

truly a historic moment in the life of this House and for the future of Social Security. We have to be committed to the future of Social Security not to spend Social Security money today. We can and we are in the process of putting this budget together without spending the surplus. We have to stay committed to that. We cannot let the American people believe that has already happened, because it has not. We cannot let the message go forth from this House that we are going to continue business as usual when we are not.

#### THE TRUTH IS REPUBLICANS PLAN NOT TO SPEND THE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND

(Mr. EHLERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I saw a Democratic member of this Congress on television stating that the Republicans were going to spend Social Security money to finally get the appropriations bills passed. I was astounded, absolutely astounded. First of all, he is wrong. We are not planning to do that. What is even worse, although I have been here only 5 years, I did serve under a Democratic administration of this House that first year I was here. Not only did we take Social Security money and spend it, we took every cent of Social Security money and spent it. Not only did we take all of the Social Security money and spend it, but we spent a couple of hundred billion dollars beyond that and added that to the national debt. That is what we had 5 years ago here in this House under Democratic control. Today the Republicans are controlling it. We are not adding to the national debt. We are trying not to spend a cent of Social Security to get our budget out. What a dramatic change, and to have someone from the other side say we are breaking the rules is just utter nonsense. Listen to the truth and the truth is things are much better today.

#### A TAX CUT IS POSSIBLE WITHOUT SPENDING THE SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUS

(Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, we may have heard the recent propaganda coming out of the White House and from the liberal tax-and-spend Democrats here in the House. The word is that a tax cut would take money from Social Security and from paying down the debt. The truth is the tax cut that the President vetoed would have allowed the American people to keep \$792 billion of their money over the next 10 years. It would have not touched Social Security. It would pay down the debt by \$2.2 trillion.

The truth is, as the former speaker said, for 40 years, a liberal tax-and-spend Democrat Congress spent the Social Security trust fund money as fast as they could on every big government program they could think of.

□ 1030

To hear them today say that they want to pay down the debt, that they want to save Social Security, is an absolute joke. They never have; they never will. What they want the money for is to spend, and to spend it on bigger and more intrusive government.

#### TAX CUTS VERSUS SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUS

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, we are hearing rhetoric from the other side of the aisle that should make them ashamed of themselves for trying to deceive the American public. Because the truth is the Republicans had every intention of using the Social Security surplus to pay for their trillion dollar tax cut.

I have some news for all of my colleagues. No one was fooled by it. And it is also no secret that the Republicans have already spent \$30 billion of the Social Security monies before we even start debating the rest of the spending bills. And now they are scrambling to use every budget trick in the book to pretend otherwise.

Well, I am here to tell my Republican friends that it just will not work. The people in this country know better. I applaud the President for vetoing the Republican payoff to their wealthy contributors and preventing the majority party in Congress from dipping into the Social Security surplus even further to fund what they consider the most important benefit of this country, tax breaks to the very wealthiest people, the top 1 percent.

#### ARREST OF ZHANG RONGLIANG

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the attention of my colleagues the very unfortunate case of Zhang Rongliang, one of the most prominent church leaders in the People's Republic of China. During the month of August, Chinese officials arrested over 30 House church leaders, including Mr. Zhang. It is reported that government security officers burst into a meeting of his church, telling the gathering that they were a cult, engaged in illegal activities.

Last year, Mr. Zhang made it clear by signing the United Appeal to the Chinese Government and the House Church Confession of Faith that he has no desire to undermine his nation. In-

stead, his desire is to serve the people of China.

Mr. Speaker, the actions of the Chinese Government in this case are a blatant violation of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which they have agreed to uphold. Mr. Zhang is not a criminal and should not be treated as such.

