arranged by or through the Commodity Credit Corporation under the authority of section 5(f) of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act (15 U.S.C. 714c(f)), or other law, to the extent that such charges are higher (than would otherwise be the case) by reason of a requirement that the commodities be transported in United States-flag vessels. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Commerce, for each fiscal year after fiscal year 1985, such sums as may be necessary to pay the ocean freight charges paid in accordance with the preceding sentence by the Maritime Administration during such year.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Bereuter] is recognized for 5 minutes, as he has had the amendment printed in the Congressional Record; and when his 5 minutes have expired, an opponent thereto will be recognized for 5 minutes, if one rises.

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Bereuter.]

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I permitted the Clerk to read the entire amendment in its entirety because I wanted the Members to hear it; it will save lengthy explanation of it. I think the issue is fairly straightforward.

The House having worked its will, continuing cargo preference on the Food for Peace Program, on our famine relief programs for Africa and in fact is apparently moving toward putting Judge Green's decision in statute.

We have heard much discussion about subsidies to the merchant marine and maritime industry and why they should be continued. I do not argue that a subsidy is appropriate; I support it.

For a long time, Members have said, "Well, perhaps we ought to fund the cargo preference program directly through the Department of Transportation, specifically the Maritime Administration or the Department of Defense, rather than through a hidden subsidy program in the USDA budget items distorting upward that budget. What my amendment does is straightforward. It provides that the cost of transporting these commodities under the cargo preference program, either grain or processed food, be budgeted within the Maritime Administration.

I think that the issue is fairly clear. I want to give the Members an opportunity to vote on this issue. I strongly urge support for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and for the moment yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. de la GARZA. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I do so to advise the gentleman and our colleagues that the only amendment that the Committee on Agriculture had has been disposed of. Any other amendments related to cargo preference are not amendments sponsored by the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. I appreciate the chairman's support.

Now, Mr. Chairman, my opposition is based not so much on the merits of the proposal of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Bereuter]; perhaps it has some merit, but it is a major change. It is one which changes the whole procedure for financing cargo preference; it has not been considered by any committee; has not even been introduced as a bill; the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture just said it has not been discussed by his committee; it has not been presented to our committee and on that basis, at this late hour here on Thursday afternoon, I ask a "no" vote on the gentleman's amendment until such time as the committees of jurisdiction, whichever that might be, have an opportunity to consider debate, amend, et cetera, his proposal.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Bereuter].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Bereuter) there were -- ayes 37, noes 45.

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were -- ayes 151, noes 269, not voting 14, as follows:

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

(See Roll No. 336 in the ROLL segment.)

Mr. TALLON and Mr. SILJANDER changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Bereuter] is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, the hour is late, discretion is the better part of valor, the handwriting is on the wall, all those kinds of things that I might say which are applicable right now.

I would like to ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and engage in a colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

The chairman knows that the thrust of the other six amendments that I have pending basically include the idea of not only moving the funding to the Maritime Administration, moving the funding to the Defense Department and beginning to cap the differential or maximums on cargo preference cost between domestic shipping and foreign shipping, including, for example, a 25 percent limitation as the amount of domestic costs in excess of the foreign shipping.

In short, Mr. Chairman, I will not proceed with my remaining amendment, but I would like to ask the chairman if he would, as a part of his committee's jurisdiction, consider the intent of those amendments that are pending and consider in hearings such legislation as the legislation introduced by the gentleman from Iowa, Cooper Evans, which moves the funding to the Maritime Administration, and other legislation which moves it to the Department of Defense.

I yield to the chairman.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. The gentleman and I have discussed this in private conversation, and he explained to me his intents and purposes, many of which I agree with. I think he has some very good ideas, but they need consideration, perhaps refining and amending, and what not, and I can assure the gentleman, as chairman of that committee, I would welcome at any time any of his legislation, it will be given a full and impartial hearing, and to whatever witnesses the gentleman sees fit to provide, the committee will be very gracious and understanding. I can assure the gentleman that his proposed legislation will in no way be pigeonholed or set aside.

Mr. BEREUTER. I thank the chairman for his gracious attitude and comments, and I look forward to working with him in pursuit of what are, hopefully, common objectives.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Kleczka] is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk which I have prepared to the cargo preference section of the bill. I will not bring the amendment before the body at this time.

I would like, however, to make a comment or 2 on the Cargo Preference Act itself.

We are now about to conclude debate on this section of the bill. During the lengthy debate on the amendments to the bill's cargo preference provisions, we were told that the program is working effectively. Well, after listening very intently over this period of time, I think one can conclude that it is not working effectively. It is not working in the best interest of the agricultural interests of the country, it is not working in the best interest of those who deal with the blended credit program, it is not working in the best interest of the Public Law 480 program, and, most importantly, for the area I represent, it is not working in the best interest of the Great Lakes and the Port of Milwaukee.

Mr. Chairman, we were also told that the merchant marine's future is at stake. Well, let me tell you what is actually transpiring on the Great Lakes. Because of the Cargo Preference Act, and because of the 50-percent requirement, we are seeing cargoes diverted from the ports of the Great Lakes to the ocean ports.

Now, if you contend that the merchant marine will be adversely affected by any changes in the law, I assure you today, Mr. Chairman, that the Great Lakes are already affected today. We are losing revenue and we are losing jobs, from longshoremen, to truckers, to millers. So even though I will not introduce the amendment, the amendment would have the effect of going back to the old, sound practice wherein the Department of Agriculture would apportion these grain shipments under title II of Public Law 480 according to the lowest landed cost. That is not the case for this year, and what they are doing instead is diverting those shipments off the Great Lakes at a high premium.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Oberstar] did take the floor and did enumerate a short time ago some of the problems the Great Lakes ports are having, and I have personally talked to the chairman of the Merchant Marine Committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Jones], and in listening to the colloquy between Mr. Oberstar and Mr. Biaggi, the fact is that the subcommittee will be holding hearings on this important matter on October 31 of this year. I look forward to those hearings not only to resolve the problems of the Great Lake ports, but also, I hope, to take up the problems of our brothers and sisters in the agriculture community vis a vis cargo preference.

MR. CHAIRMAN, MY AMENDMENT ADDRESSES A SERIOUS PROBLEM IN THE EXPORT OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES -- THE COSTS OF CARGO PREFERENCE TO THE AGRICULTURAL COMMUNITY AND TO THE GREAT LAKES.

AS WE PROCEED WITH A FARM BILL THAT ATTEMPTS TO BOLSTER THE ECONOMY OF AMERICA'S HEARTLAND, WE MUST REMEMBER THE TERRIFIC IMPORTANCE OF SUCH EXPORT PROGRAMS AS PUBLIC LAW 480 TO SEVERAL ECONOMIES AROUND THIS COUNTRY.

In 1985, Food for Peace has resulted in over \$1.5 billion in commodity purchases from American farmers. What may be less apparent is that Food for Peace shipments have also resulted in some 250,000 tons of cargo moved through Great Lakes ports. This cargo means revenue and jobs to our region -- not just for longshoremen and port personnel, but for railroad workers, grain elevator operators, and thousands of milling company employees.

Although Public Law 480 shipments have been a blessing to the Great Lakes economy, that economy is also vulnerable. Due to declining exports of machine tools and other industrial products, Public Law 480 cargoes now comprise over 90 percent of the general cargo leaving Milwaukee, Duluth, and Green Bay. A similar situation exists at Chicago and other ports throughout the region.

That vulnerability has been heightened by the cargo preference law. Since the lakes have limited U.S.-flag capability, our market has been limited primarily to the 50 percent available to foreign flags.

Despite this challenge, our ports have managed to hold their own over the years. Our proximity to the production and processing sites of the commodities, our superior port efficiency, and a host of inexpensive carriers have made Great Lakes shipping a good buy for America.

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

Now, however, the administration and USDA is turning its back on a good buy. As a result, the interests of the Great Lakes, the farm belt, and commonsense are being tossed out the window.

Recently, nearly 100 million pounds of Public Law 480 cargo that would have traveled through the lakes according to standard competitive bidding procedures was diverted to other coastal ranges in search of scarce U.S. flagships over the past year, the extra cost of securing U.S. flagships just for title II has been a staggering \$55 million. That's \$55 million that could have bought food from farmers -- \$55 million that could have fed the hungry in Africa.

SOME MAY ARGUE THAT A \$55 MILLION PREMIUM IS SIMPLY A COST OF DOING BUSINESS. MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT MAY BE TRUE FOR SOME PROGRAMS, BUT NOT FOR TITLE II. TITLE II IS UNIQUE IN THAT THE U.S. GOVERNMENT PAYS EVERY PENNY FOR BOTH PROCUREMENT AND TRANSPORTATION. BEYOND THIS, UNTIL 1984, USDA WAS ABLE TO MEET ITS 50 PERCENT REQUIREMENT WITHOUT THE NEED FOR HUGE SUBSIDIES. INSTEAD, USDA ADHERED TO A LOWEST LANDED-COST SYSTEM IN WHICH THE LOWEST BIDDER WON THE CARGO. AT THAT TIME, U.S. FLAGS FACED UP TO THE COMPETITION.

MR. CHAIRMAN, THE AMENDMENT THAT I AM PREPARED TO OFFER WOULD AVOID THIS \$55 MILLION WASTE OF TAXPAYER FUNDS BY REQUIRING THAT FOR TITLE II OF PUBLIC LAW 480 USDA MUST AGAIN ADHERE TO A LOWEST LANDED-COST SYSTEM. BESIDES SAVING MONEY, THIS AMENDMENT WOULD ALLOW THE GREAT LAKES PORTS TO COMPETE, WHILE ENCOURAGING U.S. FLAGS TO MAKE THEMSELVES COMPETITIVE.

MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD ADD THAT THE LOWEST LANDED-COST APPROACH NEED NOT BE THE ONLY SOLUTION TO THE CURRENT CARGO PREFERENCE PROBLEM. AS MOST OF MY COLLEAGUES KNOW, THE CARGO PREFERENCE LAW REQUIRES A 50 PERCENT U.S. FLAG PARTICIPATION TO THE EXTENT SUCH VESSELS ARE AVAILABLE AT FAIR AND REASONABLE RATES.

TO EVERYONE'S LOSS, THE AGENCIES RESPONSIBLE FOR ADMINISTERING THE LAW HAVE AVOIDED DEFINING AVAILABILITY TO THE POINT WHERE THIS YEAR A TITLE I SHIPMENT OF CORN TO ZAMBIA RESULTED IN U.S. FLAG SHIPPING COSTS OF \$95 PER TON VERSUS \$18 ON A FOREIGN FLAG. THE COST OF THIS PREMIUM TO THE TAXPAYER WAS OVER \$2 MILLION.

I ASK MY COLLEAGUES, IS THAT A FAIR AND REASONABLE RATE? IF THE ADMINISTRATION REFUSES TO DEFINE AVAILABILITY, IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THIS CONGRESS TO DO SO, AND I INTEND TO OFFER LEGISLATION TO THAT EFFECT IN THE NEAR FUTURE.

TO SUM UP, MR. CHAIRMAN, THE GREAT LAKES AND THE AGRICULTURAL COMMUNITY HAVE A LOT TO LOSE IF CARGO PREFERENCE CONTINUES ON ITS CURRENT COURSE. WE RECOGNIZE THE NEED FOR A STRONG MERCHANT FLEET, AND ARE WILLING TO COMMIT TAX DOLLARS TO THAT END. CERTAINLY NO ONE WANTS TO SEE AMERICAN MARITIME WORKERS LOSE THEIR JOBS. BUT THERE ARE THOUSANDS OF AMERICAN JOBS IN MY DISTRICT AND THROUGHOUT THE REGION THAT ALSO STAND TO BE LOST IF OUR INTERESTS ARE IGNORED. IF WE CAN FIND A WAY TO SAVE CARGO PREFERENCE AND RESPECT THE ECONOMIC RIGHTS OF THE GREAT LAKES, I AM ALL FOR IT; BUT TIME IS RUNNING OUT.

I WILL SAY THAT I AM ENCOURAGED TO HEAR THAT THE COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES INTENDS TO ADDRESS THIS ISSUE ON OCTOBER 31, 1985.

GIVEN THE ASSURANCES OF THE UPCOMING HEARING BY THE MERCHANT MARINE COMMITTEE, I WILL DECLINE TO OFFER MY AMENDMENT AT THIS TIME. I WILL, HOWEVER, CONTINUE TO WORK FOR A FAIR DEAL FOR THE LAKES ON THIS ISSUE, AND HOPE THAT THE CHAIRMAN'S CONCERN WILL RESULT IN AN EARLY SOLUTION.

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BEDELL

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Is the amendment printed in the Record?

Mr. BEDELL. Yes, it is, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bedell: On page 278, line 16, add the word "and" following the semicolon.

On page 278, line 23, strike "; and" and insert a period in lieu thereof.

On page 278, beginning on line 24, strike paragraph (11).

On page 279, beginning on line 6, strike all that follows through line 18 on page 282, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"EXPORT MARKET DEVELOPMENT REPORT

"Sec. 1154. In order to implement the findings set forth in section 1153, not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture, in conjunction with the Administrator of the Agency for International Development, and in consultation with the Secretary of State and the United States Trade Representative, shall submit to the President and the Congress a report that --

"(1) contains a global analysis that evaluates future production and food needs in the world, with special attention to the developing countries;

"(2) identifies a minimum of fifteen target countries that are most likely to emerge as growth markets for agricultural commodities and products thereof in the next five to ten years; and

"(3) contains a detailed plan for using available export and food aid authorities to increase United States exports of agricultural commodities and products thereof to each of such target countries, and specifies the particular export and food aid authorities to be used in each such country and the manner in which such authorities are to be used. Each year thereafter, through fiscal year 1990, the Secretary shall submit a revised report to the President and the Congress that evaluates the progress made in implementing the plan, contains any changes that need to be made in the plan based on changed conditions, and recommends any changes in legislative authorities that are needed to accomplish the objectives of this section."

Mr. BEDELL [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. BEDELL. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that I think has been agreed to by all parties. It simply removes the special assistant that I had placed in the legislation during the committee deliberations.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Gunderson].

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

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

MR. GUNDERSON. MR. CHAIRMAN, I AM PLEASSED TO RISE IN SUPPORT OF THE AMENDMENT OF THE GENTLEMAN FROM IOWA [MR. BEDELL] TO SECTION 1154 OF H.R. 2100. DURING THE CONSIDERATION OF THIS SECTION BY THE FULL HOUSE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE, I VOICED SEVERAL CONCERNS ABOUT THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A NEW LAYER OF BUREAUCRACY IN THE WHOLE AREA OF AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS AND FOOD AID.

WHILE THE PROPOSED CREATION OF A SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR AG EXPORTS AND FOOD AID IS WELL-INTENTIONED, THE FACTS ARE THAT WE ALREADY HAVE MORE THAN ENOUGH AGENCIES AND INDIVIDUALS WITHIN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WHICH WORK IN THIS AREA INCLUDING THE U.S. TRADE REPRESENTATIVE AND THE AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AS WELL AS THE STATE DEPARTMENT, COMMERCE DEPARTMENT, AND THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE. IT SEEMS TO ME THAT WE NEED LESS -- NOT MORE -- BUREAUCRACY IN THIS REGARD.

QUITE FRANKLY, THE CREATION OF A NEW SPECIAL ASSISTANT WOULD ONLY SERVE TO DUPLICATE, CONFUSE, AND FURTHER DILUTE THE POLICYMAKING ROLES OF THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE AND THE U.S. TRADE REPRESENTATIVE IN AGRICULTURAL TRADE. IF THERE ARE PROBLEMS IN THE EXISTING STRUCTURE, WE SHOULD BE FINDING WAYS TO MAKE THAT STRUCTURE MORE EFFECTIVE, NOT CONFUSE IT FURTHER.

ACCORDINGLY, I PRINTED AN AMENDMENT IN THE RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 24 (PAGE H7781) WHICH, IF ADOPTED, WOULD STRIKE THE NEW SPECIAL ASSISTANT POSITION PROVIDED IN SECTION 1154 WHILE MAINTAINING THE STUDY OF EXPORT MARKET DEVELOPMENT INCLUDED IN THAT SECTION. UNDER MY AMENDMENT, THAT STUDY WOULD NOW BE CONDUCTED BY THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE U.S. TRADE REPRESENTATIVE.

THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY THE GENTLEMAN FROM IOWA IS VIRTUALLY IDENTICAL TO THAT WHICH I PRINTED IN THE RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 24. I, THEREFORE, COMMEND HIM FOR OFFERING IT AT THIS TIME AND URGE MY COLLEAGUES TO SUPPORT IT.

Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is also offered because of some concerns that have been raised by other committees.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Bedell].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments to title XI?

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

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Skelton] is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the agricultural trade provisions contained in H.R. 2100, the Food Security Act of 1985. It is my belief that there will be no substantial long-term improvement in our farm economy until we reverse the decline in agricultural exports, which has now reached its lowest level in 6 years. We need to begin creating new markets for our agricultural products, and expand existing ones. The maintenance and development of export markets is vital to our farm economy: Currently, about one-third of harvested crops are exported

and between one-fifth and one-fourth of farm receipts are generated by exports.

Moreover, U.S. agricultural exports generate employment, income, and purchasing power across the entire economy. They help reduce the cost of farm programs. It has been estimated that each dollar of agricultural exports generates an additional dollar of domestic economic activity and that every \$1 billion of farm exports creates 35,000 jobs. In addition, net U.S. agricultural exports help to offset the overall trade deficit by nearly \$12 billion each year.

Mr. Chairman, the strong dollar, the world debt crisis, and the global recession have played major roles in the decline of U.S. agricultural exports in recent years. Other factors have also hurt, including unfair trading practices pursued by competing agricultural exporting nations, worldwide surpluses of agricultural commodities, limited U.S. use of export credit and loan guarantee programs, and the perception that the United States is an unreliable supplier of agricultural goods. H.R. 2100 contains strong provisions to help counter these factors.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that H.R. 2100 includes many of the proposals contained in a three-bill agricultural trade legislative package which I introduced earlier this year, including an export bonus program to encourage expansion of farm exports, extension of authority for the agricultural export credit revolving fund for 5 more years, and more stringent requirements on inspection and other standards for imported meat and meat products. My legislation also required the labeling of imported meat and meat products, and H.R. 2100 requires a study of the feasibility of such action.

I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, the attention of the Agriculture Committee to these recommendations and the legislation that I introduced along this line.

Mr. Chairman, the export bonus program is necessary in order for our Nation to counter the predatory export subsidies which many other nations provide to their farmers. This will help us regain some of the markets we have lost in recent years. Safeguards included in the legislation will help prevent the program from causing a disruption in the normal commercial marketings of U.S. commodities.

The reauthorization of the agricultural export credit revolving fund gives us an important tool for market development and expansion and to meet credit competition. I was the original House sponsor of agricultural export credit revolving fund legislation, and I cosponsored the amendment which attached the measure to the 1981 farm bill. I have been disappointed that, despite strong congressional support for the fund, the administration has not supported an appropriation to activate the program.

This, truly, is disappointing.

Thus, I strongly support the provision included in this bill by the House Agriculture Committee that provides for the fund to be self-financed from the repayments received by the CCC for commercially-oriented direct export credit loans. That is a good idea, and I applaud them for doing this.

Mr. Chairman, strengthening the requirements on inspection and other standards for imported meat and meat products will help provide fairer trade for U.S. meat producers, and is also proconsumer. It protects both the American consumer from consumption of dangerous substances as well as American producers from unfair competition from foreign producers who are permitted to produce meat and meat products by using chemicals and drugs which are restricted in the United States for health and safety reasons. I believe that meat produced in foreign nations for importation into the United States should be subject to the same health and safety standards as meat produced in the United States of America. The legislation which I introduced went further and required the labeling of imported meat and meat products, and required that eating establishments serving imported meat inform their customers of that fact. H.R. 2100 contains a provision requiring a study to evaluate the feasibility of labeling imported meat and meat food products and agricultural commodities and the products of such commodities. I welcome this study and I am looking forward to its results. I believe that consumers have the right to be informed that they are buying foreign-produced agricultural commodities, both at the supermarket and in restaurants.

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the agricultural trade provisions of H.R. 2100 will help reverse the continuing slump in U.S. agricultural exports. This is essential if we are to see prosperity on our farms once again. I urge all of our colleagues to give their full support to the agricultural trade policy included in H.R. 2100, the Food Security Act of 1985.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GEJDENSON

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

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

Mr. GEJDENSON. Yes, it has, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gejdenson: Page 253, after line 18, insert the following new section:

CHILD IMMUNIZATION

Sec. 1107. (a) The Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 is amended --

(1) in paragraph (11) of section 109 (7 U.S.C. 1709(11)) by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof ", including the immunization of children";

(2) in the first sentence of section 206 (7 U.S.C. 1726) by striking out "or" before "(B)", and by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof ", or (C) health programs and projects, including immunization of children"; and

(3) in the second sentence of section 301(b)(7 U.S.C. 1727(b)) by inserting "(including immunization of children)" immediately after "health services".

(b) In the implementation of health programs undertaken in relation to assistance provided under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, it shall be the target for the organizations and agencies involved to provide for the immunization by fiscal year 1987 of at least three million more children annually than receive immunizations under such programs in fiscal year 1985. Such increased immunization activities should be taken in coordination with similar efforts of other organizations and in keeping with any national plans for expanded programs of immunization. The President shall include information concerning such immunization activities in the annual reports required by section 634 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, including a report on the estimated number of immunizations provided each year pursuant to this subsection.

Mr. GEJDENSON (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 Connecticut?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I will not take the entire 5 minutes. I believe that both the majority and the minority of the committee have accepted the amendment.

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

Mr. Chairman, preventative health care is clearly the most cost effective means of preventing childhood disease and death. It has been shown, for example, that for every 100 immunizations given, five children's lives are saved and another five are saved from a crippling disease. Thus, an increase of 3 million vaccinations annually would mean that 300,000 children would be saved from being crippled or killed. Currently, at least 4 1/2 million children around the world die or are handicapped each year by only three vaccine-preventable diseases: neonatal tetanus, measles, or pertussis. If you include the deaths and disease attributed to three other diseases, the total number of children killed or handicapped by vaccine-preventable diseases rises to more than 10 million each year.

And yet, in 1984, only 20 percent of children in developing countries were protected against all or most of the common childhood diseases. One of the greatest obstacles in raising the immunization rate has not been the lack of vaccines or any unwillingness on the part of any agency, but the inconvenience associated with going to special health centers where vaccines are given. Many mothers are unable or unwilling to travel the distance to local health centers. One way to overcome this obstacle would be to take advantage of the fact that currently, 25 million children regularly visit Public Law 480 food distribution centers. So, a sensible thing to do would be to make vaccines available at those food distribution centers.

By combining the two services -- food distribution and vaccinations -- I foresee little difficulty in reaching the target of 3 million more immunizations annually.

