A similar House bill (H.R. 4975) was laid on the table.

□ 1200

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5384, and that I might include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 830 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 5384.

The Chair designates the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and requests the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) to assume the chair temporarily.

□ 1201

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 consideration of the bill (H.R. 5384) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes, with Mr. MILLER of Florida (Acting Chairman) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) and the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to bring before the House today the fiscal year 2007 appropriations bill for Agriculture, Rural Development, the Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies. Before I do so, I would like to say how proud I am to be serving in my final year as chairman of the subcommittee. It has been a great privilege and a great experience.

I want to compliment my ranking member, Ms. DELAURO, for helping us get to this point today to produce a good bill for the American people. My goal every year has been to produce a bipartisan bill.

We began our hearings on the budget on February 15, and we added an additional hearing at the request of Ms. DELAURO on bird flu, which is a very important issue to people not just in this country, but around the world; and I have tried very hard to accommodate every Member who had a request for this bill. But it has been difficult. We received this year over 1,600 individual requests for specific spending from most Members of the House.

I would say that all Members can support this bill and tell their constituents that they voted to improve their lives while maintaining fiscal responsibility.

I would also like to thank all of my subcommittee members on both sides of the aisle for helping to produce this bill, and I would like to thank people who oftentimes don't get recognized for all of the hard work, sometimes on Saturday nights and Sunday mornings, that goes into putting a bill together. It is not just the Members that are elected to serve on this subcommittee and full committee, but we have the committee staff: Martha Foley of the minority staff; Martin Delgado, the great, distinguished leader, the clerk of the subcommittee; Maureen Holohan, Leslie Barrack and Jamie Swafford of the majority staff. In addition, I would like to thank our detailee, Mike Arnold, and Walt Smith from Texas A&M back in Texas at College Station from my personal staff for working hard on this.

I also want to mention some people that I would say have never had their names mentioned before on the floor of the House, but without them we could not be here today. They are the ones that helped put this whole product together: Larry Boarman, Theo Powell, Cathy Edwards, Linda Muir and the staff of the Government Printing Office.

Mr. Chairman, we refer to this bill as the agriculture bill, but it goes so much more than assisting basic agriculture. It also supports rural and economic development, human nutrition, ag exports and land conservation, as well as the food, drug, and medical safety in this country. This bill will cover benefits to of every one of your constituents everyday, no matter what district you represent.

There are some key increases over the fiscal year 2006 spending level in the bill that include the following: $80 million for bird flu; $24 million for food safety; $11 million for the Commodity Supplemental Food Program, the budget request proposed to zero out this program; $34 million for the Farm Service Agency, salaries and expenses; $12 million for farm operating loans; $91 million for the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service; and $20 million for the FDA user-fee programs for prescription drugs, medical devices, and animal drugs.

Mr. Chairman, I will include at this point in the RECORD tabular material relating to the bill.

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 5384)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS					
Production, Processing, and Marketing					
Office of the Secretary	5,076	11,540	5,499	+423	-6,041
Executive Operations:					
Chief Economist	10,434	11,226	11,226	+792	---
National Appeals Division	14,379	14,795	14,795	+416	---
Office of Budget and Program Analysis	8,215	8,479	8,479	+264	---
Homeland Security staff	925	1,114	954	+29	-160
Office of the Chief Information Officer	16,297	16,936	16,936	+639	---
Common computing environment	108,971	108,900	68,971	-40,000	-39,929
Office of the Chief Financial Officer	5,815	19,931	5,991	+176	-13,940
Working capital fund	---	---	---	---	---
Total, Executive Operations	165,036	181,381	127,352	-37,684	-54,029
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights	813	836	836	+23	---
Office of Civil Rights	19,908	22,650	22,650	+2,742	---
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration	669	773	736	+67	-37
Agriculture buildings and facilities and rental payments	(185,857)	(209,814)	(209,814)	(+23,957)	---
Payments to GSA	146,257	155,851	155,851	+9,594	---
Building operations and maintenance	39,600	53,963	53,963	+14,363	---
Hazardous materials management	11,880	12,020	12,020	+140	---
Departmental administration	22,872	28,302	24,114	+1,242	-4,188
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations	3,783	3,940	3,940	+157	---
Office of Communications	9,414	9,695	9,695	+281	---
Office of the Inspector General	79,533	82,493	82,493	+2,960	---
Office of the General Counsel	38,957	40,647	40,455	+1,498	-192
Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education, and Economics	592	694	651	+59	-43
Economic Research Service	75,172	82,544	80,963	+5,791	-1,581
National Agricultural Statistics Service	139,293	152,584	148,719	+9,426	-3,865
Census of Agriculture	(28,824)	(36,582)	(36,582)	(+7,758)	---
Agricultural Research Service:					
Salaries and expenses	1,123,654	1,001,385	1,057,603	-66,051	+56,218
Buildings and facilities	129,883	8,415	140,000	+10,117	+131,585
Total, Agricultural Research Service	1,253,537	1,009,800	1,197,603	-55,934	+187,803
Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service:					
Research and education activities	670,081	566,300	651,606	-18,475	+85,306
Native American Institutions Endowment Fund	(12,000)	(11,880)	(11,880)	(-120)	---
Extension activities	451,395	430,727	457,042	+5,647	+26,315
Integrated activities	55,234	19,120	55,234	---	+36,114
Outreach for socially disadvantaged farmers	5,940	6,930	6,930	+990	---
Total, Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service	1,182,650	1,023,077	1,170,812	-11,838	+147,735
Office of the Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs	717	741	741	+24	---
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service:					
Salaries and expenses	807,306	945,153	898,116	+90,810	-47,037
Animal welfare (user fees) (leg. proposal) NA.	---	(8,221)	---	---	(-8,221)
Buildings and facilities	4,946	6,431	5,946	+1,000	-485
Total, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	812,252	951,584	904,062	+91,810	-47,522

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 5384)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Agricultural Marketing Service:					
Marketing Services	74,622	81,498	77,269	+2,647	-4,229
Standardization (user fees) (leg. proposal) NA	---	(2,212)	---	---	(-2,212)
(Limitation on administrative expenses, from fees collected)	(65,667)	(62,211)	(62,211)	(-3,456)	---
Funds for strengthening markets, income, and supply (transfer from section 32)	16,055	4,106	16,425	+370	+12,319
Agriculture marketing service standardization (user fees) (leg. proposal) NA	---	(12,000)	---	---	(-12,000)
Discretionary appropriations	20,000	---	9,900	-10,100	+9,900
Payments to states and possessions	3,809	1,334	1,334	-2,475	---
Total, Agricultural Marketing Service	114,486	86,938	104,928	-9,558	+17,990
Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration:					
Salaries and expenses	38,059	21,844	39,737	+1,678	+17,893
Grain inspection, packers and stockyards administration (user fees) (leg. proposal)NA	---	(19,663)	---	---	(-19,663)
Limitation on inspection and weighing services	(42,463)	(42,463)	(42,463)	---	---
Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety	596	696	656	+60	-40
Food Safety and Inspection Service	829,378	757,470	853,249	+23,871	+95,779
Food safety inspection (user fees) (leg. prop) NA.	---	(105,435)	---	---	(-105,435)
Lab accreditation fees	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	---	---
Total, Production, Processing, and Marketing	4,990,530	4,692,063	5,041,725	+51,195	+349,662
Farm Assistance Programs					
Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services	629	737	691	+62	-46
Farm Service Agency:					
Salaries and expenses	1,019,700	1,091,359	1,053,760	+34,060	-37,599
Loan deficiency payments (user fees) (leg. proposal) NA	---	(10,000)	---	---	(-10,000)
Conservation reserve program (user fees) (leg. proposal) NA	---	(25,000)	---	---	(-25,000)
(Transfer from export loans)	(1,821)	(346)	(346)	(-1,475)	---
(Transfer from P.L. 480)	(3,185)	(2,651)	(2,651)	(-534)	---
(Transfer from ACIF)	(301,545)	(311,737)	(307,338)	(+5,793)	(-4,399)
(Transfer from farm storage loan program account).	---	(4,560)	---	---	(-4,560)
Subtotal, transfers from program accounts	(306,551)	(319,294)	(310,335)	(+3,784)	(-8,959)
Total, Salaries and expenses	(1,326,251)	(1,410,653)	(1,364,095)	(+37,844)	(-46,558)
State mediation grants	4,208	4,208	4,208	---	---
Grassroot source water protection program	3,713	---	3,713	---	+3,713
Dairy indemnity program	100	100	100	---	---
Subtotal, Farm Service Agency	1,027,721	1,095,667	1,061,781	+34,060	-33,886
Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Farm ownership loans:					
Direct	(205,918)	(222,750)	(222,750)	(+16,832)	---
Guaranteed	(1,386,000)	(1,200,000)	(1,200,000)	(-186,000)	---
Subtotal	(1,591,918)	(1,422,750)	(1,422,750)	(-169,168)	---
Farm operating loans:					
Direct	(643,500)	(643,500)	(643,500)	---	---
Unsubsidized guaranteed	(1,138,500)	(1,025,610)	(1,150,000)	(+11,500)	(+124,390)

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 5384)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Subsidized guaranteed	(271,886)	(272,250)	(272,254)	(+368)	(+4)
Subtotal	(2,053,886)	(1,941,360)	(2,065,754)	(+11,868)	(+124,394)
Indian tribe land acquisition loans	(2,000)	(3,960)	(3,960)	(+1,960)	---
Boll weevil eradication loans	(100,000)	(59,400)	(59,400)	(-40,600)	---
Total, Loan authorizations	(3,747,804)	(3,427,470)	(3,551,864)	(-195,940)	(+124,394)
Loan subsidies:					
Farm ownership loans:					
Direct	10,544	9,333	9,333	-1,211	---
Guaranteed	6,653	---	6,960	+307	+6,960
Subtotal	17,197	9,333	16,293	-904	+6,960
Farm operating loans:					
Direct	64,028	75,225	75,225	+11,197	---
Unsubsidized guaranteed	34,497	2,667	28,405	-6,092	+25,738
Subsidized guaranteed	33,986	24,720	27,416	-6,570	+2,696
Subtotal	132,511	102,612	131,046	-1,465	+28,434
Indian tribe land acquisition	80	838	838	+758	---
Boll weevil eradication loans	---	1,129	1,129	+1,129	---
Total, Loan subsidies	149,788	113,912	149,306	-482	+35,394
ACIF expenses:					
Salaries and expense (transfer to FSA)	301,545	311,737	307,338	+5,793	-4,399
Administrative expenses	7,920	7,920	7,920	---	---
Total, ACIF expenses	309,465	319,657	315,258	+5,793	-4,399
Total, Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund	459,253	433,569	464,564	+5,311	+30,995
(Loan authorization)	(3,747,804)	(3,427,470)	(3,551,864)	(-195,940)	(+124,394)
Total, Farm Service Agency	1,486,974	1,529,236	1,526,345	+39,371	-2,891
Risk Management Agency	76,278	80,797	77,197	+919	-3,600
Total, Farm Assistance Programs	1,563,881	1,610,770	1,604,233	+40,352	-6,537
Corporations					
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation:					
Federal crop insurance corporation fund	3,159,379	4,131,035	4,131,035	+971,656	---
Commodity Credit Corporation Fund:					
Reimbursement for net realized losses	25,690,000	19,740,000	19,740,000	-5,950,000	---
Hazardous waste management (limitation on expenses)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	---	---
Farm Storage Facility Loans Program Account:					
Salaries and expenses:					
Farm Service Agency (transfer to FSA)	---	4,560	---	---	-4,560
Total, Corporations	28,849,379	23,875,595	23,871,035	-4,978,344	-4,560
Total, title I, Agricultural Programs	35,403,790	30,178,428	30,516,993	-4,886,797	+338,565
(By transfer)	(306,551)	(319,294)	(310,335)	(+3,784)	(-8,959)
(Loan authorization)	(3,747,804)	(3,427,470)	(3,551,864)	(-195,940)	(+124,394)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(113,130)	(109,674)	(109,674)	(-3,456)	---

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 5384)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE II - CONSERVATION PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment	737	957	810	+73	-147
Natural Resources Conservation Service:					
Conservation operations	831,124	744,877	791,498	-39,626	+46,621
Watershed surveys and planning	6,022	---	6,022	---	+6,022
Watershed and flood prevention operations	74,250	---	40,000	-34,250	+40,000
Watershed rehabilitation program	31,245	15,300	31,245	---	+15,945
Resource conservation and development	50,787	25,933	50,787	---	+24,854
Healthy forests reserve program	---	2,475	---	---	-2,475
Total, Natural Resources Conservation Service	993,428	788,585	919,552	-73,876	+130,967
Total, title II, Conservation Programs	994,165	789,542	920,362	-73,803	+130,820
TITLE III - RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development	629	823	692	+63	-131
Rural Development:					
Rural community advancement program	694,922	600,762	699,893	+4,971	+99,131
(Transfer out)	(-25,740)	---	---	(+25,740)	---
Total, Rural community advancement program	694,922	600,762	699,893	+4,971	+99,131
RD expenses:					
Salaries and expenses	162,979	170,741	182,860	+19,881	+12,119
(Transfer from RHIF)	(450,261)	(455,776)	(430,080)	(-20,181)	(-25,696)
(Transfer from MHRP)	---	---	(990)	(+990)	(+990)
(Transfer from RDLFP)	(4,745)	(4,950)	(4,780)	(+35)	(-170)
(Transfer from RETLP)	(38,396)	(39,600)	(39,101)	(+705)	(-499)
(Transfer from RTB)	(2,475)	---	---	(-2,475)	---
Subtotal, Transfers from program accounts	(495,877)	(500,326)	(474,951)	(-20,926)	(-25,375)
Total, RD expenses	(658,856)	(671,067)	(657,811)	(-1,045)	(-13,256)
Total, Rural Development	857,901	771,503	882,753	+24,852	+111,250
Rural Housing Service:					
Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Single family direct (sec. 502)	(1,129,391)	(1,237,498)	(1,237,498)	(+108,107)	---
Unsubsidized guaranteed	(3,644,224)	(3,564,238)	(3,564,238)	(-79,986)	---
Subtotal, Single family	(4,773,615)	(4,801,736)	(4,801,736)	(+28,121)	---
Housing repair (sec. 504)	(34,652)	(36,382)	(36,382)	(+1,730)	---
Rental housing (sec. 515)	(99,000)	---	(100,000)	(+1,000)	(+100,000)
Site loans (sec. 524)	(5,000)	(5,045)	(5,045)	(+45)	---
Multi-family housing guarantees (sec. 538)	(99,000)	(197,997)	(100,000)	(+1,000)	(-97,997)
Multi-family housing credit sales	(1,485)	(1,482)	(1,482)	(-3)	---
Single family housing credit sales	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	---	---
Self-help housing land develop. (sec. 523)	(4,998)	(4,980)	(4,980)	(-18)	---
Total, Loan authorizations	(5,027,750)	(5,057,622)	(5,059,625)	(+31,875)	(+2,003)

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 5384)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Loan subsidies:					
Single family direct (sec. 502)	128,638	124,121	124,121	-4,517	---
Unsubsidized guaranteed	40,491	7,772	7,772	-32,719	---
Subtotal, Single family	169,129	131,893	131,893	-37,236	---
Housing repair (sec. 504)	10,136	10,751	10,751	+615	---
Rental housing (sec. 515)	45,421	---	45,670	+249	+45,670
Multi-family housing guarantees (sec. 538)	5,366	15,325	7,740	+2,374	-7,585
Multi-family housing credit sales	674	672	672	-2	---
Single family housing credit sales	---	48	48	+48	---
Self-help housing land develop. (sec. 523)	51	123	123	+72	---
Multi-family housing preservation	8,910	---	---	-8,910	---
Total, Loan subsidies	239,687	158,812	196,897	-42,790	+38,085
RHIF administrative expenses (transfer to RD)	450,261	455,776	430,080	-20,181	-25,696
Rental assistance program:					
(Sec. 521)	638,651	486,320	329,500	-309,151	-156,820
(Sec. 502(c)(5)(D))	7,920	---	5,900	-2,020	+5,900
Total, Rental assistance program	646,571	486,320	335,400	-311,171	-150,920
Total, Rural Housing Insurance Fund	1,336,519	1,100,908	962,377	-374,142	-138,531
(Loan authorization)	(5,027,750)	(5,057,622)	(5,059,625)	(+31,875)	(+2,003)
Rural housing voucher program	15,840	---	---	-15,840	---
Multifamily housing revitalization program account	---	74,250	28,000	+28,000	-46,250
MHRP administrative expenses (transfer to RD)	---	---	990	+990	+990
Total, Multifamily housing revitalization	---	74,250	28,990	+28,990	-45,260
Mutual and self-help housing grants	33,660	37,620	37,620	+3,960	---
Rural housing assistance grants	43,536	40,590	40,590	-2,946	---
Farm labor program account	30,856	33,798	47,525	+16,669	+13,727
Subtotal, grants and payments	108,052	112,008	125,735	+17,683	+13,727
Total, Rural Housing Service	1,460,411	1,287,166	1,117,102	-343,309	-170,064
(Loan authorization)	(5,027,750)	(5,057,622)	(5,059,625)	(+31,875)	(+2,003)
Rural Business-Cooperative Service:					
Rural Development Loan Fund Program Account:					
(Loan authorization)	(33,870)	(33,925)	(33,925)	(+55)	---
Loan subsidy	14,571	14,951	14,951	+380	---
Administrative expenses (transfer to RD)	4,745	4,950	4,780	+35	-170
Total, Rural Development Loan Fund	19,316	19,901	19,731	+415	-170
Rural Economic Development Loans Program Account:					
(Loan authorization)	(24,752)	(34,652)	(34,652)	(+9,900)	---
Direct subsidy	4,943	7,568	7,568	+2,625	---
Rural cooperative development grants	29,193	27,225	9,913	-19,280	-17,312
Rural empowerment zones and enterprise communities grants	11,088	---	11,088	---	+11,088
Renewable energy program	22,770	10,163	20,000	-2,770	+9,837
Total, Rural Business-Cooperative Service	87,310	64,857	68,300	-19,010	+3,443
(Loan authorization)	(58,622)	(68,577)	(68,577)	(+9,955)	---

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 5384)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Rural Utilities Service:					
Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account:					
Loan authorizations:					
Electric:					
Direct, 5%	(99,000)	(99,018)	(99,018)	(+18)	---
Direct, Municipal rate	(99,000)	(39,602)	(99,000)	---	(+59,398)
Direct, FFB	(2,600,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(+400,000)	---
Direct, Treasury rate	(990,000)	(700,000)	(990,000)	---	(+290,000)
Guaranteed electric	(99,000)	---	---	(-99,000)	---
Guaranteed underwriting	(1,500,000)	---	(500,000)	(-1,000,000)	(+500,000)
Subtotal, Electric	(5,387,000)	(3,838,620)	(4,688,018)	(-698,982)	(+849,398)
Telecommunications:					
Direct, 5%	(145,000)	(143,513)	(143,513)	(-1,487)	---
Direct, Treasury rate	(419,760)	(246,666)	(246,666)	(-173,094)	---
Direct, FFB	(125,000)	(299,000)	(299,000)	(+174,000)	---
Subtotal, Telecommunications	(689,760)	(689,179)	(689,179)	(-581)	---
Total, Loan authorizations	(6,076,760)	(4,527,799)	(5,377,197)	(-699,563)	(+849,398)
Loan subsidies:					
Electric:					
Direct, 5%	911	2,119	2,119	+1,208	---
Direct, Municipal rate	5,000	598	1,495	-3,505	+897
Guaranteed electric	89	---	---	-89	---
Direct, Treasury rate	99	---	---	-99	---
Subtotal, Electric	6,099	2,717	3,614	-2,485	+897
Telecommunications:					
Direct, 5%	---	531	531	+531	---
Direct, Treasury rate	210	74	74	-136	---
Subtotal, Telecommunications	210	605	605	+395	---
Total, Loan subsidies	6,309	3,322	4,219	-2,090	+897
RETLP administrative expenses (transfer to RD)	38,396	39,600	39,101	+705	-499
Total, Rural Electrification and Telecommunications Loans Program Account	44,705	42,922	43,320	-1,385	+398
(Loan authorization)	(6,076,760)	(4,527,799)	(5,377,197)	(-699,563)	(+849,398)
Rural Telephone Bank Program Account:					
RTB administrative expenses (transfer to RD)	2,475	---	---	-2,475	---
Total, Rural Telephone Bank Program Account	2,475	---	---	-2,475	---
High energy costs grants (by transfer)	(26,000)	---	---	(-26,000)	---
Distance learning, telemedicine, and broadband program:					
Loan authorizations:					
Distance learning and telemedicine	(24,750)	---	---	(-24,750)	---
Broadband telecommunications	(495,000)	(356,419)	(503,535)	(+8,535)	(+147,116)
Total, Loan authorizations	(519,750)	(356,419)	(503,535)	(-16,215)	(+147,116)
Loan subsidies:					
Distance learning and telemedicine:					
Direct	371	---	---	-371	---
Grants	29,700	24,750	24,750	-4,950	---

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 5384)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Broadband telecommunications:					
Direct	10,643	10,826	10,826	+183	---
Grants	8,910	---	8,910	---	+8,910
Total, Loan subsidies and grants	49,624	35,576	44,486	-5,138	+8,910
Total, Rural Utilities Service	96,804	78,498	87,806	-8,998	+9,308
(Loan authorization)	(6,596,510)	(4,884,218)	(5,880,732)	(-715,778)	(+996,514)
Total, title III, Rural Economic and Community Development Programs	2,503,055	2,202,847	2,156,653	-346,402	-46,194
(By transfer)	(521,877)	(500,326)	(474,951)	(-46,926)	(-25,375)
(Loan authorization)	(11,682,882)	(10,010,417)	(11,008,934)	(-673,948)	(+998,517)
TITLE IV - DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS					
Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services	593	732	652	+59	-80
Food and Nutrition Service:					
Child nutrition programs	7,473,208	7,763,200	7,610,897	+137,689	-152,303
Transfer from section 32	5,187,621	5,582,287	5,734,590	+546,969	+152,303
Contingency reserve	---	300,000	---	---	-300,000
Total, Child nutrition programs	12,660,829	13,645,487	13,345,487	+684,658	-300,000
Special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children (WIC)	5,204,430	5,200,000	5,244,000	+39,570	+44,000
Food stamp program:					
Expenses	36,045,026	33,186,215	33,159,215	-2,885,811	-27,000
Indian reservations (FDPIR)	2,970	---	---	-2,970	---
Armed forces provision	1,000	1,000	1,000	---	---
Reserve	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	---	---
Nutrition assistance for Puerto Rico and Samoa	1,522,369	1,565,016	1,565,016	+42,647	---
The emergency food assistance program	140,000	140,000	140,000	---	---
CSFP transitional benefit	---	21,000	---	---	-21,000
CSFP nutrition education	---	2,000	---	---	-2,000
CSFP food Stamp expenses	---	19,000	---	---	-19,000
Total, Food stamp program	40,711,365	37,934,231	37,865,231	-2,846,134	-69,000
Commodity assistance program	177,572	70,370	189,370	+11,798	+119,000
Nutrition programs administration	139,353	160,429	142,314	+2,961	-18,115
Total, Food and Nutrition Service	58,893,549	57,010,517	56,786,402	-2,107,147	-224,115
Total, title IV, Domestic Food Programs	58,894,142	57,011,249	56,787,054	-2,107,088	-224,195
TITLE V - FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS					
Foreign Agricultural Service:					
Salaries and expenses, direct appropriation	146,422	157,486	156,486	+10,064	-1,000
(Transfer from export loans)	(3,406)	(4,985)	(4,985)	(+1,579)	---
(Transfer from P.L. 480)	(166)	---	---	(-166)	---
Total, Salaries and expenses program level	(149,994)	(162,471)	(161,471)	(+11,477)	(-1,000)
Public Law 480 Program and Grant Accounts:					
Program account:					
Loan authorization, direct	(74,032)	---	---	(-74,032)	---
Loan subsidies	64,390	---	---	-64,390	---
Ocean freight differential grants	11,821	---	---	-11,821	---
Title II - Commodities for disposition abroad:					
Program level	(1,138,500)	(1,218,500)	(1,223,100)	(+84,600)	(+4,600)

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 5384)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Appropriation	1,138,500	1,218,500	1,223,100	+84,600	+4,600
Salaries and expenses:					
Foreign Agricultural Service (transfer to FAS)	166	---	---	-166	---
Farm Service Agency (transfer to FSA)	3,185	2,651	2,651	-534	---
Subtotal	3,351	2,651	2,651	-700	---
Total, Public Law 480:					
Program level	(1,138,500)	(1,218,500)	(1,223,100)	(+84,600)	(+4,600)
Appropriation	1,218,062	1,221,151	1,225,751	+7,689	+4,600
CCC Export Loans Program Account (administrative expenses):					
Salaries and expenses (Export Loans):					
General Sales Manager (transfer to FAS)	3,406	4,985	4,985	+1,579	---
Farm Service Agency (transfer to FSA)	1,821	346	346	-1,475	---
Total, CCC Export Loans Program Account	5,227	5,331	5,331	+104	---
McGovern-Dole international food for education and child nutrition program grants	99,000	99,000	100,000	+1,000	+1,000
Total, title V, Foreign Assistance and Related Programs	1,468,711	1,482,968	1,487,568	+18,857	+4,600
(By transfer)	(3,572)	(4,985)	(4,985)	(+1,413)	---
TITLE VI - RELATED AGENCIES AND FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION					
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES					
Food and Drug Administration					
Salaries and expenses, direct appropriation	1,466,801	1,540,399	1,538,452	+71,651	-1,947
Prescription drug user fee act	(305,332)	(320,600)	(320,600)	(+15,268)	---
Medical device user fee act	(40,300)	(43,726)	(43,726)	(+3,426)	---
Animal drug user fee act	(11,318)	(11,604)	(11,604)	(+286)	---
Reinspection fees (user fees) (leg. prop) NA	---	(22,000)	---	---	(-22,000)
Food export fees (user fees) (leg. prop) NA	---	(3,536)	---	---	(-3,536)
Subtotal	(1,823,751)	(1,916,329)	(1,914,382)	(+90,631)	(-1,947)
Mammography clinics user fee (outlay savings)	(17,173)	---	(17,522)	(+349)	(+17,522)
Export and color certification	(7,640)	---	(8,481)	(+841)	(+8,481)
Payments to GSA	(134,853)	---	(146,013)	(+11,160)	(+146,013)
Buildings and facilities	7,920	4,950	4,950	-2,970	---
Total, Food and Drug Administration	1,474,721	1,545,349	1,543,402	+68,681	-1,947
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Commodity Futures Trading Commission	97,402	127,000	109,402	+12,000	-17,598
Transaction fees (user fees) (leg. prop) NA	---	(127,000)	---	---	(-127,000)
Farm Credit Administration (limitation on administrative expenses)	(44,250)	---	(44,250)	---	(+44,250)
Total, title VI, Related Agencies and Food and Drug Administration	1,572,123	1,672,349	1,652,804	+80,681	-19,545
TITLE VII - GENERAL PROVISIONS					
Hunger fellowships (sec. 716)	2,500	---	2,500	---	+2,500
National Sheep Industry Improvement Center revolving fund (sec. 717)	1,238	---	250	-988	+250
Denali Commission	743	---	---	-743	---