The actions of the Chinese Government in this case, and others like it, are undermining their own ability to bring China fully into the community of nations. I urge them to immediately release Mr. Zhang and others unjustly arrested and imprisoned because of their religious beliefs.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2559, AGRICULTURAL RISK PROTECTION ACT OF 1999

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 308 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 308

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2559) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to strengthen the safety net for agricultural producers by providing greater access to more affordable risk management tools and improved protection from production and income loss, to improve the efficiency and integrity of the Federal crop insurance program, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Agriculture now printed in the bill, modified by the amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered by title rather than by section. Each title shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII and except pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate. Each amendment so printed may be offered only by the Member who caused it to be printed or his designee, shall be considered as read, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business,

provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUSSLE). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us today is a modified open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 2559, the Agriculture Risk Protection Act.

The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill.

The rule provides 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member on the Committee on Agriculture.

The rule makes in order the Committee on Agriculture's amendment in the nature of a substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, modified by the amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying the resolution.

The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified.

The rule provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be open for amendment by title.

The rule makes in order only those amendments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate only.

The rule provides that the amendment may be offered only by the Member who caused it to be printed or his designee, which shall be considered as read and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

The rule allows the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill, and to reduce voting time to 5 minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a 15-minute vote.

Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, passage of this rule will allow the House to consider this very important piece of legislation, the Agriculture Risk Protection Act. The Agriculture Risk Protection Act is the right legislative response to the current plight of our Nation's farmers and ranchers.

It is no secret that agriculture commodity prices are down. Natural disasters, including hurricanes, floods, and droughts have only added insult to this injury. We must give agriculture producers the tools to manage risk in a responsible way. This bill is a large step in that direction.

This legislation provides better insurance coverage at a lower cost for our Nation's farmers. It provides affordable coverage at every level, with strong incentives to purchase higher levels of protection and new flexibility for producers to choose the level of coverage that best meets their needs.

Additionally, this legislation, for the first time, creates a pilot program that offers insurance assistance to livestock farmers and ranchers who suffer the same problems of volatile weather and markets that hurt crop farmers.

This legislation empowers those who understand the kind of insurance that farmers need, instead of government bureaucrats. Under this plan, new programs are developed by reimbursing universities, farm organizations, co-ops, and even individual farmers who research and develop a policy that is successful.

As many of my colleagues know, this is also an important issue to me as a Texan. In Texas, we have experienced historic droughts during 2 of the past 4 years. During these droughts, I have worked actively with not only my farmers and ranchers, but also with State, county, and local officials to find ways to survive these dry conditions.

Unfortunately, there is no easy way to manage crops and livestock once these severe drought conditions are experienced. After living through these droughts, I have made a conscious effort this year to get my district ready for the potential of the dry weather that we knew would happen. Through proactive planning sessions held in each county in my district, I made plans to try and make sure that my farmers and ranchers were prepared. However, it is common sense for us to know that being prepared is better off than reacting to the weather.

This legislation makes sure every farmer and rancher has the tools necessary for this preparation. Clearly, proactive steps such as these are needed at the Federal level. Under current conditions, too many farmers are unable to afford crop insurance. When natural disasters strike, the Federal Government assists victims with taxpayer dollars. By increasing Federal contributions to tax insurance, such insurance becomes more affordable, and there is less need for taxpayer dollars for reactive solutions.

The Agriculture Risk Protection Act is a common sense, fiscally conservative way to properly prepare for natural disasters that impact agriculture production. I urge my colleagues to support this rule.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule, which provides for consideration of crop insurance reform.

Mr. Speaker, farmers across this country are facing a disaster. The bill, as far as it goes, makes improvements in crop insurance that will probably provide some relief. But, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, this bill misses an opportunity to make substantial changes in the crop insurance program that could yield long-term relief and provide a real safety net to the agricultural sector.

However, this bill can be improved, and the rule allows for the consideration of amendments that seek to accomplish that end. While Democratic members of the Committee on Rules might ordinarily object to a rule that requires preprinting of amendments, in this case, because of the tactical nature of agriculture programs, we will not do so.

Mr. Speaker, my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), will offer a significant amendment that seeks to provide assistance to those producers who are the most in need and which addresses the long-term problems of the cyclical nature of agriculture. That assistance would come in the form of a supplemental income payment program, which squarely addresses the issue of price disasters. His amendment deserves serious consideration and support of the House.