Last, I would note that this amendment was approved by the Foreign Affairs Committee and the full House but was dropped in conference with the understanding that it would be included in another conference.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Bedell].

Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Chairman, this side of the aisle has looked at the amendment, and we have no objection to the amendment.

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

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

Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Chairman, I understand that we have also looked at the amendment, and we have no objections to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Gedjdenson].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DASCHLE

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

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

Mr. DASCHLE. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Daschle: On page 282, after line 8, insert the following:

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

"Subtitle F -- Trade Practices

"FINDINGS

"Sec. 1161. Congress finds that --

"(1) the production and marketing of agricultural commodities and products constitute one of the great basic industries of the United States, accounting for more than twenty percent of the gross national product and employing more than twenty-two million people or one-fifth of the total of private sector employment of the Nation;

"(2) the prosperity, security, general welfare, and economic progress and stability of the Nation are dependent on a productive, efficient, and profitable agricultural economy;

"(3) current unprofitable agricultural commodity production, depressed commodity prices, plummeting production asset values, massive agricultural indebtedness for which repayment ability does not exist constitute a dire economic emergency in the Nation's agricultural economy;

"(4) the equitable marketing of agricultural commodities and products in foreign commerce is essential in order for agricultural commodity producers to achieve a fair, reasonable, equitable, and adequate return on investment in production, economic stability, and profitability;

"(5) obstacles erected by foreign nations to the marketing of agricultural commodities and products in international commerce depress the price received by United States producers of such commodities impairing the purchasing power of such producers, destroying the value of agricultural assets, jeopardizing the credit structure on which such asset values are based, threatening the disruption and discontinuance of the production of agricultural commodities by such producers, increasing the net cost of commodity price support loans and payments made to such producers of commodities, all of which are contrary to the national interest.

"REPORT BY SECRETARY; TRADE PRACTICES

"Sec. 1162. Within 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act and within 30 days after the first day of each of the fiscal years 1987 through 1990, the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to the President and Congress a report that describes in detail --

(1) any tariff, import restriction, nontariff barrier, or any similar trade practice or program, and

(2) any export subsidy, export restitution payment, export incentive, export reimbursement, or any similar trade practice or program

used by each foreign nation during the fiscal year preceding such report that has the effect of prohibiting, discouraging, decreasing, disadvantaging, or otherwise inhibiting or adversely affecting the exportation from the United States of agricultural commodities or products produced in the United States.

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. Mr. Chairman, trade is becoming a growing concern to all of us. Trade barriers of all kinds are increasing in numbers, and that is especially true is world agricultural markets.

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

Recently, I attempted to learn the extent of these barriers. In fact, my study began, very simply, by attempting to determine the extent of increase in agricultural imports including all commodities in food, feed, fibre and fuel; both processed and unprocessed.

To my surprise, no comprehensive information such as this exists. In fact, there is no regular data even kept on the extent to which any tariffs or export subsidies exist within current trade practices by our foreign economic and agricultural competitors.

These facts are most disconcerting. How are we to decide the impact of trade barriers if we have no idea of what they are. How are we to decide what must be this country's response to these unfair trade practices if we know not what they are? How are we even to formulate sound agricultural trade policy if we do not have the facts?

My amendment is very simple. It requires the Secretary of Agriculture to submit a report to the President and the Congress within 60 days after the enactment of this act and each succeeding year through 1990 which describes two areas of trade practices used by our trading competitors in world agricultural trade.

First, any tariff, import restriction, or nontariff barrier.

Second, any export subsidy, export restitution payment, export incentive or export reimbursement.

Mr. Chairman, it is a reasonable and timely amendment. It deserves the support of the House.

At this time, Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Madigan].

Mr. MADIGAN. I thank my friend, the gentleman from South Dakota, and I wish to advise him that we have studied his amendment. We think it is a very good amendment, and we are anxious to see it adopted.

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

Mr. DASCHLE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Chairman, we have also looked at the amendment on this side of the aisle and we support the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Daschle].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DORGAN OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

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

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Dorgan of North Dakota: Page 263, line 14, insert "(A)" after "(1)".

Page 264, after line 2 insert the following:

(B)(i) The Secretary shall establish a pilot program to carry out, during the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, barter and countertrade transactions which are authorized under subsection (a)(3) in which the Secretary acquires and

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

holds strategic or other materials that the United States does not domestically produce in amounts sufficient for its requirements and for which national stockpile or reserve goals established by law are unmet.

(ii) In establishing pilot programs under this subparagraph, the Secretary shall give priority --

(I) to materials that entail less risk of loss through deterioration and have lower storage costs than the agricultural commodities they replace; and

(II) to nations with food and currency reserve shortages.

(iii) In establishing such programs, the Secretary shall consider barter and countertrade opportunities with --

(I) Zaire, for wheat and wheat flour in exchange for cobalt, tantalum minerals, germanium, zinc, copper, and diamonds;

(II) Zimbabwe for corn (and soybean oil) in exchange for chromium;

(III) Zambia for corn (and oilseeds) in exchange for cobalt;

(IV) Malaysia for rice, wheat, tobacco, cheese, and corn in exchange for rubber and oil;

(V) Brazil for wheat, corn, and non-fat dry milk in exchange for manganese ore and columbian concentrate.

(VI) Nigeria for corn and rice in exchange for oil.

(iv) The Secretary shall cooperate fully with the private sector for the consummation of the proposed barter transactions.

(C) The Secretary shall report to Congress not later than March 30, 1986 on progress in implementing pilot programs under this subparagraph. Such report shall include --

(i) a statement as to any progress in establishing any such programs with any country listed in this subparagraph; and

(ii) with respect to each such program, a description of --

(I) the agricultural commodities and strategic materials or minerals to be involved in the program; and

(II) the scope and timetable of the transaction.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota (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 North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, let me briefly describe this bill. This bill would require a pilot barter project to be conducted in the next fiscal year by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Congressman Cooper Evans from Iowa has done a lot of work in this area. I have worked in this area.

There does exist in this farm bill a barter provision. This amendment strengthens that and says, look, there are a lot of cash-poor countries out there that need our food but have no money. They do have strategic materials that we ought to trade for.

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

President Eisenhower had a barter program in the 1950's. We bartered 6 billion dollars' worth of goods around the world. We do not now have a barter program. I would like to see us establish a barter program to enhance our exports markets. It does three things: It helps reduce our surplus commodities and increases trade. No. 2, it fights hunger, and No. 3, it helps fill our strategic stockpile.

Mr. EVANS of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EVANS of Iowa. I want to compliment the gentleman on his amendment. I think it is an excellent one. We have been trying to get the Department to do something actively in this area for a number of years. They have been unwilling to do so, and I think it is time we mandated the pilot project, and I strongly endorse your amendment.

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

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANTHONY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, we just made a trip in August and we went to Japan and China, and I found an interesting thing there. China wanted to buy computers and certain things for their high-technology industry, but they had a surplus of corn in the northern part of China. They do not have a transportation system to get it to the southern part where they have a shortage. So they told the Japanese they would not buy their high-technology equipment until they bought their corn.

The Japanese wanted to sell their high-technology equipment, so they bartered out and bought their corn. Guess whose agricultural trade is down over 14 percent through the first half of this year with Japan? The United States because we lost the corn market.

I think we have got to fight fire with fire, and I think the gentleman has come with an excellent suggestion.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I appreciate the gentleman's statement; I think it is right on the mark. I would like to just mention one more thing for the record.

In the legislation, with the Congressional Research Service information, I have specifically outlined some areas. Trading corn to Zimbabwe in exchange for chromium. Corn to Zambia in exchange for cobalt. Rice, wheat, and tobacco to Malaysia in exchange for rubber and oil. The list goes on and on and on. I am just saying that this is a very modest step. It requires a pilot project of barter to be conducted in the next fiscal year; it requires that. We ought to do that. It is a modest first step. It is the right thing for us to do to increase those export markets for our farmers.

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

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BEREUTER. I commend the gentleman for his initiative. Some of the things that he is asking for have been possible to previous administrations, including this one. This administration wants to demonstrate that it is serious in its effort to help farmers, agricultural exports and the trade imbalance. It can take some steps to implement the gentleman's idea and I commend him for it.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. That is exactly the case. The largest growing area of world trade is non-cash barter trade. It is not because that is the way that countries want to deal. It is because a lot of folks that need food around the world, their countries do not have cash to purchase it, so they barter for it.

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

I have visited with the majority and the minority side. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Madigan].

Mr. MADIGAN. I am happy to join my colleagues on this side of the aisle in urging that the Committee of the Whole favorably consider the amendment which the gentleman has been kind enough to review with us. I think it is a good amendment and I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Chairman, I want to lend my support to the gentleman from North Dakota's amendment on farm ownership loans. The ability of many black farmers to have access to direct loans from FmHA is critical to their ability to survive and hold onto their land. The Subcommittee on Government Information, Justice and Agriculture received testimony that only 181 black FmHA borrowers are under the age of 25 in the entire country.

We need to provide a specific authorization for the continuation of direct loans. These loans enable a new person who wants to get into farming a way into the credit market. Farmers, particularly small and black farmers, who must depend only on a guaranteed loan program will be out in the cold if we don't continue the direct loan program. I hope my colleagues will support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Dorgan].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LIGHTFOOT

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

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

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Lightfoot: Page 275, after line 11, insert the following:

STUDY

Sec. 1142. The Secretary of Agriculture shall, using an interagency task force with representatives from the Departments of Agriculture, State, and Commerce, study the economic impact on agricultural exports of any law or administrative action that imposes barriers on the import of foreign goods and report to Congress as soon as practicable the results of such study.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT (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. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Chairman, the intent of this amendment is simple and straightforward. In this time of growing trade deficits, every conceivable effort must be made to expand exports.

A frequent complaint arising from the agricultural sector is the lack of control the Department of Agriculture has over agricultural trade. A number of remedies have been proposed, some of them quite worthy, such as the creation of a Special Assistant for Agricultural Exports and Food Aid, which I support.

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

But even before we prescribe remedies to our trade problems, I think it might be worthwhile to make a thorough investigation of causes, especially those over which we, in the Federal Government, can have some control.

We've got several different agencies involved in trade policy, including USDA, the State Department, and the Commerce Department. I know I'm not the only Member of Congress who's heard allegations about interagency conflicts in trade policy. My amendment simply brings USDA, Commerce, and State together to identify these conflicts so that we, Congress, can work to alleviate them. It asks the Secretary of Agriculture to study, based on an interagency task force with representatives from USDA, Commerce, and State, the economic impact of laws or administrative regulations imposing import barriers, on our agricultural exports. Never has there been a greater need for this type of study than at this time of calls for trade protection. An excellent example would be the need to consider any relationship there might have been between textile quotas we imposed and the Chinese Government canceling a wheat purchase.

We're dealing with a relatively minor amendment in terms of cost -- we'd basically be drawing upon existing personnel and putting no unrealistic time constraints on the agencies -- but in terms of the results the amendment would bring, we'd be going a long way toward pinpointing problem areas. And after all, isn't that the key to problemsolving?

I urge my colleagues' support for this amendment.

Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. I yield to the gentlewoman from Nebraska.

Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this amendment. I think it is an excellent amendment. It is something that is needed. It is vital that we expand our exports, and I urge favorable consideration of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Lightfoot].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. EMERSON

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

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

Mr. EMERSON. It has, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Emerson: Page 282, after line 18 insert the following:

Subtitle F -- Administration of Certain Assistance

AVOIDANCE OF EXPORT DISPLACEMENT

Sec. 1161. Notwithstanding any other provision of the law, no funds administered by the Agricultural Research Service, the Cooperative State Research Service, the Extension Service, the Office of International Cooperation and Development, or the Commodity Credit Corporation may be expended for the purpose of providing assistance for the production or marketing in any country of agricultural commodities which would displace imports by that country of United States agricultural commodities (or the products thereof) or which would displace exports of United States agricultural commodities (or the products thereof) to any other nation.

Mr. EMERSON (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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I am offering an amendment that would, plain and simply, prevent the Agricultural Research Service, the Cooperative State Research Service, the Extension Service, the Office of International Cooperation and Development, or the Commodity Credit Corporation from making expenditures that would displace exports of American agricultural commodities or the products thereof.

I had wanted to offer an amendment that would prevent the Agency for International Development from making such expenditures also, but I was informed by the Parliamentarian's Office that such an amendment would probably be ruled out of order.

It may come as somewhat of a surprise to many Members of the House, as it did to me, to learn that American farmers routinely pay to develop the agricultural industries of foreign nations. Even though farmers were, until recently, largely unaware that they were doing so. The manner by which they are doing so is by paying taxes that go to Federal agencies which, in turn, make expenditures to develop foreign agriculture. The expenditures themselves may appear small in comparison to the national debt, the Federal budget, and even to our foreign aid expenditures, but I can assure you that they are not small in terms of the long-term effects they have on American farmers.

Several land-grant universities across the United States, agricultural organizations, and even foreign agricultural research centers receive funding from the Agency for International Development to conduct research that cannot be applied to American agriculture. For example, one American university received funding to develop a variety of tropical soybeans. To my knowledge there aren't any typical soybean regions in the United States, but there are in Brazil.

I want to emphasize that this is not an amendment to end agricultural research. I am a strong supporter of research and the importance of education and research cannot be overemphasized, but if American taxpayers are going to continue to fund agricultural research let's fund things that will help us, such as the cyst nematode research at the Delta Center in Portageville, MS, rather than things that will help our competitors, such as the research done by one land-grant university on nematodes of importance to developing nations. We can sell other nations all the agricultural products they want to buy, but we cannot afford to increase their agricultural output.

Obviously, this is a situation that has to be changed. It is unconscionable and, quite frankly, hypocritical that some people are telling farmers to tighten their belts because the Government cannot continue to spend as much on farm programs as it has in the past, while at the same time we, in a sense, subsidize our competitors.

Although the problem of AID expenditures cannot be addressed by offering an amendment to the farm bill itself, it can be addressed by introducing legislation and that is exactly what I intend to do at this time. I hope this bill will receive the favorable consideration of the Foreign Affairs Committee in an expedited manner, and I invite the members of that committee, as well as all other Members of the House, to join in this effort by cosponsoring this bill.

Until legislation that would halt such expenditures of AID funds can be enacted into law, we can make certain that the U.S. Department of Agriculture doesn't make any such expenditures and that is the purpose of my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BEDELL AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. EMERSON

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bedell as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. Emerson:

ASSESSMENT OF EXPORT DISPLACEMENT

Sec. 1161. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture shall assess each program, project, or activity administered by the Secretary or the Department of Agriculture that --

(1) provides assistance for establishing, expanding, or facilitating the production, marketing, or use of any agricultural commodity in a foreign country; and

(2) the Secretary determines is likely to have a detrimental impact on efforts to promote the export of United States agricultural commodities;

in order to determine if such program, project, or activity is likely to have such a detrimental impact.

(b) The Secretary shall provide the results of the assessment required under subsection (a) --

(1) in the case of current programs, projects, or activities, in a report made to the Congress not later than one year from the date of enactment of this section; and

(2) in the case of programs, projects, or activities undertaken after the date of enactment of this section, on a regular basis.

Mr. BEDELL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment offered as a substitute for 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. BEDELL. Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me say that I agree completely with what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Emerson] is trying to do. I certainly agree that we should not be trying to fund efforts to enable Brazil to compete more directly with us with regard to soybeans and so on.

But there are some problems involved if we go all the way on this in that the gentleman's amendment could very possibly be construed to say that for starving countries in Africa, for example, that we would not be able to give them assistance to help them grow grains to feed their people that were the same type as we might be exporting ourselves.

Under those provisions and concerns and some of the concerns that have been expressed, I am offering this substitute amendment which would require the Secretary to report to the Congress the effects that they expected to see from any such efforts that were made.

Mr. EVANS of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEDELL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. EVANS of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the USDA had expressed some concern about the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Emerson] that it might restrict some free exchange of scientific information and the international germ plasm exchange work.

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

Does the gentleman think that his substitute amendment will overcome any difficulties along that line?

Mr. BEDELL. Absolutely. Mr. Chairman, my substitute would take care of those requirements.

I am sure that everyone expects me to be trying to help the Department of Agriculture on whatever their concerns are.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BEDELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman's point. I want to say that it was not the purpose of my amendment to prevent any reasonable assistance to the famine-ravaged nations of Africa or anywhere, as far as that goes.

But I want to stress to the gentleman that in the course of looking into the preparation of this amendment, and the idea for this comes from my constituents who are indeed on to the problem and want it addressed, I had very, very little cooperation from the Foreign Agricultural Service of the Department of Agriculture in trying to put together the information that I needed to address this problem. Indeed I asked them to work with me in crafting language that would address the problem that I am trying to address, and I did not receive the cooperation that I sought. Had I had it in a timely way, I would have presented it to the gentleman's subcommittee when the subcommittee was at work on this section of the bill before we even got to the full committee, and certainly I would have offered it in full committee had I had the information.

As it turned out, I got the information on which my amendment is based, and I have a lot of supporting data to back it up, from a variety of agricultural organizations representing various commodity groups, who feel that their government and our taxpayers are helping to finance our competition overseas.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Bedell], the chairman of the subcommittee and I have had a very satisfactory discussion on this subject. I am happy to accept the gentleman's substitute amendment for my amendment. The gentleman and I have discussed it. I hope at an early date to hold hearings on this subject to further define the problem.

With the gentleman's pledge of cooperation, I am happy to accept his substitute amendment and look forward to working with the gentleman in coming to a realistic solution to what I think is a very critical problem.

Mr. BEDELL. The substitute amendment would address the gentleman's problem of getting information because it absolutely requires them to furnish the information to the Congress. As indicated the gentleman, we do have some things we have to take care of in regard to hearings in the subcommittee. I will certainly try to work with the gentleman to have hearings and look into the problem further at the earliest time that we could work it into our schedule adequately.

Mr. EMERSON. I appreciate the gentleman's cooperation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Bedell] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Emerson].

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 Missouri [Mr. Emerson], as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LIGHTFOOT

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would inquire of the gentleman if his amendment has been printed in the Congressional Record as of September 24?

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Chairman, yes, it has.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Lightfoot: Page 253, after line 18, insert the following:

"(11) The Secretary may furnish eligible commodities under this subsection in connection with (A) concessional sales agreements entered into under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development Act of 1954 or other statutes, or (B) agricultural export bonus or promotion programs carried out under the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act or other statutes.

"(12) Eligible commodities may be furnished by the Secretary under this subsection in connection with agreements by recipient countries to acquire additional agricultural commodities from the United States through commercial arrangements.

"(13) The amount of any commodity furnished under paragraphs (11) and (12) of this subsection in any fiscal year shall be considered for the purpose of determining whether the requirements of paragraph (10)(A) of this subsection has been met during such fiscal year."

Page 253, line 18, strike out the close quotation mark and the period which follows.

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

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

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman identify which of the gentleman's amendments this is?

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Chairman, this is the first one. It concerns the Public Law 480 exports.

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

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Chairman, is this the one that requires them to publish a list of what is available?

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. No, that is not my amendment. Basically it is the mixing of concessional sales on the Public Law 480 Program.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will re-report the amendment in full.

The Clerk re-reported the amendment.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment suggests no great policy change. But I feel it necessary for us to take every opportunity we can to boost exports in this time of mounting trade deficits. If there is one thing we have plenty of in this country it's agricultural commodities and if there is one thing that the world has plenty of it's hunger.

Essentially what this amendment does is provide another tool for expanding exports by mixing concessional sales under Public Law 480 with commercial sales. The amendment merely clarifies the Secretary of Agriculture's existing authority and suggests further possibilities for negotiating agricultural export transactions.

My concern here is that no great effort appears to have been made on the part of the administration to negotiate long-term bilateral agreements, or even short-term agreements, through commercial channels. This amendment merely says that if such efforts are undertaken with countries eligible for Public Law 480, we can and will mix and match authorities to add greater incentive for both parties to set up such transactions, to provide incentives for countries to purchase more than they might otherwise purchase.

Although I'm told that the administration has objected to the gist of this amendment, the basis for the objection is no greater than could be made to the administration's earlier announced Bisepe Program. Furthermore, the possibilities posed in this amendment are discretionary, rather than mandatory, thus any concern with GATT or other trade agreement violations could be addressed prior to making use of the proposal.

I urge my colleagues' support for the amendment.

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

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Chairman, I think we need to understand the gentleman's amendment. Does the gentleman's amendment amend section 416?

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. I believe that is correct. In essence, what we are saying, if a country, for example, makes a purchase under the Public Law 480 Program, or just to use an example of a boat that is going and it is only one-third full, we try to encourage them to buy more grain through the commercial channels and we could offer some CCC commodities to help to make that come to them at the same price basically as the Public Law 480 is. It is somewhat like the export PIC or the Bisepe Program, only a little different approach to it.

Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, so we take the 416 commodities and given them -- now 416 is a giveaway program, a donation?

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Right.

Mr. BEDELL. We would take some of what we are going to donate and instead of donating it, we would say that that can be used as an export bonus program. Is it at the discretion of the Secretary?

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Yes.

Mr. BEDELL. That he at his discretion could take what was otherwise going to be given away and use it as a bonus program to get additional sales; is that what we are saying?

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. It is to encourage the country that is buying the grain under a Public Law 480 contract. It also makes some commercial buys.

The gentleman's explanation is correct.

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

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

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Certainly, I yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Chairman, we are not quite clear as to the amendment. We know what the intent of the gentleman is, but the wording of the amendment is not quite clear.

Perhaps it might be an amendment that we could agree on if we understood it more fully.

We would accept the gentleman's amendment, continue studying it with no assurance that when we are in conference that it would be kept in conference if we find objection to it in the process.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. I accept that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Chairman, with that, we have no objection to the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Lightfoot].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title XI?

If not, are there amendments to title XII?

Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to title X for the purpose of offering a one-sentence technical amendment.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MADIGAN

Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. It is an amendment to a previously adopted amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Madigan: Page 195, line 20, strike out "July 1" and insert in lieu thereof "May 1".

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

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

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Chairman, we understand the need for the amendment and have no objection.

Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Madigan].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title XXII?

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DE LA GARZA

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. de la GARZA: On page 301, strike out lines 20 through 23 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(e) Any authority to enter into contracts under this section, not within the authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation or the Secretary as of the date of enactment of the Food Security Act of 1985, shall be effective for any fiscal year to such extent or in such amounts as are provided in appropriation Acts.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would inquire of the gentleman, has the amendment been printed in the Congressional Record?

Mr. de la GARZA. Yes; it is, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Chairman, this is a technical amendment in order to conform to section 401(a) of the Budget Act.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. de la Garza].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GLICKMAN

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which has been printed in the Congressional Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Glickman: "On page 288, striking out line 14 and all that follows through line 20 and inserting in lieu thereof the following --

"(1) during the period which begins on the date of the enactment of this Act and ends on whichever is later than January 1, 1990 or the date which is two years after the date such land on which such crop is produced was mapped by the Soil Conservation Service for the purposes of classifying such land under the land capability classification system, on any land that was cultivated to produce any of the 1981 through 1985 crops of agricultural commodities or that was set aside, diverted or otherwise not cultivated under provisions of a Department of Agriculture program for any such crops to reduce production of an agricultural commodity, except as otherwise provided in section 1205(m);".