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 5384)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Section 32 (rescission) (sec. 740)	-37,601	---	-9,900	+27,701	-9,900
Milk processing and packaging facilities	644	---	---	-644	---
Alaska private lands wildlife management	198	---	---	-198	---
Livestock Expo Center	990	---	---	-990	---
Wisconsin Federation of Cooperatives	2,228	---	---	-2,228	---
WIC contingency reserve (rescission)	-32,000	---	---	+32,000	---
Specialty crop grants (sec. 736)	6,930	---	15,600	+8,670	+15,600
SFSP Summer food service program	1,000	---	---	-1,000	---
Healthy Forest Reserve	2,475	---	---	-2,475	---
Fruit and vegetable pilot program (sec. 738)	6,000	---	25,000	+19,000	+25,000
World food prize	347	---	---	-347	---
Utah State	198	---	---	-198	---
University of Nevada	139	---	---	-139	---
Ohio State University	396	---	---	-396	---
Nueces County	495	---	---	-495	---
IRP Choctaw	990	---	---	-990	---
High energy cost grants (rescission) (sec. 744)	---	-25,265	-25,265	-25,265	---
MILC extension (sec. 752)	---	---	40,000	+40,000	+40,000
Total, title VII, General provisions	-42,090	-25,265	48,185	+90,275	+73,450
OTHER APPROPRIATIONS					
EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT TO ADDRESS HURRICANES IN THE GULF OF MEXICO AND PANDEMIC INFLUENZA, 2006 (P.L.109-148, DIVISION B)					
TITLE I, CHAPTER 1					
Department of Agriculture					
Executive Operations, Working capital fund (emerg.)	35,000	---	---	-35,000	---
Agricultural Research Service					
Buildings and facilities (emergency)	9,200	---	---	-9,200	---
Rural Development					
Rural community advancement program (emergency)	45,000	---	---	-45,000	---
Rural Housing Service					
Rural housing insurance fund program (emergency)	45,000	---	---	-45,000	---
Rural housing assistance grants (emergency)	20,000	---	---	-20,000	---
Rural Utilities Service					
Rural electrification and telecom (emergency)	8,000	---	---	-8,000	---
Food and Nutrition Service					
Commodity assistance program (emergency)	4,000	---	---	-4,000	---
The emergency food assistance program (emergency)	6,000	---	---	-6,000	---
General Provisions					
Emergency conservation program (emergency)	199,800	---	---	-199,800	---
Watershed and flood prevention operations (emergency)	300,000	---	---	-300,000	---
Emergency forestry conservation reserve program	50,000	---	---	-50,000	---
Total, Title I, Chapter 1 (emergency)	722,000	---	---	-722,000	---

AGRICULTURE-RURAL DEVELOPMENT-FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 5384)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2006 Enacted	FY 2007 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE II, CHAPTER 1					
Department of Agriculture					
Office of the Secretary (emergency)	11,350	---	---	-11,350	---
Agricultural Research Service					
Salaries and expenses (emergency)	7,000	---	---	-7,000	---
Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service					
Research and educational activities (emergency)	1,500	---	---	-1,500	---
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service					
Salaries and expenses (emergency)	71,500	---	---	-71,500	---
Department of Health and Human Services					
Salaries and expenses (emergency)	20,000	---	---	-20,000	---
*Total, Title II, Chapter 1 (emergency)	111,350	---	---	-111,350	---
TITLE III, CHAPTER 1					
Department of Agriculture					
Natural Resources Conservation Service: Conservation Operations (rescission)	-10,000	---	---	+10,000	---
Rural Utilities Service					
Distance Learning, Telemedicine, and Broadband direct loan financing (rescission)	-9,900	---	---	+9,900	---
Food and Nutrition Service: Food Stamp Program (rescission)	-11,200	---	---	+11,200	---
Foreign Agricultural Service					
Public Law 480 Title I Ocean Freight Differential Grants (rescission)	-35,000	---	---	+35,000	---
Total, Title III, Chapter 1 (rescissions)	-66,100	---	---	+66,100	---
Total, Public Law 109-148	767,250	---	---	-767,250	---
Emergency appropriations	833,350	---	---	-833,350	---
(Rescissions)	(-66,100)	---	---	(+66,100)	---
Total, Other appropriations	767,250	---	---	-767,250	---
Grand total	101,561,146	93,312,118	93,569,619	-7,991,527	+257,501
Appropriations	(100,863,497)	(93,337,383)	(93,604,784)	(-7,258,713)	(+267,401)
Emergency Appropriations	833,350	---	---	-833,350	---
Rescissions	(-135,701)	(-25,265)	(-35,165)	(+100,536)	(-9,900)
(By transfer)	(832,000)	(824,605)	(790,271)	(-41,729)	(-34,334)
(Loan authorization)	(15,504,718)	(13,437,887)	(14,560,798)	(-943,920)	(+1,122,911)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(157,380)	(109,674)	(153,924)	(-3,456)	(+44,250)

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me first thank you and Mr. OBEY, as well as Chairman LEWIS, all of whom I have been pleased to work with on this bill. In particular it is a pleasure to join the chairman again as we bring to the floor our second and final agriculture appropriations bill together. As before, this has been a good process, one in which we have made substantial progress on many issues.

As I have said before, I want to take a moment to recognize that this is not only the last time this bill will be considered on the House floor under Mr. BONILLA's management, but also his last year of service on our subcommittee. He has served as chairman with distinction and carried out his responsibilities to this subcommittee with a real sense of determination and focus. So I thank you, and it has been a pleasure to work with you.

This is always an important bill, from public health and the FDA, to rural development and food safety, to environmental conservation and nutrition assistance, to investing in renewable sources of energy.

The mission of the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee is, at its core, about improving people's lives; and I think the subcommittee has produced a bill overall that we can be proud of.

There are several areas in particular that have been improved from the President's request. For one, the bill includes increased funding for the Commodity Supplemental Food Program and the Specialty Crops Program on which so many of our farmers rely. The bill restores the section 515 Housing Program and included $25 million for a National Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program.

In addition, we have turned aside several misguided proposals by the administration not included in this bill, including proposals that would have changed funding for the Agriculture Research Institutions and capped WIC administrative funds.

We also made some progress during the markup. I appreciate the chairman's willingness to increase funding for the Office of Generic Drugs, bringing that up to $5 million. This will help to reduce the backlog of generic drug applications and in turn contribute to reducing the price of prescription drugs.

I was pleased that the committee accepted an amendment that I offered to give the FDA the authority to mandate post-market drug studies when needed. With 65 percent of the post-market studies pending, it is clear that the system FDA has in place is broken and must be fixed. As such, giving FDA the authority to mandate post-market drug studies and authorizing the agency to begin proceedings that would move a drug from the market, should the drug company refuse to carry out its responsibility, is a critical part of the drug safety process.

I was also pleased that this subcommittee accepted language preventing the implementation of a final rule by USDA to allow processed chicken products from China to enter the United States. We all know China has massive problems with avian influenza in its chicken population. Only hours after the Food Safety and Inspection Service announced it would allow the imports from China, claiming these products would be safe because they will be fully processed and cooked, a Tennessee firm announced the recall of more than 20,000 pounds of breaded chicken due to possible undercooking. Stopping that process from going forward was a good decision.

I do think that there are some areas where the bill falls short. While I know we cannot do everything we want to in this bill, I believe that many Members will be disappointed to see that, for instance, we could not fund a pilot program to look at the impact of eliminating the Reduced Price Meal Program that requires children from low-income working families to pay 40 cents per lunch and 30 cents per breakfast. If a family qualifies for free WIC benefits, they should qualify for free school meals as well. I wish we had found the money to make that pilot program happen, even if only as a pilot program.

I am also disappointed that we failed to substantially increase the funding for the McGovern-Dole International Food Program which is funded in this bill at $100 million, an increase of a mere $1 million over last year's bill and the budget request. This program fights child hunger in the world's poorest countries, while expanding educational opportunities for children; and it has a proven track record. It should have been a priority in this bill.

Lastly, we missed a golden opportunity with this bill to jump-start the country's energy independence efforts by seriously and aggressively funding the many programs in this bill that deal with renewable energy. I offered an amendment that was defeated on a roll call vote of 24–36 to our commitment to renewable energy and rural development by $500 million. It is time to be bold about energy independence; and this bill is an appropriate place to start doing that, which is why I intend to offer this amendment again before the full House.

I look forward to debating this bill today, Mr. Chairman, and I want to say thank you to you and your staff as well as staff on our side of the aisle for working so hard to put together the bill before us. As I have said throughout the process, barring any unexpected developments, it is my intention to support this bill.

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

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), the distinguished chairman of the full committee.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5384, the agriculture appropriations bill for the year 2007. This is the third of 11 bills the committee plans to bring to the House floor before the 4th of July break.

I want to especially praise Chairman BONILLA and Ranking Member DELAURO, as well as members of the Agriculture Subcommittee and their staff, for the very fine work done on this bill.

In total, this measure provides $18.4 billion in total discretionary spending. This level represents a decrease, that is a decrease, of $96 million below the FY 2006 enacted level. The bill contains critical funding to protect health and safety, fulfill our commitment to important food and nutrition programs and support farmers and ranchers, as well as rural America.

I would like to make, Mr. Chairman, two additional points about the measure. First, the bill before us today includes $435 million in Member-project funding, which is $35 million below, that is, below last year's House-bill level. It is $277 million below last year's House-Senate conference report as well.

This bill also terminates eight programs resulting in $414 million in taxpayer savings; eight programs, $414 million in taxpayer savings.

Mr. Chairman, this agriculture bill is Mr. BONILLA's last bill as chairman of this subcommittee; and to say the least, this bill is a very fine product, and it is worthy of our support.

I want to commend Mr. BONILLA and certainly Ms. DELAURO, as well, for their work on this very fine measure. Indeed, it is a reflection of the best work of our committee. Mr. BONILLA is to be congratulated for his service as chairman of the committee.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to renew my comments on something that is likely to happen here later with respect to the dairy program; but before I do that, in the unlikely event that anybody in any of the congressional offices is listening, I hope they understand that there are at least 50 amendments pending to this bill. If we only take 10 minutes on each of those amendments and if we only have votes on about half of them, we will be here until about 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning. So I hope that Members will not expect us to have a schedule which allows them to go to supper and allows them to do other work around here and, at the same time, expect the committee to get us out of here before the wee hours of the morning. If all of these amendments are offered, that just isn't going to happen.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that I want to once again take note of the

fact that because the Rules Committee chose not to protect a provision in this bill that is very important to small dairy farmers around the country, we face the likelihood that a point of order will be lodged against section 752 of this bill. That section is meant to correct a major flaw in the authorization bill that was amended last year.

Under existing law, supplemental payments to dairy farmers, the so-called MILC program, will expire 1 month before the other major commodities programs expire in the existing farm bill.

□ 1215

What that means in practical terms is that there will be no dairy component in the budget baseline when the next farm bill is considered by the authorizing committee.

If that happens, we are guaranteeing that there will be fewer dollars in the Federal budget that will be flowing to rural America than would otherwise be the case. If people think it is a good idea for rural America to voluntarily relinquish any portion of their share of the Federal budget, then by all means they should be enthusiastic about the point of order.

If they do not, then I think they ought to ask the authorizing committee chairman not to make that point of order. I would point out that the provision in this bill which extends that MILC program for 1 month so that we can correct that budget baseline problem. I should point out that that provision is supported by the Midwest Dairy Coalition, the Northeast Dairy Producers, including Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island and Vermont. It is supported by the New York Farm Bureau, by the National Farmers Union, by the Wisconsin Farm Bureau, and by a good many other farmers around the country.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply say that if that point of order is lodged, and if this bill therefore does not carry that correcting provision, it will not just be dairy farmers who are hurt, it will also mean that if a dairy program is continued, financing for that program will have to come out of the base for each of the other farm groups.

That is a great recipe for having a regional war between different farm groups, and it is a great recipe for having a war between various commodity groups in the agriculture community. So I would urge the majority party leadership to prevail upon the chairman of the Agriculture Committee not to make that point of order, because, if he does, we are not going to be able to fix this problem and dairy farmers are going to be at a huge disadvantage when the next farm bill is written.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlemen from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of the committee, Mr. BONILLA, for the great job that he has done, and the leadership that he has provided. And I thank my friend, ROSA DELAURO, for all the good work that she has done and the bipartisan cooperation that we have had on this bill. We don't agree on everything, but we agree on ag policy and trying to look out for the farmers together, and all of the various commodities and programs that are in this important bill. And this is certainly one of the greatest subcommittees in Congress.

Mr. Chairman, farmers today have lots of challenges, financing. Long-term financing for farmers, they can't get loans the way business people can get loans. They have problems with labor. The immigration issue is the hot issue of the day right now. Well, it has been a hot issue down on the farm for years as they have tried to get labor who will go out there in the hot sunshine and pick apples and pick peaches and pick onions, and trying to work with the H2A program that can be very difficult to comply with.

And while farmers are trying to work with H2A, along comes legal services funded by the Federal Government and suing farmers for technical violations often and not really substantive violations.

They have problems with environmental issues, in that we have very strict EPA laws, which their international competitors do not always have. And Ms. KAPTUR, our friend from Ohio, often talks to us about Ohio tomatoes. And yet we know in Mexico they make tomatoes that can be competitive with those of Ohio tomatoes, but they do not have to follow the same labor or environmental laws.

Mr. Chairman, that is just one of the examples. And then we talk about unfair trade practices and what is subsidized and what is not. And so often the WTO, which is an organization most Americans do not even know about; yet the farmers, they are very mindful of what the WTO is up to, because so often the rulings seem to come down against American farmers.

Mr. Chairman, despite everything that farmers are up against, our food program and our food supply is the best any world has ever seen, any nation in the world at any time. Americans spend 11 cents on the dollar on groceries. We spend 43 cents on the dollar on recreation, from skiing to jet skiing, to boats, to fishing to buying CDs and going to movies and shows; we spend 43 cents on the dollar, but only 11 cents on the dollar for food. And for that, we have fruit all year long. We have meat in great abundance at low prices all year long. We have, as Mr. OBEY knows well, milk. And there used to be milk shortages all over the country. And yet we do not have those kinds of shortages anymore. We do have a very complex, hard-to-explain agriculture system in America, and yet the product on the shelf in the grocery stores across America beats all in the world.

We need to all support this bill. It is a bipartisan bill. It is well thought out, well debated. There are going to be things I am going to comment on later on.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MARSHALL).

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Mr. KINGSTON for all he has done on behalf of peanuts and milk. In the authorizing committee, we failed to extend the peanut program storage and handling fees for the year it needed to be extended, at the end of this farm program. And we also failed to extend the milk program, that 1 month that is necessary, according to Mr. OBEY and others, to establish an appropriate baseline where milk is concerned and an appropriate baseline where peanuts are concerned, peanut storage and handling.

Anticipating that a point of order might be made, Mr. Chairman, and I am not sure that it would be made by the chairman of the authorizing committee or someone else, we have put together a letter to the chairman, Chairman GOODLATTE, asking that he support the two bipartisan amendments made in the appropriations committee with regard to these two issues, the peanut storage and handling fees issue and the milk program issue that was spoken about by Mr. OBEY.

Mr. Chairman, 26 members of the 46 members of the committee have signed on. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the real question will be whether or not somehow the Appropriations Committee is inappropriately treading on the authority of the authorizing committee. Here you have a majority of the members of the authorizing committee saying that they think that the Appropriations Committee is acting properly with regard to these two issues, and they would request that the point of order be denied.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume for the purpose of entering into a colloquy with the gentlemen from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT). I now yield to Mr. GARRETT.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to enter into a colloquy with the gentlemen from Texas, the chairman of the subcommittee.

Also, before I begin, I just want to thank the chairman for all of your hard work that you put into the committee and into this bill, and all of the members of the committee.

And may I also echo the words as far as those members of the committee and the staff who do not normally get their names mentioned on the floor for their work; as the former chairman, I know there are many people behind the scenes that do not get recognized and I appreciate your recognizing those people of your committee.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I also want to voice my strong support of the Farm and Ranchland Preservation Program. The chairman may know that I

grew up on my family farm in the State of New Jersey; it is the Garden State. We are the most densely populated State in the country. And for that reason, trying to preserve open space and farmland was one of the main reasons why I went into government 12 years ago on the state level and here in the Congress as well.

And so I support strongly The National Farm and Ranchland Preservation Program and its work to contain, to preserve environmentally sensitive pieces of property in the Fifth Congressional District.

It is my hope that the chairman would continue to work closely with myself and the Department of Agriculture, so that we can move forward to see to it that as much of this property can be preserved for future generations.

Mr. BONILLA. If the gentleman would yield, I thank the gentlemen for his comments and pledge to work closely with him and the Department of Agriculture moving forward to see that any eligible environmentally sensitive farmland is given full and adequate consideration as this bill continues through the legislative process and as the Department establishes its priorities for the Farm and Ranchland Preservation Program for fiscal year 2007.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. I thank the gentlemen for his support.

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairman BONILLA and Ranking Member DELAURO for their hard work on this bill, particularly their work on the school meal and WIC program.

While I appreciate the increase in funding, I sincerely hope that we can do even better in conference on the WIC program and on the school meal program.

I also appreciate that the committee rejected a number of President Bush's requests that would have harmed the women and children who benefit from WIC. The President's proposed cap on nutrition counseling and on education for WIC recipients would limit both essential services for WIC families and for the States' abilities to negotiate cost savings with food producers.

The President also asked to limit WIC eligibility for any Medicaid recipients. These are only some of the examples that the President would have listed in his neverending effort to pay for tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans, with benefit cuts for the most vulnerable Americans.

As I say, I honor the Chair and the ranking member for not letting that happen. I am proud to have led a bipartisan effort in opposition to those proposals, and I thank the committee again for rejecting them.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I thank the committee for its promise to continue to monitor the WIC caseload to ensure that funding remains sufficient to meet the needs. I ask the committee to also monitor, as I will, USDA's implementation of its cost containment regulations.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, can you tell us, please, how much time remains on the bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman has 17½ minutes remaining.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to I guess reluctantly support the bill. I have been looking over the provisions, and I think that while I commend Chairman BONILLA and Ranking Member DELAURO for their work, given the constraints that they have been placed under, but I do have some concerns that I would like to raise.

You know, in the last farm bill, 2002 Farm Bill, we made a significant shift in the biggest increases that we placed in the 2002 Farm Bill were in the conservation programs.

And we have some limitations that have been put in the bill that have been protected against a point of order, that I have some concerns about and other people across the country have concerns about.

Our Wetlands Reserve Program, which I think has been one of the most successful programs that we have implemented and was part of the 2002 farm bill, we are going to be further limiting the level to 144,000 acres.

This is a program that has a substantial backlog. We have a lot of folks out there that are ready to go and put their land into the Wetlands Reserve Program and, you know, just does not seem logical that we would eliminate it given the amount of interest that is out there in the countryside.

The EQUIP Program was another program that we substantially increased in the 2002 farm bill. And again, we have many more requests than we have money and authorization. And we are going to have some further limitations in that area as well, as well as the CSP program, the WHIP program and some others.

So I just want to raise my concern about those limitations and I guess my displeasure from the authorizing committee point of view that the appropriators would be limiting the work of the Agriculture Committee that has spent a lot of time looking into them.

□ 1230

I would also like to follow up on the comments of Mr. OBEY regarding the milk program. Wherever you are at on that particular issue, I think this does have implications out into the next farm bill.

I know in our part of the country this is a popular program. In the west it is not popular. But eliminating this baseline is going to make it more difficult for us as we do the next farm bill next year, and it could come back to haunt some folks in the dairy area potentially given how that all plays out.

The peanut provision which also was not protected is something that was worked out in the last farm bill and is important to a lot of folks that had to have a substantial change in that program, and I just do not think it is right to end that program a year early. It would make more sense, I think, to continue it to the ends of the bill.

I am going to support this bill today. I commend the chairman and the ranking member for their work, and I look forward to the debate.

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

Ms. DELAURO. Can I ask the gentleman from Texas if he has any additional speakers.

Mr. BONILLA. At this time I do not.

Ms. DELAURO. Neither do we.

With that, my comment is I think that we will just proceed to the amendments, and I hope that with that process we can make the bill better.

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

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, once again, just to comment on how many prudent recommendations were made to put this bill together and it has been a very good product that we have come to the floor with today, and we hope that all Members would support it without any amendments.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5384, the Fiscal Year 2007 Agriculture Appropriations Act. In particular, I am pleased that funding for the Commodity Supplemental Food Program, or CSFP, has been restored in this bill.

In yet another example of the Administration's upside-down priorities, the President's request proposed eliminating CSFP. Last year, in Michigan alone, almost 76,000 low income seniors, mothers and children received much-needed, nutritious food each month thanks to this funding and the hard work of organizations like Focus: Hope in Detroit.

I thank the Committee for responding to the outpouring of grassroots support for CSFP, and refusing to do away with this important program. The bill before us includes $118.3 million for CSFP, an increase of $11 million from the current level. Following the President's recommendation would have literally taken food from the mouths of seniors and children across the country. I hope our action here not only protects CSFP, but also sends a message to the President that cuts like this are not acceptable.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, in accordance with earmark reform proposals currently under consideration in the House and Senate, I would like to place into the RECORD a listing of Congressionally-directed projects in my home state of Idaho that are contained within the report to this bill. These are projects that I asked the Agriculture Subcommittee to consider, both this year and in previous years, and I am grateful for their inclusion in this bill.

I'd like to take just a few minutes to describe why I supported these projects and why they are valuable to the nation and its taxpayers.

It is important to remember that the vast majority of these funds go to two entities.

First, the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service, CSREES, grants included below are targeted to our nation's Land Grant Colleges. In the case of Idaho, these funds are used by the University of Idaho to conduct research on a variety of crops important to the Pacific Northwest. I have also supported research in Washington and Oregon because their research is invaluable to my constituents as well.

In assessing the value of these requests, there are some important considerations that must be made. World labor standards and costs are far below those of the U.S. Our Nation's farmers are subjected to far more stringent environmental regulations than those of many of our competitors. Input costs in the U.S. far surpass those of other nations. And energy prices, including farm diesel, are rising dramatically.

So how can a U.S. farmer remain competitive in a global market? Through greater productivity and efficiency, increased yields, and better defenses against diseases. These are the very things that agriculture research funding delivers for U.S. producers—and for U.S. consumers.

If you want to rely on foreign nations for our food in the way we rely on them for our oil, then by all means eliminate these important agriculture research programs. But if you believe, as I do, that maintaining a domestic capability to produce our food is a national security issue, then you ought to support these research programs and fight for their continuation.

The second entity that receives the bulk of these funds is the Agriculture Research Service, ARS, and its stations across rural America. In Idaho, these institutions are conducting vital research into some of our most important crops—sugar, potatoes, small fruits, and aquaculture. I encourage all of my colleagues to visit an ARS station to see firsthand the value of this research. If you do, you will learn that these researchers are doing amazing things with very limited budgets. These projects are usually small in terms of their funding, but the benefits that flow from that research cannot be measured in dollars alone.

Two of the projects below are funded through the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, APHIS. These two programs are critical to combating brucellosis in bison and cattle and in assisting ranchers whose livestock are harassed and killed by predators like wolves.

The Greater Yellowstone Brucellosis funding is particularly critical to my home State of Idaho. Idaho recently lost its brucellosis free status and these funds are critical to establishing a management plan that will allow Idaho to regain its brucellosis free status.

The Tri-State Predator control funding is hardly a handout to ranchers. The federal government forced wolf reintroduction on Idaho and other western states and it is duty-bound to pay for the deadly and gruesome impacts of this decision.

The final project on this list is the Idaho One-Plan. The Idaho One-Plan is a unique collaboration of agencies, industries, and associations dedicated to assisting Idaho farmers and ranchers in their continuing natural resource stewardship responsibilities. The program was developed jointly with state and federal resource agencies, the University of Idaho Cooperative Extension program, the Environmental Protection Agency, and local commodity groups. It's a successful program that has enormous value to not only the Idaho agriculture community and the environment, but to other states that might be interested in a similar collaborative process.

Mr. Chairman, any effort to remove these projects from the bill would not only result in zero savings to taxpayers, it would stop dead these important efforts to enhance and protect our nation's food supply.

I appreciate the opportunity to provide a list of Congressionally-directed projects in my region and an explanation of my support for them.

1. ARS aquaculture research—Aberdeen ($628,843) pg. 17;
2. CSREES NW Small Fruits Research—ID, WA, OR ($443,000) pg. 36;
3. ARS Potato Breeding—Aberdeen ($365,156) pg. 18;
4. ARS Sugarbeet Research—Kimberly ($702,592) pg. 19;
5. ARS Sustainable Aquaculture Feeds—Aberdeen ($99,000) pg. 19;
6. ARS Viticulture—Corvallis, OR ($852,861) pg. 19;
7. CSREES Grain Legume Plant Pathologist—Pullman, WA ($244,125) pg. 20;
8. CSREES Alternative Crops—Canola ($1,175,000) pg. 33;
9. CSREES Aegilops Cylindricum—Goatgrass (WA, ID) ($355,000) pg. 34;
10. CSREES Cool Season Food Legume Research (ID, WA, ND) ($564,000) pg. 34;
11. CSREES Grass Seed Cropping/or Sustainable Agriculture (WA, ID, OR) ($450,000) pg. 35;
12. CSREES Increasing Shelf Life of Agricultural Commodities ($863,000) pg. 35;
13. CSREES Potato Research (national program) ($1,497,000) pg. 36;
14. CSREES STEEP III ($640,000) pg. 36;
15. CSREES Wood Utilization (multi-state) ($6,371,000) pg. 36;
16. APHIS Greater Yellowstone Brucellosis—ID, WY, MT ($10,455,000) pg. 72;
17. APHIS Tri-State Predator Control ($1,324,000) pg. 74;
18. NRCS Idaho One-Plan ($200,000) pg. 87.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support the Milk Income Loss Contract Program (MILC). Created under the 2002 Farm Bill, the MILC program has been a major success for Wisconsin dairy farmers. I believe it is inherently unfair to set the expiration date of the MILC program one month before the expiration of other farm bill programs. MILC should be on a level playing field with all other commodity programs, so that it will be dealt with equitably under the 2007 Farm Bill.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support the FY 2007 Agriculture Appropriations bill. I am especially pleased with the funding levels prescribed for the Domestic Food Assistance programs such as the Commodity Supplemental Food Program CSFP) and the Women, Infants and Children (WIC) nutritional programs.