Mr. Speaker, this rule will allow the consideration of amendments which can improve this legislation, and I urge its adoption.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my very good friend from Dallas for yielding me this time, and I congratulate him on his fine statement and his work on this.

I mention that he is from Dallas. I feel compelled to bring at least a modicum of geographic balance to this debate. As I look at the manager of the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), the manager on the minority side, the other gentleman from Dallas; and then once we pass the rule, we look at the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST), and the manager on the minority side will be the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

So I am pleased to bring some geographic balance to this debate and say this, obviously, is an issue which transcends simply our friends from Texas

and is, in fact, a very, very important issue.

I think that the statement that was made by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is right on target when he says that it is better to be prepared rather than simply reacting to weather. And we clearly know that, as we have been dealing with disasters that have hit throughout the past several weeks and months here in this country and the tragedies that we have witnessed around the world.

Obviously, this legislation, which enjoys strong bipartisan support, as does the rule, is designed to ensure that we have better risk management and those tools that are essential to an industry which obviously is dependent on the weather.

□ 1045

So I simply want to congratulate my friend and say that I am pleased to join in support of what is obviously a very, very important step to make sure that we maintain a continuity for ranchers and farmers in this country.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Lubbock, Texas (Mr. COMBEST), the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) for bringing a regional balance to this, as well as for his great work on the Committee on Rules in providing this rule. I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) and the other gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

Mr. Speaker, I just would like to say I rise in support of this rule. I think it is a process by which all Members should have an opportunity if they have desires to discuss this subject. It should give plenty of time for that. There are some amendments. We will be dealing with those, as well.

To the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) I would say, I appreciated his opening comments and statement. I just wanted to make the point, Mr. Speaker, that while the \$6 billion additional money for crop insurance that was provided for in the budget which passed this House several months ago is in itself very significant in that this is, I think, the largest increase in crop insurance, that alone is not what I believe is probably the best part of this bill.

One of the major problems that we have confronted with farm policy for many, many years is the lack of adequate risk management. To actually begin to move toward adequate risk management, it is important to make some major changes. This bill does that, and I think there are very positive changes.

We saw a disaster package last year of \$6 billion. There is one being consid-

ered today and may be considered this week that is going to be probably in excess of \$8 billion. While this alone does not solve that problem, nor would I want to lead any of my colleagues to believe that it would totally solve it, I do believe that this is the first major step in a right direction to help provide adequate protection and much needed protection.

To my colleagues who may not have an opportunity to deal in agricultural policy or who do not have a lot of farmers maybe in their districts, I would like to just make a brief explanation of why this is so important.

Almost in every endeavor of life, Mr. Speaker, whether they are buying homeowner's insurance, whether they are a businessman or businesswoman that happens to have a small business or a large business, it is possible for people to protect themselves by buying insurance. They can buy it to protect their home. They can buy it to protect their inventory.

If the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) and I are in business side by side and my inventory costs more than his inventory, I buy more insurance. It costs me more, but I can buy that. And if something happens to that inventory through some disaster that is covered by the insurance policy, then the insurance policy pays and I buy insurance on my next warehouseful of inventory.

Unfortunately, one the real fallacies in crop insurance has been that farmers cannot cover their capability. As an example, if my colleague is a farmer, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) is a farmer and can grow 50 acres of wheat on a normal year on a normal basis and he puts his input costs in to grow 50 bushels of wheat on his farm but because of past problems that have occurred, there are some antiquated historical data information that is used to determine how much insurance the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) could buy and he might only be able to buy insurance to cover 25 or 30 bushels of his crop but his input costs are to produce a 50-bushel crop of wheat, it is not advantageous, even under the maximum amount that could be purchased, for him to buy insurance. It is not cost effective. It does not adequately cover him. And there is no incentive.

So what we are trying to do in this proposal is to give him an opportunity to have his actual production capability or movement toward his actual production capability to be able to insure for.