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. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to compliment the committee, and particularly the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Jones] and the ranking member, the gentleman from Missouri

[Mr. Coleman] for producing the sodbuster language in this bill, which is something that not only can we all support, but something that reflects a great achievement in agricultural programs. For the first time in a farm bill, we are making a very dedicated and considered effort to try to reduce the amount of highly erodible land in this country.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment will strengthen the soil conservation provision of this bill. It is an amendment which will make a good and much-needed section of the bill even better. The amendment will close, after an ample notice of over 4 years, an exemption which otherwise would allow some producers to continue tilling some highly erodible ground and to continue receiving farm program benefits.

Ever since the great dust clouds of the Depression rolled across the countryside, the Federal Government has actively supported and encouraged efforts to conserve one of our Nation's most precious resources: Our rich, fertile topsoil. In those 50 years, we have made enormous progress but conservation must continue. As long as we all eat and 20 percent of our jobs, our trade, and our national economy depend on the productivity of our farmers, conservation must be a continuing job. And we still have much work to do.

We must do two things, both of which are done on this bill: We need to provide incentives to farmers to implement new conservation measures and we must remove incentives which encourage farmers to till highly erodible ground. By denying farm program benefits to farmers who till this land, the sodbuster measures of the bill will ensure that farm programs do not encourage erosive farming methods, and will also help alleviate some of the surplus problems caused by cultivating erodible ground.

However, the bill provides an exemption which I believe we must close. The bill will allow all highly erodible ground cultivated between 1981 and 1985 to forever escape the sodbuster sanctions. This amendment will close that loophole, after giving producers an appropriate time to adjust. The amendment provides that, as of January 1, 1990, all land will be subject to sodbuster, including the land now grandfathered. Producers will have to bring grandfathered, highly erosive land into compliance with soil conservation service-approved conservation plans to continue cultivating erodible ground and receiving benefits.

USDA estimates that each year we are losing some 1.6 billion tons of soil on land being cultivated at an estimated cost of as low as \$3 billion annually to \$13 billion for all associated costs. And a good portion of this loss is directly attributable to farm program benefits which encourage the cultivation of highly erodible ground. Now is the time to stop this practice on future lands, as the bill does, and gradually to treat all land the same and bring it into compliance with sound conservation measures.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud of the soil conservation provisions the committee has reported, and proud to be a member of the subcommittee which toiled on this bill. I can think of no other Member of this House more dedicated to the cause of soil conservation than our subcommittee chairman, Mr. Jones from Tennessee. Through his tireless persistence, at great odds at most times, he has brought a strong and sound package to this farm bill. I believe this amendment makes the package even better and I would urge my colleagues' support of the conservation compliance amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Glickman] has expired.

(At the request of Mr. Wolpe, and by unanimous consent, Mr. Glickman was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. GLICKMAN. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolpe].

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

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I am very pleased to join the gentleman from Kansas, who has provided important leadership in the committee on this issue, in sponsoring this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend Chairman de la Garza and the full Agriculture Committee for their diligent and painstaking efforts in crafting this year's farm bill. The committee's work on the conservation title of the bill is particularly commendable. They have crafted landmark legislation which offers a broad and innovative approach to protecting our Nation's fragile lands. It includes a tough sodbuster provision, a companion swampbuster provision, and a conservation reserve program.

The conservation compliance amendment that my distinguished colleague from Kansas, Mr. Glickman, and I are offering today merely "complements" the committee's fine work on the conservation title and provides a crucial "missing piece" to the conservation policy puzzle. It offers a cost-efficient and environmentally sound way to address one of our country's most serious -- but understated -- agricultural problems: Our Nation's soil erosion crisis.

The real question here is whether we want our Nation's farm programs as they are structured to continue to subsidize soil erosion, or whether we want them to encourage soil conservation.

The principle behind the amendment that we have coauthored is simple: We should not be subsidizing abuse of the land, especially at a time of mounting crop surpluses. It is exactly these surpluses which are in large part responsible for the decline in farm income and the explosive increase in farm program costs.

Our amendment would extend the sodbuster provision in the bill to include highly erodible land that is currently in production. It would give farmers 4 years -- until 1990 -- to apply conservation techniques to their highly erodible cropland. During this 4-year grace period, farmers would be given the opportunity to adopt an acceptable conservation plan for their land approved by their local conservation district, or they could convert the land to soil-saving pasture, hay, or forest use. They would also have the option of putting their erodible land in the conservation reserve. If farmers choose not to comply by January 1, 1990, they will be subject to the same penalties that apply to the sodbuster provisions in the bill which will make them ineligible for Federal price supports, income supports, crop insurance, and Farmers' Home Administration loans.

Our amendment, in concert with the conservation program, is a firm but fair way to redress a classic inequity in current farm programs. Current farm programs as they presently exist reward farmers who abuse highly erodible land because program benefits are directly proportional to the amount of land farmers plant -- the more land you plant, the more Federal subsidies you receive. Conservation-minded farmers, however, have long been penalized for keeping their erodible land out of production. After 1990, conservation compliance would handicap rather than reward farmers who abuse fragile soil in order to produce surplus crops.

Our amendment will help reduce price-depressing surpluses. Taking fragile land out of production will simultaneously help boost commodity prices, increase farm income, and reduce the costs of farm programs. Along with the conservation reserve, our amendment will benefit farmers, taxpayers, and our overall national conservation policy. Farmers would benefit because they would be paid to set aside highly erodible land; taxpayers would benefit because the reserve program would reduce crop surpluses, which in turn will lead to a reduction in farm programs; and finally our national conservation policy would benefit because lands protected or retired from production would help restore the productivity of the soil.

Also at issue here -- and I hope my distinguished urban colleagues are listening -- is whether our Nation's farm programs will continue to subsidize the contamination of our urban and rural water supplies. Numerous national studies indicate that soil erosion is perhaps the single greatest unregulated source of water pollution. According to a recent study by the Conservation Foundation, soil sediment washed from farm fields causes \$3 billion to \$13 billion in damages per year by clogging navigational channels and ruining our recreational lakes and streams. Our amendment would help alleviate the contamination of our urban and rural water supplies by requiring the retirement of fragile lands

which are the primary source of runoff. In doing so, this measure will enhance our Nation's water quality, wildlife habitat, and outdoor recreation.

Mr. Chairman, the conservation compliance amendment offered by Mr. Glickman and myself seeks to complement and reinforce the committee's conservation provisions. Adoption of this amendment would ensure that the 1985 farm bill contains the strongest possible soil and water conservation title.

Mr. Chairman, I have enjoyed the opportunity of working with the gentleman from Kansas on this amendment. I hope it will enjoy the support of Members of this body on both sides of this aisle.

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

Mr. GLICKMAN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, would the author of the amendment inform me or enlighten us as to the position of the major farm organizations, the wheat growers, the grain growers, and the Farm Bureau?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Glickman] has again expired.

Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 5 additional minutes.

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

Mr. MARLENEE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I went through this situation the other evening when speaker after speaker for me had their time extended and when I got up to speak, there was a gentleman from the west coast, one of our colleagues who apparently was very concerned about my argument and I had needed him somewhat and apparently was too effective and he objected to my time.

I would hope this would not happen in this case.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. MARLENEE. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, that is all I asked for, and I will not object.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Glickman] to proceed for 1 additional minute?

There was no objection.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, to answer the gentleman's question, at least to date the organizations that support this amendment are the following: National Farmers Union, National Farmers Organization, National Association of Conservation Districts, Soil Conservation Society of America, National Audubon Society, Sierra Club, National Wildlife Federation, Natural Resources Defense Council, American Farmland Trust, Izaak Walton League of America, Environmental Policy Institute, Wildlife Management Institute, International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, the Wildlife Society, and the American Forestry Association.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, let me first of all say that, as the ranking Republican on the subcommittee dealing with conservation and credit, I want to reemphasize what the committee has done here and lay a little, pardon the pun, groundwork for the purpose of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Glickman].

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

We did have the Government in the 1970's request the farmers to plant fence-row to fence-row, and in doing so, a lot of farmers went out and cropped land which probably never have been put into production in the first place. That has contributed definitely to some of our surplus problems today, and it has definitely contributed to high erosion in many parts of our Nation.

So the committee has adopted very strong sodbuster legislation. With the leadership of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Jones], we have been able to put forward a consensus package which has been supported by the administration and by, I think practically unanimous, perhaps maybe one or two dissenters on the committee, a sodbuster proposal which would, in fact, provide a disincentive to farmers to farm highly erodible soil if they are not so doing now.

We also have a conservation reserve portion of the bill which, for the first time, will pay farmers to help idle some highly erodible land and take it out of production, put it in grasses and tress, something that will save the soil. This will not only help the individual farmer in future generations; it also will help our budget because they will not be producing on this very marginal land and increasing the commodities and increasing the cost to the Treasury of our price support programs.

What the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Glickman] is doing in his amendment is very important. We ought to know exactly what he is doing, and that is, we felt that it was unfair to farmers who are plowing and have plowed in the last 5 years and are now currently cultivating on highly erodible land for us to say to them that they must conform their property to a conservation plan and have it fully in effect by 1990.

The reason I rise here in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Glickman], and eventually offer an amendment of my own to his, is that he is trying to eliminate the 5-year grandfather clause, as I so indicated.

At first blush, the Glickman amendment sounds appealing; however, its implications are very far reaching. At a time when America's farmers are obviously not having a success in meeting the cash-flow obligations that we know so well, how are they going to pay for the millions, and indeed billions, of dollars that would be required for them to put this property under a conservation plan and meet it by 1990, as required by the Glickman amendment.

I am concerned that the additional cost to the farmers to implement these conservation practices will be very, very high. There are 421 million acres of cropland throughout the country, and according to a 1982 study, only 236 million of these acres have adequate conservation practices applied to them presently. There are, therefore, 185 million acres that need additional work in some fashion. The additional cost to the farmer to comply could be unbearable during this time of farm income erosion, to the point where they cannot even maintain their own cash-flow presently.

So I am the first to agree that farmers should comply as soon as possible with the conservation plan if it only requires changes in some management practices or other minor improvements, but what do we say to a farmer who might be faced with an expenditure of \$400 an acre to put this soil back to where it should be to comply with the conservation plan? So let me share with my colleagues some cost estimates.

By using the definitions of highly erodible land that are defined in this bill, up to 89 million acres could qualify as highly erodible. If 25 million acres, and that is our proposal for the conservation reserve, were used and put into a reserve, that still leaves about 64 million acres to qualify that would have to comply with some approved conservation plan, and this gets to the heart of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Glickman].

I think it could cost, and I think it has been submitted, \$100 an acre for those 64 million acres to bring their conservation practices up to a level sufficient to allow them to continue to cultivate that and to be able to participate in the farm programs. Do not forget that under the Glickman amendment, if a current farmer who is cultivating on this highly erodible land does not conform by 1990, he will not get a Farmers Home loan, he will not qualify for any of the benefits of the farm program, including price supports, et cetera.

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Coleman] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Coleman of Missouri was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. So it could cost up to \$6 billion for this proposal, and I am very concerned. How are the farmers going to come up with this money. Even with matching funds, there are not sufficient funds to be matched by the farm community.

Therefore, while I think that the intentions of the gentleman from Kansas are very good, and we want to save the soil and have worked closely together on this, I would at this time, Mr. Chairman, offer an amendment to the gentleman's amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COLEMAN OF MISSOURI TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GLICKMAN

Mr. COLEMAN Of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Coleman of Missouri to the amendment offered by Mr. Glickman: Amend the amendment to Title XII, page 288, by inserting at the end thereof after the words "except as otherwise provided in section 1205(m)", the following: "PROVIDED, That such program loans, payments, and benefits, shall not be denied to any person if as of January 1, 1990, or two years after the Soil Conservation Service has completed a soil survey for the farm, whichever is later, such person is actively applying a conservation plan based on the local Soil Conservation Service technical guide and approved by the local soil conservation district or the Secretary, in which event, such person shall have until January 1, 1995, to comply with the plan without being subject to program ineligibility."

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri (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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, what my amendment does is modify the Glickman amendment to allow until 1995 for a farmer who is presently cropping highly erodible land, and if he is by 1990 actively applying a conservation plan to that land, to be given an extension to 1995 before he completes that plan. It gives him another 5 years, or a 10-year period.

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

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. GLICKMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, first of all let me say three things: No. 1, is that I do not object to this amendment. It does give an additional 5 years providing, as I understand it, that that person is actively applying a conservation plan and he just cannot be out there looking at his land on January 1, 1990. He has to be doing something affirmative to implement that plan. Is that correct, I would ask the gentleman?

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. That is correct. It has to be something that he is actively engaged in and applying that plan to that land, and if by 1990, or 2 years after the Soil Conservation Service completes a soil survey of his property, then he would be able to receive an extension by the Secretary to be able to comply with that plan and not lose the

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

benefits of any of the programs that he would be eligible for.

Mr. GLICKMAN. If the gentleman will yield further, I would say that I have no objection to the amendment. I would urge my colleagues to accept the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would mention just one quick thing so that people would know what the other body has done in this regard.

The other body has adopted an even more stringent enforcement deadline. I believe it is 1988, if I am correct, with respect to erodible lands that were planted between 1981 and 1985; that they would have to come into compliance by 1988 in order to be eligible for Federal farm benefits.

So by the adoption of the Coleman of Missouri amendment, which amends my amendment, we will be saying that any lands that were planted between 1981 and 1985 have to meet the standards of the bill by 1990, or they could have an extension of up to 5 years.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, if I might reclaim my time, I think the gentleman probably accurately portrays what the other body did, but I simply disagree with their timetable and I would hope in conference we could come up with a more reasonable position.

Mr. GLICKMAN. I accept the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. I thank the gentleman for accepting the amendment and working with me on this.

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

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Coleman] and commend him for the work that he has done in this regard.

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

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MARLENEE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, am I to understand that the gentleman from Kansas accepts the amendment and it is now part of the amendment by unanimous consent?

Mr. GLICKMAN. If the gentleman would yield, I think it would have to be voted on, but I am going to vote for the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend both my friend, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Glickman] and the ranking member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Coleman] for having gotten together on these two important issues and bringing to this House a very important piece of legislation.

At first glance, I was not too warmed up to this piece of legislation, but as the gentleman from Missouri, Tom Coleman, began to do some research of bringing together these figures that he presented, and we did some research in that regard, and what the other body had been doing also, I feel that we have an amendment that everybody will accept

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

and be happy with.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank both members of my subcommittee for the very splended job that they have done. I urge the adoption of the Coleman amendment to the Glickman amendment.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, I have been searching for a title for this amendment offered on behalf of the Audubon Society, the Sierra Club and the wildlife groups and the other land-use planning proponents. As bad as the sodbuster legislation is, this is even worse. Sodbuster deals only with newly cultivated land. This amendment could well be called the Federal Intervention Act.

The practical effects of this amendment is that it confiscates, without a question, it confiscates property rights. It simply says that any property, any property you have, you will invite an agent of the Federal Government onto your property to make a subjective judgment on that property as to whether or not it is erodible. He will decide whether you can farm the land that you have farmed for years and years; land that your grandparents have farmed will be left at the mercy of Government agents.

The agents will first decide whether it is erodible or whether it is nonerodible. And if that land, in fact, fits certain classes of the erodible classification, then they will mandate that it must be taken out of production.

They have testified in front of our committee that certain classes of erodible land will not classify for any production, no matter what kind of conservation plan is put to it. That, my friends, when they tell that you cannot crop your land, crop land that has been in the family for years, that is confiscation of property without compensation. And I have reason, I have just reason to question the constitutionality of this amendment and this kind of action.

The agency will also require a conservation plan, of course subjective and approved by them. And I might add, paid for by the owner.

This amendment could also be called the Soil Conservation Service Enforcement Employment Act. We have no idea how many people, how many more people will be required by the Conservation Service to make the evaluation on soil classification, and then to say nothing of the final enforcement of this act.

This amendment paves the road of regulation, the road of land-use planning right up to the producer's kitchen table.

This bill was covered in the other body, and I think if we want to discuss that in conference committee, that is fine. We do not need to do that here in this proposal. This very proposal right here was defeated, and I repeat, defeated in the full committee in the House Agriculture Committee.

Let me quote to you what my friend, the author of this amendment, said about this in the full committee.

There is also the problem of the costs our producers will incur as a result of this amendment. During the Agriculture Committee consideration of the conservation title on July 9, the gentleman from Kansas expressed a great concern about removing the 5-year exemption and requiring all cultivated land to be subject to a Government-imposed conservation plan.

The gentleman said, "I'm wondering if the situation may be getting a little draconian and that is I don't know what the effect is of requiring all farmers to bring all of this land they've been farming this last 4 years up to the standard that it isn't highly erodible, but that may involve fairly significant costs."

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

Apparently the gentleman from Kansas is no longer concerned about the cost to the producer. But I can assure you, my colleagues, that the producer will be concerned.

As I said, this was defeated, this was defeated in the full Agriculture Committee.

I will ask for a rollcall vote on this because I want the producers 10 years from now to know who voted this inequity on them.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, have we disposed of the Coleman amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. We have not.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, then I move the previous question.

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

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is one of those examples where everyone has the same objective, but overkill is going to do the opposite of what some people want done. I think we should take 55 million acres of highly erodable land out as fast as we can accomplish it.

But here are the facts: We have appropriated \$190 million the last 2 years for soil conservation programs. There is 75-percent funding going wanting in some of the county offices right now because farmers cannot even put the 25 percent up to match the 75 percent. There is a lot of 50-percent money that is going wanting. There is going to be more than \$30 million, probably \$40 million left unused this year.

In the last year that we have records for, 1 million acres was put under terraces, and seven-tenths of a million under other conservation practices like trees. If we use that as a basis or even use 2 million per year as a basis, as the amount that can be terraced under these programs, even if farmers had the money they had in 1983, which they do not have now, it would take over 25 years to get all of it under a full conservation program unless a special program removes some of it. But even if we can get 25 million out under the conservation program in this bill, and I do not think we are going to get 25 million acres out because of another provision that is in this bill, but there is no possible way that enough land can be under an active participation in a conservation program by 1990 or 1995.

So this is what happens as a practical matter. What happens is the farms which cannot comply is going to be out of the supply management program on that farm.

So when it goes out of the program, that farm does not have the 10-percent set-aside for conservation purposes under the regular farm program. That farmer not only does not have that 10 percent in a soil conserving crop, but also he is under no constraint not to plow up the rest of the farm. So we go backward and more land comes out of conservation uses than goes in.

We would have more erosion as a result of overkill instead of less.

Now, in addition to that, in this bill, it provides for a wonderful conservation reserve program. However, it has a condition precedent in it that is going to keep people from putting the 20 million acres in that we want, and that is the provision which provides at the end of the 10 years that the sodbuster provision applies and they cannot put that land back into grain or any other annual crop. Now nobody is going to take an annual payment for 10 years and then give a permanent deed to the land. They are not going to do it. They cannot do it.

As a practical matter, most of the land in this country has a mortgage on it, and a lot of it has a wraparound interest from the seller. There is a retired farmer that sold it, and wrapped his equity around that mortgage, and there is a mortgage, and to secure a permanent easement such as would be required, would require having the mortgagor and the owner of the wraparound interest to agree to it. But they would never give up their security so the present titleholder can receive an annual rent -- so as a practical matter that farm will not go into the Conservation Reserve Program and this Glickman amendment keeps him out of the annual program so he does not have any set-aside and we end up with less conservation instead of more.

This provision needs to be changed in conference. I do not propose to do it here on the floor, but conferees must eliminate that or the result will be exactly the opposite of what these conscientious organizations want to do. And I am one that thinks we need to have another bill, and I am for it. I will be for a bill, and I think you could pass it here, I really do, to take out another 30 million acres and use it for conservation purposes. I think we could dedicate it probably to State conservation commissions and let them use it for wildlife and other purposes. I think we could do it with a bill that secures and pays for permanent easements.

But this bill goes too far and this amendment sets up a condition precedent which cannot be met and as a result will do exactly the opposite of what we all want to do.

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

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. de la GARZA. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I think he has made an excellent suggestion that we continue looking at this in the process of the conference committee with the other body, plus there is a provision in the legislation, as I am sure the gentleman knows, for an appeal for anyone under this title of the legislation. So the procedure for appeal through the county committee, et cetera, is there.

But to address the concerns of the gentleman, if they should not be covered under the appeal process, I think that we could continue studying and take the gentleman's advice and work with him in cooperation with the authors of the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I agree with the gentleman, except for this: putting this out as if we really have done something is a hoax, it is a real hoax. This does not accomplish what many people are saying that it does. I will not say the authors, but the organizations think they have really done something when, in fact, they have hurt the conservation reserve program and by overkill will have reduced the acres of highly erodible soil removed from production of annual crops. You are going to have less acres in conservation reserve than you would without that subsection M of the bill.

So what we should do is keep the objective in mind and not engage in overkill which defeats a good portion of our common objective.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. Schumer). The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Smith] has expired.

(On request of Mr. Glickman and by unanimous consent, Mr. Smith of Iowa was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

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

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I respect my colleague from Iowa very much, and he does know a great deal about agriculture, far more than I do. But I just think he is dead wrong when he says this is a hoax.

For the first time, what we will be saying to farmers, and with giving them an appeals process and 10 years to comply with lands that have been producing in the last 5 years, is if they want to continue to produce on highly erodable lands, they will not get Federal farm benefits at all. If they want to continue to do it, fine, they just do not get Uncle Sam to pay them for that.

Let me just make a point. The gentleman from Montana [Mr. Marlenee] talks about the fact that Uncle Sam is going to come in and run the farm. Well, in the first place, we have sodbuster language in this. This just brings it up for the 5-year period.

But the gentleman and his constituents do not have to participate in Federal farm programs. That is Federal tax dollars that are going to subsidize farmers. I happen to support those Federal tax dollars, but that is money from the taxpayers of this country, and that money should not be going to subsidize farmers who plant on highly erodable land.

Here is a picture of some land from the State of Nebraska. It is an example of highly erodable land all over this country.

Now the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Smith] may say that the sodbuster program is worthless ab initio, whether we have got a 4-year grandfather, or a 20-year grandfather, it would not make any difference. And I gather the essence of the gentleman's comments is that sodbuster legislation does not work very well. You need more.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I did not say that at all. The sodbuster legislation in here is all right, except the committee added that subsection M that sets up the condition precedent that most farmers cannot possibly meet. Therefore, a lot of the land we need in the program will not be in the program. The Government cannot take their property without due process of law, and so they are not going to force them into a program which denies them use of the land. The Government can deny them the opportunity to be in a set-aside program but that means they are not going to have their set-aside acres in the program in conservation use either, and so they are then free to go out and plow up the rest of their fragile land.