This year, the President proposed eliminating CSFP as part of his plan to streamline government services. Participants in this program were supposed to move to either the Food Stamps program or the WIC program. I disagreed with this proposal, and that is why I am pleased that my colleagues on the House Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee chose to ignore the elimination proposal and instead increased funding for this program by $11 million above last year's level.

Under the House-passed bill, CSFP will get $118.3 million in fiscal 2007. It is my understanding and hope that the Senate will include a similar amount in its appropriations bill and that future conferees will protect this valuable program from elimination.

More than 2,000 seniors in my district depend on this important supplemental food program, which provides them a box of food staples once a month to seniors who are at or below 130 percent of the poverty level. Pregnant, breast feeding and postpartum women, infants and children up to age six also are eligible for CSFP if they are at or below 185 percent of federal poverty guidelines. For young children, the program is used as a bridge between their eligibility for WIC and their eligibility for free school lunches, which generally happens around age 6.

There is no doubt that CSFP works. In Minnesota, about 15,000 participants—85 percent of them seniors—receive a box of food at the beginning of each month. The box is about the size of a banana box and weighs about 60 pounds. Each box contains about $55 worth of pantry staples such as canned vegetables, fruit and meat, as well as evaporated milk, juice, rice and pasta. The foods are nutritionally balanced and approved by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Minnesota receives about $3.2 million each year to purchase these foods and deliver them to four food banks throughout the state. Volunteers then deliver the boxes to centralized distribution sites and in some cases to the front doors of home-bound seniors.

In Southeastern Minnesota, the Channel One Food Distribution Center in Rochester, delivers CSFP food packages to 1,750 participants in a 13 county area. The average income for a senior receiving CSFP assistance in this area is a meager $8,846 a year or $737 a month. That's why CSFP is so vital for our nation's low-income seniors, particularly those in rural America.

Seniors like Harriet Salisbury from Ceylon, Minnesota; Elsa Suter of Fairmont, Minnesota, and Edward Levy of Brownsdale, Minnesota, need these vital food packages. When the Administration proposed eliminating CSFP, these seniors took pen and paper in hand and let me know exactly what they thought about that proposal. They told me CSFP was their ''lifeline,'' and some even begged me to save this vital program from elimination.

Today, I am here to tell these seniors and thousands more across our nation that I know how important CSFP is to them, and that I will fight to save this vital program from elimination.

In conclusion, I want to thank Chairman BONILLA for his continued support for CSFP.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I will vote for the bill H.R. 5384, the ''Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, Appropriations Act of 2007.''

While the bill is a dramatic improvement from the request made by the Bush Administration it still does not fully meet the needs of rural Colorado. I'm disappointed about that, but the fact is that the federal government is being forced to do more with less because of the budget resolution the Republican leadership forced through the House.

I am pleased the bill provides support for research programs important to Colorado State University, including research on infectious diseases and ultraviolet radiation monitoring. I am also pleased provisions of the legislation adequately funds important programs for Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency grants which can provide much needed resources for rural economic development to communities throughout the Eastern Plains, Western Slope and San Luis Valley of Colorado.

While there are good things about this bill it does have its shortcomings. Even though attempts were made to the conservation provisions, more needs to be done to address the continued under funding of these important programs. I am also particularly disappointed this legislation does not address the continued delay of the implementation of a mandatory country of origin labeling (COOL) for products such as meat and produce. The shortsightedness of the committee denies Colorado ranchers and farmers a wonderful resource to market their products and provide consumers a clear choice in the products they purchase.

I am hopeful the Senate will build on the work of the House passed legislation so an even stronger bill can be sent to the President.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5384

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS

PRODUCTION, PROCESSING, AND MARKETING

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture, $5,499,000: *Provided,* That not to exceed $11,000 of this amount shall be available for official reception and representation expenses, not otherwise provided for, as determined by the Secretary.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KUCINICH

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KUCINICH:

Page 2, line 9, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $1)''.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, the Kucinich Organic Food Amendment strikes $1 of salary from the Secretary's office to raise an objection to the removal of consumer public interest representation from the National Organic Standards Board.

What is organic food? Organic food is produced in a sustainable manner without pesticides, herbicides, or artificial fertilizers. Organic food production improves the environment and delivers a safe food to our children.

Our fields and streams are relied upon to grow our food; therefore, we must protect these assets with a sustainable agricultural system. Organic food has proven itself commercially viable. It is a multi-billion dollar industry. It has improved the sustainability of our agricultural system. But organic foods cannot be distinguished by how they look, taste, or smell. Consumers can only rely on an organic label. Consumers need to trust that label if they are going to pay the premium for organic food.

The National Organic Standards Board was formed in 1990 as part of the 1990 farm bill's Organic Food Production Act. Its 15 members are meant to assist the Secretary of Agriculture in developing organic food standards. Members have 5-year terms and the board is comprised of four farmers/growers; two handlers/processors; one retailer; one scientist; three consumer public advocates; three environmentalists; and one certifying agent who sits on various committees.

This board is, among other things, tasked with ensuring that consumers can trust the organic food label. There appears to be an effort to undercut consumer public interest representation on the board. Led by Consumers Union, several food safety and public interest organizations raised objections to two recent appointments to the consumer public interest slots because those slots went to industry representatives. One occupant is a food industry lobbyist for General Mills and the other occupant is a consultant to the organic dairy industry. Fortunately, the General Mills lobbyist was responsible and resigned. Unfortunately, the dairy consultant remains on the board.

Now, the Consumers Union letter stated in part: ''These individuals could not reflect the specific interests of the consumers or the public, but rather the interests of the industry. For example, General Mills is a large corporation. It has a vested interest in the sales of organic food products which is in conflict with representing a consumer public interest position on the National Organic Standards Board.''

When the USDA was challenged by the Center For Science in the Public Interest, the USDA staff for the National Organic Standards Board responded with: ''It was the Secretary's decision to pick,'' talking about the General Mills representative, ''and he didn't want to pick anyone else.''

Clearly, the USDA has signaled its intention to leave the consumer slot vacant for the rest of the year. To ensure consumers can trust the organic label, the Secretary should fill the slots with consumer representatives. This amendment would simply remind the USDA that Congress, which created the National Organic Standards Board, believes that the consumer public interest representation on the National Organic Standards Board is critical to setting organic food standards that are credible and trustworthy.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague from Wisconsin, Mr. OBEY.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Let me simply say that I appreciate his comments, especially in light of the fact that last year in the conference on this bill after the conference was gaveled to a close, the conference committee then made arbitrary and anonymous changes in the definition of organic foods without a vote of the conference. So it seems to me that the gentleman is correct that we need to be vigilant in terms of who is trying to manipulate their definition of what represents a high organic standard.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. KUCINICH. Reclaiming my time, the comments of the gentleman from Wisconsin make it very clear that Congress has a role here in affirming the position of consumer representatives on the National Organic Standards Board. It was Congress that created this board. It was Congress that wanted to ensure the integrity of the organic label. So I am asking my colleagues to vote ''yes'' to protect the integrity of the organic food label.

I would once again say that the Consumers Union has taken this position that they believe that the integrity of the consumer public interest positions have been compromised by the appointment.

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

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that there is currently one vacancy on the National Organic Standards Board, and I understand the gentleman is very concerned about this issue and USDA is seeking nominations for the position. There was some advertisement that went out to these positions in the spring time. The vacancy closes July 14, and it will be filled. So the way we see the process going, that is, the gentleman's issues are being addressed, we see this as a non-issue, and we would hope that the gentleman would withdraw the amendment.

If there is some opposition to the way the process works, we can understand that; but the process is moving forward and the board positions will be filled in a timely manner according to our information.

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

Mr. BONILLA. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KUCINICH. Would the gentleman endorse the statement of concern that I made so that the appointment would truly go to a consumer representative?

Mr. BONILLA. I cannot advocate or endorse a particular group's choice for the position. That is not my role.

Mr. KUCINICH. If I may, if the gentleman would continue to yield, it is not my intention to ask you to endorse a particular person or a particular group's nominee. The spirit of this amendment is to protect the organic label through making sure that there is a consumer representative.

I would ask if the gentleman would be willing to work with me to make sure as we move through this process that, in fact, we will have a real consumer representative, whoever he or she may be, and not someone who is necessarily part of the industry. The industry does have representatives, and I have no quarrel with that; but consumer representatives ought to be as such. If the gentleman would agree to work with me on it, I would be happy to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. BONILLA. I would be happy to work with the gentleman on this; but, of course, I cannot stand here and guarantee the outcome.

Mr. KUCINICH. I understand, but the chairman, if we work together, I think that the consumers would have a better feeling that with the Chair being involved there is an opportunity that at least we could address the issue. I am not asking you to guarantee the outcome, but if I have your word that you will make an effort, that is good enough for me.

Mr. BONILLA. I would be happy to do that. I have a tremendous amount of respect for the gentleman. There have been many unrelated issues that we have worked on together in the past, and we would be happy to do that.

Mr. KUCINICH. In consideration of the chairman giving me his word that we will work together on this, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXECUTIVE OPERATIONS

CHIEF ECONOMIST

For necessary expenses of the Chief Economist, including economic analysis, risk assessment, cost-benefit analysis, energy and new uses, and the functions of the World Agricultural Outlook Board, as authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1622g), $11,226,000.

NATIONAL APPEALS DIVISION

For necessary expenses of the National Appeals Division, $14,795,000.

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND PROGRAM ANALYSIS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Budget and Program Analysis, $8,479,000.

HOMELAND SECURITY STAFF

For necessary expenses of the Homeland Security Staff, $954,000.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Chief Information Officer, $16,936,000.

COMMON COMPUTING ENVIRONMENT

For necessary expenses to acquire a Common Computing Environment for the Natural Resources Conservation Service, the Farm and Foreign Agricultural Service, and Rural Development mission areas for information technology, systems, and services, $68,971,000, of which $4,494,127 is for rural development-related activities, $14,494,273 is for Natural Resource Conservation Service-related activities, and $49,982,600 is for Farm Service Agency-related activities, to remain available until expended, for the capital asset acquisition of shared information technology systems, including services as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 6915–16 and 40 U.S.C. 1421–28: *Provided*, That obligation of these funds shall be consistent with the Department of Agriculture Service Center Modernization Plan of the county-based agencies, and shall be with the concurrence of the Department's Chief Information Officer: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided under this section, $410,000 shall be available to process data to acquire fourband digital color infrared imagery of the entire State of New Mexico.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WEINER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WEINER:

Page 3, line 12, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $25,576,000)''.

Page 3, line 13, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $1,666,523)''.

Page 3, line 14, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $5,374,803)''.

Page 3, line 15, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $18,534,674)''.

Page 19, line 8, insert after the first dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $23,000,000)''.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, there are a great many people who are watching with rapt attention what we do in this appropriations bill. There are many people watching, well, many might be a strong word, but there are some people watching on C–SPAN and many of our colleagues are very interested to see the outcome of this bill. But I can tell you there is a whole group of other creatures that really don't mind at all what we do here because they are going about the business of ravaging our economy.

I am talking about the invasive insects, the invasive species like the Asian longhorn beetle which because of the lack of funding in this budget and in past budgets are on course to do an estimated $268 billion worth of damage to the economy. It is insects like the Asian longhorn beetle that is eating away at Illinois and Pennsylvania and New York and New Jersey. It is insects like the emerald ash borer that my colleague Mr. SCHWARZ is so concerned about and folks in Indiana and Ohio. The sudden oak death disease in California and Oregon, all kinds of different insects are right now creating havoc in our economy.

We have over the course of time been frankly funding less and less and less for these invasive species. Sometimes it is a matter of surveillance like it is with the Asian longhorn beetle. You have to find it in order to stamp it out. Sometimes it is a matter of taking steps like we did successfully in Illinois to poison these pests before they do any more damage.

□ 1245

But I am going to tell you what the cost is if we do not pass the Weiner-Schwarz-Crowley-Maloney amendment today.

These insects will continue to move from neighborhood to neighborhood, city to city, State to State. This very same insect, which has cost over 4,000 trees in New York City, yes, Mr. OBEY, a tree does grow in Brooklyn; more than 4,000 trees have been eaten by the Asian longhorned beetle. It is on a path going north. Think of what is north of New York City. It is the Adirondacks. It is Vermont. This pest likes maple trees more than we like maple syrup. If it starts to infect that part of the U.S. economy, there will be no stopping it.

But we do have a plan now. If we provide about $23 million, it does not eliminate the problem overnight, but it does put us on a glide course to stopping this problem and these pests in their tracks.

This is a moment. This is kind of like a ripple in a pond. Right now, the problem is relatively concentrated. This is what it looks like in New York City. It started about 3 years ago, just in this neighborhood of Greenpoint, and now it is moving further and further and further out. At the same time that is happening, we have been reducing our funding, and the President has underfunded this bill appreciably.

My amendment is very simple. It would take $23 million from the common computing account and move it into this line which would help stamp out this bug and so many others. There is a list of States that this impacts, everything from the southern U.S. where the cactus moth is, all the way up to the northeast where the Asian longhorned beetle is, and Mr. SCHWARZ is going to talk about the effect it is having on Michigan.

Look, I want to upgrade the computers at the Department of Agriculture as much as anyone, but a slow computer is the least of our problems when up against this fellow. I want to tell you, as dangerous as this bug is, in all truth, this is not life size. It is a little bit smaller than this, but this bug will continue plowing away through our trees. They have already eaten 4,000 trees in New York City alone, and the only way to stop it after a while is just to raise entire forests. We simply cannot do that.

In conclusion, let me just say this, Mr. Chairman, we have shown that when the office of APHIS at the Department of Agriculture goes into a problem like they did with the boll weevil, jumps into a problem like they did with the Asian longhorned beetle in Illinois, we can stop this problem, and we can do it for relatively pennies on the dollar.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry. Am I allowed to reserve time?

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLER of Florida). No.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, in conclusion then, this is a chance to spend $23 million to save us having to spend $268 million.

I urge you to vote ''yes'' on the Weiner-Schwarz-Maloney-Crowley amendment and stamp out the Asian longhorned beetle and the other invasive species.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman raises a very good issue that deserves attention, but we have done our absolute best to fund eradication and control of plant pests in the bill before you today that we are presenting. The overall total for plant pests is $115 million, which is $16 million over last year's level.

The Asian longhorned beetle is at the President's request of $20 million; the glassy winged sharpshooter is at $24 million; emerald ash borer, $20 million, more than doubling last year's level of $8 million; citrus response is $39 million; sudden oak death, doubled from last year to $6 million; and the list goes on and on.

Eradication and control of these pests is also supported by emergency funding from the Commodity Credit Corporation at the discretion of the Secretary. The emerald ash borer control just received $7.5 million from CCC last month.

As for the offset of this amendment, it is completely irresponsible to cut funding to farmers, rural areas and conservation programs for this gentleman's purpose.

I would imagine that it would not just be me, but there would be Members from all across America that are sensitive to the cuts that are being proposed in this amendment. It is not just about one district. This is about national priorities.

If the gentleman wishes to look in his own district for offsets, New York City benefits greatly from the programs funded by this bill. I heard from you and others that funding for the Commodity Supplemental Fielding Program was a critical need. This bill includes $118 million for that program, which the President attempted to zero out. Of that amount, New York City receives $7.8 million and about 30,000 people receive food as a result. Would the gentleman propose that funding for that program be cut to fund beetle eradication since there is a parochial interest in taking money from one place and putting it in another?

The gentleman could also propose cuts in funding for WIC, the feeding program that we all care about and try to take care of every year for at-risk women and children, to fund this priority. This bill before us today includes over $5 billion of WIC funding. New York receives about $200 million of that funding every year for eligible women, infants and children. Why are beetles more important? What is the priority?

The point is that there are a lot of choices that you have to make in putting a bill like this together, and we made the choices that we feel are best for this country and have been fair to every State. So I would ask Members to oppose the amendment when it comes for a moment.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Weiner-Schwarz amendment to boost funding for the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service by $23 million to fight invasive species nationwide, all across our country, and this additional funding that we are requesting is measured, it is responsible. It is the difference between what APHIS tell us they need to eradicate invasive species and what this bill contains.

My good friend on the other side of the aisle calls this a New York issue. This is not a New York issue. This is across the country, and it addresses not only the Asian longhorned beetle, but the emerald ash borer, the sudden death oak disease, the cactus moth that is in the gulf region, the boll weevil that is in the south and has destroyed a lot of the cotton industry, and again, this is not what we are requesting. It is what the professionals are requesting.

If we are able to stop it in New York or Chicago; Chicago has practically eradicated the Asian longhorned beetle. Believe me, you do not want this moving across the country. It is a terrible, terrible bug. I have got one right here, and it is only about an inch long with white spots on it. It does not look that dangerous, but if it gets into a tree, it will completely destroy the tree.

It first appeared in Greenpoint, Brooklyn, in my district, and we did not detect it, and literally, we had to chop down every single tree in a park and throughout the neighborhood. We are now trying to contain it and to keep it out of Central Park. It has moved into New Jersey. If we are able to contain it in Chicago and New Jersey and New York, then you will not have this problem.

Again, we are not just talking about the Asian longhorned beetle. We are talking about all invasive species, and it is the amount that is requested by the professionals in the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

So this is a responsible bill. Regrettably, in New York, we have had to chop down over 4,000 trees; 27,000 trees have been chopped down across the country, and this is really an unacceptable price to pay, and that is why we need to pass this amendment which will provide more funding to fight these invasive species.

I tell you, it is a responsible request. We are just backing up what the agency is asking for, and this is a national problem. If we are able to contain it in Chicago and New Jersey, then you will not have the problem, and as I said, it also funds all of the other areas such as the sudden oak death and the emerald ash borer. I yield the remainder of my time to my colleague and friend from New York who has worked so hard on this issue, and it is so critical to all of New York City and State but to your States, too.

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

Mrs. MALONEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman.

This was passed on a bipartisan level, a similar bump-up amendment, 2 years ago. I just want to respond to the chairman's suggestion.

There is no doubt about it, the chairman makes some very difficult choices and I think did a very admirable job, but he read a long list of programs we do not take the money from. It should be clear where it comes from.

It comes from computer upgrades, computer upgrades, infrastructure, Department of Agriculture, a very worthy thing to do, no doubt about it, but if we do not wipe out these invasive species, they are going to wipe us out. The vector is like this. It is a wider and wider challenge with each additional year.

I believe that we need to have the highest technology we can in all of our agencies, but it is a matter of waiting another year to upgrade computers rather than trees.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, if we do not fell this beetle and other invasive species, they will continue to fell our trees across our country.

I have an example here from APHIS of the beetle and what to look for if it goes to your States so you will know about it, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. This is a bipartisan amendment, and this is about the health and welfare of our economy, our environment.

It has cost us zillions of dollars to stop this beetle. We need to stop it now or it is only go to cause more economic and environmental damage across our country.

So I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this important amendment.

Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the emerald ash borer started in the State of Michigan, in southeast Michigan, probably another unwanted import from someplace in Southeast Asia where it does not affect the ash species, only apparently in North America, but it has now killed tens of millions of ash trees in the Midwest, and the destruction continues.

It affects the baseball bat industry, baseball bats are made from ash; the nursery industry; Native American culture, basket weaving; hardwood flooring and furniture industry; beautification projects; et cetera. It has moved out from southeast Michigan now to central Michigan into the northern

part of the State and into the upper peninsula, Ohio and Indiana and, unfortunately with some nursery trees, into the State of Virginia as well.

It is expected, if we do not go after this effectively and aggressively, that all the ash trees east of the Mississippi River will soon be destroyed by the emerald ash borer. For that reason, I support the Weiner-Schwarz amendment. I am hopeful that the chairman will as well.

Michigan State University in my State is doing a great deal of research and trying to find an easier way than the methods now used to exterminate this pest. That has not been done yet, and as a result, all of the ash trees in the United States, but especially those east of the Mississippi, are at risk.

I would say this. We appreciate the $20 million. The $20 million is not quite enough, and I do not think, unless you live in that part of the country, one understands the magnitude of what is going on with the emerald ash borer.

If we cannot pass our amendment, I would hope the chairman would consider changing the report language in the bill to include the lower peninsula of Michigan as well as the upper peninsula and Indiana and Ohio. For some reason yet unknown to me, the lower peninsula of Michigan is not in that language, but in any event, the emerald ash borer, which is the reason I am here and the reason I so strongly support this amendment, is something that has to be eradicated. If it is not eradicated, every ash tree in the United States itself will be eradicated.

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

I rise in support of the Weiner-Schwarz amendment. I want to thank my colleague from New York (Mr. WEINER) for all his hard work on this important issue on attacking invasive species.

Many people wonder why members of the New York City delegation would be up here on the Agricultural bill, but the issue of invasive species is a serious one for Members from rural, suburban and urban areas as well.

For New York City, the pest in question is the Asian longhorned beetle, and quite frankly, if the Asian longhorned beetle were this big, we would not be having this debate right now. We would all be putting more than $48 million per year towards eradicating it. But it is much smaller. It is about one-and-a-half inches to 2 inches in length.

It has been in Queens County since 1999, where I represent. The Asian longhorned beetle has had devastating effects on trees in my home County of Queens but also of Brooklyn, the Bronx, Manhattan, as well as parts of Chicago and New Jersey.

□ 1300

I know this pest has been depriving the residents of my constituency in my district of precious shade, green space, and natural beauty provided by a variety of trees. This issue is particularly serious in an area where trees and shades are at a premium, in the County of Queens. We have lost almost half of the trees that have been lost in New York City.

But besides attacking urban area trees, scientists have stated that the Asian longhorned beetle is a real threat to the hardwood trees of America; and if left unchecked, this pest could be more threatening to our Nation's trees and forests than the Dutch elm disease, the gypsy moth caterpillar, the chestnut blight combined. This beetle would be devastating to our timber industry, but let me go to our homes and to the breakfast table. This invasive species can have a direct impact on the maple syrup industry here in America. Imagine, pancakes without real maple syrup. That is what this bug represents to America right now.

On this point, I want to thank again the Chair and the ranking member for including report language in this bill recognizing the real threat of the Asian longhorned beetle. The report states: ''The Asian longhorned beetle threatens all hardwood trees, and is of great concern to the northeast, particularly in New York and New Jersey.''

When this pest was first discovered, I called for the assistance of my colleagues in this Chamber and you all responded. I want to acknowledge the great work of then-Chairman Skeen and now Chairman BONILLA, and then-Ranking Member KAPTUR and now Ranking Member DELAURO in working with me and the City of New York to try to address this issue.

I remember visiting the Heinz family of Ridgewood, Queens, who lost some of their precious trees to this pest in 1999. Due to our hard work here in Washington, we were able to fund investigators who searched the trees to look for the beetle and worked towards eliminating the problem in this particular neighborhood. We were able to replace those trees.

Green space and trees are a vital component to the quality of life of my constituents both in Queens and the Bronx and all the outer boroughs, including Manhattan. We can fight this invasive species and other pests that plague our country, like the emerald ash borer, sudden oak death, cactus moth and boll weevil, by passing this Weiner-Schwarz amendment today.

In addition to their past support for battling the beetle, I also want to thank Chairman BONILLA and Ranking Member DELAURO for including a provision in their bill granting the Secretary of the USDA discretion to use Commodity Credit Corporation funds to combat the beetle. While this provision is important, it cannot replace the need for this amendment, as over the past several years OMB has not approved CCC funding to combat this beetle and work towards its total eradication.

That is why I am supporting this amendment today to provide a $23 million increase to APHIS this year to more effectively combat invasive species in our country. Please support this amendment. It will benefit our constituents in almost every State in the country. In fact, I would argue every State, if you eat pancakes in the morning.

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

I rise for the purpose of a colloquy with the chairman. I want to thank you for the good work you and Ranking Member DELAURO have done on this bill and all the good work you have done for agriculture, much of which is manifested in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, thank you in particular for the interest that you have paid in regard to the wine industry, which is very important not only to my district but to the entire State of California, now a nearly $50 billion annual industry in California. I know that you took the time to come out and see it firsthand from the ground up, and that is very much appreciated.

Mr. Chairman, on page 22 of the House report, it directs and approves the reprogramming of available construction funds away from certain facilities. The report further states: ''This reprogramming will be used to offset construction costs for other Federal facilities in those States.''

I would like to get clarification, Mr. Chairman, that this language is not intended to imply that the committee has decided that these other projects are unworthy facilities or that the committee has determined that construction funding is no longer warranted.

Mr. BONILLA. If the gentleman will yield, I appreciate the gentleman's inquiry. The bill ensures that previously appropriated funds for planning and design of a new facility will continue to be available. This reprogramming is not intended to signify that construction funds are no longer needed.

Let me also add that I appreciate the gentleman's remarks on my interest in the industry. I have enjoyed my touring of the gentleman's region of California and also in Washington and would look forward at some point to returning. I plan to continue supporting the industry for as long as I am here.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I look forward to working with you and your staff on this and other matters that are important to this region in the future. We would love to get you back out there to see the parts of the industry that you didn't get a chance to see, and I appreciate your continued interest and hard work on behalf of this industry.

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BUTTERFIELD

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUTTERFIELD:

Page 3, line 12, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

Page 3, line 14, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 21, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 22, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer this amendment today on behalf of the 23 rural counties that I represent in eastern North Carolina, and I might say that we are also the 15th poorest district in the Nation. I offer this amendment on behalf of the small and low-income and underserved rural communities all across America.

Mr. Chairman, before I continue with offering this amendment, I would like to say what a fine job that you and your staff have done on this bill. You were very courteous to me when I discussed this amendment with you a few minutes ago, and I thank you so very much. I also would like to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their spirit of bipartisanship on this committee.

Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to support the underlying bill. This amendment is offered to respectfully bring attention to this particular area of need.

If an individual is driving along interstate highway 95, and many of my colleagues when they travel south will travel that route, if you are driving along this interstate highway and you find yourself in an unfortunate collision, the odds are very likely that the emergency vehicles that respond to your situation were financed through the Community Facilities Account in Rural Development.

