in the course of evaluating agency rules. Although H.R. 4924 does not require GAO to review public data, neither does it forbid or preclude GAO from doing so. I bring this up, because some hope that H.R. 4924 implicitly contains a gag order, forbidding GAO to consult any analyses or data except those supplied by the agency to be reviewed. This reading of H.R. 4924 would defeat the whole purpose of the bill, which is to enable Congress to comment knowledgeably about agency rules from the standpoint of a truly independent evaluation of those rules.

Instructed by GAO's independent evaluations, Congress will be better equipped to review final agency rules under the CRA. More importantly, Congress will be better equipped to submit timely and knowledgeable comments on proposed rules during the public comment period. I say this, notwithstanding the words ''where practicable,'' which some CORA foes hope will ensure that all GAO analyses of proposed rules are untimely and, therefore, worthless. I am confident that, despite the ''where practicable'' language, GAO will want to please rather than annoy its customers and employers, and will not fail to help Members of Congress submit timely comments on regulatory proposals.

Thus, even though a far cry from the original idea of an independent CORA agency, and although inferior to the Kelly-McIntosh bill reported by the Government Reform Committee, H.R. 4924 will increase the transparency of important regulatory decisions, promote effective Congressional oversight, and increase the accountability of Congress. The best government is a government accountable to the people. For America to have an accountable regulatory system, the people's elected representatives must participate in, and take responsibility for, the rules promulgated under the laws Congress passes. H.R. 4924 is a meaningful step towards Congress's meeting its regulatory oversight responsibility.

f

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

f

FARM ECONOMY IN THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to address this Chamber on the topic of the farm economy in the United States and the agricultural policies that we have adopted in Congress.

The 1996 farm bill, generally called the Freedom to Farm Act, has been effective in one respect, and that is it has given farmers flexibility to plant what they are interested in raising and not be tied as closely to particular commodities by the design of the farm bill itself.

Unfortunately, the Freedom to Farm Act has become a freedom to fail act, and we have farmers that are exiting from farming at a record rate. We have prices for commodities in this country that have dropped to levels that are as low as they have been in 100 years, if we adjust for inflation. We constantly hear about the plight of those who were producing oil and now we have gasoline at $1.50 to $1.75 a gallon throughout the country.

Well, if farmers had seen their prices go up without any adjustment for inflation, they at least would be paying $2.50 for corn, $3.00 for wheat, and higher amounts for other products. Tragically, in the United States, in the midst of a very robust and healthy and growing economy, one sector of the American economy that is hurting severely is agriculture. So I am pleased to announce that today I have joined with my colleague, the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY), and we have introduced legislation that is the Family Farm Safety Net Act of 2000.

The purpose of this legislation is to provide an outline or guide to the type of prices that are necessary in order to enable a farm to survive in the United States.

Since 1996, we can see what has happened to the prices for corn, wheat and soybeans. Prices have dropped precipitously. In 1996, corn was at $2.71 a bushel. Here we are in the summer of the year 2000, corn is roughly half that price at most of the elevators in the Midwest.

b 1715

The drop in the price of wheat has not been quite as dramatic, but it still has come down by roughly $1.80 a bushel, and the price for a bushel of soybeans has come down by about $2.50 a bushel.

This certainly is not success in terms of agricultural policy.

In terms of flexibility, we also have a very frustrating situation. This chart shows what has happened in terms of the planting of wheat compared to the planting of soybeans. Soybeans, according to agricultural economists, are favored by the current situation. Wheat, by comparison, is not as advantageous to raise. So as a consequence, we have seen the acreage of wheat, it has been reduced by thousands of acres, and at the same time, the planting of soybeans has gone up by about a corresponding amount.

Mr. Speaker, we need to reestablish parity among the various crops. One way to do this is to take the loan rate for the marketing loans and harmonize the loan rates so that the loan rates for soybeans, for corn, for wheat, barley and other crops are neutral, and at the same time, have the loan rates pegged at a level where America's farmers can cover most of the costs of their operation. So as a consequence, our proposal is to increase the loan rate for corn as an example, to $2.43 a bushel; the loan rate on soybeans to $5.50 a bushel; to extend the period of the marketing loan to 20 months; and to include payment limitations, so that this farm program does not enrich those that are farming tens of thousands of acres, but instead, focuses its benefits and its attention on those farmers that are moderate size, family farming operations.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that this is the track that we need to take if we are going to get American agriculture back on course, and I urge my colleagues to join with the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) and myself on this legislation.

f

TOPICS OF NATIONAL INTEREST

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to speak on two unrelated, but very important topics of national interest.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, first, I spent 7½ years before coming to Congress as a criminal court judge, trying felony criminal cases. I tried several death penalty cases, and I think I am the only Member of this Congress who has sentenced anyone to the electric chair.

It is almost impossible, Mr. Speaker, to get a jury to return a death sentence today. Despite polls showing very high support for capital punishment, it is one thing to favor the death penalty, but a much more difficult thing to actually impose it. It is so difficult, in fact, that most prosecutors will not even ask for a death sentence except in the most gruesome, horrible cases; and that is the main point I wish to make today, that juries return death sentences only in extremely brutal, terrible crimes.

In fact, it has been the law in this country for many years that an ordinary, simple murder, if there is such a thing, with nothing more, is not a capital case. To have a case justifying the death penalty, there must be aggravating circumstances that outweigh any mitigating factors, anything sympathetic in favor of the defendant. There have to be multiple crimes or killings, circumstances that make the case especially heinous.

I do not think a death sentence is appropriate except in 1 in 1 million very rare, very unusual kinds of cases. But I do believe that there are cases which are so gruesome, so horrendous that a death sentence is the only appropriate punishment. Those who oppose the death penalty should ask themselves, would they oppose it if their daughter or wife or sister was brutally raped as her three small children watched and then all were strangled to death, an actual case.

The media does a great job gaining sympathy for those who are about to be put to death. I wish they would do just as good a job describing the sickening details of the murders that have been