Now you can have a provision that says any new lands plowed up can never be under grain production and that would work. But instead of that, what the bill says is that if they even continue farming 1 acre of fragile land, and you do not invest money in terraces and activate a full program by 1990, or do not have it in grass or hay after 1990, then the entire farm is not going to be in the program. Therefore, the farmer stays out of the annual supply management and set-aside program. He does not have his 10-percent, or 30-percent set-aside seeded down that year, in addition to not being in the conservation program at all.

Mr. GLICKMAN. In the first place, we talked about this in the committee, and the 1 acre is a red herring. We are talking about -- --

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. No; it is not. Why is it a red herring?

Mr. GLICKMAN. Because it is in the committee language and it is in the committee report that it is not the intent of Congress to get a man and his farm with only 1 acre.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That is what it says.

Mr. GLICKMAN. That is not the intent of the committee or the Congress.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. If it is not the intent, then it ought to say something different. I will read it to you. It is right in

here.

It says on page 286, " *** following the date of the enactment of this Act, any person who in any crop year produces an agricultural commodity on highly erodable land or on converted wetland shall be ineligible, as to any commodity produced *** ."

If he produces 1 bushel on that kind of land, he is not eligible on any of the commodities that he produces.

Mr. GLICKMAN. But there is a predominant soil test for the land and it clearly does not apply to 1 acre.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Smith] has again expired.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is exactly correct, and I tried to raise these points over and over again in the committee.

It would seem to me that it would enhance the conservation reserve that we have created, a good program as the gentleman has pointed out, a good program, if that farmer knew at the beginning of the program what he had to do at the end of the contract. Then he could start to build shelter belts or he could start to terrace, or he could start to seed grassbreakers and windbreaks on that land, or put it into some other kind of a conservation plan that would contribute to the environment, contribute to the enhancement of game habitat, and allow the farmer to know what is going on instead of at the end of the contract.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. It just makes me feel bad that after all of these years that some of us have talked about getting 55 million acres of this erodible land out that when we finally have a chance, instead of doing it, we have overkill that is going to result in getting about half as far as we want to and could go. We should get 55 million acres of erodible land out of production but as result of the conditions set up in the bill so many people will be excluded from participation that we would be lucky to remove as much under the new special program as we lose under the regular programs. Some of the provisions hurt more than they help, in addition, we ought to have another bill which is capable of actually doing what this amendment cannot do. I urge the conferees to keep the overall objective in mind and remove the harmful provisions which will substantially reduce the number of highly erodible acres removed from uses which result in erosion.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman: I rise in strong support of the Glickman-Wolpe amendment.

This amendment will be a very good addition to the sodbuster provision already in the bill. There have been many farmers converting highly erodible lands into cropland in anticipation of the conservation reserve and the sodbuster provision in the farm bill. This amendment will assure that this particular group of landowners will be the subject to the bill's provisions.

Nebraska, my State, has the highest acreage of land in the United States not now cropped in capability classes IV, VI, VII, and VIII but with a high or medium potential for conversion to cropland -- 3,342,000 acres. This is why I advocate the conservation reserve and the sodbuster provisions of the bill, but I should further point out why Nebraska is in need of this amendment. Nebraska has approximately 2.5 million acres of highly erodible cropland that has not been treated with the proper conservation measures which will be subject to the amendment. You can probably upgrade

this figure because of some landowners anticipation of a future sodbuster.

Because the amendment will not subject the land to the sodbuster until 1990 -- now 1995 -- or later, I believe it will give the farmers ample time to weigh their alternatives and it will give the Soil Conservation Service plenty of time to work with the farmers to develop the conservation plans.

Finally, if some form of a sodbuster law had been in effect 10 or 15 years ago, thousands of acres wouldn't have been torn up for the purpose of producing crops. Because of the advantages associated with converting relatively cheap highly erodible land to cropland, many farmers over expanded and that fact has contributed to their financial troubles today. Not only will there be long term conservation problems if this amendment doesn't pass but many long term financial problems have surfaced because of the lack of a sodbuster law in the past. If necessary, additional financial assistance should be provided to landowners to make very expensive conservation expenditures required by an implementation plan.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment as amended by the gentleman from Missouri.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were -- ayes 313, noes 90, not voting 31, as follows:

(See Roll No. 337 in the ROLL segment.)

Messrs. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, EMERSON, and MOORHEAD changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. COUGHLIN, QUILLEN, DORNAN of California, BEREUTER, SAXTON, SPENCE, and KINDNESS changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments to title XII?

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

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Chairman, I asked to revise my remarks only to commend the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member on this side for their excellent work in providing us with a step forward in soil conservation.

Mr. Chairman, the conservation title of the 1985 farm bill is one of the most comprehensive changes in soil

conservation policy in the last 50 years. It will at long last give us the tools to affect the underlying causes of soil erosion. It recognizes that effective soil conservation legislation must pursue several goals simultaneously. First, it establishes a program to take out of production the most highly erodible farmland that is responsible for the lion's share of current soil loss. The 1982 National Resources Inventory [NRI] completed by the Soil Conservation Service in USDA shows that just 12.5 percent of current cropland base of 421 million acres causes half of our excess cropland erosion nationally. This 53 million acres of highly erodible cropland accounts for over 1.3 billion tons of soil loss per year. Much of this land is of poor quality and is eroding at rates in excess of 15 tons per acre. In my State of Vermont this highly erodible cropland represents less than 5 percent of the total land being cropped in the State, but accounts for over half of the water erosion experienced within the State.

The conservation reserve established as a key part of H.R. 2100 will remove up to 25 million acres of this highly erodible cropland and place it back into grass or trees.

In order to understand the need for the Conservation Reserve Program, it is important to look back and examine the farm policies that have encouraged farmers to bring this type of fragile land into production.

In the mid-1970's, the Federal Government exhorted farmers to farm as many acres as they had available so that the United States could substantially increase its exports of food and feed grains. Farmers responded not only by removing shelter belts and other erosion control structures which used land that they felt they could crop, but also by breaking out highly erodible fields previously protected from erosion by perennial grasses and trees.

At the time, the market price for grains was adequate to encourage such actions. Many of these newly cultivated fields, however, were not suited to year in, year out production of annual crops because their shallow topsoil and lack of adequate moisture made consistently profitable yields unreliable. Much of this risk of failure, however, was shifted from the farmer to the Federal Government by virtue of the fact that the crops grown on these marginal soils were eligible for commodity price supports, crop insurance, farmers home loans and disaster payments, each of which is federally subsidized. In effect, Government policy encouraged the cropping of fragile soils and Government programs minimized the financial risk of doing so.

The Conservation Reserve Program will achieve two goals of U.S. farm policy: First, conserve the Nation's topsoil by reducing erosion, and second, help protect farmers and consumers from extremes in commodity prices.

The program would operate by allowing farmers to submit bids for the amount of cash or commodities that they would accept for enrolling their land in reserve. A payment limitation of \$50,000 would ensure that a producer would not receive any more than this amount annually in rental payments. To be eligible for the reserve, the land would have to be: First, erosion prone and eroding excessively, as determined by the universal soil loss equation; and second, land on which conservation techniques generally cannot protect the soil adequately if it continues to be cropped. In addition, the land must have been used for cultivated crops at least 3 of the last 5 years.

Overall, the conservation reserve would provide the following benefits:

First, it would help curb production of surplus commodities and help reduce expenses of the commodity programs.

Second, it would remove the most severely eroding cropland from production, protecting land productivity, improving water quality and wildlife habitat.

Third, it would increase commodity prices.

Fourth, it would provide income support to producers making the transition from intensive cropping to less intensive land use.

Fifth, and it would reduce the need for annual production control programs to stabilize prices.

It is projected that the cost of the program will be between \$11 and \$13 billion over the next 13 years. Balanced against these outlays for the reserve however, would be lower Federal payments for loans, deficiency payments, and storage costs under the regular commodity programs. It is estimated by USDA and other private organizations that net savings of between \$4 and \$6 billion would be achieved over current program costs between 1986 and 1991.

In addition, land in the reserve would be eliminated from the farm's base acres after the 10-year period of the contract.

This program is clearly the best solution in removing from production the highly erodible land that has been brought into production in the past decade. I have enclosed a map showing the acres eligible, by State, for the conservation reserve. (Maps are not reproduced in the Record.)

Why is it so important to control soil erosion? First, the topsoil that we are losing is the source of our much-envied agricultural productivity. Annual crops use only the top 10 to 12 inches of soil. Over the millenia, this fraction has developed unique physical and chemical properties that make abundant crop yields possible. Soil erosion destroys this capacity by stripping away this layer of soil. What remains is a thinner layer of topsoil which forces plant roots to seek sustenance in subsoil which has a far poorer ability to hold the nutrients and water necessary for large yields. The net result is lower productivity and higher costs. [What actually destroyed the agricultural base that made Rome and Athens the wealthy city-states that they were was soil erosion. Degradation of their mostly hilly cropland caused the water table to fall to depths which plant roots could not reach.]

Soil erosion reduces agricultural productivity. If crop yields per acre are the measure of productivity, it may appear that soil erosion is of no consequence. But if erosion results in a need for ever greater quantities of fertilizer in order to maintain per acre yields, then the productivity of that input actually has declined.

There are, however, other costs that are more quantifiable. Soil, when it is washed from cropland, finds its way into watercourses. To the hydrologist, such soil becomes sediment; to those charged with keeping our waterways open and our water potable, it is a very costly form of pollution.

The Mississippi River drains nearly two-thirds of the Nation. Much of the cropland within the drainage basin is level to only gently sloping and does not suffer a great deal of soil loss. However, the remainder erodes at rates of 5 to over 50 tons per acre per year.

The following chart, which I would also like included in the Record, demonstrates that, in a single year, the Mississippi's drainage area yields 900 million tons of eroded soil.

ACCOUNTING OF SOIL TRANSPORTATION WITHIN THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER BASIN n1

| | Tons |
|---|-------------|
| Average annual areal yield (900,000,000 tons annually): | |
| A. Soil lost to Gulf of Mexico | 250,000,000 |
| B. Sediment inflow into dams within sub-basins off Mississippi mainstem | 341,828,000 |
| C. Sediment dredged from river channel (for navigation purposes only) | 70,000,000 |
| Total (A + B + C) | 666,828,000 |

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Soil moving within basin but not necessarily in river system | 233,000,000 |
|--|-------------|

n1 From "Characterization of the Suspended-Sediment Regime and Bed-Material Gradation of Mississippi River Basin" Potamology Program (P-1), U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Waterways Experimental Station, Vicksburg, MS (August 1981).

As you can see, 74 percent of this soil load finds its way into the Mississippi River or its tributaries and set-backs. Indeed the Mississippi Delta is the product of over 255 million tons of that sediment moving all the way to the Gulf of Mexico where it is deposited. Eighty percent of what is dropped at the mouth of the river is silt and other fine particles that are the most valuable fractions to topsoil.

The Army Corps of Engineers reports that some 70 million tons of soil per year are dredged from the lower Mississippi mainstem alone so that it may be kept open to barge and boat traffic. The annual expense of this activity is \$170 million. Nationally, \$300 to \$350 million is spent each year on dredging water-borne sediment from rivers.

The sediment load in the Mississippi is so great that the corps has had to build weirs along its length to interrupt the transport of soil before it moves to the lower reaches of the river. Some 341,828,000 tons of such soil per year are caught by 362 dams of greater than 75,000 acre-feet of design capacity. The cost of removing this sediment ranges from \$1 to \$3 per ton per year.

The above figures do not include the cost of dredging the upstream areas of the Mississippi, its tributaries and associated ports; or of cleaning up commercial fisheries, recreation areas, flood control dams; or of building structures for sediment control.

Finally, there are many communities which must remove sediment from water before they can use it for drinking and other community services. This is a critical activity because the fine particles which are removed carry the chemical elements that are hazardous to human health. The city of St. Louis spends \$5 to \$6 million annually to precipitate soil sediment from Mississippi River water. Virtually all of this cleanup must be done in the spring when snowmelt and rainfall start to move soil that has been destabilized by agricultural cultivation.

Those costs are avoidable. The conservation reserve that we propose will reduce soil erosion on that fast eroding portion of our cropland and thereby make unnecessary much of the recurrent annual expenditure for water cleanup activities. Overall a recent study released by the Conservation Foundation placed the cost of off-site damages of soil erosion at a staggering \$6 billion annually. The conservation reserve will reduce these costs and the damage from them substantially.

Let me now turn to the sodbuster provisions of this bill. The term "sodbuster," of course, describes the practice by which farmers break out highly erodible soils that have been previously protected from erosion by their grass or forest cover. Sodbusting is primarily to blame for the fact that only 12.5 percent of our Nation's cropland today yields 50 percent of our total soil loss. The fact is that most of this land should never have been plowed up in the first place. Yet it was, largely because Federal farm program benefits encouraged farmers to cultivate this fragile land.

If we are to minimize further sodbusting and the need for this costly water cleanup and conservation programs, we must do our utmost to ensure that no more highly erodible land is brought into production. To accomplish this, we must reorient our Federal farm programs so that they no longer encourage the annual cultivation of these fragile soils.

The sodbuster provisions of title XII of H.R. 2100 will deny to farmers who persist in breaking out highly erodible soils: Price support payments; disaster payments; Commodity Credit Corporation loans; Federal crop insurance payments; and Farmers Home Administration loans.

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

The sanctions apply to all crops on all holdings. Sodbuster sanctions would not apply to land cultivated between 1981 and 1985 and farmers would be exempt from these provisions if they have implemented a locally approved conservation plan.

USDA would use either the land capability classification system or the universal soil loss equation or wind erosion equation in determining land covered by the sodbuster provisions. Attached is a map showing land covered by the sodbuster legislation as determined by the land capability classification system. It amounts to a little over 32 million acres nationally. (Maps are not reproduced in the Record).

The "sodbuster" portion of this bill will act as a brake on more highly erodible land coming into production in the future. This legislation will not prevent anyone from plowing up highly erodible land in the future -- but will merely say that, if a farmer does decide on his own to crop this type of fragile land, the Federal Government will no longer underwrite this decision by providing farm program benefits.

In addition to the "sodbuster" section of this bill, a new provision was added in the farm bill dealing with "wetlands." More commonly referred to as the "swampbuster" provision, it would deny farmers the same benefits outlined under the "sodbuster" title if they cleared and drained wetlands and converted them to cropland. In the last 20 years, millions of acres of wetlands have been cleared and drained, ruining the habitats of wildlife and adding additional cropland acres at a time when surpluses of wheat and feed grains are hurting farm prices. The Federal Government must stop the practice of underwriting these kind of practices. The "swampbuster" provision is a step in the right direction.

For years we have struggled with soil erosion. We have spent billions of dollars stabilizing land and purifying water. Most of these actions have been either after the fact or piecemeal. This legislation offers us the first comprehensive attack on the root of the problem -- highly erodible soils already being farmed and highly erodible soils and wetlands in danger of being farmed. I urge you to support this title of the farm bill as one of the most progressive and timely pieces of legislation crafted to deal with one of our Nation's most serious resource problems.

Last, let me say that I support the Glickman-Wolpe amendment to require all farmers who wish to receive farm program benefits to farm their land in a conserving fashion by 1990. We cannot continue to subsidize the erosive practices of the few who account for the lion's share of soil erosion. This amendment will complete our efforts to encourage good farming practices and to ensure that tax dollars do not subsidize poor agricultural practices.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Madigan asked and was given permission to proceed out of order.)

Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Chairman, if I could have the attention of the gentleman from Texas, my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the committee, I wonder if the gentleman has any suggestions at this point as to how we should proceed for the balance of the evening.

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

Mr. MADIGAN. I yield to the chairman.

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

Mr. Chairman, we have under a previous order allocated 1 hour to the title on food stamps and 1 hour to a proposed amendment by Mr. Petri. Otherwise we have no other limitation.

Mr. Chairman, I had anticipated and hoped, as was suggested earlier, and had accepted as reasonable the suggestion by the minority whip that we might finish by 10 o'clock this evening. I think we could. We anticipate maybe 3 or 4

other amendments that might entail some debate.

If the gentleman would allow me, I would hope and ask for the cooperation of the Members that we might expedite the process by cooperating with the offerer, whoever offers an amendment, or whoever opposes the amendment, that we avail ourselves of the rules of revise and extend and so on. But I would hope that we could conclude by 10 o'clock.

Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman like to make a unanimous consent request that we conclude debate on all titles of the bill by 10 o'clock?

Mr. de la GARZA. It had been suggested by the parliamentarian that there may be a technical problem.

But let me make an attempt.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask unanimous consent, excluding the 2 hours already mandated, that the balance of the bill, since it is now open for amendment at any point, be limited to 1 hour beyond the 2 hours already mandated.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MILLER of California. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, if I understand the gentleman's amendment, could he first tell us how much time or how many other amendments that would apply to?

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Chairman, we do not know, because we do not know how many amendments are in the record that might not be offered. But we anticipate just a very few.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I would just say that I know the committee does not want to stay late, but some of us have been now waiting for days and weeks to offer amendments that we happen to think are important. Some people may not agree with that. But we come at the end, and now we find that our time is going to be split up into one hour. If you are not first in line in that case, and in my case I come at the very end of the bill, I can conceivably be given 30 seconds or 1 minute, or whatever, to deal with my amendment. That just does not seem to be an equitable arrangement. I would have preferred to have been out of here in time for the 8 o'clock flight, but the leadership did not see it that way.

Mr. de la GARZA. If the gentleman will yeild, the gentleman has an amendment with which we have a problem with jurisdiction. There may be a point of order raised. But should the gentleman's amendment be ruled in order by the parliamentarian, I would have no objection. I do not know if the gentleman would require more than 15 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of California. I just do not want to preclude myself. I do not know how extensive the debate will be. I know that it is late, and I appreciate that. But I just do not want to be cut off at the pass with little or no debate. It is a controversial amendment. It may be ruled out of order. I do not know if that will happen yet or not. I would just prefer not to be included in that situation.

Mr. MADIGAN. If the gentleman will allow me to reclaim my time, I will ask the gentleman from California if his amendment is printed in the Record.

Mr. MILLER of California. Yes it is.

Mr. MADIGAN. Then the gentleman is entitled under a previous rule to 5 minutes. Is that adequate? Regardless of the time limitation, the gentleman is entitled to 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of California. I understand that. I was hoping that we might have some discussion on that amendment. I know there are others who wish to speak on that amendment.

I dare say, in all due respect, many of us have been very cooperative on the bill. We would like to have an

opportunity to offer those amendments.

Mr. MADIGAN. I think we are probably wasting our time at the moment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair would observe that the gentleman from California, or any others, could ask unanimous consent to be given more than 5 minutes at the time his amendment is offered, even if the time limitation has expired.

Mr. MILLER of California. I am aware of that. I have stepped in front of that train many an evening, Mr. Chairman.

Reluctantly, Mr. Chairman, I will object to the unanimous consent request.

I hope we can do this in an expeditious fashion. I have no intent to delay the Members of the House.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Are there other amendments to title XII?

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word so that I might engage in a colloquy with the chairman of the Subcommittee on Conservation and Credit.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Marlenee] is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. MARLENEE. I would say to my chairman of the Subcommittee on Conservation and Credit that I have a great concern about the ability of those who want to participate in the conservation reserve being able to participate because of certain requirements of a conservation plan.

We have discussed this, and I wonder if we could revise and extend our remarks and have something adequate put into the language at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN, I AM CONCERNED WITH THE PROVISION OF THE CONSERVATION RESERVE SECTION OF H.R. 2100 THAT MAKES LAND ENROLLED BY THE CONSERVATION RESERVE SUBJECT TO THE SODBUSTER PROVISION OF THE BILL AT THE TIME THAT THE CONSERVATION RESERVE CONTRACT EXPIRES. I AM AFRAID THAT PRODUCERS WILL SIGN UP FOR THE RESERVE, THEN FIND OUT THAT THEY ARE COVERED BY THE SODBUSTER PROVISION. IN SOME CASES, THIS COULD SERIOUSLY AFFECT THE VALUE OF THE PRODUCERS' EQUITY IN THE LAND.

I WOULD PREFER THAT THE CONSERVATION PLAN BE PREPARED PRIOR TO THE PRODUCER SIGNING THE CONSERVATION RESERVE CONTRACT SO THAT HE KNOWS, IN ADVANCE, WHAT HE WILL HAVE TO DO IN ORDER TO RETURN THE LAND TO CULTIVATION AND BE IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE SODBUSTER PROVISION.

HOWEVER, I WOULD POINT OUT THAT I AM NOT INTERESTED IN IMPOSING AN UNDUE BURDEN ON THE DEPARTMENT AS THEY IMPLEMENT THIS BILL. I AM NOT ASKING THAT A DETAILED, HIGHLY COMPLEX CONSERVATION PLAN BE PREPARED. I SIMPLY WANT TO BE ASSURED THAT THE PRODUCER IS MADE AWARE, IN ADVANCE, THAT HE MIGHT BE REQUIRED TO INSTALL CERTAIN CONSERVATION PRACTICES IN ORDER TO RETURN THE LAND TO CULTIVATION IN COMPLIANCE

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

WITH THE SODBUSTER PROVISIONS. ALSO, I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW WHETHER THERE ARE SOME LANDS THAT COULD NOT BE RETURNED TO CULTIVATION EVEN WITH A CONSERVATION PLAN IF THE PRODUCER IS TO BE IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE SODBUSTER PROVISIONS?

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

Mr. MARLENEE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

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

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and let me say that we have discussed it. I feel that we could save some time by revising and extending our remarks because there is nothing serious about the problem that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Marlenee] and I have discussed.

In implementing this program the Secretary should ensure that a producer is fully informed as to his responsibilities and the requirements that must be met as a condition of participation. One of the conditions of the sodbuster provision is that land which the producer returns to cultivation after the contract expires be covered by a conservation plan, developed with the assistance of the Soil Conservation Service District conservationist and, approved by the local Soil and Water Conservation District.

It would be very expensive and time-consuming for SCS to prepare detailed conservation plans for all land entering the conservation reserve. For instance, it is possible to use a number of combination of conservation practices to adequately treat the land. In this case, the producer might change his mind as to which combination of practices that he preferred several times during the life of the contract. This would require much extra time and resources by SCS in modifying the contract.

Those lands that SCS classifies as capability classes VI, VII, or VIII probably could not be returned to cultivation and meet the criteria for adequately treated cropland and thus meet the sodbuster provision. These lands should remain in permanent vegetation such as grass or trees in order for the producer to be in compliance with sodbuster. It should be possible to include a statement in the contract to this effect.