In all likelihood, the fire station and the police station and other facilities in the rural community that support these vehicles came from this account. Community Facilities, or CF as we call it, provides low-interest, long-term loans to rural towns and cities for buildings and emergency vehicles and other items. These loans are a net positive to the Federal Government over the life of the loan, and they have an exceptionally low default rate because the recipient is a local governmental entity. Because the funding is leveraged, a $5 million increase in this account will result in approximately $28 million in increased lending to local counties, cities, and towns.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that funding is tight this fiscal year. We all know that. But a small amount of money will allow a disproportionately large amount of lending to small communities across America to develop critical infrastructure that will save lives. So on behalf of the rural communities across America, I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment.

The amendment proposes to cut funding for computers and information technology for NRCS and to add funding for the Rural Community programs.

The gentleman did not include this funding level as a priority to the subcommittee prior to this bill coming to the floor. The bill provides over $49 million for the Rural Community programs, which is an increase of $6 million over the President's request.

We had to make some tough decisions within our funding allocation, and I do not believe we should cut the Natural Resources Conservation Service to provide an additional increase for the Rural Community programs. So we have dealt with this issue in the committee, and we feel like we have done the best we can. Therefore, I rise to oppose this amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Chief Financial Officer, $5,991,000: *Provided*, That no funds made available by this appropriation may be obligated for FAIR Act or Circular A–76 activities until the Secretary has submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress and the Committee on Government Reform of the House of Representatives a report on the Department's contracting out policies, including agency budgets for contracting out.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, $836,000.

OFFICE OF CIVIL RIGHTS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Civil Rights, $22,650,000.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ADMINISTRATION

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration, $736,000.

AGRICULTURE BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES AND RENTAL PAYMENTS

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For payment of space rental and related costs pursuant to Public Law 92–313, including authorities pursuant to the 1984 delegation of authority from the Administrator of General Services to the Department of Agriculture under 40 U.S.C. 486, for programs and activities of the Department which are included in this Act, and for alterations and other actions needed for the Department and its agencies to consolidate unneeded space into configurations suitable for release to the Administrator of General Services, and for the operation, maintenance, improvement, and repair of Agriculture buildings and facilities, and for related costs, $209,814,000, to remain available until expended, of which $155,851,000 shall be available for payments to the General Services Administration for rent and the Department of Homeland Security for building security: *Provided*, That amounts which are made available for space rental and related costs for the Department of Agriculture in this Act may be transferred between such appropriations to cover the costs of additional, new, or replacement space 15 days after notice thereof is transmitted to the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY OF MINNESOTA

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota:

Page 5, line 15, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $500,000)''.

Page 13, line 6, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $500,000)''.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, let me first of all thank the chairman of the committee and the great committee itself for the wonderful job they are doing with a very difficult task in a tight budget year of balancing so many priorities, and I commend them on the job that they have done.

I do rise today as someone who did not live in a town of more than 500 until after I graduated from high school. I understand the unique challenges that our rural communities face, and one of those challenges that has emerged in the last few years is the growing shortfall of qualified veterinarians serving in rural practice.

This shortage is particularly troubling because vets provide critical services that help make our country's food security and disease management systems the envy of the world. Veterinarians in rural communities are our front line of defense against biosecurity outbreaks, like avian influenza, SARS, BSE, West Nile virus, and others.

The need to prevent such outbreaks and identify new biohazards before they endanger our food supply makes it crucial that we have qualified vets working in our rural communities. However, over the last few years, the rising cost of veterinary education has led to a critical shortfall of new vets entering into practice in lower-paying underserved areas.

□ 1315

According to the American Veterinary Medical Association, in 2005, the average new vet had over $88,000 in debt from their education, and more than one-third of the graduates had debt over $100,000. As a result, new vets face loan repayments that amount to

nearly a third of their monthly salaries, forcing many to go into higher-paying smaller animal practices instead of the large animal, food-supply related service in our rural areas.

Worse yet, statistics show that the shortage of food-supply vets is growing by 4 percent a year with an anticipated 13 percent shortage for cattle and swine veterinarians and a 19 percent shortage for vets involved in Federal animal inspections.

To address this shortfall, in December 2003, the National Veterinary Medical Service Act was signed into law. The bill authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to exchange payment of a vet's educational loans for service in critical shortage areas such as rural, public health and inner city practices.

Although the act had nearly unanimous support when passed into law, today Congress has only appropriated $500,000 for this pilot program in last year's agriculture appropriations conference report, and I thank the chairman for that. The amount is far too short of the act's authorizing level, but veterinarian professionals like the American Veterinary Medical Association believe it is vital to encouraging more vets to enter into practices critical to our Nation's food security.

That is why I am offering an amendment to again fund this program at $500,000, the same as enacted in last year's bill. The offset for this funding would come from the Agriculture Buildings Facilities and Rental Payments Account which is set to increase at over $24 million to nearly $210 million next year.

We must provide much-needed resources in the area of work dedicated to combating the threat of economic, human and animal loss. I again acknowledge the difficult task the chairman faces and the commendable job they have done in balancing those priorities, but I encourage all Members to support my amendment, which is endorsed by the Veterinary Medical Association, so we have a strong defense against all disease outbreaks throughout the country.

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

Mr. Chairman, first let me say, I want to commend Mr. KENNEDY for his hard work on this issue. He is a great Member of the House and is destined and on his way to doing greater things for the State of Minnesota.

However, I reluctantly rise to oppose the amendment, and I think if the gentleman will listen to my reasons, he will understand why.

Mr. Chairman, it is not that we are against the issue; it is that there is no place to put the money that the gentleman is proposing. The gentleman does accurately point out that the Senate provided funding for this program in fiscal year 2006, and we agreed to fund this in the conference. The Senate-passed bill had $1 million for this program, and we agreed to $500,000.

However, adding more money to this program will have zero effect. This is a brand new program. The USDA is only currently deciding how to set this program up because they do not run a student loan repayment program. The department has coordinated a working group, and they are only now reviewing a draft management proposal. USDA wants to ensure that this program is thought out. Rules and regulations will have to be drafted and finalized, and the USDA estimates it is going to be about 18 months before this program is in place.

My point is fiscal year 2007 will have passed before this program is in place. We have a hard enough time keeping ongoing programs adequately funded. I know the gentleman appreciates that.

So, again, just to emphasize, even if I stood up here and agreed to the gentleman's amendment, the money would go into limbo and would not be used for what the gentleman wants it to be used for. I would urge the gentleman to withdraw his amendment because we can work together to make sure that this thing works properly.

This is the fiscal year 2007 appropriations bill for agriculture, and there is absolutely nothing that they can do with this money for at least 18 months. So it is not a prudent way to proceed.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONILLA. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Would the gentleman stipulate that the previously appropriated funds are going to be sufficient to cover any amounts going under this program during fiscal year 2007?

Mr. BONILLA. Yes, because until they can develop the rules, regulations and how it is going to work, there is nothing they can spend money the money on.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. At the chairman's request, I will withdraw my amendment under the agreement that in the future and once this program has been further defined by the USDA, that we work together to make sure that it becomes funded at the level necessary to ensure that we have large animal veterinarians out in our rural areas.

Mr. BONILLA. Absolutely.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 18 offered by Mr. HOLT:

Page 5, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $3,145,000)''.

Page 17, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $3,145,000)''.

Page 17, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $3,145,000)''.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to the bill that will increase funding for organic transitions. It should come as no surprise; in fact, we have talked about it already this morning, that the demand for natural pesticide-free and chemical-free foods has been increasing dramatically in the United States. In fact, the Department of Agriculture says this part, this sector of the industry, is growing at 20 percent per year.

And yet funding for a critical government program to help farmers make the transition to organic farming has remained quite small and flat year after year.

The Organic Transitions Program is a competitive grants program established as part of the Cooperative Research and Extension Service. The national program has been very important to organic farming, to organic farmers and farms, and to fund research to assist the farmers in overcoming the barriers and making the transition into organic production.

This will help farmers, and it does today, help farmers optimize management of organic matter, soil fertility, research in pests and in crop health. Farmers have been funded to implement pest management programs for use in blueberry production. Another study has been funded to look at organic weed suppression.

Organic agriculture, indeed, is coming of age. But still, there is a need for research under the Department of Agriculture to help in the transition. Despite the surge in demand for organic products, the research into the transition, the research to assist the farmers in making the transition into organic farming methods has been holding steady at just under $2 million for the last several fiscal years. Well, spread over 50 States for agricultural research and extension services, obviously that is not keeping up.

So today I am offering with my colleagues from Iowa, Oregon and Wisconsin, Mr. LEACH, Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. KIND, an amendment to increase the funding of the organic transitions program from $1.8 million to $5 million.

I am very much aware of the hard work that the chairman and the committee have put into squeezing every dollar out of their bill to get the best effect. However, I must say I was startled to find that the funding for this important program was not increased a bit even though this sector of agriculture in the United States is growing at 20 percent a year, and the demand for this very program is growing very rapidly.

So this amendment has the enthusiastic support of the National Organic Coalition, the Organic Trade Association, the northeast and other chapters of the Organic Farming Association, and many in the farming community.

And without this additional organic research funding, the farming community simply will not be able to keep

pace with the ever-growing demand for pesticide-free and chemical-free organic agricultural products.

I hope my colleagues will join me in favor of this amendment. I ask for its approval.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The amendment proposes to increase the organic transitions program by over $3 million. This represents, and I ask for all of my colleagues to get this, a 175 percent increase over the current funding level. This amendment is not even reasonable.

We struggle every day when we put a bill like this together to squeeze every last penny that we can to be fiscally responsible and to take care of requests that Members have. So to come to the floor with an amendment that has a 175 percent increase is unreasonable. It is not good government. I would urge Members to vote ''no.'' If this amendment even passes with this funding level, it would be unsustainable in conference. I do not understand, what is the point?

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

Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to the chairman of the subcommittee, and I know he has a very tough task given the allocation that he has to work with under the budget, but this amendment is not only necessary, it is fair and reasonable.

The offset would be from the facilities account which is increased even more than 175 percent from our calculation.

But the reason it is fair is because the organic industry today commands well over 2 percent of market share in this country. As my friend from New Jersey indicated, they have been growing on average 20 percent every year. The demand is growing even faster than that. Yet under agriculture appropriations funding, they are receiving approximately 0.2 percent of the funding under the agriculture bill even though they command well over 2 percent of market share.

What we are saying is that the organic industry is here and it is time to start treating them more fairly. They are growing and commanding a bigger share. Consumer demand exists, and that is why I am proud to offer this amendment with the gentleman from New Jersey, along with our colleagues, Mr. LEACH and Mr. DEFAZIO.

I personally have witnessed this growth in my congressional district in western Wisconsin, which has more organic producers than anywhere else in the entire country. In fact, it is the home of Organic Valley which has seen their sales increase, on average, roughly 50 percent every year. Last year alone, Organic Valley had an increase by 173 in the membership of their coop, bringing their total number up to 730. Today, based on a recent communication I had with them, they have over 600 applicants wanting to join Organic Valley and the cooperative, so they can sell their organic products.

But as we know, the transition to organic is very difficult, very expensive and it is very lengthy. The transition is a 3-year period where they see a tremendous drop in income during that time period until they are certified organic. That is why I think this amendment addresses a very specific need that exists, and it is helping with the transition costs into organic by the competitive grants that this amendment would offer. The increase in funding is something that I think is long overdue.

I think we in this body need to recognize the growing strength and the impact that organic is having in the market today. But this is not a question that organic is scientifically more healthy. We are not alleging that.

What organic represents is a choice: A choice that producers get to make on how they want to work their own lands, and a choice that consumers can make when it comes time to buying products for themselves and their families, and more and more consumers are choosing organic. In fact, more and more large retailers throughout the country are choosing to offer organic products on their shelves, and this will only continue to grow. Therefore, the demand will continue to grow, and the necessity for this amendment will certainly grow.

That is why I am hoping as we move forward with the reauthorization of the next farm bill in the next session of Congress, we will be able to engage the chairman of the subcommittee and other Members of this Congress in recognizing the growing need and vitality that exists in the organic industry today, and that we will be able to do some innovative and creative things to assist organic producers, but especially those smaller producers that are making that difficult and expensive transition into organic today so that there is a place in the farm bill for short-term assistance to enable them to make it.

But we can take an important step today by supporting this amendment, again with the appropriate offset that we have identified, which is a lot less than the increase in funding under this transition program.

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

Mr. KIND. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HOLT. The gentleman from Wisconsin, I am sure, is fully aware of the fact that the Department of Agriculture's Cooperative State Research and Extension Service has been one of the things that has made agriculture in America great and has made it successful.

What we are talking about is a highly competitive grant program under that service. This is not any give-away. This is something that advances the understanding and advances the agricultural science. The chairman makes it sounds like we are talking about a whooping amount of money, $5 million. We are talking about agricultural services all over the country; every State is involved in organic agriculture now. This is an important increase, but this is not a whooping, prohibitive increase.

□ 1330

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the organic industry has never come before the Congress asking for a heck of a lot. That has been the history of them. God bless them for doing so. This is one small program in the overall agriculture appropriations bill that they have come to us asking for greater assistance, because their need has grown exponentially.

We believe that with the appropriate offset we have identified, moving from roughly $1.8 million in these competitive grants up to $5 million will help relieve a little pent up pressure in that need that exists today. Because the organic industry has the potential of growing much faster and much larger than it is, even in recent years. I encourage my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey as well as the gentleman from Wisconsin for their statements in support of the organic transitions program.

As someone who has traveled the country, I can tell you that organic food growers are an emerging sector in agriculture. Mr. KIND pointed out that they now are at 2 percent.

I can tell you that all around this country there are many people getting into organic agriculture. What that means is that there needs to be structures in place to facilitate the growth of organic agriculture, which is just what this amendment will do.

I think we can look at it as emerging small business persons as well. These are individuals who believe in sustainability. These are individuals who believe in the American dream of being able to farm a plot of land and do it in a way that is consistent with a high quality, something that we ought to all be proud of. It is something that affects many Congressional districts in certainly every State.

I wanted to add my voice to support the efforts of Mr. HOLT, Mr. KIND and others who understand that the organic transition program is something that is going to help the organic industry grow. It is good for the industry, and it is good for American agriculture, and it is good for our ability to keep growing our economy as we grow with the growth of the organic industry.

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

Mr. Chairman, I won't take all of my time, I just want to lend my support to this amendment as a State in which we are seeing increasing efforts in terms of organic farming, and having visited those efforts, myself and understanding

the concerns that they have in making these kinds of transitions with the kinds of movement of the American public that is moving in this direction.

I just wanted to associate myself with the words of my colleagues and support the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS MANAGEMENT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Department of Agriculture, to comply with the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.) and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.), $12,020,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That appropriations and funds available herein to the Department for Hazardous Materials Management may be transferred to any agency of the Department for its use in meeting all requirements pursuant to the above Acts on Federal and non-Federal lands.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For Departmental Administration, $24,114,000, to provide for necessary expenses for management support services to offices of the Department and for general administration, security, repairs and alterations, and other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for and necessary for the practical and efficient work of the Department: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be reimbursed from applicable appropriations in this Act for travel expenses incident to the holding of hearings as required by 5 U.S.C. 551–558.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR CONGRESSIONAL RELATIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations to carry out the programs funded by this Act, including programs involving intergovernmental affairs and liaison within the executive branch, $3,940,000: *Provided*, That these funds may be transferred to agencies of the Department of Agriculture funded by this Act to maintain personnel at the agency level: *Provided further*, That no funds made available by this appropriation may be obligated after 30 days from the date of enactment of this Act, unless the Secretary has notified the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress on the allocation of these funds by USDA agency: *Provided further*, That no other funds appropriated to the Department by this Act shall be available to the Department for support of activities of congressional relations.

OFFICE OF COMMUNICATIONS

For necessary expenses to carry out services relating to the coordination of programs involving public affairs, for the dissemination of agricultural information, and the coordination of information, work, and programs authorized by Congress in the Department, $9,695,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $2,000,000 may be used for farmers' bulletins.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Inspector General, including employment pursuant to the Inspector General Act of 1978, $82,493,000, including such sums as may be necessary for contracting and other arrangements with public agencies and private persons pursuant to section 6(a)(9) of the Inspector General Act of 1978, and including not to exceed $125,000 for certain confidential operational expenses, including the payment of informants, to be expended under the direction of the Inspector General pursuant to Public Law 95–452 and section 1337 of Public Law 97–98.

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

For necessary expenses of the Office of the General Counsel, $40,455,000.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR RESEARCH, EDUCATION AND ECONOMICS

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Research, Education and Economics to administer the laws enacted by the Congress for the Economic Research Service, the National Agricultural Statistics Service, the Agricultural Research Service, and the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service, $651,000.

ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE

For necessary expenses of the Economic Research Service in conducting economic research and analysis, $80,963,000.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS SERVICE

For necessary expenses of the National Agricultural Statistics Service in conducting statistical reporting and service work, $148,719,000, of which up to $36,582,000 shall be available until expended for the Census of Agriculture.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY OF MINNESOTA

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 17 offered by Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota:

Page 9, line 10, insert after the first dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $500,000)''.

Page 19, line 8, insert after the first dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $500,000)''.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, as a representative from Minnesota's largest dairy-producing region, I have been a strong advocate for working with the Federal Government to protect my State's dairy producers and ranchers.

With 30,000 cattle producers representing a $2 billion industry in the State of Minnesota, I take very seriously any potential threat to the viability of the livestock sector in my State. The continued spread of bovine tuberculosis in cattle throughout Minnesota and other States poses a major risk of devastation to herds across the country.

So far this year, five beef cattle herds have tested positive for bovine tuberculosis in Minnesota. During the same period, seven beef and dairy herds in Michigan, and one dairy heard in Arizona have contracted the disease.

While some may believe that these outbreaks are the exception rather than the rule, it should be noted that several other States, including California, New Mexico and Texas have seen outbreaks in their herds. In fact, back in 2000, the USDA Secretary Glickman authorized over $44 million in emergency funds to expand TB eradication in Texas, Michigan and elsewhere.

States are responsible for the lion's share of the cost of dealing with these outbreaks. Not only must they combat the spread of bovine TB in livestock, but they must also make do with the shortage of limited Federal funds for indemnity payments to the ranchers and dairy producers.

The scope of the problem is evident at USDA's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, APHIS, where the limited funding for the bovine TB eradication program has been strained so severely that no indemnity money is left for the rest of this fiscal year. In fact, as a result of the most recent herds testing positive for bovine TB, USDA has had to find an additional $1.5 million above what has been appropriated for the bovine TB program for this year.

This has resulted in delays, threatens animal health and increases costs for our farmers and ranchers who are now reluctant. They are reluctant to test their herds unless they are confident that indemnity money is available.

Simply put, this is not acceptable. That is why I am offering an amendment today that calls for a $500,000 increase in APHIS TB's eradication program. Such an increase was specifically referenced in the meeting that I had with APHIS Administrator DeHaven just last week.

My amendment, which is endorsed by the National Cattlemen's Beef Association, would mean that the total of $17.2 million would be appropriated for this year to deal with tuberculosis outbreaks in fiscal 2007. The offset for this funding would come from the National Agricultural Statistics Service, which has provided an increase of $9 million this year to a total of $145 million.

I, again, commend the chairman for the difficult balancing act that he has and a difficult tight year, but I encourage all Members to support my amendment so that all ranchers and dairy farmers, dairy producers, receive the resources they need to combat this resilient and destructive disease.

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

Mr. Chairman, it is with great reluctance I rise to oppose the gentleman's amendment, because the gentleman is such a distinguished Member. But we have funded the bovine TB program at $16.7 million, the same as the President's request. That is $1.8 million over the current level. So it is not like we haven't tried to address this issue.

We have challenges in fighting TB, but we feel like the resources provided can meet those challenges for now. If indemnity funds are exhausted in the current year, the Secretary can then access emergency funds.

So we do feel that this issue that the gentleman is concerned about, the concerns could be addressed. We certainly

would be willing to work with the Department and the gentleman if there is a greater need that we currently don't foresee.

The gentleman also proposes to cut funds for the National Agriculture Statistics Service. Those funds are for the purposes of agriculture and agriculture estimates. The census of agriculture does have an increase this year because it is a 5-year cycle and has up and down years. We are headed up to a census.

If you cut agricultural estimates, you decrease the USDA's ability to provide quality agriculture data. That data affects cash receipts to America's farms and ranches and exceeds $200 billion annually. The estimates must be precise; for example, a 1 cent change in the average corn price can result in the change of more than $110 million in counter-cyclical payments.

That is why I oppose the amendment. I know the gentleman can see my points very clearly and also the earlier point I made that it is not like we are not trying to address the gentleman's concerns and feel like, again, that we have increased this line item. There is additional money available, if there is a problem that emerges, so we are on your side, would be my quote to the gentleman.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONILLA. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, the concern that we have, having met with the administrator, the funds have run out for this year some time ago. They have other diseases where they have sort of known expiration funds that they can give assurance.

But there is no assurance that funds would be released by OMB from CCC to provide this. Our farmers are telling us, as you know, farmers can take time to be concerned, that they just don't even want to test their animals because they know there isn't assured indemnity funds out there. So given the current status we are at today, where we are out of indemnity funds, farmers are concerned that their concern and their lack of confidence in the program being there could result in them making decisions that would delay identification of TB.

I recognize the issues that the chairman has brought up, but I do believe that given the heightened importance of this, that I think we need to proceed. I would also point out, as I mentioned, that when Texas was vitally concerned, we had $44 million back in 2000. Yes I do commend the increase, but I do believe this further increase remains being called for.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would further emphasize CCC funds could be used if they are needed to address this. So we feel like, again, we are doing all we can to address this issue at this time. That is why I am opposing the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY).

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to enable the Agricultural Research Service to perform agricultural research and demonstration relating to production, utilization, marketing, and distribution (not otherwise provided for); home economics or nutrition and consumer use including the acquisition, preservation, and dissemination of agricultural information; and for acquisition of lands by donation, exchange, or purchase at a nominal cost not to exceed $100, and for land exchanges where the lands exchanged shall be of equal value or shall be equalized by a payment of money to the grantor which shall not exceed 25 percent of the total value of the land or interests transferred out of Federal ownership, $1,057,603,000, of which $2,350,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That appropriations hereunder shall be available for the operation and maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed one for replacement only: *Provided further*, That appropriations hereunder shall be available pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 2250 for the construction, alteration, and repair of buildings and improvements, but unless otherwise provided, the cost of constructing any one building shall not exceed $375,000, except for headhouses or greenhouses which shall each be limited to $1,200,000, and except for 10 buildings to be constructed or improved at a cost not to exceed $750,000 each, and the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 percent of the current replacement value of the building or $375,000, whichever is greater: *Provided further*, That the limitations on alterations contained in this Act shall not apply to modernization or replacement of existing facilities at Beltsville, Maryland: *Provided further*, That appropriations hereunder shall be available for granting easements at the Beltsville Agricultural Research Center: *Provided further*, That the foregoing limitations shall not apply to replacement of buildings needed to carry out the Act of April 24, 1948 (21 U.S.C. 113a): *Provided further*, That the foregoing limitations shall not apply to the purchase of land at Florence, South Carolina: *Provided further*, That funds may be received from any State, other political subdivision, organization, or individual for the purpose of establishing or operating any research facility or research project of the Agricultural Research Service, as authorized by law: *Provided further*, That the Secretary, through the Agricultural Research Service, or successor, is authorized to lease approximately 40 acres of land at the Central Plains Experiment Station, Nunn, Colorado, to the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System, for its Shortgrass Steppe Biological Field Station, on such terms and conditions as the Secretary deems in the public interest: *Provided further*, That the Secretary understands that it is the intent of the University to construct research and educational buildings on the subject acreage and to conduct agricultural research and educational activities in these buildings: *Provided further*, That as consideration for a lease, the Secretary may accept the benefits of mutual cooperative research to be conducted by the Colorado State University and the Government at the Shortgrass Steppe Biological Field Station: *Provided further*, That the term of any lease shall be for no more than 20 years, but a lease may be renewed at the option of the Secretary on such terms and conditions as the Secretary deems in the public interest: *Provided further*, That the Agricultural Research Service may convey all rights and title of the United States, to a parcel of land comprising 19 acres, more or less, located in Section 2, Township 18 North, Range 14 East in Oktibbeha County, Mississippi, originally conveyed by the Board of Trustees of the Institution of Higher Learning of the State of Mississippi, and described in instruments recorded in Deed Book 306 at pages 553–554, Deed Book 319 at page 219, and Deed Book 33 at page 115, of the public land records of Oktibbeha County, Mississippi, including facilities, and fixed equipment, to the Mississippi State University, Starkville, Mississippi, in their ''as is'' condition, when vacated by the Agricultural Research Service: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available to carry out research related to the production, processing, or marketing of tobacco or tobacco products.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For acquisition of land, construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities as necessary to carry out the agricultural research programs of the Department of Agriculture, where not otherwise provided, $140,000,000, to remain available until expended.

COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND EXTENSION SERVICE

RESEARCH AND EDUCATION ACTIVITIES

For payments to agricultural experiment stations, for cooperative forestry and other research, for facilities, and for other expenses, $651,606,000, as follows: to carry out the provisions of the Hatch Act of 1887 (7 U.S.C. 361a–i), $183,275,000; for grants for cooperative forestry research (16 U.S.C. 582a through a–7), $22,668,000; for payments to the 1890 land-grant colleges, including Tuskegee University and West Virginia State University (7 U.S.C. 3222), $38,331,000, of which $1,507,496 shall be made available only for the purpose of ensuring that each institution shall receive no less than $1,000,000; for special grants for agricultural research (7 U.S.C. 450i(c)), $103,471,000; for special grants for agricultural research on improved pest control (7 U.S.C. 450i(c)), $14,952,000; for competitive research grants (7 U.S.C. 450i(b)), $190,000,000; for the support of animal health and disease programs (7 U.S.C. 3195), $5,006,000; for supplemental and alternative crops and products (7 U.S.C. 3319d), $1,175,000; for grants for research pursuant to the Critical Agricultural Materials Act (7 U.S.C. 178 et seq.), $1,091,000, to remain available until expended; for the 1994 research grants program for 1994 institutions pursuant to section 536 of Public Law 103–382 (7 U.S.C. 301 note), $1,250,000, to remain available until expended; for rangeland research grants (7 U.S.C. 3333), $1,000,000; for higher education graduate fellowship grants (7 U.S.C. 3152(b)(6)), $4,455,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b); for higher education challenge grants (7 U.S.C. 3152(b)(1)), $5,445,000; for a higher education multicultural scholars program (7 U.S.C. 3152(b)(5)), $988,000 to remain available until

expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b); for an education grants program for Hispanic-serving Institutions (7 U.S.C. 3241), $5,940,000; for a secondary agriculture education program and 2-year post-secondary education (7 U.S.C. 3152(j)), $990,000; for aquaculture grants (7 U.S.C. 3322), $3,956,000; for sustainable agriculture research and education (7 U.S.C. 5811), $12,196,000; for a program of capacity building grants (7 U.S.C. 3152(b)(4)) to colleges eligible to receive funds under the Act of August 30, 1890 (7 U.S.C. 321–326 and 328), including Tuskegee University and West Virginia State University, $12,375,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b); for payments to the 1994 Institutions pursuant to section 534(a)(1) of Public Law 103–382, $3,000,000; for resident instruction grants for insular areas under section 1491 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3363), $500,000; and for necessary expenses of Research and Education Activities, $39,542,000, of which $2,723,000 for the Research, Education, and Economics Information System and $2,151,000 for the Electronic Grants Information System, are to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available to carry out research related to the production, processing, or marketing of tobacco or tobacco products: *Provided further*, That this paragraph shall not apply to research on the medical, biotechnological, food, and industrial uses of tobacco.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. DELAURO

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. DELAURO:

Page 13, line 6, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $25,000,000)''.