This bill also is a major step in the right direction for revenue assurance, and that is very important to people that farm in areas that do not have historical natural disasters and generally always make a crop. Because the revenue aspect or the downward turn in revenue aspect are one of the reasons we are looking at disaster and emergency packages today, farm assistance, because of low market prices, some of the lowest we have seen in many, many years.

So this does have a good program in it to provide insurance for revenue loss. It does increase the subsidy substantially that the farmer receives for buying insurance. We believe that this creates real incentives, albeit not as far as I would like to see it.

I will tell my colleagues that, in the next couple of years, we intend to even move forward with a second phase of crop insurance reform. But it is important for there to be a risk management tool available to farmers that is, number one, economically feasible and, number two, it covers their crops in an adequate fashion and creates an incentive to buy rather than disincentive, which I think today is the case.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this is a major move in the right direction for risk management that I think will lessen the impact of natural disasters or low commodity prices in the future, and I would commend it to my colleagues and ask for their support.

Again, I am strongly in support of the rule, and I appreciate the Committee on Rules for its efforts.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, we reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL), who comes from a huge agriculture State.

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the two gentlemen from Texas who are managing the rule for a good rule and the two gentlemen from Texas who will be managing the bill for a good bill.

Mr. Speaker, as our colleagues are listening to the debate, they will be able to distinguish the difference between the Texans and the rest of us because the Texans will say "insurance" and the rest of us will say "insurance" when we talk about this. So that is one of the ways we can tell the difference.

Crop insurance is the primary risk management tools that producers have. It helps them and has historically helped them manage the greatest risks they have and that is, of course, the loss of crop, a catastrophic loss of their crop. But as we have asked producers to produce for the marketplace, it has been apparent that we need to make some changes in the risk management tools that we have to help them do a better job of doing that. We need to do that in a fashion that does not distort the marketplace, and that is not easy to do. But this bill goes a long way in helping us address those concerns. I want to just touch on some of them.

One of them, for example, is to make it more accessible for those who would produce alternative crops to get crop insurance. One of the things we are asking producers to do is to diversify their production, to reduce their risk to the catastrophic potential that weather might have on an individual crop or that prices might have on an individual crop. This bill makes alternative crops more accessible for insurance.

One of the problems with the existing program is that the amount of support the Government gives to lower levels of insurance is greater than the amount of support we give to higher levels of insurance. And the consequence of that is that it actually discourages many producers from participating in the crop insurance program and then it reduces the effectiveness of it.

This bill increases support for the highest levels of guaranty, actually across the board, which should encourage more producers to participate. Many producers will tell us that crop insurance is not affordable, and this bill will help that by adding more support across the board, as I mentioned.

Without this bill, the crop insurance premiums for producers is going to go up about 30 percent, which would be a catastrophic thing to occur given the hardship that is out there in ag country right now. Without this bill, we will have a 30-percent increase. This bill avoids that increase.

The current program hits producers when they are down. If they have a number of bad production years, the amount of insurance that they can buy goes down based upon their average production. This bill allows them to take on some of those bad years to be able to keep their insurance level high enough so that they can get enough insurance to cover production costs and to cover their loan.

The program also now introduces the idea of premium discounts. If they have a number of good years where they do not have a claim and they have good production years, they can actually get a discount on their premium, which will help it be more affordable to producers.

It also expands the principle of revenue insurance. One of the things we discovered is that production loss is not the only loss that producers need to be able to manage the risk of. There is also the potential of price loss. This bill allows producers to insure their revenue, which covers both price and production risks.

Lastly, the bill allows livestock producers for the first time to participate in the crop insurance program and the risk management principles that are associated with it.

I just want to again congratulate the ranking member and the chairman for bringing forward a very good rule and a very good bill, and I would urge all my colleagues to support both the rule and the bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES).

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) for bringing a great rule to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, as many people know, we have heard from California and Montana and Texas, now we go to the East Coast, North Carolina, where floods have inundated our farmers and our families.

I come to the floor today to voice my strong support for a good rule, for a good bill, H.R. 2559, the Agricultural Risk Protection Act.