In addition, on those lands that are classified in other capability classes that probably can be returned to cultivation, a statement such as "In order to return the land covered by this contract to cultivation and meet the sodbuster provisions, the producer must operate the land in accordance with a conservation plan approved by the local Soil and Water Conservation District. Such conservation plans in this district, for the land capability classes covered by your contract, normally include practices such as conservation tillage, terracing, etc." could be included. That seems like a reasonable solution. It would assure that the producer is made aware of his responsibilities and the requirements that are placed on him as a consequence of his participation in the conservation reserve. It also seems to be a solution that would not place an undue burden on the Soil Conservation Service as the program is implemented.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there other amendments to title XII?

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Bereuter] is recognized for 5 minutes.

There is no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there other amendments to title XII?

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

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Franklin] is recognized for 5 minutes.

There is no objection.

Mr. FRANKLIN. Mr. Chairman, I take this time concerning the swampbuster provisions of the conservation title.

I would like to engage in a colloquy with my distinguished colleague, Mr. Daschle.

In my district, which in the past had been mainly swampland, small areas of wetland still exist. These areas are located on many farms.

Because of the devastating droughts and proven economic benefits of higher yields many farmers are considering going through the expense of installing a center pivot irrigation system. A center pivot irrigation system is the type of modern technology that enables the farmer to irrigate an entire field as long as the field is open and clear. However, if a small area of wetland is located within the field it is impossible for this equipment to function because these areas would be in the path of the irrigation system.

I am very concerned that these farmers would be prevented from breaking into small areas of wetland and installing an irrigation system because of the provisions that exist in the present farm bill, H.R. 2100.

Mr. Daschle, would the farmers in my district, given the situation that I described, be able to convert a small area of wetland into agricultural use in order to install a center pivot system?

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, in the bill, we have outlined a definition of wetland, and added specific unique agricultural practices that we intend to be exempt from swampbuster sanctions. In addition, we have added the following provision, under which wetlands conversions would be exempt from swampbuster sanctions:

(iv) wetlands on which production is possible as a result of actions by the producer whose cumulative and individual effect on the hydrological and biological values of the wetlands is minimal, as determined by the Secretary under regulations prescribed by the Secretary in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior;

Another section of the proposal directs the Secretary to encourage local conservation districts to reflect unique, local agricultural practices within the context of the definition and the above exemptions.

This legislation is not intended to preclude the situation you described. This legislation would provide clear direction that I, as the author, intend such requests to be considered within the wetlands conservation plan, and not automatically be ruled as a violation of swampbuster.

Mr. FRANKLIN. I thank the gentleman. Reclaiming my time, I would ask if it is your intention to exempt these farmers from any penalties that are presently in H.R. 2100 regarding swampbusting.

Mr. DASCHLE. If the gentleman will yield,

Within the context of the definition contained in the legislation, the specified exemptions, and the earlier clause to which I referred, it would not be unreasonable to consider economic impacts in determining "minimal impact".

Mr. FRANKLIN. And the last question:

When the decision regarding the hydrological and biological impact on wetlands is made regarding the installation of a center pivot system will the economic benefits to the farmer also become an important and perhaps an overriding factor?

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

Mr. DASCHLE. If the gentleman will yield, I would certainly think that that would be within the confines of the definition as we intended it, and we would accept that kind of understanding.

Mr. FRANKLIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I had an amendment that would address these concerns I had with the swampbuster provisions. But in lieu of the conversation and the colloquy we have just had, I do not intend to introduce that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there additional amendments to title XII? If not, are there any amendments to title XIII?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ANTHONY

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is the amendment printed in the Record?

Mr. ANTHONY. It is printed in the Record, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be modified to read, "Page 323, strike lines 6 through 10."

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. FRANKLIN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is this the amendment that was originally offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Rostenkowski]?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes, it is.

Mr. FRANKLIN. I would like to ask, under the reservation, if I could, if the amendment that is presently at the desk is in the same form as the one printed in the Record.

Mr. ANTHONY. It is the identical amendment. All it does is correct the pages, inasmuch as when the amendment was filed, it was according to the bill that was reported out of the committee rather than the one that was under the Union Calendar version. It is the identical amendment.

Mr. FRANKLIN. Continuing under my reservation, then the amendment that is now offered is not in the same form as was printed in the Record?

Mr. ANTHONY. I think it is very clear it is the identical intent of the same amendment. All it does is correct the page and the lines under which the bill before us is being debated. There is no change in the amendment. All it does is correct the notations as to the page and the proper lines.

Mr. FRANKLIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FRANKLIN. Mr. Chairman, continuing under my reservation, I would like to raise a point of order to the amendment now offered, which was originally filed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Rostenkowski], and state that the amendment as printed in the Record does not refer to the sections to be amended on H.R. 2100, the Union Calendar, under which we are dealing.

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

I would call the Chair's attention to a previous ruling on a point of order when the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts attempted to strike the honey provisions of H.R. 2100 and the Chair ruled, because of a not specific reference to line and title and page number, that that amendment was ruled out of order.

I at this time insist on my point of order to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The amendment that is in the Record has a specific line and title and may be offered in that form.

The Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. FRANKLIN. Mr. Chairman, if I could continue under my reservation of objection, I have the amendment here. It is not the same one printed in the Record and it does not refer to the line and title as attempted to be amended by the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Arkansas offer the amendment in the original form as printed in the Record?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Anthony: Page 322, strike out lines 17 through 21.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Anthony] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would strike section 1311(d) of H.R. 2100 which modifies the Federal income tax consequences of certain loan cancellations. It is very clear that the tax treatment of cancellation of debt is an issue that is in the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. The rule under which we are considering H.R. 2100 waives a point of order under clause (5)(b) of House rule XXI that this matter was not considered by a committee within whose jurisdiction this tax matter falls. Consequently, I offer an amendment to strike subsection 1311(d) of the substitute.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that section 1311 of H.R. 2100 allows the Secretary of Agriculture to accept and retain certain easements in payment for farm loans which the borrower is unable to repay otherwise. Subsection 1311(d) provides that any part of a loan canceled under the section shall not be included in income and shall not have any effect on any tax attributable with respect to any taxpayer or property.

I understand and personally sympathize with the intent of this provision. As the gentleman knows, the Committee on Ways and Means has begun the long and difficult process of enacting tax reform. If the present tax laws make it impossible for today's farmers to get out from under their exorbitant debts through rational means such as the Easement Program contemplated by the gentleman, I will work, in the context of the tax bill, to correct the law.

Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment now because this tax issue should be addressed in the context of tax legislation and not farm legislation.

I urge adoption of my amendment which would strike subsection 1311(d) from H.R. 2100.

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

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

Mr. FRANKLIN. I thank the gentleman for his comments, particularly in support of the theory that is incorporated in H.R. 2100 that was originally H.R. 1000 that I introduced. I would like to point out to the gentleman, however, that without the tax relief as is stated in the agriculture reported bill, the effect of the amendment would be useless for those farmers who tried to take advantage of it. That is why I think it was allowed by the Committee on Agriculture to stay in, and I do not think that we in the Agriculture Committee, and I certainly did not intend to usurp the authority of the Ways and Means Committee, and I do hope that you and the other members of the Ways and Means Committee realize the possible benefits of this section and when considering the tax reform will realize it is not workable without some tax relief as is already in this agriculture bill that you now wish to strike.

Mr. ANTHONY. I can assure my colleague from Mississippi that I will work very hard. I will offer the amendment at the proper time during the tax reform markup.

Mr. FRANKLIN. If the gentleman will continue to yield, with that assurance, then I will have no objection to striking this, and, as I stated, I did not intend to usurp the power of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. ANTHONY. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does the gentleman wish to ask unanimous consent to modify his amendment?

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment to conform with the Union Calendar version of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The text of the amendment, as modified, is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Anthony, as modified: Page 323, strike out lines 6 through 10.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Anthony], as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MICHEL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Michel: Page 332, line 21, insert the following:

"FARM CREDIT REPORT

"Sec. 1317. The President shall, prior to November 1, 1985, prepare and submit to the Congress his findings and recommendations concerning the continued sound and efficient operation of the Farm Credit System."

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, my amendment to H.R. 2100, would require the President to prepare and submit to the Congress by November 1, 1985, his findings and recommendations concerning the continued sound and efficient operation of the farm credit system.

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

First and foremost, I think we must recognize the critical importance of American agriculture to the well-being of our people, and to America's constructive role as leader of the free world. This is not an overstatement. Between 1970 and 1982, grain production in the United States climbed from 170 to 330 million metric tons. And while U.S. exports climbed from 38 to 150 million tons, Soviet imports climbed from 8 to 43 million tons. American enterprise agriculture accomplished this with 350 million acres of land under plow, in contrast to 500 million acres cultivated in the Soviet Union. The 44 billion dollars' worth of American agricultural exports in 1981 were an essential offset to our otherwise rapidly deteriorating balance of trade.

Despite this unexcelled record, American agriculture today stands at a troubled and uncertain crossroad. All is not well on the farm. Aggregate income is the lowest it has been in 50 years. Farmer return on equity in 1981 and 1982 was a negative 9.2 and 6.5 percent, respectively, and the negative return continued through 1984. Land values declined for the first time in 27 years. Exports have slipped, suffering more than a 20-percent shrinkage. The debt/equity ratio is way up as farm debt climbed 300 percent between 1971 and 1983. Bankruptcies and foreclosures have become daily events.

Our farmers are now in a most difficult financial bind because of high real interest rates, stagnant farm prices, rising production costs, and erosion in the value of farm assets, and the severe financial problems of our Nation's farmers are adversely affecting the single most important source of agricultural credit -- the farm credit system. The privately financed farm credit system is a nationwide network of 37 farmer-owned banks and hundreds of cooperative associations. The system accounts for \$70 to \$80 billion worth of farmers' loans.

The system, which makes loans for farming, was formed after World War I, and except for its initial Federal seed money, it has required no Federal assistance until now even during the Depression. But the deteriorating farm economy and falling land values have led to an increasing number of bad loans. Many American family farmers are unable to carry their heavy debt load, and are faced with the loss of further credit and, consequently, the loss of their farm.

Why is this happening? Are we talking about another American industry whose time has passed, whose methods and practices have become obsolete? Absolutely not. If anything, the American farmer is too good at his job, too efficient. This is not a sector of the economy which needs retraining, relocation, reindustrialization, reeducation, or reinvestment. On the contrary, the American family farmer is already high tech, and his methods and practices are envied and emulated around the world.

Exports account for nearly 40 percent of U.S. farm product sales. For the fourth time in 6 months, however, the USDA has lowered its value estimate of U.S. farm exports. As it looks now, farm export value is expected to decline to a 6-year low of \$32 billion, down 16 percent from more than \$38 billion in 1983-84. This decline in U.S. exports has been a major factor in the problems that have dogged the farm credit system.

How can it happen, then, that agriculture banks, historically a healthier group than any other commercial banks, are falling at a faster rate than the others -- fastest since the Depression? I'm told that of the 77 banks that have closed their doors in the first half of this year, 43 were agriculture banks. How did we lose ground? How did we get ourselves into the mess we're in?

To be sure, agriculture has always been subject to great uncertainties. Historically, these uncertainties were predominantly on the supply side. No one can control the weather or the onslaught of disease and pests. The uncertainties will continue. But uncertainties in demand have now become as great, or greater. I refer to the astronomical national debt and the mounting trade deficit, the resulting high rate of dollar exchange that prices U.S. exports out of markets, the past embargoes, the confusing policies that called on farmers to "feed the world" and at the same time called for land retirement. That farmers are being forced to bear a major share of such burden is both unjust and unwise.

There are serious consequences of the farm debt crisis -- and it is a crisis -- of the U.S. economy. The unhappy results are higher interest rates, lower employment, reduced gross national product, fewer housing starts, lower personal

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

income and a larger Federal deficit. If preemptive actions are not taken, the losses could significantly affect U.S. financial markets. Such outcomes would seriously jeopardize the farm sector and also impose important costs for even those people not employed by or involved in agriculture. The potential negative economywide effects of a farm financial crisis, and in addition to the direct adverse impacts on agriculture, call for comprehensive measures to address the problem.

I recognize that several committees of the Congress have already begun hearings, and that in due course they will be submitting legislative remedies. I recognize, too, the constructive effort our colleague, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Marlenee] has made in proposing a Commission on farm credit. In each of these instances, however, there is delay involved so I hope we can begin the process of remedy as soon as possible.

That is why I am offering this amendment requiring that the President recommend to the Congress the road we should take to bring strength and viability back to the farm credit system. Early corrective and preventive measures will be less costly than absorbing the impacts of doing nothing or approaching the problem in a divisive or reactionary mode. The stakes for agriculture and national economy performance are high.

In summary, I am asking that the President submit to the Congress, in 1 month, his recommendations for keeping the farm credit system solvent. In an interview just a few weeks ago, Secretary Block admitted that, "we don't have a good feeling for where the system really is," and that we need a "full accounting" of the depth of its problems. One can wonder why this has taken so long. American farmers have known about this problem for some time, and have been waiting on the farm bill for over 9 months to give them some direction and hope.

Mr. Chairman, it is time to get off the dime. It is time to move forward toward coping with the credit crisis.

It is time to adopt this amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I wish to advise the gentleman, I am sure that he already knows, that the subcommittee of jurisdiction has initiated hearings. They have already had the first of a series of hearings. They will have a second series of hearings and will listen to all concerned and will do the necessary research.

We have no objection to involving the President. I do not know why we should burden the President with any more work while the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Jones] is willing to do the work. Otherwise, we have no objection.

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

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly commend the distinguished minority leader for his interest and for his sincere concern about the future viability of the cooperative farm credit system. I share those views, and there are many others who share them the same as the gentleman and I do.

I assure the gentleman that we are going to do everything that we know to do in our subcommittee to make it a viable procedure to do something to save the farm credit system as well as the other institutions of higher lending that are in trouble. As my chairman has already said, we do have hearings scheduled. We have already had hearings. I am in

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

constant touch with the Department of Agriculture. We are talking almost daily about what the procedure will be as well as the Farm Credit Administration and the farm credit system, because I realize, as the gentleman does, that we must all work together. We do have a very serious job in front of us.

Mr. MICHEL. I certainly appreciate what the chairman and his subcommittee have already done. I just want to put a little bit more pressure on that they fully, completely understand also downtown that it is of concern enough to us that we also have them cooperating fully with the intention of the Members of Congress to do what is right.

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

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Michel amendment, which instructs the President to prepare and submit to the Congress, prior to November 1, 1985, his findings and recommendations concerning the continued sound and efficient operation of the farm credit system.

I want to thank my distinguished Republican leader for offering this amendment, which compliments the measure I introduced on September 12 -- House Concurrent Resolution 190. My resolution calls on the President to appoint a select blue ribbon panel, called the National Commission on the Farm Credit System. This 12-member panel, composed of Members of Congress, officials of the Government and farm lending institutions, would examine the crisis and make recommendations to the Congress in 3 weeks time. This crisis in the farm credit system demands immediate action!

Mr. Chairman, many of us saw this farm credit crisis coming. This crisis, which how threatens the very existence of the farm credit system, is the result of years of selling farm products at prices below the cost of production, and then going to the lender to finance that cheap food policy.

The greatest transfer of wealth the world has ever seen is occurring: the credit crisis. We have two options: First, either we address the problem in a nonpartisan cooperative spirit or second, within 6 to 8 months we will see the damndest crash in real estate values that this Nation has ever experienced. It will make the slide of the 1930's look like a mere reasonable adjustment.

Those of us in a position of responsibility, beginning with the President, must sit down and, without partisanship or pride of authorship, put in place actions which reestablish confidence in the farm credit system.

The Michel amendment instructs the administration to provide the required leadership to see that the problem is examined and addressed. I would remind my colleagues that, unless we take immediate action on the crisis in the farm credit system, the rest of the farm bill could be an exercise in futility.

Again, I want to thank the distinguished Republican leader for offering this amendment, and I strongly urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, in view of the receptive attitude on the part of the chairman, the distinguished chairmen of the full committee and the subcommittee, and I think apparently the agreement of our minority Member, I would certainly forego the very profound, extensive remarks that I might make in support of this amendment outlining the history of the bank, the credit institutions, the problems that are confronting the farmer today and ask for a favorable vote on the amendment.

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

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MADIGAN. Is the gentleman going to revise and extend so that those remarks will be in the Record for all of us to read?

Mr. MICHEL. That was the gentleman's intention particularly out of deference to the time restraints under which we find ourselves this evening and in all courtesy to those who have been so good to give the gentleman the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Michel].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VOLKMER. 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. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I had previously introduced to have in the Record an amendment that would strike the authority of the Secretary to lease the land that Farmer's Home presently has, approximately 600,000. Of course, there is language in the committee bill that may address this, but before I make a decision whether to offer the amendment, I would like to inquire either of the ranking minority Member or of the committee or subcommittee, especially the subcommittee, since he helped work it, in here it says:

The Secretary shall not lease or operate the real property for the production of agricultural commodities that the Secretary has determined to be in surplus supply.

Now, those are the words that concern me as to, in other words, some of us do not really trust everything that the Secretary would do, to be honest with the Members. If he makes a determination and says that it is not in surplus, then he can go ahead and lease it.

I would like to get on the record here, what do we mean by "surplus"? Do we mean at least 1 year's supply like of wheat we are going to have at the end of this year and carry over approximately 1.6 billion bushels?

Would the gentleman agree that would be a surplus supply of wheat?

I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Coleman] for his response.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. I would say to the gentleman the purpose of the language that he cited is to prohibit the Secretary from allowing crops to be grown under his authorization responsibility as the landowner, basically, of inventory property, any commodities that are in surplus.

The gentleman has asked about the definition of surplus and how you would handle that. Of course, I would assume that reasonable people could define it. There is a definition of normal supply in the 1949 act which he might conclude would be defined as an agricultural commodity in a marketing year under normal supplies, the estimated domestic consumption; the estimated exports of that commodity, plus an allowance for a carry over.

We do not want to drop down to the bare bottom. As a result, I think that definition within that framework would probably define the word surplus supply. From that standpoint, I think the intent is probably clear.

Mr. VOLKMER. In other words, if we had a supply beyond the normal supply, that would be in surplus?

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I would conclude that reading, normal reading

of those words would conclude that, yes.

Mr. VOLKMER. I thank the gentleman and I will not offer my amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BRUCE

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bruce: On page 332, after line 21, insert the following:

"FMHA LOAN APPEAL STUDY

"Sec. 1317. (a)(1) The Secretary of Agriculture shall conduct a study concerning the administrative appeals procedure used under the farm loan programs of the Farmers Home Administration.

"(2) In conducting such study, the Secretary shall examine --

"(A) the number and type of appeals initiated by loan applicants and borrowers;

"(B) the extent to which initial administrative actions are reversed on appeal;

"(C) the reasons that administrative actions are reversed, modified, or sustained on appeal;

"(D) the number and disposition of appeals in which the loan applicant or borrower is represented by legal counsel;

"(E) the quantity of time required to complete action on appeals and the reasons for delays;

"(F) the feasibility of the use of administrative law judges in the appeals process; and

"(G) the desirability of electing members of county committees established under section 332 of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1982).

"(b) Not later than September 1, 1986, the Secretary shall submit a report describing the results of the study required under this section to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate."

Mr. BRUCE (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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am offering would call for a study to review FMHA loan appeal procedures. Nationwide, 97 percent of farmers who appeal when their loans are rejected have their appeals rejected as well. In my home State of Illinois, only 1 percent of farmers appealing had the loan decision reversed.

One reason appeals may be rejected is that in most cases the person who hears the appeal is the FmHA district director, the immediate boss of the FmHA county supervisor who turned down the loan. It seems to me that this process raises some questions about whether farmers can get a fair hearing. In addition, farmers often experience long delays before their appeals are heard. It can take months -- months that a farmer waiting to plant cannot afford -- to go through the entire loan-appeal-rejection process.

My amendment would initiate a study of why and to what extent loan decisions are sustained on appeal, of the reasons for delays, and of several ways the process could be made more impartial. Nothing in my amendment would increase the budget of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Given the current agricultural financial crisis, we need to be certain that farmers are not turned way without a just hearing of their loan appeals. I urge my colleague to support this amendment to ensure that farmers are given a fair chance to stay in business.

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

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

Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Chairman, in the interest of conserving the time of the membership, I would like to say to the gentleman that we have had the opportunity to study his amendment over here, and we think it is a good amendment and are quite anxious to accept it.

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

Mr. BRUCE. With that explanation, I will gladly yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I do commend the gentleman for offering this proposal, and certainly this side has no objection. We commend him for offering the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Bruce].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. TOWNS

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendments, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. Towns: Page 322, after line 21, insert the following:

PROMPT APPROVAL OF LOANS AND LOAN GUARANTEES

Sec. 1317. (a) Subtitle D of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act is amended by inserting after section 333 (7 U.S.C. 1983) the following new section:

"Sec. 333A. (a)(1) The Secretary shall approve or disapprove the application for a loan or loan guarantee made under this title, and notify the applicant of such action, within forty-five days after the Secretary has received a completed application for such loan or guarantee.

"(2) If an application for a loan or loan guarantee under this title is incomplete, the Secretary shall inform the applicant of the reasons such application is incomplete within five days after the Secretary has received such application.

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

"(3) If an application for a loan or loan guarantee under this title is disapproved by the Secretary, the Secretary shall state the reasons for the disapproval in the notice required under paragraph (1).

"(b) If an application for an insured loan under this title is approved by the Secretary, the Secretary shall provide the loan proceeds to the applicant within five days (or such longer period as the applicant may approve) after the application for the loan is approved by the Secretary, except that, if the Secretary is unable to provide the loan proceeds to the applicant within such five-day period because sufficient funds are not available to the Secretary for such purpose, the Secretary shall provide the loan proceeds to the applicant as soon as practicable (but in no event five days unless the applicant agrees to a longer period) after sufficient funds for that purpose become available to the Secretary.

"(c) If an application for a loan or loan guarantee under this title is disapproved by the Secretary, but such action is subsequently reversed or revised as the result of an appeal within the Department of Agriculture or to the courts of the United States and the application is returned to the Secretary for further consideration, the Secretary shall act on the application and provide the applicant with notice of the action within five days after return of the application to the Secretary.

"(d) If the Secretary fails to comply with subsection (a), (b), or (c) on an application for a loan or loan guarantee that is approved by the Secretary, the Secretary shall --

"(1) for insured loans, reduce the interest payments due on the loan, or

"(2) for loan guarantees, make payments on behalf of the borrower to cover interest due to the lender on the loan,

in an amount calculated by multiplying the outstanding principal of the loan by that part of the annual rate of interest being charged for the loan that bears the same proportion to the full annual rate of interest as the period during which the Secretary was not in compliance with such subsection bears to a full year.

"(e) Upon receipt of an application for a loan or loan guarantee under this title, the Secretary shall inform the applicant of the requirements of this section."

(b) The amendment made by subsection for loans or loan guarantees under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1921 et seq.) received by the Secretary of Agriculture after the date of enactment of this Act.