Page 36, line 21, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $229,303,000)''.

Page 48, line 26, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $12,000,000)''.

Page 50, line 6, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $23,000,000)''.

Page 51, line 23, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 52, line 7, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $6,697,000)''.

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following new sections:

''SEC. ____. In addition to amounts otherwise provided by this Act, there is hereby appropriated to the Secretary the following amounts for the following purposes:

''(1) For biorefinery grants authorized by section 9003 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8103), $50,000,000.

''(2) For grants under the energy audit and renewable energy development program authorized by section 9005 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 8105), $10,000,000.

''(3) For payments under the bioenergy program authorized by section 9010 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 8108), and notwithstanding subsection (c)(2) of such section, $120,000,000.

''(4) For grants under the Biomass Research and Development Initiative authorized by section 307 of the Biomass Research and Development Act of 2000 (7 U.S.C. 7624), $14,000,000.

''SEC. ____. In the case of taxpayers with income in excess of $1,000,000, for the calendar year beginning in 2007, the amount of tax reduction resulting from enactment of Public Law 107–16, Public Law 108–27, and Public Law 108–311 shall be reduced by 1.21 percent.''.

Ms. DELAURO. (During the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to address energy and rural development needs. We have become all too aware in recent years of the growing divide between rural Americans and other parts of our nation. Rural America has 90 percent of the country's poorest counties, a poverty rate of over 14 percent, and the number of farms in the United States has declined by two-thirds over the past 7 decades. Crop prices are low. Subsidies are eroding deepening digital divide. The opportunities for opportunity in rural America are slim.

In offering the amendment, I believe we could begin to meet a variety of rural development needs. From waste and water grants and community facility grants to funding for broadband expansion and renewable energy infrastructure, the amendment would raise the total water and waste grant program in the bill to $689 million, an increase of 44 percent over the bill, higher than any of the years since at least fiscal year 1996. These are the kinds of community facilities which help communities, that provide direct loans to them to build libraries, medical facilities, daycare centers. The funds help small rural communities meet EPA Clean Water Act requirements, lower water costs for homeowners and businesses, helping lower-income smaller communities get funds they need.

USDA has left grant applications with $497 million from 536 communities unfunded at the end of fiscal year 2005 because it had used up the funds appropriated for the program. This happens year after year. We have got to start doing better. I believe this amendment helps us to do that.

Let me focus on energy for a moment. The single most significant action this committee could take to improve the prospects for rural and national economies would be to make a strong commitment to renewable energy. There are several programs in the 2002 farm bill, last year's energy bill, funded through the agricultural appropriations bill that offer us this opening to look at meaningful incentives for renewal energy, production, consumption and infrastructure.

□ 1345

We ought to seize this opportunity to re-energize a farm economy and at the same time jump-start the country's energy independence by looking at these new technologies.

Unfortunately, I believe our investment in these programs continues to be tentative. Let's take a look at the programs. Bioenergy makes available reduced-price feedstocks for expansion of ethanol and biodiesel facilities. That receives no funding at all under this bill. This program alone could help our farmers take those first steps towards creating a market for renewable energy.

The Value-Added Agricultural Product Market Development Grants could build more integrated ethanol biorefineries and spur development of new uses for agricultural products that does not even receive its authorized level in this bill with only $28 million.

Despite its popularity, the Renewable Energy Systems and Energy Efficiencies Improvement Program that provides resources to farmers and rural small businesses for energy efficiency is only funded at $23 million. That is half its authorized level.

Let me just be clear. These are all USDA programs funded under this bill, so we have a serious role to play in this committee. The amendment proposes to seriously fund these programs. It would increase biorefinery development grants by $50 million, restore $120 million to the bioenergy program, and fund the Value-Added Agricultural Product Market Development Grant Program at an authorized level of $40 million.

In addition, it doubles the funding for the Renewable Energy Systems and the Energy Efficiency Improvements Program and the Biomass Research and Development Program, while providing increased funding to finance renewable fuel filling stations in rural areas. It also increases funding for the land grant universities by $25 million to look at their portion of the research, which will be critical in order for us to move forward.

The amendment is fully paid for by asking those making more than $1 million per year to forego less than $1,500 of their $90,000-plus tax cuts. American families are sacrificing enough. It is time this Congress ask the most well-off to do their part to meet the challenge as well.

So, Mr. Chairman, with biofuels on the cusp of revolutionizing the American economy in the very near future, the technologies are here, they are here now. Brazil did this in only a few years' time. We can make a statement here, a statement that the Congress is ready to face this challenge head-on.

As I said before, Americans are ready to declare their energy independence. We can make this possible with this bill. We can tap the promise of our farms that they hold to reduce our dependence on oil. We can provide a more secure economic future for our farmers. We can make it happen with this amendment.

Renewable energy has the incredible potential to revive the American farm economy and our own agricultural base. We ought to pass this amendment.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation on an appropriations bill, and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part: ''An amendment to a general appropriations bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.'' The amendment changes the application of existing law.

I request a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLER of Florida). Does any Member wish to be heard?

The Chair is prepared to rule. The Chair finds this amendment changes the application of existing law. The amendment therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BACA

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BACA:

Page 13, line 6, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $100,000)''.

Page 13, line 19, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $800,000)''.

Page 14, line 12, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $700,000)''.

Page 18, line 16, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $100,000)''.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Chairman, I first wish to commend Ranking Member ROSA DELAURO and Chairman BONILLA for their good work on this appropriations bill. It is a good bipartisan bill that has brought in a very important issue, especially as it pertains to Hispanic Serving Institutions and Colleges.

I now rise in favor of this collaboration amendment by my Congressional Hispanic and Black Caucus to boost funding for minority education in farming programs at the USDA. This amendment is being offered by me, Representatives BUTTERFIELD, HINOJOSA and THOMPSON to increase funding for Hispanic Serving Institutions and for the 2501 Socially Disadvantaged Farmers and Ranchers Program.

This amendment is important because it provides funding to help minority educations in agriculture.

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

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

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is presenting a good amendment, and I would just like to inform the gentleman we would be happy to accept the gentleman's amendment if he would like to move it to a vote.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I don't mind. I just wanted to read it for the RECORD to be recorded that I am fighting on behalf of everyone, if you don't mind, Mr. Chairman. But I appreciate that. I think it is important, and I appreciate the fact that they are moving on the amendment. Also I felt it was important for people to hear the amendment itself in terms of what it does.

This amendment is important because it provides funding for minority education in agriculture and helps rebuild a minority farming community that has been often neglected and discriminated against.

Hispanic Serving Institutions are a great source of innovation and deserve funding to continue generating advances in agricultural sciences. We must stop the long-standing practice of underfunding these institutions.

HSI funding lags behind funding for other minority institutions and remains underfunded by nearly 75 percent. With population growth, and this is why I appreciate the chairman's concern, and innovative ideas in terms of helping Hispanic-growing populations, we see enrollment at HSIs has skyrocketed, but funding remains very low and it is still unacceptable.

HSIs have grown to a number nearly equal to Historically Black Colleges and Universities. The funding has remained much lower.

A decade ago, we had less than 100 of the HSIs, and now we have nearly 250. In my district alone, we have three Hispanic Serving Institutions: Chaffey Community College, San Bernardino Community College and San Bernardino Cal State University of California. Hispanic community colleges want to know why they should not receive the full $20 million per year in investment we promised them in the farm bill.

In addition, the 2501 program helps socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers, the fastest growing population in agriculture. We need to help these small minority farmers who are investing and keeping our country's farming legacy alive and well.

This program can help thousands of farm workers who are leaving strawberry fields behind and growing their own crops. This is a great example of the American Dream.

On the opposite side of the American Dream, this program helps keep farming traditions of thousands of African American farmers forced to the brink of discrimination, often by our own Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, I understand you have agreed to accept this amendment, and I appreciate that. Again, I want to thank you; I want to thank Ranking Member DELAURO for the fine and great work on this legislation and this bill. So I thank both of you.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I won't take the full 5 minutes. Let me thank the chairman for agreeing to this amendment and thank him for his leadership on the committee and thank him for his work on this Congress.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is critically needed to provide financial assistance to our Nation's minority farmers, 1890 Land Grant Colleges and Universities, and our Nation's Hispanic serving institutions.

We must offer more outreach and more technical assistance to our farmers. During fiscal year 1983, President Reagan initiated the Small Farmer Outreach Training and Technical Assistance program in response to the USDA task force on A.A. farm ownership.

This is the only program—the only program—implemented by the USDA that directly helps minority farmers who are losing their farms at a rate that far exceeds their White counterparts.

Mr. Chairman, the USDA has already paid over $1 billion to settle discrimination lawsuits. By investing in the 2501 program, we can improve relationships between the USDA and socially disadvantaged farmers and prevent future lawsuits. This is a small investment that could potentially save millions in the future. I therefore, Mr. Chairman, urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge my colleagues to support the Baca-Butterfield-Hinojosa-Thompson amendment to increase funding for the USDA education grants program for Hispanic-serving institutions and for the Minority Rancher and Farmer Program. I would like to thank my colleague from California, my good friend, Mr. BACA, for his leadership role in building the capacity for our community to fully participate and contribute to the USDA research agenda.

I am also pleased to join in partnership with Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mr. THOMPSON to offer this amendment to advance equality and equity in the agriculture sector.

I would especially like to thank the chairman, my colleague from Texas, Mr. BONILLA, for working with us to craft an amendment that could draw bipartisan support.

The minority farmer and rancher outreach and technical assistance program provides outreach and technical assistance to encourage and assist socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers in owning and operating farms and ranches as well as participating equitably in the full range of agricultural programs offered by the USDA.

My region is home to a large number of hispanic farmers, and their numbers are growing. our nation is stronger when our minority farmers and ranchers are successful, and this program is a modest investment to advance that success.

The competitive USDA/HSI grant program is designed to promote and strengthen the ability of HSIs to carry out education programs that attract, retain, and graduate outstanding students capable of enhancing the nation's food and agricultural scientific and professional work force.

This program is making a difference in my community and across the nation.

Only 2.7 percent of Hispanic college graduates earn a degree in agriculture-related areas. The continued under-representation of Hispanics in these important demands a greater investment in such programs to expand funding to additional HSIs to better meet USDA goals.

Our amendment is a modest step in that direction.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on behalf of some of our most vulnerable Americans who are being denied access to needed and I underscore needed food stamps because of states eliminating face-to-face interviews.

Mr. Chairman, I speak on behalf of children, the elderly, the disabled and those with limited literacy. And I regret that they are not here to speak for them selves. Because if they were here to speak for themselves, they would tell you about the 20 minute phone waits, they would tell you about the phone calls that have been abandoned because they had to wait too long (44 percent per the USDA). They would tell you about the inability to use the phone because they can't speak; the inability to use the phone because they can't hear; they would tell you about the lack of computer access and the lack of computer literacy. This amendment assures a user friendly system for some of our most vulnerable Americans. I speak for them, I stand for them, I cast my vote for them.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FALEOMAVAEGA

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA:

Page 13, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(decreased by $200,000)''.

Page 15, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $200,000)''.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Chairman, I first would like to express my appreciation to Chairman BONILLA and our senior ranking member, Ms. DELAURO, for allowing me this opportunity to introduce this amendment on behalf of my colleagues, the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. FORTUÑO), the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO), and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN).

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

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

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, we have reviewed the amendment and would be happy to accept it. If the gentleman would like to submit his remarks for the RECORD, we can accept the amendment and move on.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. I thank the distinguished chairman and the ranking member for their support of my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the bill as reported by the committee provides five hundred thousand dollars for the Resident Instruction Grants Program for Institutions of Higher Education in the Insular Areas. Our amendment would increase this amount by two hundred thousand dollars for a total of seven hundred thousand dollars for this program.

The Resident Instruction Grants Program is a competitively-awarded program administered by the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service of the United States Department of Agriculture. The Program is authorized by Section 7503 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002.

Resident Instruction Grants, as described by C-S-R-E-E-S, are designed to promote and strengthen the ability of institutions in the insular areas to carry out teaching and education programs within the food and agricultural sciences and related disciplines. This Program helps the land-grant institutions in the territories meet their unique needs by strengthening their institutional educational capacities in instruction and curriculum, and by enhancing the quality of teaching and learning. Funding this program at a more sufficient level will allow for a more efficient use of existing educational funds by the institutions in the territories. Partnerships between faculties at insular area and mainland institutions can be forged with continued and increased funding for this program.

The amendment would reduce the amount appropriated for the National Research Initiative competitive grants program by a corresponding amount to ensure budget neutrality. The NRI is slated to receive roughly a five percent increase over the Fiscal Year 2006 level under this bill. The Congressional Budget Office has reviewed this amendment and determined that it is budget neutral.

Adoption of this amendment would fund the Resident Instruction Grants Program at an amount closer to what my colleagues from the territories and I have requested in this cycle. The additional two hundred thousand that this amendment would provide is still below the amount my colleagues and I originally requested. This figure is also below the amount recommended for this program by the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

Mr. Chairman, for the past three fiscal years my colleagues and I have requested a level of funding for this program proportional to the level provided under this bill for historically black colleges and universities, Hispanic-serving institutions and tribal colleges. The land grant institutions in our districts, in ways similar to the 1890 and 1994 institutions, are underserved and have unique needs that deserve to be addressed.

We have written to the subcommittee chairman and to the ranking member to request their support for the Resident Instruction Grants Program. We have done so most recently as of last week regarding this specific amendment, a version of which was preprinted in the May 16 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by my colleague from Guam, Ms. BORDALLO. We are grateful Mr. Chairman that Chairman BONILLA has recognized the unique needs of the land-grant institutions in the insular areas. He understands their potential to contribute more substantially with USDA support to national agricultural research missions.

This Program was first funded two years ago with the support of Chairman BONILLA and our colleague from Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR. This program is important to strengthening the curriculum in the agricultural and food sciences in the territories. The territorial colleges were designated by Congress in 1972 as part of the land grant university system, and are considered 1862 institutions. They include American Samoa Community College, the University of Guam, the University of the Virgin Islands, the University of Puerto Rico at Mayaguez, Northern Marianas College, and the College of Micronesia in Palau, Pohnpei, and the Marshall Islands.

The institutions in the territories do not have the advantage of housing long-established and historically well-funded agricultural and food science programs as do many of the flagship programs within the 1862 institutions. Our institutions boast a much smaller faculty and student enrollment compared with the most reputable 1862 institutions on the U.S. mainland. Our institutions also do not have the capability and capacity, from an institutional perspective, to effectively compete for National Research Initiative dollars at the national level. The inherent disadvantages experienced by our institutions are significant concerns from a policy standpoint. We seek to address these concerns with the amendment.

The amendment simply recognizes that the 1972 community—the land grant in the territories—should have the ability to compete amongst themselves for research and instruction grants. This amendment would afford them that opportunity. I hope the gentleman from Texas, Chairman BONILLA, and the gentle lady from Connecticut, Ms. DELAURO, can support this amendment and, provided that it is adopted, will work to support this increased level of funding in conference with the other body.

I thank the gentleman from Texas for committing the first funds for this program two years ago and for his continued support of the land-grant colleges in the territories. I also want to thank Mr. Chairman, the Ranking Member for her support, as well as the assistance of Martin Delgado and Martha Foley of the subcommittee staff. This program is important to us and to our institutions in the territories. We hope we can strengthen the Resident Instruction Grants Program in future years, but we recognize that the modest increase proposed by this amendment is a good start. I urge adoption of this amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIVE AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS ENDOWMENT FUND

For the Native American Institutions Endowment Fund authorized by Public Law 103–382 (7 U.S.C. 301 note), $11,880,000, to remain available until expended.

EXTENSION ACTIVITIES

For payments to States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, Micronesia, Northern Marianas, and American Samoa, $457,042,000, as follows: payments for cooperative extension work under the Smith-Lever Act, to be distributed under sections 3(b) and 3(c) of said Act, and under section 208(c) of Public Law 93–471, for retirement and employees' compensation costs for extension agents, $281,429,000; payments for extension work at the 1994 Institutions under the Smith-Lever Act (7 U.S.C. 343(b)(3)), $3,273,000; payments for the nutrition and family education program for low-income areas under section 3(d) of the Act, $62,634,000; payments for the pest management program under section 3(d) of the Act, $10,152,000; payments for the farm safety program under section 3(d) of the Act, $4,517,000;

payments for New Technologies for Ag Extension under Section 3(d) of the Act, $1,985,000; payments to upgrade research, extension, and teaching facilities at the 1890 land-grant colleges, including Tuskegee University and West Virginia State University, as authorized by section 1447 of Public Law 95–113 (7 U.S.C. 3222b), $16,777,000, to remain available until expended; payments for youth-at-risk programs under section 3(d) of the Smith-Lever Act, $8,396,000; for youth farm safety education and certification extension grants, to be awarded competitively under section 3(d) of the Act, $494,000; payments for carrying out the provisions of the Renewable Resources Extension Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.), $4,052,000; payments for federally-recognized Tribes Extension Program under section 3(d) of the Smith-Lever Act, $3,000,000; payments for sustainable agriculture programs under section 3(d) of the Act, $4,067,000; payments for rural health and safety education as authorized by section 502(i) of Public Law 92–419 (7 U.S.C. 2662(i)), $1,945,000; payments for cooperative extension work by the colleges receiving the benefits of the second Morrill Act (7 U.S.C. 321–326 and 328) and Tuskegee University and West Virginia State University, $34,073,000, of which $1,724,884 shall be made available only for the purpose of ensuring that each institution shall receive no less than $1,000,000; for grants to youth organizations pursuant to section 7630 of title 7, United States Code, $2,000,000; and for necessary expenses of Extension Activities, $18,248,000.

INTEGRATED ACTIVITIES

For the integrated research, education, and extension grants programs, including necessary administrative expenses, $55,234,000, as follows: for competitive grants programs authorized under section 406 of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7626), $45,792,000, including $11,278,000 for the water quality program, $12,997,000 for the food safety program, $3,890,000 for the regional pest management centers program, $4,219,000 for the Food Quality Protection Act risk mitigation program for major food crop systems, $1,275,000 for the crops affected by Food Quality Protection Act implementation, $3,075,000 for the methyl bromide transition program, and $1,855,000 for the organic transition program; for a competitive international science and education grants program authorized under section 1459A of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3292b), to remain available until expended, $990,000; for grants programs authorized under section 2(c)(1)(B) of Public Law 89–106, as amended, $1,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008 for the critical issues program; and $1,378,000, for the regional rural development centers program; $2,277,000 for asian soybean rust; and $11,000,000 for the Food and Agriculture Defense Initiative authorized under section 1484 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Act of 1977, to remain available until September 30, 2008.

OUTREACH FOR SOCIALLY DISADVANTAGED FARMERS

For grants and contracts pursuant to section 2501 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279), $6,930,000, to remain available until expended.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR MARKETING AND REGULATORY PROGRAMS

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs to administer programs under the laws enacted by the Congress for the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service; the Agricultural Marketing Service; and the Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration; $741,000.

ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to prevent, control, and eradicate pests and plant and animal diseases; to carry out inspection, quarantine, and regulatory activities; and to protect the environment, as authorized by law, $898,116,000, of which $4,127,000 shall be available for the control of outbreaks of insects, plant diseases, animal diseases and for control of pest animals and birds to the extent necessary to meet emergency conditions; of which $40,269,000 shall be used for the Cotton Pests program for cost share purposes or for debt retirement for active eradication zones; of which $33,107,000 shall be available for a National Animal Identification program; of which $47,205,000 shall be used to conduct a surveillance and preparedness program for highly pathogenic avian influenza: *Provided,* That no funds shall be used to formulate or administer a brucellosis eradication program for the current fiscal year that does not require minimum matching by the States of at least 40 percent: *Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated under this heading for the National Animal Identification program may be obligated until the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives receives from the Secretary a complete and detailed plan for the National Animal Identification System, including, but not limited to, proposed legislative changes, cost estimates, and means of program evaluation, and such plan is published as an Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in the Federal Register for comment by interested parties: *Provided further,* That this appropriation shall be available for the operation and maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed four, of which two shall be for replacement only: *Provided further,* That, in addition, in emergencies which threaten any segment of the agricultural production industry of this country, the Secretary may transfer from other appropriations or funds available to the agencies or corporations of the Department such sums as may be deemed necessary, to be available only in such emergencies for the arrest and eradication of contagious or infectious disease or pests of animals, poultry, or plants, and for expenses in accordance with sections 10411 and 10417 of the Animal Health Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 8310 and 8316) and sections 431 and 442 of the Plant Protection Act (7 U.S.C. 7751 and 7772), and any unexpended balances of funds transferred for such emergency purposes in the preceding fiscal year shall be merged with such transferred amounts: *Provided further,* That appropriations hereunder shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2250) for the repair and alteration of leased buildings and improvements, but unless otherwise provided the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 percent of the current replacement value of the building.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KUCINICH

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KUCINICH:

Page 19, line 8, insert after the first dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $89,000,000)(increased by $89,000,000)''.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would maintain current testing levels for mad cow disease. The underlying bill already appropriates the same amount as that appropriated in fiscal year 2005. This amendment merely calls for the same funding levels using the same funding mechanism.

Until the United States Department of Agriculture stumbled upon America's first case of mad cow disease, testing rates were abysmally low. Out of 35 million cattle slaughtered annually, the USDA tested 20,000 in fiscal year 2003. Out of every 10,000 cattle that went to the dinner table, only six were tested.

Then came the first case of mad cow in the U.S., that we know of. The USDA ramped up the testing rate significantly, but only after considerable public pressure. Six months after the positive test in fiscal year 2005, the USDA tested at the rate of 100 cattle tested for every 10,000 slaughtered. Another way of looking at it is 99 percent were untested even after a major increase in testing rates. Though still inadequate, it was a big improvement.

Contrast that with the other industrialized nations, many of whom did not know the extent to which their countries harbored mad cow disease until they got serious with their testing program. France and Germany test over half their cattle. The U.K. tests all cattle over 24 months old. Japan tests every single one.

So far, even with an untested rate of 99 percent, we managed to find a total of three cases in the United States. When we looked, we found cases. Even the USDA predicts undetected cases exist in the U.S.

Now their illogical response is to try to drastically cut back its testing rates again. It is not enough of a gift to the large cattle producers that 99 percent of the cattle do not go tested. Do we have to do more for them at the expense of public health? So now 99.9 percent will go untested?

Now, you could almost call this a we-aren't-looking-so-it-is-not-there policy. And this policy is built on the assumption that we have a firewall in place that prevents infected material from getting into the food supply.

By banning high-risk material like cattle brains and spinal cord from cattle feed, we are supposedly preventing any infected cow from contaminating other cattle. This is an important part of our efforts, because mad cow disease spreads when cattle eat infected parts of other cattle. And yet scientists, advocates, the Inspector General and the GAO have detailed the ways in which this practice is still allowed because of gaping holes in the firewall.

Consider that the infectious material can be found in materials that are allowed to be fed to cattle. Bone marrow, cow blood, peripheral nerves, tongue and now some muscles are well-known or suspected to contain the same infectious agent called a prion.

□ 1400

And they are all still allowed in animal feed. There is very little protection for cattle under 30 months. The

justification is, we do not expect to see the disease in younger cattle. But at least two cases in Japan, 19 cases in the UK and 20 cases in the European Union have occurred in cattle under 30 months old.

This level of protection failed to end the epidemic in the UK. Enforcement of the firewall has been weak. The GAO found on three separate occasions, including 2005, that even the meager laws designed to keep cattle from eating cattle were being poorly enforced.

Finally, we must not forget that the USDA is in favor of this ''do not look, do not find'' policy. When testing results for a cow in Texas were inconclusive in November of 2004, the USDA declared the cow to be free of Mad Cow Disease. But, again, after a public outcry and a public admonition from the inspector general, the cow was tested 7 months later and was found to be positive. And now the USDA wants to reduce testing rates without adequate protections to ensure the disease cannot be amplified through industrial agriculture practice. We need a backstop.

Mr. Chairman, we need a way to know for sure whether our so called firewall is working. Surveillance is the way to do that. But we are taking an already weak program and undermining it; 99.9 percent of our cattle will not be tested unless we signal to the USDA that Congress demands otherwise.

Mr. Chairman, I am asking for support for my amendment to keep the same level of testing we are using right now. This is the level that proved what we all knew despite reassurances to the contrary, that undetected Mad Cow Disease is here in the United States.

We must test to build the confidence of both domestic and foreign consumers of American beef.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment. And I want to explain to the gentleman from Ohio why, because I know he has got a serious concern here. Let me assure the gentleman that there is not a Member in this House of Representatives that is not concerned about BSE.

But sometimes some fringe groups in this country and big media start talking about the sky is falling, and you have got to do this, that or the other to check our beef supply, but for the most part, I am proud of what this country has done to monitor BSE. I mean, nobody, most people that serve in the House have children; they have families, and no one wants to expose anyone to anything dangerous to eat.

USDA has had an enhanced surveillance program going since the spring of 2004, they have tested 700,000 cattle. They have had two positive tests. USDA is evaluating data from the enhanced surveillance program to design a maintenance surveillance program. The data and design are being peer reviewed by an outside group who will report findings within a month.

Under any surveillance program, the U.S. will continue to test 100 percent of animals that have signs of a central nervous system disorder. Any BSE program USDA adopts will meet or exceed international standards.