I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Chairman COMBEST) the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING) and others for the work that they and the staff have done with Members, farm constituents, and agricultural associations to put together this thoughtful, far-sighted crop insurance bill which is covered by this rule.

Over the past several months, I have traveled around my district, the 8th of North Carolina, and spent dozens of hours listening to farmers and ranchers telling me about the state of the farm economy.

In February, I, with the help of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING) and the Committee on Agriculture, hosted a field hearing in Laurinburg, North Carolina, to learn farmers' concern about the current crop insurance program and what changes they felt needed to be implemented to achieve meaningful reform.

The Committee on Agriculture took the comments of my farmers and the comments of other farmers around the country and passed a bill which addresses their concerns and strengthens crop insurance and provides better risk management tools for farmers and ranchers. Crop insurance is just one recent example of how the Committee on Agriculture takes a grass roots approach to learning about a problem and then, with a bipartisan effort, efficiently works to solve it. We are now looking to our colleagues here in the full House and the Senate to help us implement this reform and pass this rule.

H.R. 2559 is a good bill created, for the most part, by our own farmers. This bill will provide long-term assistance badly needed. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this rule and the bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Dallas, Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a modified, open rule. It is a good rule. It allows us to discuss federal agricultural policy as we deal with dramatic changes in agriculture.

Last February, I served on the Committee on the Budget as well as the Committee on Agriculture, and last February we decided in the Committee on the Budget that we were going to include in the budget \$6 billion from the year 2001 to 2004. The Budget Resolution funding would be to help farmers adjust to the challenges of survival that Americans now face. The 1996 Freedom to Farm legislation provides a phaseout of the old Government programs.

The challenges now facing farmers, include subsidies to farmers in other

countries that put our farmers at a disadvantage, reduced exports and Washington's lack of efforts to be more aggressive in expanding our trade. Certainly the greatest challenge this year are record-low prices that farmers receive for their commodities. So farmers today are receiving record low prices. For example, soybean price is the lowest in the last 30 years. Corn lower than the last 15 years.

This bill helps farmers adjust.

□ 1100

What we are suggesting in this legislation is that insurance be more available to farmers that would add to their tools of reducing risk. This insurance covers two areas: One, insurance for some commodity price protection. Secondly, is what I call sunshine insurance, insurance to cover those farmers against loss in case of natural disasters.

I think the challenge before us, as we revisit federal agricultural policy is how do we make sure that we keep a strong agricultural industry in the United States? If consumers want to continue with the high quality, low cost that they now pay for food in this country, if we want to continue to know the food is safe because we know how it was produced, then we are going to have to save and maintain and make sure we keep strong, stable agriculture in the United States.

We'll examine some other ways that we can help farmers in the future years. Crop insurance deserves taxpayer support because we do not know what the risks are, because those people that are selling that insurance do not have the experience. It is appropriate, it is proper, it is necessary that government support some of those premiums as we get more experience as we encourage farmers to take out crop insurance in the new freedom to farm environment.

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

Mr. Speaker, like my other colleagues who have spoken, I have spent a great deal of time visiting with the farmers and ranchers in my district down through central Texas in recent months. Clearly there needs to be a long-term solution to the crop insurance situation. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) has an amendment which he may or may not offer today, it has been made in order by the Committee on Rules, but the gentleman from Texas as the ranking member on the Committee on Agriculture will be offering a long-term approach to this situation in the months ahead. While today's bill will offer some short-term relief to farmers, there will need to be a more comprehensive approach down the road which the gentleman from Texas will offer at the appropriate time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule so that we may proceed to consideration of this legislation today.

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

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

As my colleague the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) has suggested, I would like to thank the participants from the Committee on Agriculture, including the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST) and also the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) not only for their leadership but for their care and consideration of the men and women who are involved in agribusiness.