Page 332, after line 21 insert the following new section:

CONTINUATION OF SMALL FARMER TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Sec. 1317. The Secretary of Agriculture shall maintain at substantially current levels the small farmer training and technical assistance program in the office of the Administrator of the Farmers' Home Administration.

Page 332 after line 21, insert the following:

NONSUPERVISED ACCOUNTS

Sec. 1317. Section 312 of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1942) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(e) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the Secretary shall reserve at least 10 percent of any loan made under this subtitle to be placed in a nonsupervised bank account which may be used at the discretion of the borrower for necessary family living needs or purposes not inconsistent with previously agreed upon farming or ranching plans. If the borrower exhausts this reserve, the Secretary may review and adjust the farm plan with the borrower and consider rescheduling the loan, extending additional credit, the use of income proceeds to pay necessary

farm, and home and other expenses, or additional available loan servicing."

Page 232, after line 21, insert the following:

FARM PROGRAM APPEALS

Sec. 1318. Subtitle D of the Consolidated Farm and rural Development Act is amended by inserting after section 333A (as added by section 1317(a) of this Act) the following new section:

"Sec. 333B. (a) The Secretary shall provide an applicant for or borrower of a loan or loan guarantee under this title who has been directly and adversely affected by a decision of the Secretary taken under this Act (hereinafter in the section referred to as the 'appellant') with the right to written notice, an opportunity for an informal meeting, and an opportunity for a hearing on the record, with respect to such decision, in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary consistent with this section.

"(b) Within ten days of such adverse decision, the Secretary shall provide the appellant with written notice of the decision, the opportunity for an informal meeting and formal hearing, and the procedure to appeal such decision (including any deadlines for filing appeals).

"(c)(1) An appellant shall have the right to --

"(A) access to the personal file of the appellant maintained by the Secretary, including a reasonable opportunity to inspect and reproduce the file at an office of the Farmers Home Administration located in the area of the appellant; and

"(B) representation by an attorney or nonattorney at an inspection and reproduction of files under clause (A), an informal meeting under subsection (d), and a formal hearing under subsection (e).

"(2) The Secretary may charge an appellant for any reasonable costs incurred in reproducing files under paragraph (1)(A).

"(d)(1) In order to provide an opportunity for parties to reconsider and resolve differences over decisions referred to in subsection (a) and to minimize the need for formal appeals of such decisions, the Secretary shall establish producers for informal meetings between appellants and officials of the Farmers Home Administration to discuss such decisions.

"(2) In establishing procedures for an informal meeting between an appellant and official concerning a decision of the Secretary, the Secretary shall --

"(A) require the appellant and official to conduct an informal meeting, or to waive such meeting in accordance with clause (E), before a formal hearing may be conducted under subsection (e) on such decision;

"(B) preserve the rights of the appellant to further review under this section;

"(C) require completion of the informal meeting process (including notice of any reconsidered decision required under clause (F)) within thirty days after notice of the original adverse decision provided to the appellant under subsection (b);

"(D) provide for the direct involvement in the informal meeting of the official who originally made the decision and, if such official is a country supervisor of an office, the district director of the office;

"(E) permit a waiver of the informal meeting if the appellant and official agree that such process would likely not avoid a formal appeal under subsection (e); and

"(F) require the Secretary to provide the appellant with written notice of any reconsidered decision of the Secretary

reached after such informal meeting or waiver and, in the case of an adverse reconsidered decision, the reasons therefor.

"(3) If an appellant and official agree to waive an informal meeting under paragraph (2)(E) with respect to a decision of the Secretary, the Secretary shall notify the appellant of the right of the appellant to a formal hearing on the decision under subsection (e).

"(4) For the purpose of an appeal, a reconsidered decision reached by the Secretary under paragraph (2)(E) shall become the record of the Secretary with respect to the original decision made by the Secretary.

"(e)(1) If an informal meeting is conducted or waived under subsection (d) with respect to the decision of the Secretary under this title and the reconsidered decision reached under subsection (d)(2)(E) remains adverse to the appellant, the appellant may request a hearing on such reconsidered decision before an administrative law judge appointed under section 3105 of title 5, United States Code, by filing a complaint with the Secretary with twenty days of notice of such reconsidered decision.

"(2) The Secretary may submit an answer to a complaint filed under paragraph (1).

"(3)(A) A hearing under this subsection shall take place within thirty days of the filing of the complaint of the appellant.

"(B) Such hearing shall be held at a Farmers Home Administration Office located in --

"(i) the state in which the appellant resides or in which the farmland of the appellant is located; or

"(ii) an adjacent State if the office in the adjacent State is no more than five hundred miles from the location at which the appellant resides or the farmland of the appellant is located.

"(C) Evidence at such hearing may include the complaint of the appellant, the answer of the Secretary, the notice of any reconsidered decision, and any testimony by any official of the Farmers Home Administration, the appellant, and any relevant expert, except that affidavits by such official, appellant, and expert may be substituted for direct testimony when agreed to by the parties or allowed by the administrative law judge.

"(D) Such hearing shall be tape recorded and a transcript of such hearing shall be made available at cost upon the request of any party to the proceeding.

"(4)(A) The administrative law judge shall decide all questions of fact and law in a proceeding brought under the subsection and shall uphold, reverse, or modify the reconsidered decision of the Secretary.

"(B) The decision of the administrative law judge shall be final unless appealed pursuant to subsection (f).

"(5) Within ten days of the hearing, both parties to the proceeding shall be provided with a copy of the decision of the administrative law judge setting forth all findings of fact and reasons for the decision.

"(6) The Secretary shall report and make available to the public --

"(A) a decision of an administrative law judge reached under this subsection; and

"(B) a description of any subsequent action taken by the Secretary pursuant to subsection (f).

"(f)(1) If a party is aggrieved by the decision of an administrative law judge under subsection (e), such aggrieved party may request a review of the decision within ten days of the issuance of such decision.

"(2) Upon such request, the Secretary shall review the decision of the administrative law judge and make a

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

determination on the record to modify, uphold, or reverse such decision.

"(3) The Secretary shall make such review and determination within twenty days of the request for review.

"(4) Such determination shall be the final administrative determination subject to judicial review."

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Chairman, my amendments will assist particularly the small farmer. I would like to move that these amendments be considered in bloc. This package would: First, continue the Small Farmer Training and Technical Assistance Program in the office of the Administrator of the Farmers' Home Administration; second, create a 10 percent discretionary account for farmers with supervised bank accounts; third, establish time limits on loan decisions; and fourth, create a program appeals procedure which emphasizes the farmers access to his records and his due process rights.

I want to emphasize that this amendment does not require new monies but stresses administrative changes within the existing structure at FmHA. In this regard, I am pleased that a broad range of groups and individuals have indicated their support for this package including Governor Pepich of Minnesota, the Center for Rural Affairs in Nebraska, the Rural Coalition, the Interfaith Action for Economic Justice, the North American Farm Alliance, the United Farmers Organization of North and South Carolina, the American Agriculture Movement and the Federation of Southern Cooperatives.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this amendment will improve the day-to-day operations at FmHA and this agency's relations with the American farmer. It's a sad day when an agency designed to help a constituency is viewed as "the enemy" by that constituency. I hope that this amendment will help to change the farmers' current attitude toward FmHA.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. TOWNS. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Chairman.

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

I take this time very sincerely to commend the gentleman for his interest in the plight of rural America and in the small farmers.

As all of us know, the gentleman hails from Brooklyn, but he has roots from another area of the South. But the interest he has shown and the time which has devoted in this effort we welcome. We hope that we will have more participation in a positive way from the Brooklyns of all the urban areas of the United States.

As far as I am concerned, after commending the gentleman, we would be very happy to accept his amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like for the gentleman to yield to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee to make that approval at this time.

Mr. TOWNS. I would be delighted to yield to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend from New York [Mr. Towns] for yielding.

I, too, want to share in the praise and support of the amendment. I want to commend the gentleman for having done the research work that he has on the amendments, because I am familiar with what has taken place as far as staff work goes, and for the diligence that the gentleman has shown on behalf of all farmers and the small rural communities of rural America, particularly those who are hard pressed and who need some special assistance here in the country.

Time after time the committee has heard testimony from farmers who have been victims of discrimination and neglect by the Farmers Home Administration.

I think it is very appropriate that this study be made and that this kind of abuse is not confined to any one particular area of the Nation or any single class of borrower. It should not continue to be tolerated.

I share the gentleman's concern very much as Chairman of this subcommittee and I commend the gentleman for the work he has done and certainly am willing to accept the amendments.

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

Mr. TOWNS. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Lewis].

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman give me just a quick explanation on a 10-percent allocation on supervised bank accounts, on that portion, and also the creation of a new appellate procedure for FmHA borrowers?

Mr. TOWNS. The 10 percent supervised bank accounts, as it stands now, many times small farmers have an opportunity to get things on sale or be able to buy at a discount. As a result of not being able to do it in a very quick fashion, they lose out on these things. So this would allow them to have 10 percent flexibility to go in and to avail themselves of these kinds of situations.

Many of the farmers in the hearings have said that they feel that if they are able to do this, this might make the difference between making it and not making it. As the gentleman knows, many of these small farmers are going out of business at a very, very rapid rate.

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman also explain the new appellate procedure he is proposing?

Mr. TOWNS. What happens there is the informal process within the majority of appeals would be settled at that level. It would be an informal process, because what happens now is that they have to wait so long before this occurs that many of them do not have the -- --

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Towns] has expired.

(At the request of Mr. Lewis of Florida, and by unanimous consent, Mr. Towns was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. TOWNS. What happens is, as the gentleman knows, as it stands now, while they are waiting to hear, many times they pass the season to plant. So what we are asking for is an informal process where they would be able to appeal and be able to get an answer and, as a result, that they would be able to do it within the time limit of planting.

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

MR. FAUNTROY. MR. CHAIRMAN, THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MY DISTINGUISHED COLLEAGUE FROM NEW YORK, CONGRESSMAN Edolphus Towns is deserving of support and is reflective of

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

the gentleman's wisdom in recognizing the stake that urban consumers have in the survival of our Nation's hard-pressed small-scale agricultural producers.

This amendment would enhance the access of small farmers to the programs of the Farmers Home Administration. Specifically, the amendment would:

Continue the FmHA's Small Farmer Training and Technical Assistance Program;

Create a discretionary 10 percent allocation within FmHA-supervised bank accounts for use by the borrower for unforeseen needs consistent with the original loan;

Require that an FmHA loan be approved or disapproved within 45 days and that funds be ordered within 5 days of a loan's approval; and

Create a new appellate procedure for FmHA borrowers.

We all know that our Nation's small farmers are in deep economic distress crushed by the impact of a huge budget deficit resulting in high interest rates and an overvalued dollar.

As is often the case, the problems confronting our Nation are hitting the most vulnerable. This is certainly the situation in the agricultural sector. Also, as is often the case, the problems that confront our Nation are most acutely reflected in the context of the black experience and the difficulties facing the 57,000 black farmers of America.

THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY CONGRESSMAN Towns seeks to assist in the preservation of our small scale agricultural producers and in doing this it would also address the alarming situation described so graphically by the U.S. Civil Rights Commission in a 1982 report entitled, "The Decline of Black Farming in America." That report documented a disturbing pattern and practice of inaccessibility of the FmHA to black farmers. I urge all of my colleagues to study this most important and disturbing document. The conclusion of the report was that:

The Farmers Home Administration has not given adequate emphasis or priority to the crisis facing black farmers today. *** In 1981, blacks received only 2.5 percent of the total dollar amount loaned through FmHA's farm credit programs.

I URGE MY COLLEAGUES TO APPROVE THIS AMENDMENT OFFERED BY CONGRESSMAN Towns. It is a positive first step in improving FmHA's accessibility to our small farmers and in doing this will also begin to remove the barriers at the FmHA to the black framers of America.

MRS. COLLINS. MR. CHAIRMAN, I RISE IN SUPPORT OF CONGRESSMAN TOWNS' AMENDMENT. THIS MUCH-NEEDED AMENDMENT WOULD GIVE NEW LIFE TO THE FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION'S [FMHA], SMALL FARMER SUPPORT PROGRAMS IN A VARIETY OF WAYS, AND IN SO DOING, WOULD PROVIDE VITAL ASSISTANCE TO THIS NATION'S LONG IGNORED BLACK FARMER, WHO TYPICALLY OWNS OR OPERATES A SMALL FARM.

FIRST, THE AMENDMENT WOULD CONTINUE THE SMALL FARMER TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM. THE CLEAR VALUE OF THIS PROGRAM IS THAT IT HELPS THE SMALL FARMER HELP HIMSELF OR HERSELF. THE DOLLARS ALLOCATED FOR SUCH TRAINING NOW ARE DOLLARS SAVED LATER, FOR SMALL FARMERS, BLACK AND WHITE, ARMED WITH NEW TECHNICAL KNOWLEDGE, BECOME INCREASINGLY ABLE TO MANAGE WITHOUT GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE. WITHOUT QUESTION, WE CANNOT TURN OUR BACKS ON THIS IMPORTANT PROGRAM.

SECOND, THE AMENDMENT CREATES A DISCRETIONARY 10 PERCENT ALLOCATION WITHIN FMHA-SUPERVISED BANK ACCOUNTS FOR USE BY THE BORROWER FOR UNFORESEEN NEEDS

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

CONSISTENT WITH THE ORIGINAL LOAN. GIVEN THE VERY HARD TIMES OUR NATION'S FARMERS ARE FACING, AND THE UNPRECEDENTED CONDITIONS FACING BLACK FARMERS, THIS PROVISION IS BOTH COMPASSIONATE AND REALISTIC. CLEARLY AS AMERICA FACES ITS WORST FARM CRISIS SINCE THE GREAT DEPRESSION, CONGRESS MUST ENSURE THAT OUR FMHA LOANS ARE FLEXIBLE ENOUGH TO HELP THE SMALL FARMER THROUGH CONDITIONS NOT FORESEEN AT THE TIME OF THE ORIGINAL LOAN. WHEN WE LIVE IN A TIME WHERE THE FARM CRISIS SEEMS TO GROW WORSE EACH DAY, WE MUST HAVE A LOAN POLICY THAT CAN ADAPT TO THE TOUGH REALITIES OF THE SITUATION.

THIRD, MR. TOWNS' AMENDMENT WOULD REQUIRE THAT AN FMHA LOAN BE APPROVED OR DISAPPROVED WITHIN 45 DAYS, AND THAT FUNDS BE ORDERED WITHIN 5 DAYS OF A LOAN'S APPROVAL. THIS PROVISION SQUARELY RECOGNIZES THAT TIME IS THE WORST ENEMY OF THE STRUGGLING SMALL FARMER WAITING FOR APPROVAL OR RECEIPT OF A LOAN. LOANS MUST BE APPROVED AND FUNDS MUST BE ORDERED QUICKLY, OR THE RESULT WILL BE ONE OF DESERVING APPLICANTS FACING FINANCIAL DISASTER, WHILE REDTAPE GROWS LONGER AND LONGER. MOREOVER, A UNIFORM DEADLINE REDUCES THE POSSIBILITY OF UNEQUAL AND UNFAIR TREATMENT BY THOSE WHO WOULD QUICKLY APPROVE LOANS FOR CERTAIN FARMERS WHILE OTHERS ARE STILL UNABLE TO PLANT THEIR CROPS.

Fourth, this amendment would create a new appellate procedure for FmHA borrowers. Specifically, it would provide professional assistance for farmers appealing FmHA decisions on loans. This is a change that is long overdue, and one that will ensure that the small farmer, regardless of race, be treated fairly by the FmHA.

As I have already made clear, this amendment is particularly important because of its ability to ease the struggle of the black farmer. I would like for a moment to describe those difficulties, recently documented by the U.S. Civil Rights Commission's report, "The Decline of Black Farming in the United States." The Commission concluded that black family farmers are a rapidly diminishing group in this country, and could disappear by the end of the century. While all family farmers face problems in this dreadful farm crisis, the Commission stated that blacks face special problems of racism and a disproportionately low share of available credit, including the last resort credit supplied by the FmHA.

The statistics cited in this report underscore the dire situation. In the last decade, the number of black farmers fell 57 percent, which is about 2 1/2 times the rate of decline for white farms. There were 926,000 black-run farms in 1920, and about 57,000 by the end of the 1970's. Unless we break the present trends by adopting such measures as the Towns amendment, the experts predict there will be only 10,000 black farms by the end of this century.

Given these shocking statistics, the FmHA can and must play a role in reversing these unacceptable trends. When the Civil Rights Commission released its report on the black farmer, it was revealed that despite the pressing need of black farmers for credit, they received only 2.5 percent of the total dollars lent by the FmHA. The Commission observed further, "There are indications that FmHA may be involved in the very kind of racial discrimination that it should be seeking to correct." That is why the Towns amendment, with its strengthened appellate procedures, its guarantees of speedy loan decisions, its adaptability to unforeseen credit needs, and its emphasis on small farmer training must be adopted today.

In the words of the Civil Rights Commission's report:

A society where whites control virtually all agricultural production and land development *** is not racially equal. Such an imbalance can only serve to further diminish the stake of blacks in the social order and reinforce their skepticism regarding the concept of equality under the law.

I call upon this Congress to ensure that this bleak possibility does not become a reality, to guarantee that racial equality is a goal we will strive for not just in our schools and factories, but on our farms.

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I am reminded of a line from an essay about Illinois farming, applicable, I think, to farming throughout this country. As the essayist aptly observed, "To plow is to pray -- to plant is to prophesy, and the harvest answers and fulfills." I urge my colleagues to answer and fulfill the prayers and prophecies of black farmers all across this Nation. Please join me in supporting the Towns amendment. And together we shall plant the seed for a most bountiful harvest, not just of black agricultural revival, but of fairness, justice, and racial equality.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from New York, [Mr. Towns].

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Bereuter] is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

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

MR. BEREUTER. MR. CHAIRMAN, I WOULD LIKE TO USE THIS TIME TO ENGAGE IN A DISCUSSION OR A COLLOQUY WITH SOME OF MY COLLEAGUES, PARTICULARLY THE GENTLEMAN FROM TEXAS [MR. STENHOLM] AND THE GENTLEMAN FROM WISCONSIN [MR. GUNDERSON], WHO WERE ACTIVE IN COMMITTEE IN DRAFTING THIS LANGUAGE AND MOVING IT THROUGH THE COMMITTEE MARKUP.

FIRST OF ALL, I RECOGNIZE THAT WE NEED TO MOVE TOWARD A MORE UNIFORM SYSTEM OF HANDLING THE CLEAR TITLE/DOUBLE JEOPARDY PROBLEM. I COMPLIMENT THE MEMBERS OF THE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE FOR THE EFFORT THEY HAVE PUT INTO THIS SECTION AND I KNOW WHAT A DIFFICULT ISSUE IT HAS BEEN TO RESOLVE.

THIS ISSUE HAS BEEN A PARTICULARLY DIVISIVE ISSUE BETWEEN FARMERS, RANCHERS, AGRICULTURE PRODUCERS, PURCHASERS OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS, AND LENDERS. UNTIL IT IS RESOLVED, DOUBLE JEOPARDY WILL POSE CONTINUAL PROBLEMS FOR LENDER, AGRICULTURAL PRODUCERS WHO EACH YEAR MUST BORROW OPERATING CAPITAL TO FINANCE THEIR OPERATION, AND FOR PURCHASERS OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS.

INDEED, THE CLEAR TITLE ISSUE HAS AFFECTED MANY OF MY CONSTITUENTS IN NEBRASKA.

I WISH TO MAKE IT CLEAR THAT I RAISE THIS ISSUE NOT BECAUSE I WISH TO CHAMPION THE CAUSE OF BANKERS OVER THAT OF FARMERS OR RANCHERS. IN FACT, I AM NOT SYMPATHETIC TO THE ACTIONS TAKEN BY BANKS IN COLLECTING DOUBLE JEOPARDY CLAIMS WHEN THOSE CLAIMS BANKRUPT INNOCENT PURCHASERS OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to engage in a colloquy instead of offering an amendment that I had filed to this title. I would ask if the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Stenholm] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Gunderson] who have been very active in this subject would be willing to engage in a short colloquy with me.

As the Members know, I had filed a clear title amendment concerning the issue of double jeopardy. This is a matter of great concern to us. I agree with the objectives that I think the gentleman is attempting to pursue through the legislation. I have some questions and some doubts about its applicability.

I would like to submit a complete list of questions to the gentleman since they have been so active.

One of the questions that I would like to have answers for, particularly since my State has just passed legislation to

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

move to a highly accessible computerized information system on this subject, the questions include these: What would be written notice as described by the bill, certified or registered mail? If written notice does not in reality mean certified or registered mail, what does it mean? Would it preclude a computerized central filing system as some States have established? Does this require each lender in effect to keep his own filing system to protect their liens or to protect themselves from double jeopardy? Why is the maximum fine \$5,000? I do believe the "clear title" provisions in the bill will create problems and hope that other relevant committees in the two bodies will also examine this crucial issue. Some States like Nebraska have struck a compromise, legislatively, after some difficulty and have taken steps to move to a highly accessible computerized information system. Of course there are problems of interstate sales, but the solution is technologies through a computerized filing system.

Mr. Chairman, I would be pleased to yield now to the gentleman from Texas.

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

I have looked at the questions and listened as the gentleman has asked them. I believe that the answers to these questions will go a long way toward defining the legislative intent of the clear title legislation that we have in this bill.

After deferring to my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Gunderson], who has worked very hard with me on this legislation and within our committee, I would then ask unanimous consent that we be allowed to insert the answers to the questions that the gentleman has posed at this particular point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would point out to the gentleman from Texas that he cannot insert a colloquy into the Record.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. He is an expert and I appreciate the time he has delivered.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Gunderson].

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and I join with my colleague in this regard.

I think the way to handle this, not only in the interests of time, because I thought I just heard the gentleman ask a question about a limit on penalty which was not on the list of questions we had. I think the way for it to be handled is for the gentleman to submit the questions in his revised and extended remarks and then following that, within the 5 legislative days that we have, we will be able to insert into the Record as well specific answers as to some of the details to these questions so that the legislative history is very clear on this issue.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

I would say that I did not think the approach the committee has taken will work adequately, but I would hope that we might be able to accommodate the States that are moving toward a computerized information system, because I think that when we cross State borders we are talking about a technological solution to this problem eventually.

Mr. MORRISON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEREUTER. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

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

Mr. MORRISON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Nebraska for yielding. I, too, have some concerns about the clear title provisions included in the farm bill.

I rise to express my reservations to the "clear title" provisions of H.R. 2100. We all agree that these provisions address a very real problem. Currently, a farmer who sells farm products used as collateral for a loan can shift liability

for the loan to the purchaser. Put another way, the lender has recourse against a purchaser of farm products because there is no clear title conveyed with a sale. Agricultural sales are often conducted on such short notice that purchasers have little opportunity to check property for liens. In some cases, purchasers have had to pay twice for the same product, once to the farmer who failed to repay the bank, and again to the bank that holds the loan.