Again, to compare our standards to another country that has a minimal industry versus what we have in this country is absolutely not fair and comparing apples to oranges. No country tests 100 percent of its cattle.

The budget request covers 40,000 tests per year. However, if the peer review panel or USDA determine that more than 40,000 are needed, the Secretary has the ability to access additional funds. I can assure you that if more tests need to be done to affirm the safety of the food supply, they will be done.

Again, I can assure the gentleman that I have no less concern about this issue than he does. And I understand, I have read the gentleman's amendment. It is a very short amendment. It is going to take money out of a line item, put it back into a line item in the appropriations bill.

Mr. Chairman, I can assure the gentleman that the points have been made. This is, again, not going to change one dollar in the bill. So now that we have had this discussion, maybe the gentleman would consider withdrawing the amendment unless he has an additional comment that he would like to make.

I would yield for a response.

Mr. KUCINICH. If the gentleman would yield. I thank the gentleman. I think that the gentleman's expression of concern that is shared by all Members of Congress is correct. I appreciate you voicing it.

I want to point out that the feed ban, which is an underlying problem here, and the USDA insists is strong, in reality is so weak that you have companies like McDonalds, Cargill, Purina Mills, and even Pharma, the pharmaceutical industry publicly calling for closing the loopholes.

So while I would agree with you, that if there were an outbreak, the Secretary would advance more funds, I am also concerned that if we do not keep the present funding levels, that we may not know if there is a problem. So that is why I brought this amendment, Mr. Chairman.

I would reluctantly ask for the amendment to be voted on, only because of that underlying concern that there is not enough, and we should just keep things the way they are at the current levels and not cut back on them. That is what my concern is.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's position, because I know he brings a great deal of sincerity to the floor when he has an amendment. In closing, I would just comment on how no matter what business you have that sells beef to the public, whether it is a fast food chain or a single restaurant, doesn't the gentleman understand that that industry in itself, that the gentleman mentioned, would do everything humanly possible to keep the beef supply safe?

So I know the gentleman is not making insinuations beyond what he is saying today. But there are a lot of groups out there that somehow try to scare the American people into thinking that this is not happening. But I can assure the gentleman, again, that there is no less concern on this side of the aisle about this issue than he has.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment because I, too, am very, very concerned that the USDA is deciding or may decide to lower the number of BSE tests that are performed annually. I spent some time in this area.

Since the enhanced testing program began, the Inspector General of the USDA has raised series concerns about the current enhanced surveillance program. We have raised concerns with the USDA agencies in hearings and in private conversations.

Let me just give you just a little bit of information. For example, 2004, the IG reported serious problems with the testing program, including sampling was not random, and APHIS had not exercised the authority it had to collect the samples. Geographic representation in the testing was not assured. Cattle with central nervous system symptoms were not always tested. Because of interagency confusion, a process for getting samples of animals that die on the farm, those who are at the highest risk, was not in place.

More recently, the IG found that senior APHIS officials blocked the recommendations of scientists at the National Veterinary Services Laboratory in Ames, Iowa, for additional BSE testing on a sample that had tested positive initially several times.

Faced with the conflicting results, the scientists recommended additional testing to resolve the discrepancy. APHIS headquarter officials concluded no further testing was necessary, because testing protocols were followed. In the end, it was the IG who decided the additional testing should take place. It was done by AIS and the British lab at Weybridge who both found that the sample tested positively for BSE.

The IG also made shocking findings about the quality assurance and the BSE testing program at the NVSL, the National Veterinary Service Laboratory, such as the lack of adequate controls and procedures to ensure the quality or capability of the BSE testing program, the failure to implement an adequate quality assurance program for its own laboratory testing procedures, or to obtain internationally recognized accreditation for its BSE testing program.

Those are our concerns. That is what I was trying to lay out here, and flaws in the program, the existing program. It does not make sense to return to a lower level of BSE testing. I support the amendment.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KUCINICH. I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

As the gentlewoman has pointed out, we have questions about the current testing practices at the current funding levels. If we reduce substantially the funding levels, with the thought that we have flaws in the current test and practices, what could the consumers expect?

I mean, what the gentlewoman has suggested is that the USDA in this regard has not been doing its job. Part of its job is to advocate for defects for which the world has told us they do not want beef from the United States if they cannot be assured of its safety.

Mr. Chairman, in same way you can say that the USDA is sabotaging U.S. beef exports by its failure to have the kind of program that people have a right to expect with the money that has already been appropriated; if that money is cut, it essentially plays into the USDA's lack of performance. So I want to thank the gentlewoman for bringing that up. I, again, want to let the chairman know that I am convinced on his commitment to this.

I believe that he wants to make sure that there is safety here. And I just feel that it is important to bring this up and to call for a vote on it.

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

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to join Chairman BONILLA in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the most important thing that should come out of this debate is that the American beef supply is very, very safe, the safest in the world. And that is based not only on the statistics maintained by the Department on food-borne illness, the lowest in the world, but also based on the fact that there is no evidence of any American ever contracting any disease from BSE based upon consuming American beef, ever.

The enhanced surveillance program for BSE was designed as a one-time intensive assessment to test as many animals as possible from the portion of the cattle population considered to be most at risk for BSE.

A surveillance program is not designed to test every single animal at risk for a disease, and surveillance is not a food safety measure. Surveillance testing looks for signs of the disease in the cattle herd. But it is USDA's other safeguards, such as the removal of specified risk materials from cattle at slaughter, that protect consumers and the food supply.

USDA has tested over 714,000 samples. And they have tested the greatest at-risk cattle for having BSE. It has cost us more than $1 million a week to do it. The USDA's analysis of that surveillance data shows that we are dealing with an incredibly low prevalence of the disease in the United States, no more than four to seven cases in the entire U.S. herd of 100 million cows.

What is more, because of the other practices, even if a cow has BSE, like four to seven may have, they are not getting into our food supply. The two cows that have been found so far in this country with BSE, neither one got into our food supply. The USDA is currently putting its analysis through a rigorous peer review process to ensure that the conclusions drawn are sound and that they are scientifically credible.

We should allow that process to go forward. The enhanced surveillance program gives the USDA the ability to stand on solid scientific ground in saying that the prevalence of BSE in the United States is extraordinarily low.

Mr. Chairman, given that fact, there is little justification for continuing surveillance at the enhanced level once the USDA analysis is affirmed by peer review. The USDA has said that the framework for ongoing BSE testing will be based in science and will be in line with international guidelines for a country like the United States that is at minimal risk for the disease.

Mr. Chairman, we now have the data to draw scientific specific conclusions, leaving no need to continue the enhanced program and no justifications for the related costs. Surveillance testing is distinct from food-safety testing, which we also conduct.

It is appropriate that the USDA will transition to ongoing testing for BSE from a standpoint of sound science and policy.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, after conferring with the Chair and the ranking member, I decided that it looks like they are really engaged in this to keep on the USDA, so I am going to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In fiscal year 2007, the agency is authorized to collect fees to cover the total costs of providing technical assistance, goods, or services requested by States, other political subdivisions, domestic and international organizations, foreign governments, or individuals, provided that such fees are structured such that any entity's liability for such fees is reasonably based on the technical assistance, goods, or services provided to the entity by the agency, and such fees shall be credited to this account, to remain available until expended, without further appropriation, for providing such assistance, goods, or services.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For plans, construction, repair, preventive maintenance, environmental support, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities, as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 2250, and acquisition of land as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 428a, $5,946,000, to remain available until expended.

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE

MARKETING SERVICES

For necessary expenses to carry out services related to consumer protection, agricultural marketing and distribution, transportation, and regulatory programs, as authorized by law, and for administration and coordination of payments to States, $77,269,000, including funds for the wholesale market development program for the design and development of wholesale and farmer market facilities for the major metropolitan areas of the country: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2250) for the alteration and repair of buildings and improvements, but the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 percent of the current replacement value of the building.

Fees may be collected for the cost of standardization activities, as established by regulation pursuant to law (31 U.S.C. 9701).

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Not to exceed $62,211,000 (from fees collected) shall be obligated during the current fiscal year for administrative expenses: *Provided*, That if crop size is understated and/or other uncontrollable events occur, the agency may exceed this limitation by up to 10 percent with notification to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

FUNDS FOR STRENGTHENING MARKETS, INCOME, AND SUPPLY (SECTION 32)

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Funds available under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c), shall be used only for commodity program expenses as authorized therein, and other related operating expenses, including not less than $9,900,000 for replacement of a system to support commodity purchases, except for: (1) transfers to the Department of Commerce as authorized by the Fish and Wildlife Act of August 8, 1956; (2) transfers otherwise provided in this Act; and (3) not more than $16,425,000 for formulation and administration of marketing agreements and orders pursuant to the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 and the Agricultural Act of 1961.

PAYMENTS TO STATES AND POSSESSIONS

For payments to departments of agriculture, bureaus and departments of markets, and similar agencies for marketing activities under section 204(b) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1623(b)), $1,334,000.

GRAIN INSPECTION, PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the United States Grain Standards Act, for the administration of the Packers and Stockyards Act, for certifying procedures used to protect purchasers of farm products, and the standardization activities related to grain under the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, $39,737,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2250) for the alteration and repair of buildings and improvements, but the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 percent of the current replacement value of the building.

LIMITATION ON INSPECTION AND WEIGHING SERVICES EXPENSES

Not to exceed $42,463,000 (from fees collected) shall be obligated during the current fiscal year for inspection and weighing services: *Provided*, That if grain export activities require additional supervision and oversight, or other uncontrollable factors occur, this limitation may be exceeded by up to 10 percent with notification to the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FOOD SAFETY

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Food Safety to administer the laws enacted by the Congress for the Food Safety and Inspection Service, $656,000.

FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE

For necessary expenses to carry out services authorized by the Federal Meat Inspection Act, the Poultry Products Inspection Act, and the Egg Products Inspection Act, including not to exceed $50,000 for representation allowances and for expenses pursuant to section 8 of the Act approved August 3, 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1766), $853,249,000, of which no less than $766,290,000 shall be available for Federal food safety and inspection; and in addition, $1,000,000 may be credited to this account from fees collected for the cost of laboratory accreditation as authorized by section 1327 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 138f): *Provided,* That of the total amount made available under this heading, no less than $20,653,000 shall be obligated for regulatory and scientific training: *Provided further,* That not to exceed $565,000 is for construction of a laboratory sample receiving facility at the Russell Research Center in Athens, Georgia: *Provided further,* That this appropriation shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2250) for the alteration and repair of buildings and improvements, but the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 percent of the current replacement value of the building.

FARM ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FARM AND FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICES

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services to administer the laws enacted by Congress for the Farm Service Agency, the Foreign Agricultural Service, the Risk Management Agency, and the Commodity Credit Corporation, $691,000.

FARM SERVICE AGENCY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for carrying out the administration and implementation of programs administered by the Farm Service Agency, $1,053,760,000: *Provided,* That the Secretary is authorized to use the services, facilities, and authorities (but not the funds) of the Commodity Credit Corporation to make program payments for all programs administered by the Agency: *Provided further,* That other funds made available to the Agency for authorized activities may be advanced to and merged with this account: *Provided further,* That none of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any officer or employee of the Department of Agriculture to close any local or county office of the Farm Service Agency unless the Secretary of Agriculture, not later than 30 days after the date on which the Secretary proposed the closure, holds a public meeting about the proposed closure in the county in which the local or county office is located, and, after the public meeting but not later than 120 days before the date on which the Secretary approves the closure, notifies the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and the members of Congress from the State in which the local or county office is located of the proposed closure.

□ 1415

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF OHIO

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

Page 27, line 1, strike ''after'' and insert ''before''.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would simply strike the word ''after'' and insert ''before'' in the section of the bill dealing with the Farm Service Agency.

The amendment at hand would allow for the public hearing to take place no later than 30 days before and not after the Secretary of Agriculture allows for an office closure.

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

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, we have reviewed the amendment and would be happy to accept the amendment. If the gentleman would take ''yes'' for an answer and submit his remarks for the RECORD, we could move on.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I would be happy to, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BONILLA. I withdraw my reservation of the point of order.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the chairman and I thank Ms. DELAURO.

Thank you Mr. Chairman, Chairman BONILLA and Ranking Member DELAURO and the staff on the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee.

My amendment would simply strike the word "after" and insert "before" in the section of the bill dealing with the Farm Service Agency. The amendment at hand would allow for the public hearing to take place no later than 30 days before—and not after—the Secretary of Agriculture allows for an office closure.

In this section of the current bill, language had been put in place to safeguard local FSA offices from inappropriate closure and relocation. In current form, the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture would be able to propose an office closure—and then after the closure is proposed, then hold a public hearing. This language was in last years Agriculture Appropriations Bill—and we thought this would help the process and allow for local public input before any office closures were proposed.

The reason for this amendment is due to my profound concerns of what is currently taking place in Ohio. Last month I was contacted by local producers in my district concerned that their local FSA office would be closed.

My office received a copy of the proposed "county office reorganization" as provided by the Ohio State FSA Committee, and I was surprised to see this proposal as there has been no involvement from my local county FSA committees or local producers.

In a memo sent from Administrator Teresa Lasseter (USDA) to all State FSA Executive Directors on January 13, 2006, she states, "Further, USDA agrees with the long-standing intent of Congress that office closures and relocations should occur based on rigorous analysis to ensure actions are cost-effective and will better serve the public."

The bottom line is that we need to have complete information about the needs of family farmers and ranchers before we or the Department makes radical decisions about FSA Personnel levels.

This process should start at the county committees and involve an office-by-office and regional analysis. Only then, can our State FSA offices and the USDA make the best decisions on office closures and relocations.

I understand the need for efficiency, but we must be concerned about how this will impact our family farmers and agricultural communities. In most of our counties, our farmers know that they can drive to one place to access their FSA, NRCS, SWCD and Extension. This is the place where they access the Internet, the fax machine and socialize with others in their community.

Again, my amendment only says that the public hearing be 30 days prior to closure, rather than after the closure has been proposed. Please help in supporting the family farmers in your district and support this fair and simple amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

STATE MEDIATION GRANTS

For grants pursuant to section 502(b) of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1987, as amended (7 U.S.C. 5101–5106), $4,208,000.

GRASSROOTS SOURCE WATER PROTECTION PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out wellhead or groundwater protection activities under section 1240O of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839bb–2), $3,713,000, to remain available until expended.

DAIRY INDEMNITY PROGRAM

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses involved in making indemnity payments to dairy farmers and manufacturers of dairy products under a dairy indemnity program, $100,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That such program is carried out by the Secretary in the same manner as the dairy indemnity program described in the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001 (Public Law 106–387, 114 Stat. 1549A–12).

AGRICULTURAL CREDIT INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For gross obligations for the principal amount of direct and guaranteed farm ownership (7 U.S.C. 1922 et seq.) and operating (7 U.S.C. 1941 et seq.) loans, Indian tribe land acquisition loans (25 U.S.C. 488), and boll weevil loans (7 U.S.C. 1989), to be available from funds in the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund, as follows: farm ownership loans, $1,422,750,000, of which $1,200,000,000 shall be for unsubsidized guaranteed loans and $222,750,000 shall be for direct loans; operating loans, $2,065,754,000, of which $1,150,000,000 shall be for unsubsidized guaranteed loans, $272,254,000 shall be for subsidized guaranteed loans and $643,500,000 shall be for direct loans; Indian tribe land acquisition loans, $3,960,000; and for boll weevil eradication program loans, $59,400,000: *Provided,* That the Secretary shall deem the

pink bollworm to be a boll weevil for the purpose of boll weevil eradication program loans.

For the cost of direct and guaranteed loans, including the cost of modifying loans as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as follows: farm ownership loans, $16,293,000, of which $6,960,000 shall be for guaranteed loans, and $9,333,000 shall be for direct loans; operating loans, $131,046,000, of which $28,405,000 shall be for unsubsidized guaranteed loans, $27,416,000 shall be for subsidized guaranteed loans, and $75,225,000 shall be for direct loans; Indian tribe land acquisition loans, $838,000; and for boll weevil eradication program loans, $1,129,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, $315,258,000, of which $307,338,000 shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''Farm Service Agency, Salaries and Expenses''.

Funds appropriated by this Act to the Agricultural Credit Insurance Program Account for farm ownership and operating direct loans and guaranteed loans may be transferred among these programs: *Provided,* That the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress are notified at least 15 days in advance of any transfer: *Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel to collect from the lender an annual fee on unsubsidized guaranteed operating loans, a guarantee fee of more than one percent of the principal obligation of guaranteed unsubsidized operating or ownership loans, or a guarantee fee on subsidized guaranteed operating loans administered by the Farm Service Agency.

RISK MANAGEMENT AGENCY

For administrative and operating expenses, as authorized by section 226A of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6933), $77,197,000: *Provided,* That not to exceed $1,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses, as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1506(i).

CORPORATIONS

The following corporations and agencies are hereby authorized to make expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to make contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for such corporation or agency, except as hereinafter provided.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION FUND

For payments as authorized by section 516 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1516), such sums as may be necessary, to remain available until expended.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION FUND

REIMBURSEMENT FOR NET REALIZED LOSSES

For the current fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for net realized losses sustained, but not previously reimbursed, pursuant to section 2 of the Act of August 17, 1961 (15 U.S.C. 713a–11): *Provided,* That of the funds available to the Commodity Credit Corporation under section 11 of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act (15 U.S.C 714i) for the conduct of its business with the Foreign Agricultural Service, up to $5,000,000 may be transferred to and used by the Foreign Agricultural Service for information resource management activities of the Foreign Agricultural Service that are not related to Commodity Credit Corporation business.

HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT

(LIMITATION ON EXPENSES)

For the current fiscal year, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not expend more than $5,000,000 for site investigation and cleanup expenses, and operations and maintenance expenses to comply with the requirement of section 107(g) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (42 U.S.C. 9607(g)), and section 6001 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (42 U.S.C. 6961).

TITLE II

CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment to administer the laws enacted by the Congress for the Forest Service and the Natural Resources Conservation Service, $810,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LUCAS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LUCAS:

Page 32, line 12, insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $810,000)''.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the amendment is to remove $810,000 in salaries and expenses from the Office of the Under Secretary For the Natural Resources and the Environment.

Mr. Chairman, I have had the privilege since and during the 2002 farm bill of chairing the subcommittee with jurisdiction over the conservation programs. In the 2002 farm bill we did an outstanding job of bringing new and substantial resources to conservation. Since then I have had the privilege of working with Chairman BONILLA and the subcommittee on appropriations in making sure those resources are effectively put in the hands of producers out there to protect our environment, our soil, our water, our wildlife. But after a number of years, I have worked diligently to address problems in the technical assistance programs, how these problems are paid for, the implementation.

I must say after much frustration with working with the national office of the NRCS today I have to take action. In that I offer this amendment to set aside $810,000 so that when the Appropriations Committee begins the process of putting the final conference committee reports together this fall, that they will have the necessary ammunition to correct this situation.

I know it is a bold statement, and I know it is a serious thing; but making sure that the technical assistance dollars are available to local and State NRCS offices so that the farm bill programs, conservation programs can be implemented is of the greatest importance. And only after tremendous frustration as a subcommittee chairman on the authorizing committee do I take this bold and drastic step.

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

I would like to commend the gentleman from Oklahoma for his work on this issue. When a gentleman who works as hard and as sincerely as Mr. LUCAS does on this issue, it is just unconscionable that he cannot get the response that he needs.

This is a gentleman who does not ask for too much. He tries to be fair about the request that he has from the Department. I support the gentleman's amendment with enthusiasm. There is also, as an aside from the issues that he has addressed, it has been brought to my attention that there may be some inappropriate activity that has been conducted out of this office. We are not going to name names here, but there is a buddy who has the nickname by the name of ''chief'' or something like that that has been lobbying on behalf of their causes which is an unethical, illegal activity that has been conducted out of this office.

We need to get to the bottom of this as well as trying to address the gentleman from Oklahoma's issue. The gentleman brings a good amendment forward, and we are prepared to vote ''aye'' on it.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION SERVICE

CONSERVATION OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses for carrying out the provisions of the Act of April 27, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 590a–f), including preparation of conservation plans and establishment of measures to conserve soil and water (including farm irrigation and land drainage and such special measures for soil and water management as may be necessary to prevent floods and the siltation of reservoirs and to control agricultural related pollutants); operation of conservation plant materials centers; classification and mapping of soil; dissemination of information; acquisition of lands, water, and interests therein for use in the plant materials program by donation, exchange, or purchase at a nominal cost not to exceed $100 pursuant to the Act of August 3, 1956 (7 U.S.C. 428a); purchase and erection or alteration or improvement of permanent and temporary buildings; and operation and maintenance of aircraft, $791,498,000, to remain available until March 31, 2008, of which not less than $10,588,000 is for snow survey and water forecasting, and not less than $10,678,000 is for operation and establishment of the plant materials centers, and of which not less than $27,225,000 shall be for the grazing lands conservation initiative: *Provided,* That appropriations hereunder shall be available pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 2250 for construction and improvement of buildings and public improvements at plant materials centers, except that the cost of alterations and improvements to other buildings and other public improvements shall not exceed $250,000: *Provided further,* That when buildings or other structures are erected on non-Federal land, that the right to use such land is obtained as provided in 7 U.S.C. 2250a: *Provided further,* That this appropriation shall be available for technical assistance and related expenses to carry out programs authorized by section 202(c) of title II of the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act of 1974

(43 U.S.C. 1592(c)): *Provided further,* That qualified local engineers may be temporarily employed at per diem rates to perform the technical planning work of the Service.

WATERSHED SURVEYS AND PLANNING

For necessary expenses to conduct research, investigation, and surveys of watersheds of rivers and other waterways, and for small watershed investigations and planning, in accordance with the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (16 U.S.C. 1001–1009), $6,022,000.

WATERSHED AND FLOOD PREVENTION OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses to carry out preventive measures, including but not limited to research, engineering operations, methods of cultivation, the growing of vegetation, rehabilitation of existing works and changes in use of land, in accordance with the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (16 U.S.C. 1001–1005 and 1007–1009), the provisions of the Act of April 27, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 590a–f), and in accordance with the provisions of laws relating to the activities of the Department, $40,000,000, to remain available until expended; of which up to $10,000,000 may be available for the watersheds authorized under the Flood Control Act (33 U.S.C. 701 and 16 U.S.C. 1006a): *Provided,* That not to exceed $20,000,000 of this appropriation shall be available for technical assistance: *Provided further,* That not to exceed $1,000,000 of this appropriation is available to carry out the purposes of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (Public Law 93–205), including cooperative efforts as contemplated by that Act to relocate endangered or threatened species to other suitable habitats as may be necessary to expedite project construction.

WATERSHED REHABILITATION PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out rehabilitation of structural measures, in accordance with section 14 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (16 U.S.C. 1012), and in accordance with the provisions of laws relating to the activities of the Department, $31,245,000, to remain available until expended.

RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses in planning and carrying out projects for resource conservation and development and for sound land use pursuant to the provisions of sections 31 and 32 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (7 U.S.C. 1010–1011; 76 Stat. 607); the Act of April 27, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 590a–f); and subtitle H of title XV of the Agriculture and Food Act of 1981 (16 U.S.C. 3451–3461), $50,787,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That the Secretary shall enter into a cooperative or contribution agreement, within 45 days of enactment of this Act, with a national association regarding a Resource Conservation and Development program and such agreement shall contain the same matching, contribution requirements, and funding level, set forth in a similar cooperative or contribution agreement with a national association in fiscal year 2002: *Provided further,* That not to exceed $3,411,000 shall be available for national headquarters activities.

TITLE III

RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Rural Development to administer programs under the laws enacted by the Congress for the Rural Housing Service, the Rural Business-Cooperative Service, and the Rural Utilities Service, $692,000.

RURAL COMMUNITY ADVANCEMENT PROGRAM

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For the cost of direct loans, loan guarantees, and grants, as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1926, 1926a, 1926c, 1926d, and 1932, except for sections 381E–H and 381N of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, $699,893,000, to remain available until expended, of which $49,477,000 shall be for rural community programs described in section 381E(d)(1) of such Act; of which $561,252,000 shall be for the rural utilities programs described in sections 381E(d)(2), 306C(a)(2), and 306D of such Act, of which not to exceed $500,000 shall be available for the rural utilities program described in section 306(a)(2)(B) of such Act, and of which not to exceed $1,000,000 shall be available for the rural utilities program described in section 306E of such Act; and of which $89,164,000 shall be for the rural business and cooperative development programs described in sections 381E(d)(3) and 310B(f) of such Act: *Provided,* That of the total amount appropriated in this account, $24,000,000 shall be for loans and grants to benefit Federally Recognized Native American Tribes, including grants for drinking water and waste disposal systems pursuant to section 306C of such Act, of which $4,000,000 shall be available for community facilities grants to tribal colleges, as authorized by section 306(a)(19) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, and of which $250,000 shall be available for a grant to a qualified national organization to provide technical assistance for rural transportation in order to promote economic development: *Provided further,* That of the amount appropriated for the rural business and cooperative development programs, not to exceed $500,000 shall be made available for a grant to a qualified national organization to provide technical assistance for rural transportation in order to promote economic development; $3,000,000 shall be for grants to the Delta Regional Authority (7 U.S.C. 1921 et seq.) for any purpose under this heading: *Provided further,* That of the amount appropriated for rural utilities programs, not to exceed $25,000,000 shall be for water and waste disposal systems to benefit the Colonias along the United States/Mexico border, including grants pursuant to section 306C of such Act; $16,215,000 shall be for technical assistance grants for rural water and waste systems pursuant to section 306(a)(14) of such Act, of which $5,600,000 shall be for Rural Community Assistance Programs; and not to exceed $14,000,000 shall be for contracting with qualified national organizations for a circuit rider program to provide technical assistance for rural water systems: *Provided further,* That of the total amount appropriated, not to exceed $22,800,000 shall be available through June 30, 2007, for authorized empowerment zones and enterprise communities and communities designated by the Secretary of Agriculture as Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones; of which $1,100,000 shall be for the rural community programs described in section 381E(d)(1) of such Act, of which $13,400,000 shall be for the rural utilities programs described in section 381E(d)(2) of such Act, and of which $8,300,000 shall be for the rural business and cooperative development programs described in section 381E(d)(3) of such Act: *Provided further,* That any prior year balances for high cost energy grants authorized by section 19 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 901(19)) shall be transferred to and merged with the ''Rural Utilities Service, High Energy Costs Grants Account''.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SANDERS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SANDERS:

Page 36, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $1,500,000) (reduced by $1,500,000)''.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to provide $1.5 million in Federal funding for a revival of the National Agri-Tourism Initiative under the USDA Rural Community Advancement Program.