Mr. Speaker, I support this rule. I am asking for each one of our Members to support this bipartisan rule and piece of legislation.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUSSLE). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

This 15-minute vote will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 422, nays 1, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 458]

YEAS—422

Abercrombie	Brown (FL)	DeFazio
Ackerman	Brown (OH)	DeGette
Aderholt	Bryant	Delahunt
Allen	Burr	DeLauro
Andrews	Burton	DeLay
Archer	Buyer	DeMint
Army	Callahan	Deutsch
Bachus	Calvert	Diaz-Balart
Baird	Camp	Dickey
Baker	Campbell	Dicks
Baldacci	Canady	Dingell
Baldwin	Cannon	Doggett
Ballenger	Capps	Dooley
Barcia	Capuano	Doolittle
Barr	Cardin	Doyle
Barrett (NE)	Carson	Dreier
Barrett (WI)	Castle	Duncan
Bartlett	Chabot	Dunn
Barton	Chambliss	Edwards
Bass	Chenoweth	Ehlers
Bateman	Clay	Ehrlich
Becerra	Clayton	Emerson
Bentsen	Clement	Engel
Bereuter	Clyburn	English
Berkley	Coble	Eshoo
Berman	Coburn	Etheridge
Berry	Collins	Evans
Biggert	Combest	Everett
Bilbray	Condit	Ewing
Bilirakis	Conyers	Farr
Bishop	Cook	Fattah
Blagojevich	Cooksey	Filner
Bliley	Costello	Fletcher
Blumenauer	Cox	Foley
Blunt	Coyne	Forbes
Boehlert	Cramer	Ford
Boehner	Crane	Fossella
Bonilla	Crowley	Fowler
Bonior	Cubin	Frank (MA)
Bono	Cummings	Franks (NJ)
Borski	Cunningham	Frelinghuysen
Boswell	Danner	Frost
Boucher	Davis (FL)	Gallegly
Boyd	Davis (IL)	Ganske
Brady (PA)	Davis (VA)	Gejdenson
Brady (TX)	Deal	Gekas

Gephardt	Luther
Gibbons	Maloney (CT)
Gilchrist	Maloney (NY)
Gillmor	Manzullo
Gilman	Markey
Gonzalez	Martinez
Goode	Mascara
Goodlatte	Matsui
Goodling	McCarthy (MO)
Gordon	McCarthy (NY)
Goss	McCollum
Graham	McCrery
Granger	McDermott
Green (TX)	McGovern
Green (WI)	McHugh
Greenwood	McInnis
Gutierrez	McIntosh
Gutknecht	McIntyre
Hall (OH)	McKeon
Hall (TX)	McKinney
Hansen	McNulty
Hastings (FL)	Meehan
Hastings (WA)	Meek (FL)
Hayes	Meeks (NY)
Hayworth	Menendez
Hefley	Metcalfe
Herger	Mica
Hill (MT)	Millender-
Hilleary	McDonald
Hilliard	Miller (FL)
Hinchee	Miller, Gary
Hinojosa	Miller, George
Hobson	Minge
Hoefel	Mink
Hoekstra	Moakley
Holden	Mollohan
Holt	Moore
Hoolley	Moran (KS)
Horn	Moran (VA)
Hostettler	Morella
Houghton	Murtha
Hoyer	Myrick
Hulshof	Napolitano
Hunter	Neal
Hutchinson	Nethercutt
Hyde	Ney
Inslee	Northup
Isakson	Norwood
Jackson (IL)	Nussle
Jackson-Lee	Oberstar
(TX)	Obey
Jenkins	Olver
John	Ortiz
Johnson (CT)	Ose
Johnson, E. B.	Owens
Johnson, Sam	Oxley
Jones (NC)	Packard
Jones (OH)	Pallone
Kanjorski	Pascrell
Kaptur	Pastor
Kasich	Paul
Kelly	Payne
Kennedy	Pease
Kildee	Pelosi
Kilpatrick	Peterson (MN)
Kind (WI)	Peterson (PA)
King (NY)	Petri
Kingston	Phelps
Kleczka	Pickering
Klink	Pickett
Knollenberg	Pitts
Kolbe	Pombo
Kucinich	Pomeroy
Kuykendall	Porter
LaFalce	Portman
LaHood	Price (NC)
Lampson	Pryce (OH)
Lantos	Quinn
Largent	Radanovich
Larson	Rahall
Latham	Ramstad
LaTourette	Rangel
Lazio	Regula
Leach	Reyes
Lee	Reynolds
Levin	Riley
Lewis (CA)	Rivers
Lewis (GA)	Rodriguez
Lewis (KY)	Roemer
Linder	Rogan
Lipinski	Rogers
LoBiondo	Rohrabacher
Lofgren	Ros-Lehtinen
Lowe	Rothman
Lucas (KY)	Roukema
Lucas (OK)	Roybal-Allard