H.R. 2100 contains provisions that are intended to protect agricultural purchasers from this double whammy. While I welcome the effort to address this problem, I believe the bill leans too far in protecting purchasers and places an unfair burden on agricultural lenders. This problem will come back to haunt us if we simply allow the pendulum to swing to the opposite extreme and require farm lenders to sustain all of the losses from defaulted loans. These are tough times for farm lending, and this is no time to dramatically change the rules.

I understand that the Senate Banking Committee will soon hold hearings on the clear title provisions of the Senate farm bill. I urge my colleagues in the House to be receptive to any compromise that might emerge in conference that would be fair to both agricultural lenders and purchasers.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, I would certainly encourage the author of the bill to include in the legislative intent of this the fact that the State of Nebraska, the State of Montana, and other States that deal in livestock heavily and in agricultural loans have passed in fact very adequate lien laws and a computerized system for recording those. I think that they should be grandfathered into this situation or that they be covered under this situation.

I want to encourage the gentleman to do that in his remarks of legislative intent.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin once again.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I just want to acknowledge to the committee that there are two important things here. No. 1, there is nothing -- correct me if I am wrong -- in the proposal that is now in front of us from the committee that prevents any State from using the registry if they so choose.

Second, by virtue of doing this I think we are going to be able to clarify under a mutually agreed set of scenarios to the Department, so that when the regulations are implemented, clearly they will be able to deal with any specific concerns the gentleman and others might have.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, in light of the statement that the Chair just made to me regarding the colloquy, is it not in order at this point in the Record to accept the questions that were stated from the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Bereuter] and have the answers to those questions inserted into the Record at this point?

The CHAIRMAN. They can appear in the Record. It will not be effective legislative colloquy as a part of the

legislative history, but it will appear.

Mr. de la GARZA. 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. de la GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to advise the Members that unless the pace that we have been taking in the past several amendments and colloquies is accelerated tremendously, we would not be able to finish this legislation by 10 o'clock. We have a mandated 2 hours, 1 on the so-called Petri amendment, and 1 on food stamps, and we have various and sundry amendments. If we were to set a limit for 10 o'clock, I am sure that we could finish; otherwise, it does not look like we will, and I would be ready to rise at this time -- I am not making that motion yet -- and hopefully conclude on Monday.

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

Mr. de la GARZA. I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois.

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

I am looking at the list of what I understand is outstanding here in title XIII.

There is an amendment by Mr. Dorgan of North Dakota, which we are ready to accept on this side.

There is an amendment of mine, which the gentleman from Texas has indicated he is willing to accept.

There is a study amendment by the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. Snowe], which I am ready to accept.

In title XIV, there are two study amendments which we are ready to accept on this side.

That gets us down to the point where we really only have left tobacco and food stamps, on which we have a 1-hour limit on both of those, so theoretically by 10 after 10, plus the time to vote on those things, we could be done with this whole bill.

Mr. de la GARZA. I agree with the gentleman. I do not want to be accused of cutting anyone off or limiting debate. I would hope that we could conclude, and I am ready to proceed to conclusion, but there is no sense in prolonging the agony of many Members who have commitments otherwise, if we are not going to finish.

Perhaps if we could continue for another few minutes, but if we do not get the necessary cooperation, which we have not up to this point, we will not be able to proceed expeditiously.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps if we just attempt to finish the title we are on now, and then we will see where we are.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MADIGAN

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is the amendment reported in the Congressional Record as of September 24?

Mr. MADIGAN. Yes, it is, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Madigan: Title XIII, page 332 insert the following new section and designate it accordingly:

Sec. . Sections 302 and 311 of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1922 and 1941) are amended by adding, at the end of the parenthetical provision in clause (3) of the second sentence, the following: "or, in the case of holders of the entire interest who are related by blood or marriage and all of whom are or will become farm operators, the ownership interest of each such holder separately constitutes not larger than a family farm, even if their interests collectively constitute larger than a family farm, as defined by the Secretary."

Mr. MADIGAN (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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment modifies the eligibility criteria for Farmers Home Administration operating and ownership loans. It is an amendment which has been discussed with the chairman of the committee.

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

Mr. MADIGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas for any comment he might wish to make or would wish to make.

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Chairman, we have examined the gentleman's amendment and have no objection on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Madigan].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to this title?

If not, the Clerk will designate title XIV.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. SNOWE

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

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

Ms. SNOWE. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. Snowe: Page 379, line 21, strike out "(5)" and insert "(7)" in lieu thereof.

Page 380, line 14, after "system," insert "(5) an assessment of how economic policies and trade policies of the United States affect the financial operation of, and prospects for, family farm operations, (6) an assessment of the effect of Federal farm programs and policies on family farms and non-family farms which (A) derive the majority of their

income from non-farm sources, and (B) derive the majority of their income from farming operations,".

Ms. SNOWE (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 gentlewoman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Chairman, my amendment to section 1448 would require the Secretary of Agriculture to report to Congress annually on the status of the family farm in this country.

My amendment simply broadens the scope of the annual report to include two additional analyses that are key to the survival of the family farm. First, the Secretary would be required to measure the effect of economic and trade policies on the family farm, and second, to evaluate the effect of Federal farm policies and programs on family and nonfamily farms which earn the major portion of their income from off-farm sources.

As we are all well aware, the agricultural sector has been fully integrated into this Nation's economic system. Probably the most fundamental difference between the agricultural industry of today and that of only a decade ago is the tremendous influence of national macroeconomic forces outside the farm sector on the U.S. food economy.

I contend that the survival of the family farm has become largely dependent upon Government choices in fiscal, monetary, and trade policies. These policies determine the rate of inflation and the level of interest rates, investment and savings, the value of the dollar, the volume of exports and imports, and employment opportunities. What is missing, in my opinion, is a firm understanding of how these policies effect the family farm. Without such an understanding, we may unknowingly cripple the very farms that need our assistance the most.

I believe it is particularly important for us to understand how our trade policies affect these smaller farm operations. Let me use Maine's potato industry as an example. The survival of this industry, composed largely of family farms, may depend on new trade policy developments, especially with Canada. Both the Maine farmers and agriculture officials concerned with trade matters need to fully understand the issues and concerns in need of redress during future bilateral negotiations. The Department of Agriculture, under my amendment, will be responsible for determining how trade policies and actions affect family farm operations. Such an annual review, I think, will be constructive for farmers and the Department.

My amendment calls on the Secretary of Agriculture to identify, review, and analyze economic and trade policy decisions made during the previous year and to assess their impact on the family farm.

The second part of my amendment would require the Secretary of Agriculture to report on the influence and effect of Federal farm programs and policies on those farms where the majority of income is earned from off-farm sources as opposed to those farms where the majority of income is earned on the farm.

I believe that one of our important responsibilities in enacting the 1985 farm bill is to ensure that our Federal farm programs primarily serve to support family farm operations. These farming families, now having to rely more and more on an off-farm source of income to keep their farms going, are the same ones that are in the most financial trouble today.

I am concerned that our policies are squeezing out family farm operations in favor of large, industrialized corporate farms and also, so-called hobby farms, whose owners depend almost totally on off-farm income and where farming is not their primary occupation.

Our policies should not work to discourage these hobby farms or the large, corporate farms. However, as this bill

already makes clear in this section, neither should our Government policies work to the detriment of family farm operations.

The growing importance of off-farm income to keep a farm operation in business, Mr. Chairman, should be a real concern. We need to know more about the direction our farmers are heading in before the traditional family farm becomes truly extinct.

My amendment, by requiring the Department of Agriculture to focus on the importance of off-farm income, will help to determine whether our programs are efficient, and are helping the farmers who really need the assistance. I urge my colleagues to support these small, but important, additions to the Secretary's annual report so that we may better utilize scarce resources to further the cause of American agriculture.

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

Ms. SNOWE. Yes, I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Chairman, we have looked at the gentlewoman's amendment on this side of the aisle and we are willing to accept the amendment.

(Ms. SNOWE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. Snowe].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments to title XIV?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TALLON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Tallon: Page 374, strike out line 12 and all that follows through line 17 of page 376 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Sec. 1445. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall jointly conduct an assessment of existing scientific literature and research, respecting --

- (1) the relationship between dietary cholesterol and blood cholesterol and human and nutrition, and
- (2) dietary calcium and its importance in human health and nutrition.

In conducting the assessments under this subsection, the Secretaries shall consult with agencies of the Federal Government involved in related research. Upon completion of such assessments the Secretaries shall each recommend such further studies as the Secretaries consider useful.

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall each submit to the House Committees on Agriculture and Energy and Commerce and the Senate Committees on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry and Labor and Human Resources a report on the results of the assessment conducted under subsection (a) and any recommendations made under such subsection, including a protocol, feasibility assessment, budget estimates and a timetable for such research as each Secretary shall deem appropriate.

Mr. TALLON (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 Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALLON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modification to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Tallon].

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification of amendment offered by Mr. Tallon: Strike out page 2 of the proposed amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(b) Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall each submit to the House Committees on Agriculture and Energy and Commerce and the Senate Committees on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry and Labor and Human Resources a report which shall include the results of the assessments conducted under subsection (a) and recommendations made under such subsection, for more complete studies of the issues examined under such subsection, including a protocol, feasibility assessment, budget estimates and a timetable for such research as each Secretary shall deem appropriate.

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

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

There was no objection.

The text of the amendment, as modified, is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Tallon, as modified: Page 374, strike out line 12 and all that follows through line 17 of page 376 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Sec. 1445. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall jointly conduct an assessment of existing scientific literature and research, respecting --

- (1) the relationship between dietary cholesterol and blood cholesterol and human health and nutrition, and
- (2) dietary calcium and its importance in human health and nutrition.

In conducting the assessments under this subsection, the Secretaries shall consult with agencies of the Federal Government involved in related research. Upon completion of such assessments the Secretaries shall each recommend such further studies as the Secretaries consider useful.

(b) Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall each submit to the House Committees on Agriculture and Energy and Commerce and the Senate Committees on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry and Labor and Human Resources a report which shall include the results of the assessments conducted under subsection (a) and recommendations made under such

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

subsection, for more complete studies of the issues examined under such subsection, including a protocol, feasibility assessment, budget estimates and a timetable for such research as each Secretary shall deem appropriate.

Mr. TALLON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment clarifies section 1445 of H.R. 2100, dealing with research done by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

It has been worked out and agreed upon by the commodity groups involved, the chairman of the Agriculture Committee and members of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, which had some jurisdictional concerns.

I appreciate the cooperation of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Chairman Dingell, Subcommittee Chairman Waxman, and their staff in working out this compromise.

Quite simply, as reported from the House Agriculture Committee, the section requires the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct an assessment of existing literature and research on dietary cholesterol and blood cholesterol as well as calcium and their relationships to human health and nutrition. It also calls for a report to the Agriculture Committees on further research recommendations.

The amendment being offered now would make the assessment a joint project between USDA and HHS. This and some other changes will solve the jurisdictional situation between the two committees.

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

Mr. TALLON. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Chairman, we have looked at the amendment. We have no objection to the amendment on this side of the aisle.

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

Mr. TALLON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection on this side of the aisle.

We further understand that with the gentleman's modification, the Energy and Commerce Committee no longer has a reservation against the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Tallon], as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to note that the House Agriculture Committee has reconciled a printing error in its report to accompany H.R. 2100. Language was inadvertently omitted regarding the implementation of Integrated Pest Management under Title XIV, the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act Amendments of 1985. The official committee's report language that was omitted now appears on page H 7665 in the September 20, 1985, Congressional Record. THIS LANGUAGE IS IMPORTANT TO ME BECAUSE IT INCORPORATES A SECTION OF MY BILL, H.R. 2339. THE LANGUAGE WOULD ESSENTIALLY HELP FARMERS REDUCE THEIR DEPENDENCE ON CHEMICAL PESTICIDES. THE FIRST DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT, WHICH I REPRESENT, IS PARTICULARLY CONCERNED WITH PESTICIDE POLLUTION, WHERE NEARLY 1,000 WATER WELLS HAVE BEEN CONTAMINATED BY AGRICULTURAL PESTICIDES.

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

Again, Mr. Chairman, I am pleased this error was corrected and that the language was inserted in the Congressional Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title XIV?

If not, the Clerk will designate title XV.

Under the previous agreement, debate is limited to 1 hour on the food stamp section of title XV. Are there amendments?

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. GLICKMAN

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. Glickman: On page 413, line 21, strike the word "and", and on line 22, insert before the period the following: ", and system security and privacy."

On page 414, line 4, strike the word "and" and insert in lieu thereof a comma, and after the word, "cost-effective", insert the following: ", and secure".

Mr. GLICKMAN (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 gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, the two amendments I am offering will strengthen accountability in the food stamp program by encouraging States to take steps to assure that both data and Federal food stamp dollars flowing through their automated data processing systems are secure.

Specifically, my first amendment adds "computer security and privacy" to the components of the model computer plan the Secretary is directed to develop under this section. As provided in the bill, States choosing to adopt this plan will receive 90-percent matching funds for improvements to their system, instead of the current 75 percent.

The second amendment requires the USDA's report on the adequacy of each State's automated data processing and computerized information system include not only analyses of steps needed to achieve system effectiveness and cost efficiency, as the bill currently directs, but an analysis of system security as well.

Mr. Chairman, the issue of computer security is not new to any of us; however, we are just beginning to realize the dimensions and the seriousness of the threat unprotected computer systems present to Federal agencies and Federal programs. I have participated in three congressional hearings on computer security and am convinced that the potential for fraud, vandalism and sabotage is great and growing, as Government programs move toward greater computerization.

The Office of Inspector General of the Department of Agriculture has just completed an audit evaluating the

security of State computer systems which process food stamp and other Food and Nutrition Service Program payments. The objective of the survey was to determine if security controls were sufficient to prevent unauthorized access to or use of automated data processing systems to fraudulently create or maintain cases receiving food stamp benefits.

Although the Inspector General's final report is not yet completed, preliminary reports of the OIG's review of 13 computer systems disclose a number of significant security weaknesses. These weaknesses range from inadequate controls over physical security, thereby permitting unrestricted access to computer hardware, to inadequate software controls, enabling persons to improperly manipulate or change data bases.

An earlier audit by the Inspector General of the Department of Health and Human Services of computer-related fraud in Government agencies concluded that existing controls in the victimized systems were weak and easily bypassed, and it recommended implementation of additional controls to strengthen the integrity of automated systems and prevent the perception that "no one is watching." About half of the perpetrators interviewed for this audit worked for State, local, or private agencies which were administering Federal programs, including the Food Stamp Program.

Noting that "Federal agencies have a substantial investment in State, local, and private computer systems, both because the Federal Government finances most of the development and maintenance costs of such systems, and because those systems control the allocation of Federal funds," the audit also recommended that Federal agencies reevaluate their guidance to State, local, and private administering agencies regarding computer security and controls, and that vulnerabilities in these computer systems be addressed with the same energy and diligence as those in Federal systems.

My amendments take a small step toward addressing these concerns. They do not force any new requirements on the States, nor do they dictate to the Secretary how he should attack this problem. I urge my colleagues to adopt them.

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

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, we have had an opportunity to look at the amendments that the gentleman has offered. It makes good sense in terms of improving computerization of the program.

I would have no objection to accepting the amendments.

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

The amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title XV?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BEDELL

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

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

Mr. BEDELL. Yes, it was, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bedell: Page 385, after line 23, insert the following new section (and redesignate references and succeeding sections accordingly):

INCOME FROM SELF-EMPLOYMENT

Sec. 1508. Section 5(f)(1)(A) of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2014(f)(1)(A)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, if the averaged amount does not accurately reflect the household's actual monthly circumstances because the household has experienced a substantial increase or decrease in business, the State agency shall calculate the self-employment income based on anticipated earnings."

Mr. BEDELL [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. BEDELL. Mr. Chairman, as I understand, this amendment has also been approved by both the minority and the majority.

This is a very simple, straightforward amendment. It is, however, an important amendment which will allow farmers to be treated more fairly in their efforts to qualify for food stamps.

My amendment simply clarifies in the law current USDA regulations which provide that a self-employed household, such as a farmer household, shall not have eligibility and benefits for the Food Stamp Program determined on the basis of income received in the past year if there has been a substantial change in business earnings in the current year.

While this is an existing regulation, there seems to be a number of States which continue to use prior year tax returns to make eligibility and benefit determinations in farm families who have experienced substantial decreases in income in the current year. This amendment simply states that in these cases, the States shall anticipate income for food stamp purposes based on a household's current income rather than last year's income tax form. As this is already a regulation, there is no cost involved in this amendment.

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

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

Mr. PANETTA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this also is an amendment which we have had an opportunity to review. It deals with counting countable income for self-employed persons.

We think it makes a great deal of sense and restates basically the current regulations. Therefore, I would have no objection to accepting it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Bedell].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title XV?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. EMERSON

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will inquire whether the gentleman's amendment was printed in the Record as of

September 24?

Mr. EMERSON. It was, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Emerson: Page 381, strike out line 25 and all that follows through line 25 on page 382, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Sec. 1503. The first sentence of section 3(o) of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2012(o)) is amended by striking out "fifty-four and inserting in lieu thereof "fifty".

Page 388, strike out line 1 and all that follows through line 22 on page 389, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(2) effective October 1, 1985, inserting in clause (2) of the fourth sentence "excluding expenses paid on behalf of the household under the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (42 U.S.C. 8621 et seq.)," after "by a household for shelter";

Page 389, line 23, strike out "(4)" and insert in lieu thereof "(3)".

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

(4) effective October 1, 1985, inserting in clause (c) of the last sentence ", excluding expenses paid on behalf of the household under the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act of 1981 (7 U.S.C. 8621 et seq.)," after "by a household for shelter".

Page 393, strike out line 2 and all that follows through line 4 on page 394, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Sec. 1511. The first sentence of section 5(g) of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2014(g)) is amended by inserting "and any other property, real or personal, to the extent that it is directly related to the maintenance or use of such vehicle" after "physically disabled household member".

Page 406, strike out lines 12 through 25.

Page 417, strike out lines 4 through 11.

Page 417, line 12, strike out "(2)" and insert in lieu thereof "(1)".

Page 417, line 14, strike out "(3)" and insert in lieu thereof "(2)".

Page 417, line 17, strike out "(4)" and insert in lieu thereof "(3)".

Page 417, line 21, strike out "(5)" and insert in lieu thereof "(4)".

Mr. EMERSON (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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, within these three titles of the food stamp provisions of the farm bill there are

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

many positive measures. The Food Stamp Program, the temporary Emergency Food Assistance Program and the Commodity Supplemental Food Program are reauthorized. A Mandatory Work and Employment Program designed by States is included. Monthly reporting and retrospective budgeting is better targeted. A Nutrition Education Program which strengthens the expanded Food and Education Program is authorized, and the USDA nutrition monitoring is expanded.

All of these are worthy of support and I do support them.

The Food Stamp Program itself serves on the average over 22 million people per month. In 1984 it is estimated that 38 million people were helped by the Food Stamp Program, up from a 35.3 million figure in 1980. Some of these same people, and more, are helped by the other USDA food assistance programs.

These are basically good programs. In fact, I believe the food stamp program is significantly improved. Ultimately, and I am going to get to the point here, this is an amendment designed to save \$2 billion over the course of the bill, and I would hope that Members would give it some attention.

In fact, I think the Food Stamp Program is significantly improved by one provision in H.R. 2100. That is the mandatory employment and training program. However, there are several provisions within title XV with which I do not agree.

I offered an amendment in committee which failed on a 22 to 21 vote to delete additional spending in the Food Stamp Program. My amendment would have reduced the cost of H.R. 2100 by over \$1 billion by 1988, and by 1990 it would have reduced the cost by over \$2 billion. Bear in mind that that is a reduction in cost in the bill and it is not a cut in the program.

My amendment deletes much of the additional spending contained in the committee bill for food stamps. It does not -- and I repeat for emphasis -- it does not cut benefits. I urge my colleagues to look at this amendment very carefully. It takes out the add-ons, but it does allow all cost-of-living adjustments for benefits and deductions.

Under my amendment, the thrifty food plan for a family of 4 will increase from the present level of \$268 a month to \$295 a month by 1988. The standard deduction will increase from \$98 to \$107. The sheltered dependent care deduction will increase from \$139 a month to \$152 a month.

All increases are provided for in the act, and my amendment does not change that. This is not a freeze amendment. For those who think that we ought simply to freeze, this is not even a freeze amendment. Growth is allowed in this amendment and is accommodated.

My amendment removes the add-ons. The committee bill increases benefits and deductions over and above the cost-of-living adjustments. The committee bill expands the food stamp program, adopts methods of adjusting benefits and deductions that were repudiated as long ago as the Carter administration, and reinstates reforms of 1981 and 1982.

In addition, the amount of money to be provided for food assistance in Puerto Rico is increased by \$370 million by 1990, and yet somehow, the way the budget is calculated, this \$370 million increase in spending to occur by 1990 is described as a savings of \$208 million.

My amendment deletes the add-ons in the committee bill. The additional increases above the cost-of-living adjustment for the thrifty food plan and the sheltered dependent care deduction are deleted. The expansion of earned income deduction and the separation of the sheltered dependent care deduction are eliminated.

I have agreed, and we will have a colloquy with the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. Roukema] in a few moments, to add back the medical deductions.

Resource limits are retained at the current levels. Outreach is eliminated, and the Puerto Rico nutrition assistance grant is retained, retained at a level of \$825 million a year. That is higher level than any State receives except New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Emerson] has expired.

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

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this amendment. We will be giving cost-of-living adjustments to food stamp participants. Benefits will go up and deductions will increase.

I remind this House that the debate over Social Security in the course of the budget debate was not whether or not there would be a COLA increase and an expansion of Social Security. The question was: Will there be a COLA or will there not be a COLA?

This amendment says that there will be a COLA in food stamps, but not an expansion of the program.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for my amendment.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, for his presentation here, and I want to express my support for his amendment in consideration or with the understanding that we can come to an agreement as to an amendment to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will yield, the gentlewoman and I have discussed this, and I am perfectly happy to accept her amendment relating to a medical deduction.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. I would like to take a few moments, Mr. Chairman, please, to describe the amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. ROUKEMA TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. EMERSON

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentlewoman wish to offer her amendment at this point?

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman. I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. For what reason does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. de la Garza] rise?

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Chairman, may I ask, has the gentleman from Missouri concluded his time?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has concluded, and the Chair recognized the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. Roukema] who was the only Member on her feet. She was speaking and now has requested that an amendment be read by the Clerk.

Mr. de la GARZA. I would defer to the gentlewoman from New Jersey. It was my intention to rise at this time, but I will defer to her at this point.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. Roukema to the amendment offered by Mr. Emerson: Page 1, strike out the amendment proposed to be made to page 390 of the bill, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Page 390, line 9, strike out "(5)" and insert in lieu thereof "(4)".