Mr. Chairman, I do not have to explain to anybody in this room that family farmers all over this country are in desperate condition. Commodity prices are extremely low, and we are seeing the loss of thousands and thousands of family farmers and the way of life that many rural communities in Vermont and throughout this country have known.

What this amendment does is pretty simple. What it says is that in many States like mine, people come to rural areas because they enjoy the beauty, the incredible beauty that farmers help create.

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

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

Mr. BONILLA. I would say to the gentleman that we would be happy to accept the gentleman's amendment, and if he could submit his remarks for the RECORD and he can take ''yes'' for an answer, we can move on.

Mr. SANDERS. I thank the chairman very much. I will be very brief. Just to say that I think we can all agree that we want to help family farmers increase their cash flow, and one of the ways we can do that is enable them to come up with ideas that will bring tourists to their farms, and that is what this amendment is about. It has worked well in Vermont up to now. I think it can work well all over the country. I thank the chairman very much for his support and Ms. DELAURO as well.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to provide $1.5 million in Federal funding for a revival of the national agri-tourism initiative under the USDA Rural Community Advancement Program. This program received $1 million in the fiscal year 2000 Agriculture appropriations bill. The House provided $2 million in the fiscal year 2001 Agriculture appropriations bill, but unfortunately this funding was stripped in conference, and this program hasn't received funding since. Mr. Chairman, it is time to bring this program back to life. Family farmers today need all of the help that they can get if they are going to stay in business, and agri-tourism is one way to help them.

Mr. Chairman, it is imperative that in Vermont and throughout rural America we preserve family owned farms and maintain strong rural economies. As family farmers struggle to survive, it is important that we develop new sources of revenue for them. Reviving the national agri-tourism program will help family farmers increase their incomes. From creating advertising campaigns and working more closely with the tourism industry, to developing farmers' markets, food festivals, bed and breakfasts and farm tours, such programs have great potential for increasing the incomes of family farmers.

Mr. Chairman, family farmers throughout this country deserve more revenue from tourism than they are currently receiving. Many tourists come to rural America because of the beautiful agricultural landscape. Unfortunately, however, family farmers receive relatively little direct revenue from that tourism. This program will help put more tourists' dollars into the hands of our farmers and that is very important.

Specifically, Mr. Chairman, this amendment would help farmers with the knowledge, networks, markets and loans critical to starting-up farm-based businesses that take advantage of the tourism dollars coming into their States.

Let me give you some examples of what agri-tourism is all about and why we need additional help for family farmers to get involved in this growing enterprise. Family farmers throughout this country are converting their guest rooms to small bed and breakfast operations, and are making a few bucks in doing that. To be successful, they might need a loan to convert a room into a bed and breakfast, and they might need some help in learning how to market their enterprise.

Farmers are now encouraging tour buses to stop by and to learn what family agriculture is about. In order to be successful, they might need a loan or a small grant to build a restroom or a parking facility. Farmers might want to build snowmobile trails through their fields in the wintertime. It costs a little bit of money to do that and advertise what you have.

A farm family that grows apples might want to add value to their product and bake apple pies, and they might need some help in buying a large enough oven to do that and to get started in a small business venture.

The list goes on and on. But family farmers all over this country, who desperately want to stay on the land, increasingly are trying to take advantage of the tourism that comes into their region.

Family farmers all across America desperately need the kind of funding that this agri-tourism initiative would provide. The agri-tourism initiative can mean the difference between another family farm going out of business or finding a way to thrive.

To put it simply, agri-tourism funding is about saving family farms.

Without this kind of funding America will lose its family farms, agriculture will cease to be competitive and consumers will pay the price of shortsighted government policies.

Mr. Chairman, family farmers deserve the support of this Congress. I urge my colleagues to stand up for America's family farmers and support this amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RURAL DEVELOPMENT SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for carrying out the administration and implementation of programs in the Rural Development mission area, including activities with institutions concerning the development and operation of agricultural cooperatives; and for cooperative agreements; $182,860,000: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated under this section may be used for advertising and promotional activities that support the Rural Development mission area: *Provided further*, That not more than $10,000 may be expended to provide modest nonmonetary awards to non-USDA employees: *Provided further*, That any balances available from prior years for the Rural Utilities Service, Rural Housing Service, and the Rural Business-Cooperative Service salaries and expenses accounts shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation.

RURAL HOUSING SERVICE

RURAL HOUSING INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For gross obligations for the principal amount of direct and guaranteed loans as authorized by title V- of the Housing Act of 1949, to be available from funds in the rural housing insurance fund, as follows: $4,801,736,000 for loans to section 502 borrowers, as determined by the Secretary, of which $1,237,498,000 shall be for direct loans, and of which $3,564,238,000 shall be for unsubsidized guaranteed loans; $36,382,000 for section 504 housing repair loans; $100,000,000 for section 515 rental housing; $100,000,000 for section 538 guaranteed multi-family housing loans; $5,045,000 for section 524 site loans; $11,482,000 for credit sales of acquired property, of which up to $1,482,000 may be for multi-family credit sales; and $4,980,000 for section 523 self-help housing land development loans.

For the cost of direct and guaranteed loans, including the cost of modifying loans, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as follows: section 502 loans, $131,893,000, of which $124,121,000 shall be for direct loans, and of which $7,772,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for unsubsidized guaranteed loans; section 504 housing repair loans, $10,751,000; repair, rehabilitation, and new construction of section 515 rental housing, $45,670,000; section 538 multi-family housing guaranteed loans, $7,740,000; credit sales of acquired property, $720,000; and section 523 self-help housing land development loans, $123,000: *Provided*, That of the total amount appropriated in this paragraph, $1,500,000 shall be available through June 30, 2007, for authorized empowerment zones and enterprise communities and communities designated by the Secretary of Agriculture as Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones: *Provided further*, That any obligated balances for a demonstration program for the preservation and revitalization of the section 515 multi-family rental housing properties as authorized in Public Law 109–97 shall be transferred to and merged with the ''Rural Housing Service, Multifamily Housing Revitalization Program Account''.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, $430,080,000, which shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''Rural Development, Salaries and Expenses''.

RENTAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

For rental assistance agreements entered into or renewed pursuant to the authority under section 521(a)(2) or agreements entered into in lieu of debt forgiveness or payments for eligible households as authorized by section 502(c)(5)(D) of the Housing Act of 1949, $335,400,000, to remain available through September 30, 2008; and, in addition, such sums as may be necessary, as authorized by section 521(c) of the Act, to liquidate debt incurred prior to fiscal year 1992 to carry out the rental assistance program under section 521(a)(2) of the Act: *Provided*, That of this amount, up to $5,900,000 shall be available for debt forgiveness or payments for eligible households as authorized by section 502(c)(5)(D) of the Act, and not to exceed $50,000 per project for advances to nonprofit organizations or public agencies to cover direct costs (other than purchase price) incurred in purchasing projects pursuant to section 502(c)(5)(C) of the Act: *Provided further*, That agreements entered into or renewed during the current fiscal year shall be funded for a one-year period: *Provided further*, That any unexpended balances remaining at the end of such one-year agreements may be transferred and used for the purposes of any debt reduction; maintenance, repair, or rehabilitation of any existing projects; preservation; and rental assistance activities authorized under title V of the Act: *Provided further*, That rental assistance that is recovered from projects that are subject to prepayment shall be deobligated and reallocated for vouchers and debt forgiveness or payments consistent with the requirements of this Act for purposes authorized under section 542 and section 502(c)(5)(D) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended: *Provided further*, That up to $4,190,000 may be used for the purpose of reimbursing funds used for rental assistance agreements entered into or renewed pursuant to the authority under section 521(a)(2) of the Act for emergency needs related to Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.

MULTIFAMILY HOUSING REVITALIZATION PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the rural housing voucher program as authorized under section 542 of the Housing Act of 1949, (without regard to section 542(b)), for the cost to conduct a housing demonstration program to provide revolving loans for the preservation of low-income multi-family housing projects, and for additional costs to conduct a demonstration program for the preservation and revitalization of the section 515 multi-family rental housing properties, $28,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this heading, $16,000,000 shall be available for rural housing vouchers to any low-income household (including those not receiving rental assistance) residing in a property financed with a section 515 loan which has been prepaid after September 30, 2005: *Provided further*, That the amount of such voucher shall be the difference between comparable market rent for the section 515 unit and the tenant paid rent for such unit: *Provided further*, That funds made available for such vouchers, shall be subject to the availability of annual appropriations: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, administer such vouchers with current regulations and administrative guidance applicable to section 8 housing vouchers administered by the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (including the ability to pay administrative costs related to delivery of the voucher funds): *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, $3,000,000 shall be available for loans to private nonprofit organizations, or such non-profit organizations' affiliate loan funds and State and local housing finance agencies, to carry out a housing demonstration program to provide revolving loans for the preservation of low-income multi-family housing projects: *Provided further*, That loans under such demonstration program shall have an interest rate of not more than 1 percent direct loan to the recipient: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may defer the interest and principal payment to the Rural Housing Service for up to 3 years and the term of such loans shall not exceed 30 years: *Provided further*,

That of the funds made available under this heading, $9,000,000 shall be available for a demonstration program for the preservation and revitalization of the section 515 multi-family rental housing properties to restructure existing section 515 loans, as the Secretary deems appropriate, expressly for the purposes of ensuring the project has sufficient resources to preserve the project for the purpose of providing safe and affordable housing for low-income residents including reducing or eliminating interest; deferring loan payments, subordinating, reducing or reamortizing loan debt; and other financial assistance including advances and incentives required by the Secretary: *Provide further*, That if Congess enacts legislation to permanently authorize a section 515 multi-family rental housing loan restructuring program similar to the demonstration program described herein, the Secretary may use funds made available for the demonstration program under this heading to carry out such legislation with the prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct loan program, $990,000, which shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''Rural Development, Salaries and Expenses'', which shall be made available for the Secretary to contract with third parties to acquire the necessary automation and technical services needed to restructure section 515 mortgages.

MUTUAL AND SELF-HELP HOUSING GRANTS

For grants and contracts pursuant to section 523(b)(1)(A) of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1490c), $37,620,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the total amount appropriated, $1,000,000 shall be available through June 30, 2007, for authorized empowerment zones and enterprise communities and communities designated by the Secretary of Agriculture as Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones.

RURAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE GRANTS

For grants and contracts for very low-income housing repair, supervisory and technical assistance, compensation for construction defects, and rural housing preservation made by the Rural Housing Service, as authorized by 42 U.S.C. 1474, 1479(c), 1490e, and 1490m, $40,590,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the total amount appropriated, $1,188,000 shall be available through June 30, 2007, for authorized empowerment zones and enterprise communities and communities designated by the Secretary of Agriculture as Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones*: Provided further*, That any balances to carry out a housing demonstration program to provide revolving loans for the preservation of low-income multi-family housing projects as authorized in Public Law 108–447 and Public Law 109–97 shall be transferred to and merged with ''Rural Housing Service, Multifamily Housing Revitalization Program Account''.

FARM LABOR PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of direct loans, grants, and contracts, as authorized by 42 U.S.C. 1484 and 1486, $47,525,000, to remain available until expended, for direct farm labor housing loans and domestic farm labor housing grants and contracts.

RURAL BUSINESS—COOPERATIVE SERVICE

RURAL DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the principal amount of direct loans, as authorized by the Rural Development Loan Fund (42 U.S.C. 9812(a)), $33,925,000.

For the cost of direct loans, $14,951,000, as authorized by the Rural Development Loan Fund (42 U.S.C. 9812(a)), of which $1,724,000 shall be available through June 30, 2007, for Federally Recognized Native American Tribes and of which $3,449,000 shall be available through June 30, 2007, for Mississippi Delta Region counties (as determined in accordance with Public Law 100–460): *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated, $880,000 shall be available through June 30, 2007, for the cost of direct loans for authorized empowerment zones and enterprise communities and communities designated by the Secretary of Agriculture as Rural Economic Area Partnership Zones.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan programs, $4,780,000 shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''Rural Development, Salaries and Expenses''.

RURAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

For the principal amount of direct loans, as authorized under section 313 of the Rural Electrification Act, for the purpose of promoting rural economic development and job creation projects, $34,652,000.

For the cost of direct loans, including the cost of modifying loans as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, $7,568,000, to remain available until expended.

Of the funds derived from interest on the cushion of credit payments, as authorized by section 313 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, $78,514,000 shall not be obligated and $78,514,000 are rescinded.

RURAL COOPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

For rural cooperative development grants authorized under section 310B(e) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1932), $9,913,000, of which $500,000 shall be for a cooperative research agreement with a qualified academic institution to conduct research on the national economic impact of all types of cooperatives; and of which $3,000,000 shall be for cooperative agreements for the appropriate technology transfer for rural areas program: *Provided*, That not to exceed $1,485,000 shall be for cooperatives or associations of cooperatives whose primary focus is to provide assistance to small, minority producers and whose governing board and/or membership is comprised of at least 75 percent minority.

RURAL EMPOWERMENT ZONES AND ENTERPRISE COMMUNITIES GRANTS

For grants in connection with second and third rounds of empowerment zones and enterprise communities, $11,088,000, to remain available until expended, for designated rural empowerment zones and rural enterprise communities, as authorized by the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997 and the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105–277): *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated, $1,000,000 shall be made available to third round empowerment zones, as authorized by the Community Renewal Tax Relief Act (Public Law 106–554).

RENEWABLE ENERGY PROGRAM

For the cost of a program of direct loans, loan guarantees, and grants, under the same terms and conditions as authorized by section 9006 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8106), $20,000,000 for direct and guaranteed renewable energy loans and grants: *Provided*, That the cost of direct loans and loan guarantees, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

RURAL UTILITIES SERVICE

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Insured loans pursuant to the authority of section 305 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 935) shall be made as follows: 5 percent rural electrification loans, $99,018,000; municipal rate rural electric loans, $99,000,000; loans made pursuant to section 306 of that Act, rural electric loans, $3,000,000,000; Treasury rate direct electric loans, $990,000,000; guaranteed underwriting loans pursuant to section 313A, $500,000,000; 5 percent rural telecommunications loans, $143,513,000; cost of money rural telecommunications loans, $246,666,000; and for loans made pursuant to section 306 of that Act, rural telecommunications loans, $299,000,000.

For the cost, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, including the cost of modifying loans, of direct and guaranteed loans authorized by sections 305 and 306 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 935 and 936), as follows: cost of rural electric loans, $3,614,000, and the cost of telecommunications loans, $605,000: *Provided*, That notwithstanding section 305(d)(2) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, borrower interest rates may exceed 7 percent per year.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, $39,101,000 which shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''Rural Development, Salaries and Expenses''.

DISTANCE LEARNING, TELEMEDICINE, AND BROADBAND PROGRAM

For the principal amount of broadband telecommunication loans, $503,535,000.

For grants for telemedicine and distance learning services in rural areas, as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 950aaa et seq., $24,750,000, to remain available until expended.

For the cost of broadband loans, as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 901 et seq., $10,826,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided*, That the interest rate for such loans shall be the cost of borrowing to the Department of the Treasury for obligations of comparable maturity: *Provided further*, That the cost of direct loans shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

In addition, $8,910,000, to remain available until expended, for a grant program to finance broadband transmission in rural areas eligible for Distance Learning and Telemedicine Program benefits authorized by 7 U.S.C. 950aaa.

TITLE IV

DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FOOD, NUTRITION AND CONSUMER SERVICES

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services to administer the laws enacted by the Congress for the Food and Nutrition Service, $652,000.

FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE

CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.), except section 21, and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1771 et seq.), except sections 17 and 21; $13,345,487,000, to remain available through September 30, 2008, of which $7,610,897,000 is hereby appropriated and $5,734,590,000 shall be derived by transfer from funds available under section 32 of the

Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c): *Provided*, That up to $5,335,000 shall be available for independent verification of school food service claims.

SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION PROGRAM FOR WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN (WIC)

For necessary expenses to carry out the special supplemental nutrition program as authorized by section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786), $5,244,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 2008, of which such sums as are necessary to restore the contingency reserve to $125,000,000 shall be placed in reserve, to remain available until expended, to be allocated as the Secretary deems necessary, notwithstanding section 17(i) of such Act, to support participation should cost or participation exceed budget estimates: *Provided*, That amounts over $125,000,000 in the contingency reserve shall be treated as general WIC appropriated funds rather than contingency reserve funds: *Provided further*, That of the total amount available, the Secretary shall obligate not less than $15,000,000 for a breastfeeding support initiative in addition to the activities specified in section 17(h)(3)(A): *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 17(h)(10)(A) of such Act, only the provisions of section 17(h)(10)(B)(i) and section 17(h)(10)(B)(ii) shall be effective in 2007; including $14,000,000 for the purposes specified in section 17(h)(10)(B)(i) and $20,000,000 for the purposes specified in section 17(h)(10)(B)(ii): *Provided further*, That funds made available for the purposes specified in section 17(h)(10)(B)(ii) shall only be made available upon a determination by the Secretary that funds are available to meet caseload requirements without the use of the contingency reserve funds: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available under this heading shall be used for studies and evaluations: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available to pay administrative expenses of WIC clinics except those that have an announced policy of prohibiting smoking within the space used to carry out the program: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this account shall be available for the purchase of infant formula except in accordance with the cost containment and competitive bidding requirements specified in section 17 of such Act: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided shall be available for activities that are not fully reimbursed by other Federal Government departments or agencies unless authorized by section 17 of such Act.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out the Food Stamp Act (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.), $37,865,231,000, of which $3,000,000,000 to remain available through September 30, 2008, shall be placed in reserve for use only in such amounts and at such times as may become necessary to carry out program operations: *Provided*, That funds provided herein shall be expended in accordance with section 16 of the Food Stamp Act: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be subject to any work registration or workfare requirements as may be required by law: *Provided further*, That funds made available for Employment and Training under this heading shall remain available until expended, as authorized by section 16(h)(1) of the Food Stamp Act: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 5(d) of the Food Stamp Act of 1977, any additional payment received under chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, by a member of the United States Armed Forces deployed to a designated combat zone shall be excluded from household income for the duration of the member's deployment if the additional pay is the result of deployment to or while serving in a combat zone, and it was not received immediately prior to serving in the combat zone.

COMMODITY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out disaster assistance and the commodity supplemental food program, as authorized by section 4(a) of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (7 U.S.C. 612c note); the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983; special assistance for the nuclear affected islands, as authorized by section 103(f)(2) of the Compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003 (Public Law 108–188); and the Farmers' Market Nutrition Program, as authorized by section 17(m) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, $189,370,000, to remain available through September 30, 2008: *Provided*, That none of these funds shall be available to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for commodities donated to the program: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, effective with funds made available in fiscal year 2007 to support the Seniors Farmers' Market Nutrition Program (SFMNP), as authorized by section 4402 of Public Law 107–171, such funds shall remain available through September 30, 2008: *Provided further*, That no funds available for SFMNP in fiscal year 2007 shall be used to pay State or local sales taxes on food purchased with SFMNP coupons or checks: *Provided further*, That the value of assistance provided by the SFMNP shall not be considered income or resources for any purposes under any Federal, State or local laws related to taxation, welfare and public assistance programs: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under section 27(a) of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.), the Secretary may use up to $10,000,000 for costs associated with the distribution of commodities.

NUTRITION PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATION

For necessary administrative expenses of the domestic nutrition assistance programs funded under this Act, $142,314,000.

TITLE V

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Foreign Agricultural Service, including carrying out title VI of the Agricultural Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1761–1768), market development activities abroad, and for enabling the Secretary to coordinate and integrate activities of the Department in connection with foreign agricultural work, including not to exceed $158,000 for representation allowances and for expenses pursuant to section 8 of the Act approved August 3, 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1766), $156,486,000: *Provided*, That the Service may utilize advances of funds, or reimburse this appropriation for expenditures made on behalf of Federal agencies, public and private organizations and institutions under agreements executed pursuant to the agricultural food production assistance programs (7 U.S.C. 1737) and the foreign assistance programs of the United States Agency for International Development.

PUBLIC LAW 480 TITLE I DIRECT CREDIT AND FOOD FOR PROGRESS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For administrative expenses to carry out the credit program of title I, Public Law 83–480, $2,651,000, to be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''Farm Service Agency, Salaries and Expenses''.

PUBLIC LAW 480 TITLE II GRANTS

For expenses during the current fiscal year, not otherwise recoverable, and unrecovered prior years' costs, including interest thereon, under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, for commodities supplied in connection with dispositions abroad under title II of said Act, $1,223,100,000, to remain available until expended.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION EXPORT LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For administrative expenses to carry out the Commodity Credit Corporation's export guarantee program, GSM 102 and GSM 103, $5,331,000; to cover common overhead expenses as permitted by section 11 of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act and in conformity with the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, of which $4,985,000 may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''Foreign Agricultural Service, Salaries and Expenses'', including $775,000 to be made available for debt recovery, and of which $346,000 may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for ''Farm Service Agency, Salaries and Expenses''.

MCGOVERN-DOLE INTERNATIONAL FOOD FOR EDUCATION AND CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAM GRANTS

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 3107 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 1736o–1), $100,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to provide the services, facilities, and authorities for the purpose of implementing such section, subject to reimbursement from amounts provided herein.

TITLE VI

RELATED AGENCIES AND FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Food and Drug Administration, including hire and purchase of passenger motor vehicles; for payment of space rental and related costs pursuant to Public Law 92–313 for programs and activities of the Food and Drug Administration which are included in this Act; for rental of special purpose space in the District of Columbia or elsewhere; for miscellaneous and emergency expenses of enforcement activities, authorized and approved by the Secretary and to be accounted for solely on the Secretary's certificate, not to exceed $25,000; and notwithstanding section 521 of Public Law 107–188; $1,914,382,000: *Provided*, That of the amount provided under this heading, $320,600,000 shall be derived from prescription drug user fees authorized by 21 U.S.C. 379h, shall be credited to this account and remain available until expended, and shall not include any fees pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 379h(a)(2) and (a)(3) assessed for fiscal year 2008 but collected in fiscal year 2007; $43,726,000 shall be derived from medical device user fees authorized by 21 U.S.C. 379j, and shall be credited to this account and remain available until expended; and $11,604,000 shall be derived from animal drug user fees authorized by 21 U.S.C. 379j, and shall be credited to this account and remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That fees derived from prescription drug, medical device, and animal drug assessments received during fiscal year 2007, including any such fees assessed prior to the current fiscal year but credited during the current year, shall be subject to the fiscal year 2007 limitation: *Provided further*, That none of these funds shall be used to develop, establish, or operate any program of user fees authorized

by 31 U.S.C. 9701: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated: (1) $454,006,000 shall be for the Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition and related field activities in the Office of Regulatory Affairs; (2) $545,938,000 shall be for the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research and related field activities in the Office of Regulatory Affairs; (3) $194,637,000 shall be for the Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research and for related field activities in the Office of Regulatory Affairs; (4) $105,595,000 shall be for the Center for Veterinary Medicine and for related field activities in the Office of Regulatory Affairs; (5) $253,789,000 shall be for the Center for Devices and Radiological Health and for related field activities in the Office of Regulatory Affairs; (6) $34,118,000 shall be for the National Center for Toxicological Research; (7) $62,007,000 shall be for Rent and Related activities, of which $25,552,000 is for White Oak Consolidation, other than the amounts paid to the General Services Administration for rent; (8) $146,013,000 shall be for payments to the General Services Administration for rent; and (9) $118,279,000 shall be for other activities, including the Office of the Commissioner; the Office of Management; the Office of External Relations; the Office of Policy and Planning; and central services for these offices: *Provided further*, That funds may be transferred from one specified activity to another with the prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

In addition, mammography user fees authorized by 42 U.S.C. 263b may be credited to this account, to remain available until expended.

In addition, export certification user fees authorized by 21 U.S.C. 381 may be credited to this account, to remain available until expended.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For plans, construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities of or used by the Food and Drug Administration, where not otherwise provided, $4,950,000, to remain available until expended.

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), including the purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles, and the rental of space (to include multiple year leases) in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, $109,402,000, including not to exceed $3,000 for official reception and representation expenses.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Not to exceed $44,250,000 (from assessments collected from farm credit institutions and from the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation) shall be obligated during the current fiscal year for administrative expenses as authorized under 12 U.S.C. 2249: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to expenses associated with receiverships.

TITLE VII

GENERAL PROVISIONS

(INCLUDING RESCISSIONS AND TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

SEC. 701. Within the unit limit of cost fixed by law, appropriations and authorizations made for the Department of Agriculture for the current fiscal year under this Act shall be available for the purchase, in addition to those specifically provided for, of not to exceed 292 passenger motor vehicles, of which 290 shall be for replacement only, and for the hire of such vehicles.

SEC. 702. New obligational authority provided for the following appropriation items in this Act shall remain available until expended: Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, the contingency fund to meet emergency conditions, information technology infrastructure, fruit fly program, emerging plant pests, cotton pests program, low pathogen avian influenza program, high pathogen avian influenza program, up to $33,107,000 in animal health monitoring and surveillance for the animal identification system, up to $682,000 in the brucellosis program for indemnities, up to $2,888,000 in the chronic wasting disease program for indemnities, up to $3,934,000 in the scrapie program for indemnities, up to $2,387,000 in the tuberculosis program for indemnities, up to $4,900,000 in the emergency management systems program for the vaccine bank, up to $1,000,000 for wildlife services methods development, up to $1,000,000 of the wildlife services operations program for aviation safety, and up to 25 percent of the screwworm program; Food Safety and Inspection Service, field automation and information management project; Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service, funds for competitive research grants (7 U.S.C. 450i(b)), funds for the Research, Education, and Economics Information System, and funds for the Native American Institutions Endowment Fund; Farm Service Agency, salaries and expenses funds made available to county committees; Foreign Agricultural Service, middle-income country training program, and up to $2,000,000 of the Foreign Agricultural Service appropriation solely for the purpose of offsetting fluctuations in international currency exchange rates, subject to documentation by the Foreign Agricultural Service.

SEC. 703. The Secretary of Agriculture may transfer unobligated balances of discretionary funds appropriated by this Act or other available unobligated discretionary balances of the Department of Agriculture to the Working Capital Fund for the acquisition of plant and capital equipment necessary for the delivery of financial, financial management modernization initiative, administrative, and information technology services of primary benefit to the agencies of the Department of Agriculture: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available by this Act or any other Act shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund without the prior approval of the agency administrator: *Provided further*, That none of the funds transferred to the Working Capital Fund pursuant to this section shall be available for obligation without the prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress.