NAYS—1

Vento

Royce	Rush
Ryan (WI)	Ryan (KS)
Sabo	Salmon
Sanchez	Sanders
Sandlin	Sanford
Sawyer	Saxton
Schaffer	Schakowsky
Scott	Sensenbrenner
Serrano	Sessions
Shadegg	Shaw
Shays	Sherman
Sherman	Sherwood
Shimkus	Shows
Shuster	Simpson
Sisisky	Skeen
Skelton	Slaughter
Smith (MI)	Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)	Smith (WA)
Snyder	Souder
Spence	Stabenow
Stark	Stearns
Stenholm	Strickland
Stump	Neal
Stupak	Sununu
Sweeney	Talent
Tancredo	Tanner
Tauscher	Tauzin
Taylor (MS)	Taylor (NC)
Terry	Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)	Thornberry
Thune	Thurman
Tierney	Tiahrt
Toomey	Townsend
Towns	Traficant
Turner	Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)	Upton
Velazquez	Visclosky
Vitter	Walsh
Walden	Wamp
Walters	Watkins
Watt (NC)	Waxman
Weiner	Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)	Weller
Wexler	Weygand
Whitfield	Wicker
Wilson	Wolfe
Wise	Woolsey
Wolf	Wynn
Young (AK)	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—10

Dixon	Nadler	Watts (OK)
Hill (IN)	Scarborough	Wu
Istook	Spratt	
Jefferson	Thomas	

□ 1124

Mr. HILLIARD and Mr. RAMSTAD changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 458, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NUSSLE). Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, the pending business is the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 375, nays 43, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 459]

YEAS—375

Abercrombie	Callahan	Doolittle
Ackerman	Calvert	Doyle
Allen	Camp	Dreier
Andrews	Campbell	Duncan
Archer	Canady	Dunn
Armey	Cannon	Edwards
Bachus	Capps	Ehlers
Baldacci	Cardin	Ehrlich
Baldwin	Carson	Emerson
Balenger	Castle	Engel
Barcia	Chabot	Eshoo
Barr	Chambliss	Etheridge
Barrett (NE)	Chenoweth	Evans
Barrett (WI)	Clayton	Everett
Bartlett	Clement	Ewing
Barton	Clyburn	Farr
Bass	Coble	Fattah
Bateman	Coburn	Fletcher
Becerra	Collins	Foley
Bentsen	Combest	Forbes
Bereuter	Condit	Ford
Berkley	Conyers	Fossella
Berman	Cook	Fowler
Berry	Cooksey	Frank (MA)
Biggert	Cox	Franks (NJ)
Bilbray	Coyne	Frelinghuysen
Bilirakis	Cramer	Frost
Bishop	Crowley	Gallegly
Blagojevich	Cummings	Ganske
Bliley	Cunningham	Gejdenson
Blumenauer	Danner	Gekas
Blunt	Davis (FL)	Gephardt
Boehlert	Davis (IL)	Gilchrist
Boehner	Davis (VA)	Gillmor
Bonilla	Deal	Gilman
Bonior	DeGette	Gonzalez
Bono	Delahunt	Goode
Boucher	DeLauro	Goodlatte
Boyd	DeMint	Goodling
Brady (TX)	Deutsch	Goss
Brown (FL)	Diaz-Balart	Graham
Bryant	Dickey	Granger
Buyer	Dicks	Green (TX)
	Dingell	Greenwood
	Doggett	Hall (OH)
	Dooley	Hall (TX)