Mrs. ROUKEMA (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 gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I will yield back to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture for his consideration as long as my rights, as I understand it, can be reserved.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman has the time. She has 5 minutes in support of her amendment.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. I yield back to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. de la GARZA. I thank the gracious gentlewoman. If she does not wish to take her time at this time, the Chair would see that her time is protected when we next continue with the legislation.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a few comments on the Food Security Act.

We all realize that American farmers are undergoing one of the most difficult periods in the history of our country. For years now we have been warned about their economic crisis and the dire consequences they face as a result of mounting debts and overdue credit obligations.

For years now the policy of our Government has been to pay farmers not to produce crops in an effort to keep commodity prices at profitable levels.

On the other hand, we are faced with another serious and growing problem in our Nation, and indeed, in the world. That is the problem of hunger. Several studies released in the past year indicate that hunger has increased even as the economy has improved and unemployment has dipped to its prerecession levels.

According to "Bitter Harvest," a survey of emergency food providers conducted by the Food Research and Action Center, there was an average increase of over 20 percent nationally in the number of households served by emergency food providers between 1983 and 1984.

For some 35 million Americans with below-poverty incomes, the thought that farmers are paid not to grow food is one that probably boggles their minds.

In my congressional district, I have far too many hungry constituents who would gladly take the excess food that our farmers could produce. And as evidenced when the Government released stored butter and cheese to the needy, many of my constituents would also fight to receive those products.

In the face of rising consumer prices and growing domestic and world hunger I ask this question -- should we be in the business of paying farmers not to grow food? I believe the answer is self-evident.

It appears to me that what is needed is a reassessment and a rethinking of the guiding principals on which we base our farm policies. If there is a problem with storing excess commodities -- lets correct is. If there is a problem with marketing excess commodities -- lets correct it. If there is a problem with giving food to hungry people, by all means -- let's correct it.

I am by no means an expert on food production. However, I do know that there are an increasing number of people who are hungry. I do know that where there is a will, there is a way.

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

We can cure the problem of hunger if we so desire. While it may be too late to make that commitment in H.R. 2100, it is not too late to get started on addressing the plight of the hungry of this Nation. You, my colleagues, owe it to your constituents. I know I owe it to mine.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, farm prices are continuing to drop, farmers are going broke in record numbers, and the Federal budget expenditures for agriculture, while increasing substantially in past years, have done nothing to stop the hemorrhaging.

We have a farm program that gives the biggest producers the biggest checks, and they're the ones who need it least. So we desperately need to change the farm program. But we face a roadblock here in the House, even in my own political party, from those who want to cling to what we've been doing for years -- an approach that simply doesn't work.

But despite my frustration with members of my own party in the House of Representatives, the major stumbling block that we've faced in writing a new farm bill in 1985 has been President Reagan. He sent a farm bill to Congress that we described as "dead on arrival" by both Republicans and Democrats who view it as a ridiculous proposal, totally out of touch with reality. The President, in the middle of a farm crisis, suggested it's time to get back to the old Herbert Hoover approach and get rid of all farm programs. Then the President promptly vetoed an emergency farm credit relief bill passed by the House. Now he is threatening to veto either version of the farm bill reported out by the House or the Senate Agriculture Committees.

I call on this President to stop the political sloganeering on agriculture and give us some help. Let's design a policy that tries to save the network of family farms in America. There is money enough to do it. In fact, what we're spending today would do it if we spent the money the right way.

The inattention to family farms in the administration can probably be attributed to their preoccupation with the military. We have seen this administration spending itself silly for military weapons, both at home and abroad. The Defense Department has been showered with so much money that they apparently have to buy \$800 toilet seats and \$7,600 coffeemakers in order to spend it all.

The administration's requests for overseas military spending have been just as lavish -- while it was proposing cuts of 38 percent for agriculture and a 25-percent reduction for higher education, it was asking for a giant increase in foreign aid, primarily for military and related security aid -- an incredible 100 percent increase for security aid in the past 5 years. Much of this military assistance goes to the Third World, which has been encouraged to go on a weapons buying spree over the past several years, lured by easy credit terms. This is truly a sad state of affairs, when these nations have so many other more pressing needs, including simply feeding their citizens.

A farm wife who visited my office the other day was wearing a button which summed it all up neatly. It read, "Farms, not arms."

That is exactly what we need to remember here in Congress. We can have adequate military security without overspending on fraud and waste. We can far better contribute to the security of the world by sharing our farm abundance and technical knowledge through the Food for Peace and other assistance programs, than we can by arming every nation to the teeth. And our farms themselves, as Chairman de la Garza HAS RECOGNIZED IN NAMING THE HOUSE FARM BILL THE FOOD SECURITY ACT OF 1985, ARE, IN A VERY REAL SENSE, A BASIC BUILDING BLOCK OF OUR NATIONAL SECURITY.

I have said many times that we ought to compete with the Soviet Union not in arms sales to other countries -- where they can match us weapon for weapon -- but in agricultural exports, where there is no contest. We all know that the Soviet Union must buy a significant amount of grain even to meet its own needs, much of it from the United States.

But it is not enough just to point out the faults of this administration on farm policy. Responsible criticism must be

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

accompanied by ideas for change. That is why, over the past months here in Congress, I have worked in three different areas for change in our farm and foreign policy:

First, I firmly believe that we can do a better job of spending those Federal resources we have for agriculture by targeting farm program benefits to family-size farms. I introduced such a bill early in this session, and I supported the amendment sponsored by Congressmen Glickman, Slattery, and others, which incorporated targeting as a major component. I was disappointed when that amendment lost by a narrow margin in the House yesterday. I would hope, since the Senate Agriculture Committee's farm bill does have a targeting feature, that perhaps we could achieve this in the conference committee on the farm bill.

Second, we need to explore new ways to boost our slumping agricultural exports. I believe that barter presents us with such an opportunity. Since this administration has not agreed, I am introducing an amendment which requires the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct a barter pilot program to test the workability of this idea.

Third, I have worked to freeze foreign aid at current levels, preserving needed humanitarian aid and stopping the runaway growth in security and military aid.

I urge my colleagues to keep these principles in mind as we debate the 1985 farm bill. Our family farms are truly our first line of defense. I urge President Reagan to start caring about family farms.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the attempt to reduce target prices.

The Agriculture Committee went through a painful process to get a farm bill which was within the budget limits. We had to cut several important programs, but the one thing we all agreed on was that the basic farm income supports must remain in place.

Farmers are being stretched to the limit trying to cover the gap between their rising costs of production and the falling farm prices. We can't promise them that this farm bill will solve their problems. But we can give them a bill that says, "Hang in there and we'll see you through." Now some Members want to take away even that assurance. Having seen the situation of farmers from Champaign County clear down to White County at the other end of my district. I cannot go along with the attempt to lower target prices.

The economic arguments we get here in the House sometimes overlook the human picture. Last spring the University of Illinois Extension Service opened a hotline for farmers in trouble. In the first 5 days the hotline handled 200 calls. Today they continue to field calls from farmers all over Illinois. The callers ask for financial counseling, they ask for help finding jobs off the farm, they ask how they can deal with the stress they are under. The farm crisis is real, and we cannot turn our backs on farmers.

A 5-percent drop in target prices each year may not sound like much, but over 4 years that means corn farmers would lose 60 cents on each bushel of corn they produce. I can tell you right now that corn is not going to be 60 cents cheaper to produce in 1990.

The farm bill the Agriculture Committee brought to the floor provides that if the cost of production does drop, the Secretary of Agriculture may lower target prices correspondingly. I believe that this approach makes sense. We have a farm budget Congress can live with -- let's pass a farm bill farmers can live with. I urge you to defeat this amendment.

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. de la Garza].

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand a recorded vote, and pending that I make the point of order that a

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

quorum is not present.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count for a recorded vote.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I made a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would state to the gentleman that a quorum is not necessary on a motion to rise. It is only required on a negative vote, so if the gentleman requests a recorded vote, he will have to have Members rise.

The Chair will count all those standing.

An insufficient number; a recorded vote is rejected.

So the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. Foley] having assumed the chair, Mr. Bonior of Michigan, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that 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. 336]

AYES -- 151

| | | |
|--------------|-------------|--------------|
| Alexander | Anthony | Archer |
| Armey | Bartlett | Barton |
| Bedell | Bereuter | Boulter |
| Breaux | Broomfield | Brown (CO) |
| Broyhill | Bruce | Burton (IN) |
| Chapman | Chappie | Cheney |
| Coats | Cobey | Coble |
| Coleman (MO) | Combest | Craig |
| Crane | Daniel | Dannemeyer |
| Daschle | Daub | DeLay |
| DeWine | Dorgan (ND) | Dreier |
| Durbin | Eckert (NY) | Edwards (OK) |
| Emerson | English | Evans (IA) |
| Evans (IL) | Fawell | Fiedler |
| Fowler | Franklin | Frenzel |
| Fuqua | Gingrich | Glickman |
| Goodling | Gradison | Grotberg |
| Gunderson | Hall, Ralph | Hamilton |

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

| | | |
|--------------------|---------------|---------------|
| Hammerschmidt | Hansen | Hendon |
| Henry | Hiler | Hillis |
| Hopkins | Huckaby | Hyde |
| Ireland | Jeffords | Jenkins |
| Johnson | Jones (OK) | Kasich |
| Kastenmeier | Kolbe | Kramer |
| Lagomarsino | Latta | Leach (IA) |
| Leath (TX) | Lightfoot | Loeffler |
| Lundine | Lungren | Madigan |
| Marlenee | Martin (IL) | McCain |
| McCandless | McCurdy | McEwen |
| McHugh | McMillan | Meyers |
| Michel | Miller (OH) | Monson |
| Montgomery | Moody | Moore |
| Moorhead | Morrison (WA) | Myers |
| Nelson | Nielson | Obey |
| Oxley | Pashayan | Penny |
| Petri | Porter | Pursell |
| Ray | Regula | Roberts |
| Robinson | Roemer | Rogers |
| Roth | Rudd | Schroeder |
| Schuette | Seiberling | Sensenbrenner |
| Sharp | Shuster | Siljander |
| Skeen | Skelton | Slattery |
| Slaughter | Smith (IA) | Smith (NE) |
| Smith, Robert (OR) | Stallings | Stangeland |
| Stenholm | Strang | Stump |
| Sweeney | Swindall | Synar |
| Tallon | Tauke | Taylor |
| Thomas (CA) | Visclosky | Volkmer |
| Walker | Watkins | Weber |
| Whittaker | Wirth | Wylie |
| Zschau | | |

NOES -- 269

| | | |
|----------|----------|-----------|
| Ackerman | Akaka | Anderson |
| Andrews | Annunzio | Applegate |

| | | |
|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| Aspin | Atkins | AuCoin |
| Badham | Barnes | Bateman |
| Bates | Beilenson | Bennett |
| Bentley | Biaggi | Bilirakis |
| Bliley | Boehlert | Boggs |
| Boland | Boner (TN) | Bonior (MI) |
| Bonker | Bosco | Boucher |
| Boxer | Brooks | Brown (CA) |
| Bryant | Burton (CA) | Bustamante |
| Byron | Callahan | Campbell |
| Carney | Carper | Carr |
| Chandler | Chappell | Clay |
| Clinger | Coelho | Coleman (TX) |
| Collins | Conte | Conyers |
| Cooper | Coughlin | Courter |
| Coyne | Crockett | Darden |
| Davis | de la Garza | Dellums |
| Derrick | Dickinson | Dicks |
| Dingell | DioGuardi | Dixon |
| Donnelly | Dornan (CA) | Dowdy |
| Downey | Duncan | Dwyer |
| Dymally | Dyson | Early |
| Eckart (OH) | Edgar | Edwards (CA) |
| Erdreich | Fascell | Fazio |
| Feighan | Fields | Fish |
| Flippo | Florio | Foglietta |
| Foley | Ford (MI) | Ford (TN) |
| Frank | Frost | Gallo |
| Garcia | Gaydos | Gejdenson |
| Gekas | Gephardt | Gibbons |
| Gilman | Gonzalez | Gordon |
| Gray (IL) | Green | Gregg |
| Guarini | Hall (OH) | Hartnett |
| Hatcher | Hawkins | Hayes |
| Hefner | Heftel | Hertel |
| Holt | Horton | Howard |
| Hoyer | Hubbard | Hughes |
| Hunter | Hutto | Jacobs |

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

| | | |
|--------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| Jones (NC) | Jones (TN) | Kanjorski |
| Kaptur | Kemp | Kennelly |
| Kildee | Kleczka | Kolter |
| Kostmayer | LaFalce | Lantos |
| Lehman (CA) | Lehman (FL) | Leland |
| Lent | Levin (MI) | Levine (CA) |
| Lewis (CA) | Lewis (FL) | Lipinski |
| Livingston | Lloyd | Long |
| Lott | Lowery (CA) | Lowry (WA) |
| Lujan | Luken | Mack |
| MacKay | Markey | Martin (NY) |
| Martinez | Matsui | Mavroules |
| Mazzoli | McCloskey | McCollum |
| McDade | McGrath | McKernan |
| McKinney | Mica | Mikulski |
| Miller (CA) | Miller (WA) | Mineta |
| Mitchell | Moakley | Molinari |
| Mollohan | Morrison (CT) | Mrazek |
| Murphy | Murtha | Natcher |
| Neal | Nichols | Nowak |
| O'Brien | Oakar | Oberstar |
| Olin | Ortiz | Packard |
| Panetta | Parris | Pease |
| Pepper | Perkins | Pickle |
| Price | Quillen | Rahall |
| Rangel | Reid | Richardson |
| Ridge | Rinaldo | Ritter |
| Roe | Rose | Rostenkowski |
| Roukema | Rowland (CT) | Rowland (GA) |
| Roybal | Russo | Sabo |
| Savage | Saxton | Schaefer |
| Scheuer | Schneider | Schulze |
| Schumer | Shaw | Shelby |
| Shumway | Sikorski | Sisisky |
| Smith (FL) | Smith (NJ) | Smith, Denny (OR) |
| Smith, Robert (NH) | Snowe | Snyder |
| Solarz | Solomon | Spence |
| Spratt | Staggers | Stark |

| | | |
|-------------|------------|-------------|
| Stokes | Stratton | Studds |
| Sundquist | Swift | Tauzin |
| Thomas (GA) | Torres | Torricelli |
| Towns | Traficant | Traxler |
| Udall | Valentine | Vander Jagt |
| Vucanovich | Walgren | Weaver |
| Weiss | Wheat | Whitehurst |
| Whitley | Whitten | Williams |
| Wilson | Wise | Wolf |
| Wolpe | Wortley | Wyden |
| Yates | Yatron | Young (AK) |
| Young (FL) | Young (MO) | |

NOT VOTING -- 14

| | | |
|----------|------------|-----------|
| Addabbo | Barnard | Berman |
| Bevill | Borski | Gray (PA) |
| Kindness | Manton | Owens |
| Rodino | St Germain | Vento |
| Waxman | Wright | |

[Roll No. 337]

AYES -- 313

| | | |
|------------|------------|-------------|
| Ackerman | Akaka | Anderson |
| Andrews | Annunzio | Anthony |
| Applegate | Archer | Aspin |
| Atkins | AuCoin | Barnes |
| Bartlett | Bateman | Bates |
| Bedell | Beilenson | Bennett |
| Bentley | Bereuter | Biaggi |
| Bliley | Boehlert | Boggs |
| Boland | Boner (TN) | Bonior (MI) |
| Bonker | Bosco | Boucher |
| Boxer | Breaux | Brooks |
| Broomfield | Brown (CA) | Brown (CO) |
| Bruce | Bryant | Burton (CA) |
| Bustamante | Byron | Carper |

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

| | | |
|-------------|---------------|--------------|
| Chandler | Chapman | Chappell |
| Clay | Clinger | Coats |
| Coelho | Collins | Conte |
| Conyers | Cooper | Coughlin |
| Courter | Coyne | Crane |
| Crockett | Dannemeyer | Darden |
| Daschle | Daub | de la Garza |
| Dellums | Derrick | DeWine |
| Dicks | Dingell | DioGuardi |
| Dixon | Donnelly | Dorgan (ND) |
| Dornan (CA) | Dowdy | Downey |
| Dreier | Duncan | Durbin |
| Dwyer | Dyson | Early |
| Eckart (OH) | Edgar | Edwards (CA) |
| English | Erdreich | Evans (IL) |
| Fascell | Fawell | Fazio |
| Feighan | Fields | Fish |
| Flippo | Florio | Foglietta |
| Foley | Ford (MI) | Ford (TN) |
| Fowler | Frank | Frenzel |
| Fuqua | Gallo | Garcia |
| Gaydos | Gejdenson | Gephardt |
| Gibbons | Gilman | Glickman |
| Gonzalez | Goodling | Gordon |
| Gradison | Green | Gregg |
| Guarini | Gunderson | Hall (OH) |
| Hamilton | Hammerschmidt | Hartnett |
| Hayes | Hefner | Heftel |
| Henry | Hertel | Hiler |
| Horton | Howard | Hoyer |
| Huckaby | Hughes | Hunter |
| Hutto | Jacobs | Jeffords |
| Jenkins | Johnson | Jones (NC) |
| Jones (OK) | Jones (TN) | Kanjorski |
| Kaptur | Kastenmeier | Kennelly |
| Kildee | Kindness | Klecza |
| Kolbe | Kolter | Kostmayer |
| Kramer | LaFalce | Lagomarsino |

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

| | | |
|--------------|--------------------|---------------|
| Lantos | Leach (IA) | Lehman (CA) |
| Lehman (FL) | Leland | Lent |
| Levin (MI) | Levine (CA) | Lewis (FL) |
| Lipinski | Lloyd | Long |
| Lowery (CA) | Lowry (WA) | Lujan |
| Luken | Lundine | Lungren |
| MacKay | Markey | Martin (IL) |
| Martin (NY) | Martinez | Matsui |
| Mavroules | Mazzoli | McCain |
| McCloskey | McCollum | McCurdy |
| McDade | McEwen | McGrath |
| McHugh | McKernan | Meyers |
| Mica | Mikulski | Miller (CA) |
| Miller (OH) | Miller (WA) | Mineta |
| Mitchell | Moakley | Molinari |
| Mollohan | Moody | Morrison (CT) |
| Murphy | Murtha | Myers |
| Natcher | Neal | Nelson |
| Nowak | O'Brien | Oakar |
| Oberstar | Obey | Olin |
| Ortiz | Panetta | Pashayan |
| Pease | Penny | Pepper |
| Perkins | Petri | Pickle |
| Porter | Price | Quillen |
| Rahall | Rangel | Ray |
| Reid | Richardson | Ridge |
| Rinaldo | Ritter | Robinson |
| Roe | Roemer | Rostenkowski |
| Roth | Roukema | Rowland (CT) |
| Rowland (GA) | Roybal | Russo |
| Sabo | Savage | Saxton |
| Scheuer | Schneider | Schroeder |
| Schumer | Seiberling | Sensenbrenner |
| Sharp | Shelby | Sikorski |
| Sisisky | Slattery | Smith (FL) |
| Smith (NJ) | Smith, Robert (NH) | Snowe |
| Solarz | Spence | Spratt |
| Staggers | Stallings | Stangeland |

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

| | | |
|------------|-------------|-------------|
| Stark | Stokes | Stratton |
| Studds | Sundquist | Sweeney |
| Swift | Swindall | Synar |
| Tallon | Tauke | Tauzin |
| Taylor | Thomas (CA) | Thomas (GA) |
| Torres | Torricelli | Towns |
| Traficant | Valentine | Visclosky |
| Walgren | Watkins | Waxman |
| Weber | Weiss | Wheat |
| Whitley | Whittaker | Williams |
| Wilson | Wirth | Wise |
| Wolf | Wolpe | Wortley |
| Wyden | Yates | Yatron |
| Young (AK) | Young (FL) | Young (MO) |
| Zschau | | |

NOES -- 90

| | | |
|-------------|--------------|---------------|
| Arney | Badham | Barton |
| Bilirakis | Boulter | Broyhill |
| Callahan | Carney | Carr |
| Chappie | Cheney | Cobey |
| Coble | Coleman (MO) | Coleman (TX) |
| Combest | Craig | Daniel |
| Davis | DeLay | Dickinson |
| Eckert (NY) | Edwards (OK) | Emerson |
| Evans (IA) | Fiedler | Franklin |
| Gekas | Gray (IL) | Grotberg |
| Hall, Ralph | Hansen | Hendon |
| Holt | Hopkins | Hubbard |
| Hyde | Ireland | Kasich |
| Latta | Leath (TX) | Lewis (CA) |
| Lightfoot | Livingston | Loeffler |
| Lott | Mack | Madigan |
| Marlenee | McCandless | McMillan |
| Michel | Monson | Montgomery |
| Moore | Moorhead | Morrison (WA) |
| Nichols | Nielson | Packard |

131 Cong Rec H 8222 Thursday, October 3, 1985

| | | |
|-------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| Pursell | Regula | Roberts |
| Rogers | Rose | Schaefer |
| Schuette | Shaw | Shumway |
| Shuster | Siljander | Skeen |
| Skelton | Slaughter | Smith (IA) |
| Smith (NE) | Smith, Denny (OR) | Smith, Robert (OR) |
| Snyder | Solomon | Stenholm |
| Strang | Stump | Traxler |
| Vander Jagt | Volkmer | Vucanovich |
| Walker | Whitten | Wylie |

NOT VOTING -- 31

| | | |
|-------------|------------|------------|
| Addabbo | Alexander | Barnard |
| Berman | Bevill | Borski |
| Burton (IN) | Campbell | Dymally |
| Frost | Gingrich | Gray (PA) |
| Hatcher | Hawkins | Hillis |
| Kemp | Manton | McKinney |
| Mrazek | Owens | Oxley |
| Parris | Rodino | Rudd |
| Schulze | St Germain | Udall |
| Vento | Weaver | Whitehurst |
| Wright | | |

SUBJECT: AGRICULTURAL MARKETING (90%); AGRICULTURAL PRICES (79%); LAKES (79%); COMMODITIES TRADING (79%); AGENCY RULEMAKING (59%); AGRICULTURAL INCOME (59%); EXPORT PRICES (59%); BUDGET (59%); TRADE DEVELOPMENT (59%); FORECLOSURE (59%); ADMIRALTY LAW (59%); CONTRACTS & BIDS (59%); TARIFFS & DUTIES (59%); AGRICULTURE (59%); JOB CREATION (59%); LEGISLATION (59%); MARINE SHIPPING (59%); AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY REGULATION (59%); INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE (59%); AGRICULTURAL LAW (59%); INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (59%); EXPORT TRADE (59%); AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENTS (59%); US FEDERAL GOVERNMENT (59%); TAXES & TAXATION (59%); IMPORT TRADE (59%);