SEC. 704. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 705. No funds appropriated by this Act may be used to pay negotiated indirect cost rates on cooperative agreements or similar arrangements between the United States Department of Agriculture and nonprofit institutions in excess of 10 percent of the total direct cost of the agreement when the purpose of such cooperative arrangements is to carry out programs of mutual interest between the two parties. This does not preclude appropriate payment of indirect costs on grants and contracts with such institutions when such indirect costs are computed on a similar basis for all agencies for which appropriations are provided in this Act.

SEC. 706. None of the funds in this Act shall be available to pay indirect costs charged against competitive agricultural research, education, or extension grant awards issued by the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service that exceed 22 percent of total Federal funds provided under each award: *Provided*, That notwithstanding section 1462 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3310), funds provided by this Act for grants awarded competitively by the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service shall be available to pay full allowable indirect costs for each grant awarded under section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638).

SEC. 707. Appropriations to the Department of Agriculture for the cost of direct and guaranteed loans made available in the current fiscal year shall remain available until expended to disburse obligations made in the current fiscal year for the following accounts: the Rural Development Loan Fund program account, the Rural Electrification and Telecommunication Loans program account, and the Rural Housing Insurance Fund program account.

SEC. 708. Of the funds made available by this Act, not more than $1,800,000 shall be used to cover necessary expenses of activities related to all advisory committees, panels, commissions, and task forces of the Department of Agriculture, except for panels used to comply with negotiated rule makings and panels used to evaluate competitively awarded grants.

SEC. 709. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to carry out section 410 of the Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 679a) or section 30 of the Poultry Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 471).

SEC. 710. No employee of the Department of Agriculture may be detailed or assigned from an agency or office funded by this Act to any other agency or office of the Department for more than 30 days unless the individual's employing agency or office is fully reimbursed by the receiving agency or office for the salary and expenses of the employee for the period of assignment.

SEC. 711. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Agriculture or the Food and Drug Administration shall be used to transmit or otherwise make available to any non-Department of Agriculture or non-Department of Health and Human Services employee questions or responses to questions that are a result of information requested for the appropriations hearing process.

SEC. 712. None of the funds made available to the Department of Agriculture by this Act may be used to acquire new information technology systems or significant upgrades, as determined by the Office of the Chief Information Officer, without the approval of the Chief Information Officer and the concurrence of the Executive Information Technology Investment Review Board: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be transferred to the Office of the Chief Information Officer without the prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress: *Provided further*, That none of the funds available to the Department of Agriculture for information technology shall be obligated for projects over $25,000 prior to receipt of written approval by the Chief Information Officer.

SEC. 713. (a) None of the funds provided by this Act, or provided by previous Appropriations Acts to the agencies funded by this Act that remain available for obligation or expenditure in the current fiscal year, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury of the United States derived by the collection of fees available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds which—

(1) creates new programs;

(2) eliminates a program, project, or activity;

(3) increases funds or personnel by any means for any project or activity for which funds have been denied or restricted;

(4) relocates an office or employees;

(5) reorganizes offices, programs, or activities; or

(6) contracts out or privatizes any functions or activities presently performed by Federal employees; unless the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress are notified 15 days in advance of such reprogramming of funds.

(b) None of the funds provided by this Act, or provided by previous Appropriations Acts to the agencies funded by this Act that remain available for obligation or expenditure in the current fiscal year, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury of the United States derived by the collection of fees available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure for activities, programs, or projects through a reprogramming of funds in excess of $500,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less, that: (1) augments existing programs, projects, or activities; (2) reduces by 10 percent funding for any existing program, project, or activity, or numbers of personnel by 10 percent as approved by Congress; or (3) results from any general savings from a reduction in personnel which would result in a change in existing programs, activities, or projects as approved by Congress; unless the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress are notified 15 days in advance of such reprogramming of funds.

(c) The Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, or the Chairman of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress before implementing a program or activity not carried out during the previous fiscal year unless the program or activity is funded by this Act or specifically funded by any other Act.

SEC. 714. None of the funds appropriated by this or any other Act shall be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel who prepare or submit appropriations language as part of the President's Budget submission to the Congress of the United States for programs under the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Subcommittees on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies that assumes revenues or reflects a reduction from the previous year due to user fees proposals that have not been enacted into law prior to the submission of the Budget unless such Budget submission identifies which additional spending reductions should occur in the event the user fees proposals are not enacted prior to the date of the convening of a committee of conference for the fiscal year 2008 Appropriations Act.

SEC. 715. None of the funds made available by this or any other Act may be used to close or relocate a State Rural Development office unless or until cost effectiveness and enhancement of program delivery have been determined.

SEC. 716. In addition to amounts otherwise appropriated or made available by this Act, $2,500,000 is appropriated for the purpose of providing Bill Emerson and Mickey Leland Hunger Fellowships, through the Congressional Hunger Center.

SEC. 717. There is hereby appropriated $250,000 for a grant to the National Sheep Industry Improvement Center, to remain available until expended.

SEC. 718. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the funds made available in this Act for competitive research grants (7 U.S.C. 450i(b)), the Secretary may use up to 30 percent of the amount provided to carry out a competitive grants program under the same terms and conditions as those provided in section 401 of the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (7 U.S.C. 7621).

SEC. 719. No funds shall be used to pay salaries and expenses of the Department of Agriculture to carry out or administer the program authorized by section 14(h)(1) of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (16 U.S.C. 1012(h)(1)).

SEC. 720. No funds shall be used to pay salaries and expenses of the Department of Agriculture to carry out or administer the calendar year 2007 wetlands reserve program as authorized by 16 U.S.C. 3837 in excess of 144,776 acres.

SEC. 721. No funds shall be used to pay salaries and expenses of the Department of Agriculture to carry out or administer an environmental quality incentives program authorized by chapter 4 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa et seq.) in excess of $1,087,000,000.

SEC. 722. No funds shall be used to pay salaries and expenses of the Department of Agriculture to carry out or administer a program authorized by section 601(j)(1) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 950bb(j)(1)).

SEC. 723. None of the funds made available in fiscal year 2006 or preceding fiscal years for programs authorized under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1691 et seq.) in excess of $20,000,000 shall be used to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for the release of eligible commodities under section 302(f)(2)(A) of the Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust Act (7 U.S.C. 1736f–1): *Provided,* That any such funds made available to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation shall only be used pursuant to section 302(b)(2)(B)(i) of the Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust Act.

SEC. 724. No funds shall be used to pay salaries and expenses of the Department of Agriculture to carry out or administer a program authorized by section 6401 of Public Law 107–171, in excess of $28,000,000.

SEC. 725. Notwithstanding subsections (c) and (e)(2) of section 313A of the Rural Electrification Act (7 U.S.C. 940c(c) and (e)(2)) in implementing section 313A of that Act, the Secretary shall, with the consent of the lender, structure the schedule for payment of the annual fee, not to exceed an average of 30 basis points per year for the term of the loan, to ensure that sufficient funds are available to pay the subsidy costs for note guarantees under that section.

SEC. 726. No funds shall be used to pay salaries and expenses of the Department of Agriculture to carry out or administer a conservation security program authorized by 16 U.S.C. 3838 et seq., in excess of $280,173,000.

SEC. 727. No funds shall be used to pay salaries and expenses of the Department of Agriculture to carry out or administer a program authorized by section 2502 of Public Law 107–171, in excess of $55,000,000.

SEC. 728. No funds shall be used to pay salaries and expenses of the Department of Agriculture to carry out or administer a program authorized by section 2503 of Public Law 107–171, in excess of $50,000,000.

SEC. 729. No funds shall be used to pay salaries and expenses of the Department of Agriculture to carry out or administer a ground and surface water conservation program authorized by section 2301 of Public Law 107–171, in excess of $51,000,000.

SEC. 730. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to issue a final rule in furtherance of, or otherwise implement, the proposed rule on cost-sharing for animal and plant health emergency programs of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service published on July 8, 2003 (Docket No. 02–062–1; 68 Fed. Reg. 40541).

SEC. 731. Funds made available under section 1240I and section 1241(a) of the Food Security Act of 1985 in the current fiscal year shall remain available until expended to disburse obligations made in the current fiscal year, and are not available for new obligations. Funds made available under section 524(b) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, 7 U.S.C. 1524(b), in fiscal years 2004, 2005, and 2006 shall remain available until expended to disburse obligations made in fiscal years 2004, 2005, and 2006, respectively, and are not available for new obligations.

SEC. 732. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, Rural Development shall provide grants from funds available for the Rural Community Advancement Program for the Ohio Livestock Expo Center in Springfield, Ohio, in an amount not to exceed $1,000,000.

SEC. 733. No funds shall be used to pay salaries and expenses of the Department of Agriculture to carry out or administer an agricultural management assistance program authorized by section 524 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, in excess of $6,000,000 (7 U.S.C. 1524).

SEC. 734. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used for salaries and expenses to draft or implement any regulation or rule insofar as it would require recertification of rural status for each electric and telecommunications borrower for the Rural Electrification and Telecommunication Loans program.

SEC. 735. Unless otherwise authorized by existing law, none of the funds provided in this Act, may be used by an executive branch agency to produce any prepackaged news story intended for broadcast or distribution in the United States unless the story includes a clear notification within the text or audio of the prepackaged news story that the prepackaged news story was prepared or funded by that executive branch agency.

SEC. 736. In addition to other amounts appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act, there is hereby appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture $15,600,000, of which not to exceed 5 percent may be available for administrative expenses, to remain available until expended, to make specialty crop block grants under section 101 of the Specialty Crops Competitiveness Act of 2004 (Public Law 108–465; 7 U.S.C. 1621 note).

SEC. 737. No funds shall be used to pay salaries and expenses of the Department of Agriculture to carry out or administer a program authorized by section 18(g)(6)(B)(i) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1769(g)(6)(B)(i)).

SEC. 738. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, there is hereby appropriated $25,000,000, of which not to exceed 5 percent may be available for administrative expenses, to carry out section 18(g) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1769(g) in each State and on Indian reservations.

SEC. 739. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to study, complete a study of, or enter into a contract with a private party to carry out, without specific authorization in a subsequent Act of Congress, a competitive sourcing activity of the Secretary of Agriculture, including support personnel of the Department of Agriculture, relating to rural development or farm loan programs.

SEC. 740. Of the unobligated balances under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935, $9,900,000 are hereby rescinded.

SEC. 741. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall be used to pay salaries and expenses of personnel who implement or administer section 508(e)(3) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7

U.S.C. 1508(e)(3)) or any regulation, bulletin, policy or agency guidance issued pursuant to section 508(e)(3) of such Act for the 2007 and the 2008 reinsurance years, except that funds are available to administer section 508(e)(3) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act for policies in effect as of the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 742. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used—

(1) to grant a waiver of a financial conflict of interest requirement pursuant to section 505(n)(4) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for any voting member of an advisory committee or panel of the Food and Drug Administration; or

(2) to make a certification under section 208(b)(3) of title 18, United States Code, for any such voting member.

SEC. 743. Section 739 of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 2001 (H.R. 5426 as enacted by Public Law 106–387, 115 Stat. 1549A–34) is amended by striking ''2 percent'' and inserting ''3 percent''.

SEC. 744. Of the unobligated balances available in the High Energy Cost Grants account, $25,265,000 is hereby rescinded.

SEC. 745. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purposes of title V of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1471 et seq.), the Secretary of Agriculture shall consider the City of Atascadero, California, the City of Paso Robles, California, the City of Freeport, Illinois, and Kitsap County (except the City of Bremerton), Washington, as meeting the requirements of a rural area contained in section 520 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1490) until the receipt of the decennial Census in the year 2010.

SEC. 746. Of the appropriations available for payments for the nutrition and family education program for low-income areas under section 3(d) of the Smith-Lever Act (7 U.S.C. 343(d)), if the payment allocation pursuant to section 1425(c) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3175(c)) would be less than $100,000 for any institution eligible under section 3(d)(2) of the Smith-Lever Act, the Secretary shall adjust payment allocations under section 1425(c) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 to ensure that each institution receives a payment of not less than $100,000.

SEC. 747. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to implement the final rule published by the Secretary of Agriculture on April 24, 2006, amending part 381 of title 9 of the Code of Federal Regulations to add the People's Republic of China to the list of countries eligible to export poultry products to the United States.

SEC. 748. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to prohibit the use of non-government electronic certification forms that verify properly certified results of equine infectious anemia testing for the purpose of interstate or international shipment of tested animals.

□ 1430

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I rise to make a point of order against section 749, which begins on page 80, line 19, and ends on page 81, line 7, because it violates rule XXI, clause 2, which prohibits legislative language in a general appropriations bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair finds that this section directly amends existing law. This section, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2, rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the section is stricken from the bill.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 750. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act for the Food and Drug Administration may be used under section 801 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prevent an individual not in the business of importing a prescription drug within the meaning of section 801(g) of such Act, wholesalers, or pharmacists from importing a prescription drug which complies with sections 501, 502, and 505.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that the language beginning with, ''The Secretary of Health and Human Services,'' on page 81, line 16, through, ''Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act,'' on page 82, line 5, violates clause 2 of rule XXI of the rules of the House which prohibits legislation on appropriations bills.

The language that I have cited permits the Secretary of HHS to require the holder of an approved application for a drug to conduct studies to refute proposed theories. This language clearly constitutes legislating on an appropriations bill and, as such, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I regret that my friend has moved to strike this language, particularly given the GAO's recent findings.

The FDA needs the authority to mandate post-marketing drug studies when needed, and indeed, the General Accountability Office has issued a very harsh report of the post-market studies saying, and I quote, FDA lacks clear and effective processes for making decisions about and providing management oversight of post-market safety issues. They further say that, to improve the decision-making process for post-market drug safety, Congress should consider expanding FDA's authority to require drug sponsors to conduct post-market studies, such as clinical trials or observational studies, as needed, to collect additional data on drug safety issues.

The FDA is under increasing pressure to approve new drugs quickly. Some of us have been concerned by the implication of the approval process. Since 2000, ten drugs have been withdrawn for safety reasons by their manufacturers, all voluntarily. As far back as 1996, when the inspector general at HHS looked into the matter, it found that the FDA lacked an appropriate system for monitoring or tracking the status of the post-market——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman would confine her remarks to the substance of the point of order.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, no one is accusing FDA of willful negligence. There can be innocent reasons why this study is not done, but the fact is the FDA needs to have authority in order to assure that we are not putting lives at risk with unsafe drugs that are not fully tested.

This language would ensure that they have the authority. Prescription drugs are the foundation of modern medical treatment. The public's interest is being preserved by having the FDA have this authority.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will remind the gentlewoman that her remarks must be confined to the substance of the point of order.

□ 1445

If no other Members wish to be heard on the point of order, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this section confers authority on the Executive. The section, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI. The point of order is sustained and the section is stricken from the bill.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 752. Section 1502(c)(3) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 7982(c)(3)) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (A);

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''August 31, 2007, 34 percent; and'' and inserting ''September 30, 2007, 34 percent.''; and

(3) by striking subparagraph (C).

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order against section 752.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I raise a point of order against page 82, line 6, ending on page 82, line 17, because it violates rule XXI, clause 2, which prohibits legislative language in a general appropriations bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does anybody wish to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order.

The Chair finds that this section directly amends existing law. This section, therefore, constitutes legislate in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the section is stricken from the bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, in less than 6 months, farmers will begin to plan for the next crop year. Without extending the storage and handling fee program for peanuts, all over the Southeast there will be problems in the ag world. As we know, when we did away with the peanut quota program, the farmers went from a support price of over $600 down to $355. Now, in exchange for such a reduction in the support price and elimination of the quota program, farmers

were also successful in negotiating a $50 per ton storage and handling fee.

The reason why this was important is because when peanuts are ready to harvest, the market might not be at the optimal selling price for the peanuts. Likewise, when the shellers and the folks in manufacturing and processing need peanuts, there might at times be an abundance and at other times there might be a deficit. So for everyone involved in the peanut food chain, having a good storage and handling program is important. You can't just put peanuts in any warehouse and keep them in fresh order. You have to have a specialized warehouse, and that is why this program is important.

This program is important not just to those in the peanut business directly, the farmer, the producer, the processor, the user, and the shelling facility; but it is also important for rural southeast America. The peanut program is bigger in poor counties across the southeastern States. You don't have a problem with the peanut program in Atlanta, Georgia, or in Birmingham, Alabama, or St. Simons Island, Georgia, or Savannah, Georgia. You have it in the small areas, like Cook County and Berien County and Candler County and Bulloch County, counties that do not have the growth in many cases of those in the urban areas.

This program has been successful from South Carolina to southern Mississippi to Alabama. Just one example: in Donalsonville, Georgia, the American Peanut Growers Group, a co-op comprised of 85 different peanut producers, invested in a shelling facility after the last farm bill and created 50 new full-time jobs and six new buying points throughout the region, a great success story.

In Tifton, Georgia, over $18 million has been invested in a new dome storage peanut shelling facility that employs 60 people. This is a product of 56 different peanut producers in making this shelling plant.

Examples of this are all over here. And I know the gentleman from Alabama is here and he has seen it from his own area, but even though the chairman of the Ag Committee has been a good supporter of farm programs and the peanut program, striking this language on a point of order actually hurts us at this time. Because as these peanut farmers are making growing decisions, we have just taken away one of the great economic tools they need to successfully decide if they are going to be planting peanuts or planting corn or planting soybeans or cotton.

What I would say to the members of the committee is as this bill moves through the process without this language in it, it is quite likely our friends in the other body will restore this language, and I am hoping that the Senators from Georgia are able to do that. The language was put in the bill by me, Mr. BISHOP, and Congressman BOYD, bipartisan support and southeastern agriculture support, and we are hoping to get it restored at some point along the line.

So I just wanted to come down here on the point of order to make sure folks know that even though this is going to be stricken today, we do feel like it does not kill this, but for the time being.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend Mr. KINGSTON for his work on this issue. This is an issue that we have worked very closely with the authorizers on to try to fix this program because it expired, as the gentleman said. Mr. KINGSTON has been a real leader, as has Senator CHAMBLISS on the other side of the Capitol, in trying to address this issue.

I am very grateful the gentleman came to the floor today to address the concerns, because they needed to be exposed rather than just rule on the technicality that was before us. The gentleman understood that the peanut issue was subject to a point of order and nonetheless fought the good fight to the very end.

So I would just like to commend the gentleman for his work in this area.

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

Mr. BONILLA. I would be happy to yield to my good friend from Alabama.

Mr. EVERETT. I thank the chairman, and Mr. KINGSTON has adequately explained the situation that we are in. This handling and storage fee is absolutely critical for the peanut farmers in these very small rural towns that we all represent.

One thing that might be noted is that in the last farm bill, which I had the privilege of being the subcommittee chairman that wrote this peanut title, this was put in there to help the farmers and the shellers transition into a more market-based program. The problem that we have gotten into is because I believe that the USDA has not followed the word and/or spirit of the peanut title, in that they have kept these peanuts, we have had about 2 or 3 years of great peanut crops, and they have kept these peanuts in loan. That has not created a market that we intended to create. They have not moved these peanuts out of loan, which we fully intended for them to do.

They have to understand if it is a budget thing, it is either pay now or pay later. But the longer they keep them in there, the less those peanuts are going to be worth and they will go out to people for almost nothing.

So I appreciate Mr. KINGSTON for putting this language in there, and I further appreciate the chairman. I understand my full committee chairman on the authorizing side is trying to protect the committee's privileges, and also my friend from Texas, Mr. BONILLA, I appreciate the words that he had concerning this issue and, hopefully, we can do something in conference about it.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's remarks and, in closing, there are oftentimes issues like this that come before us that as appropriators you never know what is around the next corner with legislation that is being put in our lap that has a profound impact above and beyond dollar figures that we debate on every day in our committee.

So, again, I realize and all of us realize this is a very serious issue that needs to be addressed.

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

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to express my chagrin at the fact that the chairman of the authorizing committee has exercised a point of order against the provision in the appropriation bill, section 752, which would have corrected a gross shortcoming in the dairy program.

The fact is that with the language in the appropriation bill being stricken, we will now face the situation under which dairy will be at a distinct disadvantage when the farm bill is renewed in 2007 because the authorization committee arranged in previous legislation to see to it that the milk program expired one month before the end of the fiscal year. What that means is that evidently the Agriculture Committee majority desires to see the supplemental milk payment program die.

I hope that every small dairy farmer in America takes note of that fact. It is a pretty clear indication of whose side people are on. And I simply want to make the observation that this provision that required the milk program to expire 1 month early was not done for any policy reason. It was done as a gimmick to get around the budget act. And it is another illustration of the fact that when our principal goal is to find whatever parliamentary gimmicks we can find in order to fit programs into a defined box, then real people get hurt. The fact is that there will be many small dairy farmers who go out of business if they do not have the support that comes from that supplemental milk payment program.

So, Mr. Chairman, I regret very much the gentleman felt required to do that. I hope that dairy farmers will take note of the fact that the only possible dairy farmers who could benefit from this are the giant operators, the 1,000- and 2,000-cow herd operators, but the average dairy farmer in the United States is hurt by the action that was taken today, and I hope they take that into account when they go to the polls in November.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the point of order that was offered by my good friend, the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, Mr. GOODLATTE, and in support of the peanut storage and handling language that was included in the 2007 agriculture appropriations bill.

As the Representative of the Second Congressional District of Georgia,

which I am proud to say is the largest peanut producing district in the Nation, I would like to lend my full support and endorsement of language that was included in the bill extending the peanut storage and handling program for an additional year.

During consideration of the 2002 farm bill, the peanut industry, including growers, manufacturers, and processors, asked that the House Agriculture Committee change the Nation's peanut program from a supply management structure to a more market-oriented program.

At the time, I had the pleasure of serving as a member of the Agriculture Committee. The House Ag Committee made these changes, working in cooperation with the peanut industry, and the transition to the new market-oriented program was a part of a very carefully crafted compromise that was developed and approved by the House Agriculture Committee.

□ 1500

The 2002 farm bill provided storage, handling fees and related costs for the peanut program through the 2006 crop year. Our concern centered on the fact that growers would have to absorb the storage costs associated with peanuts placed under loan.

The language included in the committee bill would simply continue the peanut storage and handling fees program through 2007, terminating at the beginning of fiscal year 2008. The language was reviewed by the CBO and will not have a 2007 cost, primarily because the payments will come after the 2007 harvest. There will be a cost of approximately $77 million in 2008. By all measures, the new peanut program is a true success story.

The storage and handling fees paid on peanuts by this loan program are very limited in scope. And more importantly, the storage and handling segment of the peanut program will actually expire at the end of this fiscal year.

As the chairman will recall, the original intent of this program was to provide an efficient and practical transition from the old supply-management structure to the new market-oriented approach. Without the bridge provided by this program, producers would not have participated in transitioning to the new program.

Every licensed warehouse operator has a structure for storage and handling fees. These fees will be passed on to the peanut producer if they are not paid by the Department of Agriculture. Much of the 2006 peanut crop has already been contracted, and the underlying business decisions associated with these transitions are in large part based on the program provisions that are in effect under current law.

Peanut producers entered this crop year and planned for this farm bill period based on the commitment that Congress made in the 2002 farm bill. Warehouse operators will not absorb these costs. It will be the producer who will pay if these fees are not paid as designed by the current bill.

Peanuts, unlike many other crops, can't practically be stored on the farm. Specialized handling and storage by knowledgeable warehouse operators is necessary to preserve the value of this semi-perishable commodity. So it is an expense that is absolutely necessary and one that the grower can't avoid by doing it himself.

Without this language, what is now a $355 per ton marketing loan program will effectively be reduced to a loan program that will not be profitable for the peanut producer.

Mr. Chairman, this language is crucial to the future of the peanut industry and continuation of the program into 2007. It could literally mean the difference between profitability and loss, between success and failure, between farmers surviving or forcing even more family farmers off the land. These farmers are real people, Mr. Chairman, real people whose lives will be profoundly changed if this point of order is upheld by the Chair.

I strongly oppose the point of order and ask the Chairman to retain the language in question which is vital to the American peanut farmer, particularly those in the State of Georgia.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY) having assumed the chair, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, 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. 5384) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LIMITING AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5384, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 5384 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 830, notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no further amendment to the bill may be offered except:

Pro forma amendments offered at any point in the reading by the chairman or ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees for the purpose of debate;

An amendment by Mr. BLUMENAUER regarding funding limitations for sugar loan rates, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes;

An amendment by Ms. SLAUGHTER regarding funding for Center For Veterinary Medicine;

An amendment or amendments by Mr. BONILLA regarding funding levels;

An amendment by Mr. LATHAM regarding section 741 of the bill;

An amendment by Mr. HEFLEY regarding an across-the-board reduction;

An amendment by Mr. TIAHRT regarding funding limitation on competitiveness;

An amendment by Mr. PAUL regarding funding limitation on National Animal Identification System;

An amendment by Mr. KING of Iowa regarding submission of a report on the National Animal Identification System and certain pilot projects;

An amendment by Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan regarding emerald ash borer;

An amendment by Mr. SWEENEY regarding a funding limitation on examination, inspection, and processing of horses;

An amendment by Mr. WEINER regarding payments to certain cotton and rice producers;

An amendment by Mr. CARTER regarding funding for program integrity activities in Federal Crop Insurance program;

An amendment by Mr. CHABOT regarding a funding limitation on the MAP program;

An amendment by Mr. LUCAS regarding funding for conservation technical assistance programs;

An amendment by Mr. GUTKNECHT regarding funding limitation on section 720 of this bill;

An amendment by Mr. BACA regarding funding limitation on operational changes to the Food Stamp program;

An amendment by Mr. GERLACH regarding funding limitation on section 728 of the bill;

An amendment by Mr. REICHERT regarding funding limitation on certain milk producer handlers;

An amendment by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey regarding Federal employee attendance at overseas conferences;

An amendment by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey on food stamp program in contravention of the INA;

An amendment by Mr. ENGEL regarding funding limitation on alternative fuel vehicles;

An amendment by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas regarding claims processing on Pigford v. Glickman case;

An amendment by Mr. KING of Iowa regarding the Livestock Identification and Marketing Act;

An amendment by Mr. BOREN regarding funding limitation on the transfer of activities from Oklahoma;

An amendment by Mr. GORDON regarding energy standards for Federal buildings;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE regarding funding limitation on dairy education in Iowa;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE regarding funding limitation on fruit and vegetable market analysis in Arizona and Missouri;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE regarding funding for Food Marketing Policy Center in Connecticut;